Mesopotamian iconography of demons and the “night terrors” of Hebrew poetry

Abstract

The article analyzes the relationship between Mesopotamian iconography of demons — with particular attention to Lamashtu and Pazuzu — and the motif of “night terror” in Hebrew poetry, represented by Ps 91. Based on iconographic and archaeological material as well as a lexico-literary analysis, I show that the shared cultural milieu of the ancient Near East produced similar patterns of imagining nocturnal threats, disease and dangers for women and children. Nevertheless, there is no direct evidence for the transfer of specific demonic figures — such as Pazuzu or Lamashtu — into the Hebrew Bible. Psalm 91 employs a poetic personification of an invisible assailant while retaining a theological perspective of trust in the one God, rather than a mechanism of magical protection.

Keywords

Lamashtu, Pazuzu, Ps 91, paḥad lājlāh, Mesopotamian iconography, apotropeia, Near Eastern culture

---

1. Introduction: problem and method

Interest in the relationship between Mesopotamian imagery and Hebrew poetics arises from a simple fact: in the space of the northern Levant and Mesopotamia there existed a long period of cultural contacts, trade and movement of material goods, by which certain iconographic and ritual motifs could circulate beyond their place of origin. This study therefore does not consist in an automatic demonstration of “borrowings’’ in the sense of the transfer of a name or a character, but in the distinction of two levels: (a) a shared symbolic environment in which night, disease, wind and maternal dangers were associated with the activity of invisible assailants; (b) direct, identifiable iconographic or terminological borrowing. Methodologically, combining iconography (amulets, plaques) with analysis of the Hebrew text requires caution: images and texts operate by different means of expression and fulfill different socio-ritual functions. The following chapters locate points of contact between these spheres, while avoiding the reduction of one tradition to the other[12].

2. Lamashtu — iconography of a nocturnal assailant

In Mesopotamian iconography Lamashtu functions as a female demonic being associated with threats of the perinatal period and early childhood. Cuneiform texts and amulets depict her as a hybrid — with animal and human elements — which in Mesopotamian symbolism signals a transgression of the created order and manifests a biological as well as socio-ritual threat. The image of Lamashtu focuses on locating victims: pregnant women, women in labor, infants, feverish persons and defenseless sleepers. In the tradition she was credited with causation in miscarriages, loss of milk, fevers, nightmares and infant death[3].

Iconographic attributes of Lamashtu — documented by numerous protective plaques and clay amulets — include features such as a lion's or dog's snout, donkey ears and teeth, bird talons, a hairy or animal body, holding snakes, or scenes of standing or kneeling on a donkey. Equally notable is a series of depictions in which Lamashtu "departs'' by boat to the underworld or nurses animals in an inverted maternal act — an image of motherhood transformed into a murderous force. This hybridity served a semantic function: it materialized chaos and the lethal nature of the threat[4].

Plaques bearing the image of Lamashtu had a therapeutic-apotropaic character; they functioned as means to counteract her harmful action. Ritual practice also made use of contra-images and inscriptions intended to neutralize or expel the demon from the sick person's house or from a woman in labor[5].

3. Pazuzu — a dangerous demon used against another demon

Pazuzu represents another type of Mesopotamian being: a threatening, apotropaic figure associated with destructive winds, epidemics and droughts. Iconographically Pazuzu combined bestial features — a doglike or lion-dog face, bulging eyes, horns, wings, a scaly body and clawed limbs — with characteristic details such as a serpentine element at the genitals. His image was striking, often terrifying, but in practice served as an instrument of protection. In apotropaic thinking we find here the classic logic: a threatening power could be ritually directed against an even more threatening power, setting a "demon against a demon'' as a countermeasure[6].

The use of Pazuzu as a protective device is documented by finds of amulets bearing his head or figure, which were placed at the bedsides of women and children. This practice has a clear Mesopotamian context, but material evidence from the Levant is also significant: iconographic objects and amulets associated with Mesopotamian protective figures have been found in archaeological layers of the southern Levant, including at the site of Beth Shean. The presence of such artifacts attests to the material presence of Mesopotamian iconographic motifs on the

southern shore of the Levant, without however providing necessary proof of literary appropriation of specific names or demonological concepts into the Hebrew Bible[78].

The apotropaic schema, of which Pazuzu was one expression, shows that the region entertained a subtle distinction between the “evil” figure as object of attack and the “evil” figure as an instrument of protection. This distinction is sometimes misleadingly rendered in popular reconstructions; in reality no simple dualism of “good–evil” prevailed here[9].

4. “Night terror” in Ps 91: language, imagery and theology

Psalm 91, verses 5–6, composes a dense catalogue of dangers: “You shall not fear the terror of the night, nor the arrow that flies by day, nor the pestilence that walks in darkness, nor the destruction that wastes at noon.” Central to this analysis is the Hebrew expression פַּחַד לָיְלָה (paḥad lājlāh), usually translated as “night terror’’ or “terror of the night’’. The word paḥad in itself is not a demonic name; its semantics cover subjective fear, a sudden danger, an object that elicits dread, and also, in narrative and poetic contexts, an invisible assailant moving by night. The lexical treatment is confirmed by classical Hebrew lexica (BDB, HALOT) and by modern commentaries on the Psalms[1011].

The next image — “the pestilence that walks in darkness” (דֶּבֶר — deber) — appears as a personification of threat. Deber occurs in the Bible as the power of pestilence or plague, moving as if a living being. In psalmic poetics such personification serves to anthropomorphize and poeticize misfortune: the threat is not described as an impersonal phenomenon but as a being that “walks’’ and menaces. This manner of representation is compatible with the logic of Mesopotamian iconography, where misfortune takes on the features of an assailant. However, in the Hebrew Bible — and in Ps 91 in particular — poetic personification does not imply a mythological biography or an elaborate demonology; the function of the text is to call for trust in YHWH, who cares for and protects[12].

It is important to emphasize the theological aspect: Psalm 91 does not formulate an apotropaic ritual nor a protective recipe based on the magical “invocation’’ of a figure. The poet issues a declaration of covenantal trust. Interpretive literature highlights two planes: the imagistic repertoire of dangers and the theological trust in God as the sole source of safety. The difference between the amuletic practice (directing the power of one being against another) and the psalmic theological proclamation is fundamental here and should be clearly separated in comparative analysis[1314].

5. From the image of a demon to poetic personification — comparison and interpretive implications

The difference between Mesopotamian iconography and Israelite poetics lies not so much in the content of fear — night, disease, loss of children — as in the mode of its representation and its socio-ritual function. In brief order:

- Shared cultural motifs: both in Mesopotamia and in circles of ancient Hebrew culture night was associated with physical threats (assault, wild animals), medical threats (fever, pestilence) and psychological threats (nightmares, sleep paralysis). The motif of threat to pregnant women and infants is particularly strong and widely documented in iconographic and textual sources[15].
- Different functions of representations: in Mesopotamia representations of Lamashtu and Pazuzu have practical application in apotropaic rites and healing rituals; among the Israelites the psalms use personification as a literary and theological means of confession — protection comes from God, not from the amulet itself[16].
- Material contacts ≠ textual borrowing: the presence of Mesopotamian amulets and iconography in the southern Levant demonstrates material links and the flow of symbols. It does not, however, automatically prove that the psalmists directly drew the name or cult of Lamashtu or Pazuzu. The presence of an imagistic pattern within the cultural space could only have produced a shared repertoire of figures and metaphors, which Hebrew poets reorganized within a different religious discourse[17].

From an interpretive point of view, one must stress hermeneutical caution: analogies between Mesopotamian images and biblical phraseology are important for understanding the emotional and symbolic context of the ancient world, but they should not lead to simplified conclusions about the direct transference of particular demons into the Hebrew Bible. Finally, from a theological perspective, Ps 91 remains a text in which central place is given to trust in the one God-Caretaker. Even if the poet employs the personification of “night terror” and “pestilence,” he does so to highlight the superiority of divine care over the forces of evil, not to codify a magical repertoire of protection comparable to Mesopotamian amulets[18].

6. Night visions and their language in biblical literature

The description of nocturnal experiences in the Book of Job constitutes one of the most suggestive portrayals of an excess of fear, which earlier in Mesopotamian cultures may have been hermeneutically compacted into the figure of a particular demon. Eliphaz’s vision (Job 4:13–16) and Job’s lament about the nights (Job 7:14) build an image of threat that appears in

the hours of sleep: sleep or a hypnagogic state, a feeling of paralysis and terror, the presence of an invisible being, and a voice coming from the darkness. Such a repertoire of experiences overlaps with Mesopotamian sources, in which nocturnal assaults were described both in ritual terminology and in demonic terms. This, however, does not warrant an automatic identification of a given biblical text with a specific Mesopotamian figure. The methodological difference is crucial here: the Bible adopts elements of a shared field of imagination — night as a time of particular danger, the body as a locus of attack — but not necessarily specific images or names, unless there is historical evidence of direct borrowing.1

Attention should be paid to the language of demonic actions in the Hebrew texts. The threat is more often described by action than by a static description of appearance: “walks,” “flies,” “ravages,” “shoots like an arrow.” Such dynamism portrays fear as an active evil in the world, not merely as a thing to be recognized and affixed to an emblem. At the same time certain beings, as in the case of Lilith in Isa 34:14, receive a name that signals a broader cultural context; that name, however, does not carry a complete iconographic description or a cultic program, but a symbolic function in the prophetic text.2

7. Psalm 91 — an apotropaic text or a theological declaration of trust?

Psalm 91 appears from this perspective as a key example of the transformation of the ancient language of protection. Structurally and functionally the psalm serves as a prayer for deliverance from “the terrors of the night” and from other dangers. Yet its logic is theologically shifted: protection is not presented as the effect of a neutral amulet’s power or as the result of a conflict between two demons, but as the consequence of covenantal rule of the one God. The text contains images very close to apotropaic language: “the shadow of the Almighty” and “under his wings” — images that in iconographic traditions may have had counterparts in protective figurines. Psalm 91, however, does not provide a pattern of magical operation: the promise of protection is tied to a relationship with God, to trust and calling upon Him, not to a repeatable ritual that traps demonic power as a form of magical technique.3

The historical reception of the psalm confirms its later use in the apotropaic sphere. In Jewish tradition and in early Christianity Ps 91 functioned as a prayerful and exorcistic text, used in protective practices. This interpretation is, however, secondary to the original theological sense, in which the sovereignty of YHWH over all is emphasized. Translations and exegetical commentaries indicate that the psalmic text more likely affirms a relationship than a magical formula; the later apotropaic use should be understood as a reception of the function of the text, not as proof that the psalm’s author constructed an explicit protective formula analogous to Mesopotamian amulets.4

8. Limits and principles for comparisons between Mesopotamia and the Bible

Studying the relations between Mesopotamian demon iconography and images of the “terrors of the night” in Hebrew poetry requires clear methodological boundaries. I propose three principles of caution:

- Distinguish a common cultural milieu from direct borrowing. Detecting analogies — e.g., night as a time of danger — documents shared ways of feeling and symbolizing the world, but not necessarily the historical transfer of specific images.5
- Avoid identifying Mesopotamian figures with biblical ones without solid textual or archaeological evidence. Pazuzu or Lamashtu remain important for understanding the mental landscape of the Ancient Near East, but their direct attribution to biblical figures is methodologically unwarranted unless sources support it.6
- Distinguish the function of iconography from the function of the text. Mesopotamian figurines and images of demons had a material, apotropaic dimension. The Bible transforms this function — sometimes adopting it (prayer as protection) — but does so in theological terms, where deliverance results from God’s rule rather than from the autonomous efficacy of a symbol. This moment of transformation is key to understanding the difference between the traditions.7

9. Theological perspective: God, protection and magic

Biblical theology here makes two connected moves. First, it maintains an acknowledgment of the reality of evil as a force acting in the world — disease, nocturnal assaults, death — and a sensitivity to the fact that people experience real vulnerability. Second, it redefines the basis of protection. Where Mesopotamian practice could rely on the “technical” deflection of a threatening force (one demon repelling another, a figurine binding fate), biblical poetry locates deliverance in a personal and sovereign relationship to YHWH. Psalm 91 displays trust in the one God, not the mechanism of magical protection. This shift does not belittle protective practices in the lives of the faithful, but changes their meaning: prayer is not so much a “formula” as a covenantal profession and an exposure of God’s power over all forces.8

From a theological perspective an ethical and pastoral distinction is also important. Texts such as Ps 91 bring consolation and affirmation of God’s care, but they do not remove human responsibility for caring for loved ones, for medical practices, or for prudence in the face of real dangers. Accepting that the wealth of biblical imagery appealing to protection surpasses simple magic allows one to preserve its spiritual sense without reducing it to superstition.9

10. A responsible conclusion

The analysis points to the existence of a common symbolic field in the environment of the ancient Near East: night as a time of danger, disease as an assailant moving in the world, woman and child as categories of particular vulnerability, object and word as tools of protection. Mesopotamian demon iconography illustrated these fears in hybrid and material forms. Hebrew poetry, however, adopts part of this language while making an essential theological transformation: image is replaced by word, and the demonic sentinel — by trust in the one God.

From a research perspective this means that comparisons between cultures should focus on the function and language of symbols, not on searching for direct “copies” of figures. From a religious perspective, the reader of the psalms receives a non-technical message: the protection expressed in Psalm 91 is a summons to trust and to experience God’s sovereignty, not a magical instruction. Recognizing this difference makes it possible to reconcile historical-cultural study of texts with their theological content and pastoral use.

Nightly threat, prayer and the limits of analogy

Addressing the motif of the “terror of the night” in Hebrew poetry in relation to Mesopotamian phenomena and figures — such as Pazuzu or Lamashtu — requires distinguishing three levels of analysis: the typological similarity of motifs, the theological transformation of fear into formulas of trust, and hermeneutical caution regarding literal readings of poetic images. Each carries different methodological demands and different interpretive consequences; separating them helps avoid exaggerated conclusions about direct borrowings, while allowing one to see the real ways in which biblical texts respond to universal human fears.

1. Why similarity of motif does not prove borrowing

Asserting that similar images appear in the literature of different cultural spheres — night as a time of danger, threats from invisible forces, protective practices — is easy and often accurate. But similarity of motif alone does not suffice as evidence of historical borrowing. First, there is simply a community of experience: night is a universal biological and social condition conducive to fear (darkness, limited visibility, greater fragility of social control), so independent societies very easily arrive at similar metaphors and apotropaic practices. Second, the functional character of motifs means they serve similar roles in different traditions — protection against disease, safeguarding children, explaining unexpected events — which favors convergence of themes without the necessity of direct transmission.

Moreover, recognizing borrowings requires philological and contextual criteria: identifiable lexical, syntactic, or serial parallels, a chronologically possible route of transfer, and evidence of communicative cultural contact (e.g., intermediary texts, translations, reception testimonies). The

absence of such premises — especially when motifs are general and functional — should urge caution. One should also not overvalue superficial analogies: a similarly phrased description of the “terror of the night” may have completely different theological and ritual implications in two traditions. Thus the comparative method is useful only when accompanied by evidentiary rigor and sensitivity to different levels of meaning.

1. How Psalm 91 transforms apotropaic fears into a confession of trust in God

Psalm 91 is sometimes interpreted as a text with an apotropaic function — bringing protection from disease and hostile nocturnal beings. Literary and theological reading, however, shows that the psalm does not mechanically reproduce magical formulas but reinterprets and sacralizes apotropaic fear: it is not a ritual, amulet, or self-sufficient spell that acts, but a relationship with God (סֵתֶר עֶלְיוֹן, מבצר ומִשְׂגָּב) as the source of security. In this sense Psalm 91 performs an axiological and etiological shift — it transforms human security strategies into a confession of faith in providence and a promise of divine intervention.

Several features of the text illustrate this transformation. First, the language: the text employs theological terminology (refuge, shield, the name of God), not technical magical formulas. Second, syntax and argumentation: the psalm ties descriptions of potential dangers (“the threat of night,” “pestilence that stalks by day”) to a covenantal declaration — God is the active subject of protection who “will not let you be harmed.” Third, narrative elements: the text includes a promise to command angels — yet the fullness of security is described as personal dwelling in “the habitation of the Most High,” which gives protection a religious and existential character that surpasses apotropaic procedures.

As a result Psalm 91 functions in two dimensions simultaneously: as prayer and confession for believers with practical application (use in daily prayers, liturgy, Jewish and Christian practices), and as a theological reinterpretation of human fears. Replacing the causal logic of magic (effect = performed spell) with the logic of faith (effect = God’s promise) illustrates how a religious text can absorb apotropaic motifs and give them new meaning without reproducing local magical practices.

1. Why one must not read poetic images as direct diagnoses of the supernatural

Poetry, and especially religious poetry, operates with multivalent language: metaphor, hyperbole, symbolism and ritual conventions. A fundamental hermeneutical principle is therefore the distinction between literary description and an ontological assertion about the supernatural reality. Poetic images serve religious communication — they evoke emotion, build communal identity, shape ethics and trust — but do not necessarily depict a system of beliefs about a detailed demonology.

Literal readings of metaphors lead to several errors: first, anachronism — attributing to the author or community a precise ontology that cannot be substantiated from the text; second,

reductionism — diminishing the literary function of the text to a catalog of technical beliefs; third, insensitivity to the performative context — reciting a psalm in prayer has different effects and meanings than compiling “religious data” or documenting magical practices ethnographically.

Methodologically one should therefore combine literary analysis (form, imagery, rhetorical figures), form-functional analysis (genre, liturgical context) and socio-historical analysis (religious context and communal practices), instead of immediately moving to an ontological conclusion about the “existence” of the described beings in a strict sense. Where sources show practical use of a text as an amulet, one must distinguish the performative use from the theological content of the text. Likewise, the presence of terms such as “angels,” “demons” or “powers” in poetry does not mean the author intentionally produced a classification of supernatural beings — more often they are linguistic devices to express the human–God relationship and the dynamics of protection.

In conclusion: analogies between Mesopotamian literature and Hebrew poetry are a valuable source of questions and research inspiration, but their interpretation should be balanced and assigned to appropriate levels of explanation. Psalm 91 shows how a religious text can employ familiar apotropaic motifs yet transform them theologically so that they function as a confession of trust in God. Ultimately, reading poetry requires sensitivity to the metaphorical and performative character of religious language, so as not to confuse poetic images with a literal diagnosis of the supernatural world.

Reception, religious imagination and prudence of interpretation

In the ancient Near Eastern imagination, motifs connected with nocturnal dangers assumed personal and symbolic forms. Figures such as Pazuzu and Lamashtu, known to us from Mesopotamian texts and artifacts, display one of the ways people understood dangers: not only as random events but as forces attributed with will, personality and intent. Parallel images appear in Hebrew literature, where the motif of nocturnal fear, threatening beings and a poetic world saturated with inner dread becomes a means of expressing human frailty and the need for God’s protection. This long symbolic sequence was then reinterpreted in various Jewish and Christian contexts, acquiring new shades in homiletics, popular piety and art.

The persistence of these motifs in Jewish and Christian imagination does not, however, imply a simple continuity of transmission or an unreflective adoption of beliefs. Rather we encounter a tension between cultural memory and theological interpretation. In Jewish tradition images of nocturnal threats functioned both in protective practices and in prayers professing trust in Yahweh as the only true guardian. In Christianity the motif was absorbed into a theological narrative of the struggle between good and evil, in which ultimate security remains in God’s hands, not in magical techniques or in fear of immanent powers. For Catholic pastoral

imagination it is important to emphasize that God's care through the sacraments, liturgy and prayer does not eliminate the experience of threat, but gives it meaning and points the way of hope.

The role of the scholar of religious history thus differs fundamentally from the role of the believer and the pastor. Comparative study — analyzing Mesopotamian figures such as Pazuzu and Lamashtu alongside Hebrew images of nocturnal threats — enables an understanding of the symbolic and social mechanisms that shaped the ancient imagination. Such study contributes to knowledge of the contexts in which biblical and non-biblical texts arose, and to critical reflection on the functions that demonic or protective images played in everyday life. Nevertheless, scientific knowledge does not replace religious practice: the historian describes, classifies and interprets; he should not displace from pastoral practice the hope and trust that are essential to Christian life.

This difference should shape an interpretive stance: there is a need for prudence and humility in drawing conclusions. Sensational readings of ancient symbols — reducing them to sensationalism, to literal sense, or using them as evidence for sensational theories — distort both scholarship and faith practice. In the Catholic context the question is not "how far can one frighten" the audience, but "how to help the faithful discern," how to distinguish elements of religious culture that lead to genuine entrustment to God from those that foster superstition or fear that paralyzes spiritual life. Critical historical awareness should therefore harmonize with pastoral wisdom, which can use research results to deepen faith rather than weaken it.

Ultimately the religious imagination that in many cultures produced figures of nocturnal threat can be transformed into a confession of trust: recognizing ancient fears and their symbolic functions helps today to orient theological and pastoral discourse toward what is foundational — toward God's presence in the darkness of human experience. Prudence in interpretation and humble trust in God together form the path on which the study of the past and the practice of faith enliven one another rather than compete.

Notes

1 Cf. descriptions of nocturnal visions in Job 4:13–16 and Job 7:14; a general survey of nocturnal motifs in Mesopotamian literature see J. Black, A. Green, Gods, Demons and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia, British Museum Press 1992; also The Context of Scripture, ed. W. W. Hallo, Brill — a collection of Mesopotamian texts useful for comparisons.

2 On Lilith and her relation to Mesopotamian terms lilû, lilītu, ardat-lilî see the entry "Lilith" in Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible, ed. K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, P. van der Horst, Brill 1999.

3 Literary and theological analysis of Ps 91 see R. Alter, The Book of Psalms: A Translation with Commentary, W. W. Norton 2007; general treatment of the psalms as a protective and prayerful

genre cf. H. Gunkel, The Psalms: A Form-Critical Introduction, Fortress Press 1967.

4 The apotropaic reception of Ps 91 in later traditions is discussed in works on the history of religion and the reception of the psalms; cf. M. Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel, Clarendon Press 1985.

5 For the methodological distinction between a shared field of symbols and borrowing cf. M. S. Smith, The Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel, Eerdmans 2002.

6 On Pazuzu, Lamashtu and the mechanics of Mesopotamian apotropeia see J. Black, A. Green, Gods, Demons and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia; thematic entries in DDD, Brill 1999.

7 Cf. reflections on the function of image and word in the Bible and on the transformation of protective practices in religious literature in M. S. Smith, The Early History of God; see also DDD entries concerning defensive rites and amulets.

8 On the theological distinction between prayer and magical practices and on the significance of trust in the psalms see R. Alter, The Book of Psalms; M. Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel.

9 On the dialogue between historical analysis and the pastoral dimension of biblical texts see editions of biblical commentaries and works in practical theology; generally: M. Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel.

Bibliography

- Black, Jeremy; Green, Anthony. Gods, Demons and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia. British Museum Press, 1992.
- Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible. Edited by Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, Pieter W. van der Horst. Brill, 1999.
- Fishbane, Michael. Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel. Clarendon Press, 1985.
- Gunkel, Hermann. The Psalms: A Form-Critical Introduction. Fortress Press, 1967.
- Hallo, William W., ed. The Context of Scripture. Brill.
- Smith, Mark S. The Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel. Eerdmans, 2002.
- Alter, Robert. The Book of Psalms: A Translation with Commentary. W. W. Norton, 2007.

(Note: the cited biblical texts and their interpretations refer to standard editions and commentaries; for linguistic readings the principles of the Hebrew edition and literary criticism applied in Old Testament studies were used.)

---

1. Black, Jeremy, and Anthony Green, Gods, Demons and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia: An Illustrated Dictionary.
2. Bottero, Jean, Religion in Ancient Mesopotamia.
3. Wiggermann, Frans A. M., entries on “Lamashtu” in Reallexikon der Assyriologie.
4. Black & Green, Gods, Demons and Symbols.
5. Bottero, Religion in Ancient Mesopotamia.
6. Black & Green, Gods, Demons and Symbols.
7. British Museum, online collection: objects related to Pazuzu (accessed 22 August 2026).
8. Stager, Lawrence E., works concerning excavations at Beth Shean and the Levantine cultural context.
9. Wiggermann, Frans A. M., entries on “Pazuzu” in Reallexikon der Assyriologie.
10. Brown, Driver, Briggs (BDB).
11. Koehler & Baumgartner (HALOT).
12. Goldingay, John, Psalms: Volume 3 (Psalms 90–150).
13. Alter, Robert, The Book of Psalms: A Translation with Commentary.
14. Brueggemann, Walter, The Message of the Psalms.
15. Black & Green; Bottero.
16. Wiggermann; British Museum (online collection).
17. Stager; archaeological research in the Levant.
18. Goldingay; Alter.