Models for Prayer in Lamentations and Psalms John Goldingay

What might emerge in a conversation between the authors of Lamentations and the authors of the lament psalms—or protest psalms, as I prefer to call them? I here take up one theme from each chapter of Lamentations and set one or two psalms alongside each chapter.[[1]](#footnote-1) I treat both Lamentations and Psalms as texts provided for people to pray. I don’t know how far they reflect personal experience or feelings on the part of their authors, but I assume that they found a place in their respective collections because they were thought useful for other people to pray.

1. **Prayer and Guilt**

Lamentations 1 grieves over the deserted state of Jerusalem and affirms that it came about

Because Yahweh made her suffer

on account of the great number of her rebellions. (Lam 1:5)

Jerusalem did wrong and did wrong;

therefore she became taboo. (Lam 1:8)

The yoke of my rebellions was bound on,

they interweave by his hand. (Lam 1:14)

In describing people’s grief, abandonment, sense of betrayal, anguish, humiliation, suffering, desolation, wretchedness, pain, exhaustion, bondage, and helplessness, the protest psalms use similar language to that of Lamentations. What they generally lack is a parallel sense that the suppliants have to accept any responsibility for what has happened to them. Cassiodorus identified a group of seven “Penitential Psalms” (6, 32, 38, 51, 102, 130, 143),[[2]](#footnote-2) but only Psalms 51 and 130 really qualify for that description, though there are other psalms that make acknowledgment of sin as a proper aspect of prayer, but do not focus on sin.

There is greater such focus in Old Testament prayers outside the Psalter than inside, though the focus is more marked in Ezra 9; Nehemiah 9; Daniel 9 than in Lamentations.[[3]](#footnote-3) Perhaps Lamentations simply shares the Old Testament’s regular assumption that the fall of Jerusalem was an act of judgment on Judah’s waywardness. The Prophets actually put more emphasis on sin and judgment, though in contrast Daniel 1 simply sees the fall of Jerusalem as issuing from Yahweh’s sovereignty; it is an interesting exception to the rule in light of the stress on Israel’s waywardness in Daniel 9.

Within the Psalter, Psalm 44 is an example of a protest psalm that accepts no responsibility and feels no guilt, while presupposing a similar context of conquest to Lamentations 1. It notes how God had blessed his people in the past, affirms present trust in him, describes how God has more recently let them be defeated, and in due course urges God to help and redeem. But before doing so, it declares,

All this has come upon us and we haven’t put you out of mind;

 we haven’t been false to your pact.

Our mind has not turned backward;

 our steps have not deviated from your path….

If we’d put our God’s name out of mind,

 and spread our palms to a foreign god,

God would search this out, wouldn’t he,

 because he knows the mind’s secrets.

Rather, it’s because of you that we’ve been run through all day;

 we’ve been thought of as sheep for slaughter. (Ps 44:18-23 [17-22])

Western spirituality traditionally emphasized the guilt of which Psalms 51, Psalm 130, and Lamentations speak, and felt embarrassed or superior in relation to Psalm 44’s claims. Over the past half century it has put more emphasis on lament or protest as a feature of relationships with God, without abandoning the inner sense of individual guilt. It’s not clear why this development happened. It’s not because people who enthuse about the protest psalms are going through persecution or other forms of attack; perhaps it’s because we are coming to own the despair from which we had hidden.[[4]](#footnote-4)

If protest psalms derive more from the monarchic period and penitential prayers from the decades after the fall of Jerusalem and from the Second Temple period, possibly Old Testament spirituality underwent a converse development. Yet the Old Testament does not give the impression that Israel was more committed to Yahweh in the monarchic period; rather the opposite. Just before or soon after the fall of Jerusalem, Jeremiah 31:31-34 promised that the Torah would come to be inscribed into people’s thinking, and in the Second Temple period people were more inclined to acknowledge Yahweh alone, to foreswear the use of divine images, to take care over their use of Yahweh’s name, and to keep the Sabbath.

There doesn’t seem to be evidence that Western Christians are more committed to God or are suffering more than in previous centuries, so it is a mystery why there should be such a difference between Western spirituality in these two periods, and such a difference between the spirituality of the protest psalms and that of Lamentations. The conversation between them has the potential to encourage protesters to ask whether they need to be more penitential and to encourage penitents to ask if they are being too hard on themselves. Lamentations confronts the protest psalms with the need for penitence; the protest psalms urge Lamentations not to subject people to “worm theology.”[[5]](#footnote-5)

Whereas one reason why Lamentations has become a focus of study is that it points towards a way of thinking and of talking to God about the Holocaust, it is a complicated gift in this connection because of its linking suffering and sin. And whereas scholarship once tended to emphasize the link between sin and suffering in Lamentations, scholarship now tends to emphasize its secondary place.[[6]](#footnote-6) We should neither dismiss or ignore the confession in Lamentations, nor claim that it explains everything.[[7]](#footnote-7) Lamentations is “a polyphony of pain, penitence, and protest.”[[8]](#footnote-8) If tragedy suggests someone is “caught up in events involving suffering, events not completely of his or her own making, and yet at the same time he or she bears some responsibility for these events,” so that “there is guilt,” then Lamentations reflects a tragic situation, even if it also reflects the conviction that the suffering is out of proportion to the wrongdoing.[[9]](#footnote-9)

1. **Prayer and Divine Anger**

Lamentations 2 is especially insistent on Yahweh’s anger (*’ap*), fury (*‘ebrāh*),blazing (*ḥŏrî*), and wrath (*ḥēmāh*), though it mostly speaks of it in the third person rather than directly confronting Yahweh with it.

Oh!—with his anger the Lord clouds over

 Miss Zion….

In his fury he tore down

 Miss Judah’s fortifications….

He cut off every horn of Israel

 in his angry blazing….

He burned up against Jacob like a flaming fire

 consuming all round….

In Miss Zion’s tent

 he poured out his wrath like fire….

In his angry condemnation he spurned

 king and priest. (Lam 2:1-6)

My girls and my young men

 fell by the sword.

You killed them on your day of anger,

 you slaughtered them, you didn’t spare. (Lam 2:21)

The first line expresses the main idea of the chapter in a nutshell:[[10]](#footnote-10) notwithstanding the former close relationship between Yahweh and “daughter Zion,” his grace has turned to anger.

Psalm 6 also begins with a plea regarding Yahweh’s anger:

Yahweh, don’t reprove me in your anger,

 don’t discipline me with your wrath. (Ps 6:2 [1])

But the psalm lacks any indication that the suppliant might have earned Yahweh’s anger. There is an overlap with the comparison between Lamentations 1 and Psalm 44, though there’s no reference to guilt in Lamentations 2. Indeed, Lamentations 2:20-22 has been seen as a “protest against divine injustice” and as an expression of “resistance to divine injustice and suffering, especially the suffering of the city’s little children”[[11]](#footnote-11) (which is worse—rape, or watching your children suffer and die?).[[12]](#footnote-12) But there’s no actual reference to injustice or justice in the verses, only a protest at concrete acts—partly because Hebrew has no words equivalent to the English words justice and injustice.

Psalm 6 is one of Cassiodorus’s penitential psalms; he presupposes that reference to God’s wrath implies that this wrath would be a response to people’s waywardness. Yet there are other psalms referring to Yahweh’s anger or wrath whose context points away from this implication (Pss 27:9; 74:1; 88:8 [7]). So there is no reason to infer that Psalm 6 refers to anger or wrath that was earned.

Behind the language of wrath in Psalm 6 and in Lamentations may lie the consideration that wrath can denote the wounding nature of our experience of pain, suffering, torment, and affliction, rather than a concern with the attitude of the person who does the wounding. It’s *as if* someone is behaving in wrath towards us; it may not imply the person actually has angry feelings. The psalm and the poem may then refer to Yahweh’s bringing or allowing suffering of such fury that it seems like the expression of someone’s anger. On the other hand, an upside to its being personal anger would be—well, that it’s personal. Yahweh is not a detached sovereign or a dispassionate judge. Still less is Yahweh a principle or a theory. He is a person of like passions as we are (love, mercy, anger, hate), “yet without sin” (Heb 4:15).

While some psalms speak of anger without linking it to waywardness, others do see Yahweh’s anger, wrath, and fury as a response to wrongdoing. The close of Psalm 89 and the subsequent declarations of Psalm 90 make for particularly apposite comparison with Lamentations.

How long, Yahweh – will you hide permanently,

 will your wrath burn up like fire? (Ps 89:47 [46])

We are finished through your anger,

 through your wrath we’ve been fearful.

You’ve set our wayward acts in front of you,

 our youthful deeds in the light of your face….

The days of our years in themselves are seventy years,

 or with strength eighty years.

 But their drive has been oppression and trouble,

 because it’s passed by speedily and we’ve flown away. (Ps 90:7-10)

In the Old Testament, seventy years is not a term for a lifespan but the classic period of Israel’s affliction as a people. The burden of Psalm 90 corresponds quite closely to that of Lamentations—specifically, to that of Lamentations 5 with its protest at the way oppression is dragging on. The notion that Yahweh is longsuffering, “long of anger” (Ps 86:15) seems ironic in this context.

The protest psalms take up the theme of Yahweh’s anger in another quite different connection. As well as appealing against it they appeal to it (e.g., Pss 7:7 [6]; 56:8 [7]; 59:14 [13]; 69:25 [24]; 79:6). Yahweh ought to be angry with the wrongdoing of the attackers who oppress the people who are praying these psalms, and he ought to express his anger by removing them from a position of power.

Lamentations says to the Psalms, then, be bold to articulate for yourself the reality of Yahweh’s anger and be bold in reflecting it back to Yahweh. The Psalms say to Lamentations, recognize the positive significance of Yahweh’s capacity for anger. Ask Yahweh to turn it onto your attackers.

# Prayer, Protest and Trust

 “God is… a source of hope and pain” throughout Lamentations,[[13]](#footnote-13) but especially in chapter 3. The “man” in this chapter both expresses penitence and submission, and issues protests and accusations.[[14]](#footnote-14) In holding onto such admixtures “the book does not construct a theology of its own.”[[15]](#footnote-15) It is “a dialogic text.”[[16]](#footnote-16)

Lamentations 3 first gives twenty lines to describing how the suppliant has been under attack from Yahweh; the entire protest concerns what “he” has done, though Yahweh is never named, nor is he addressed. He is portrayed as an attacker, a jailor, a bear, a lion, a shooter, a poisoner. Then there follows a startling move to an affirmation that Yahweh’s commitment, compassion, and truthfulness are still realities. These declarations continue to be third-person but they now name Yahweh, four times. As the poem reaches the center point of this central chapter in the book, it makes one of the Old Testament’s most significant theological assertions:

It is not from his heart that he humbles

 and brings suffering to human beings. (Lam 3:33)

The poem has asserted at some length that Yahweh does humble and bring suffering, but it now avows that such action does not come from his heart (*lēb*), from his inner being. English translations mostly have Yahweh acting in this way “not willingly”; some translations have a phrase indicating that he doesn’t enjoy it. The implication is that when Yahweh acts to bless, it does come from his heart. It’s deliberate, it comes naturally, he likes doing it. When he acts to afflict, it comes from somewhere else within his person. It doesn’t come as naturally to him, he doesn’t enjoy it. “Yahweh is not a God of affliction; it is not in his nature to grieve human beings…. Afflicting is not of the essence of Yahweh.”[[17]](#footnote-17)

Yet the poem then complements that statement with

Who is it who said and it happened,

 when the Lord didn’t order?

From the mouth of the One on High

 do not the bad things and the good things issue? (Lam 3:37-38)

And there is good reason:

Of what should a living person complain,

 a man in connection with his wrongdoings? (Lam 3:39)

Therefore we need to examine our ways and turn back to Yahweh (Lam 3:40).

The poem now becomes a prayer (or lays out a prayer for people to pray), reverts to describing Yahweh’s destructive action, then speaks of how Yahweh has listened and responded in the past (unless vv. 55-62 are precative), and urges Yahweh to acts against the suppliant’s attackers.

Psalm 22 has in common with Lamentations 3 that it interweaves protest and trust. It compares and contrasts with Lamentations 3 in various ways.

* The two compositions are resolute in the way they insist on facing two sets of facts—both the fact of Yahweh’s abandonment and hostility and the fact of Yahweh’s compassion and commitment. In both, “God’s people can be ‘forsaken’ but never Forsaken…. God is ‘absent’ *in the sense that* he is not acting to bless his people and protect them from their enemies.”[[18]](#footnote-18)
* In facing the two sets of facts, both compositions combine vehement protest and meek submission. Neither protest alone nor submission alone is adequate.
* Both compositions testify to some resolution, though its reality is clearer in the psalm. There resolution comes at the end, apparently because the suppliant knows Yahweh has responded to the protest and that he has made a commitment to deliver the suppliant from the attackers. In Lamentations the resolution may seem to come in the middle, but it is not sustained. Indeed, “in context… these orthodox affirmations become near accusations,” or at least motivations to Yahweh to act in accordance with them.[[19]](#footnote-19)
* Both compositions thus testify to ongoing struggle. In the psalm, protest and affirmation alternate. In Lamentations 3, the affirmations in vv. 22-24 are not the resolution of the issues the chapter raises; the poem returns in vv. 43-44 to protest at Yahweh’s anger, abandonment, slaughter, and hiding.
* Both compositions speak in the first-person singular. Lamentations’ first-person singular in some way represents the community; it wouldn’t be surprising if the same is true of the psalm. “The effective blurring of corporate/individual identity… enabled both perspectives of suffering to intermingle,” the individual and the larger corporate entity.[[20]](#footnote-20)
* The psalm addresses Yahweh throughout the protest part (vv. 2-22 [1-21) but moves to addressing the community for the thanksgiving/testimony part (vv. 23-32 [22-31]). In Lamentations 3 the movement is the reverse: it speaks about Yahweh for its first two-thirds, both in protests and in statements of faith, and it speaks to Yahweh for the last third.

It’s clear why the last part of Psalm 22 addresses the community; this configuration belongs to the nature of testimony. Thanksgiving that no one hears has little point. It’s less clear why Lamentations’ protest and statement of faith address the community. Is it to provide the community with something that expresses what is true for the community as a whole? Is it designed for Yahweh to overhear and be affected by, as prophets speak *about* Ephraim or Judah as well as *to* Ephraim and Judah, in a way that they are meant to overhear and be affected by? Or is it really the self-expression of a suppliant who needs to say how things are, for the sake of no one else?

Conversely, does Lamentations broaden the question about the psalm’s rhetoric? If the community was meant to hear the last third of the psalm, presumably it also heard the first third. Did it join in because the prayer and the statements of trust were ones it needed to utter? Or did it do so because it thereby made the prayer an intercession for the suppliant? Does the psalm’s presence in the Psalter imply that a suppliant would pray it in the company of family and friends, perhaps when offering a sacrifice? Does the suppliant pray publicly thus so as to be heard by other people as well as by God? These possibilities help to reframe the idea of intercession. In Western culture someone who is suffering may find comfort through being able to articulate their pain, especially with the help of someone else and in their company. Many people who suffer want to tell their story and want their story to be heard. They wish “to witness to pain rather than to find meaning in it”[[21]](#footnote-21)—or to pray about it. They want God to see; they want people to see (Lam 1:12). Lamentations articulates “a relentless search for comfort” which takes the form of “the cries across the poems for someone to ‘see’ the suffering of the people.”[[22]](#footnote-22)

It’s partly for this reason that rhetoric is important in Lamentations. Lamentations 1 begins by talking about Zion in its suffering and about Yahweh as the one who caused it, and in due course about the wrongdoing that made him do so. It then talks as Zion in its suffering and about Yahweh as the one who caused it, and in due course about the wrongdoing that made him do so. Eventually it talks as Zion suffering to Yahweh as the one who caused it, and talks about the wrongdoing that made him do so. Lamentations 2 speaks about what Yahweh has done, then speaks about what Zion has experienced, then articulates the grief of the poet. Eventually there is one line that addresses Yahweh and appeals to Yahweh to heed (Lam 2:20). Lamentations 3 is a testimony which for the first third speaks about Yahweh’s causing suffering. For nearly the next third the suppliant tells himself what he should still believe about Yahweh. For the last third it speaks to Yahweh about how he has caused suffering, acknowledges to him that he has listened, and appeals to him to put down the attackers. Lamentations 4 simply describes the city’s suffering which Yahweh has brought on. Lamentations 5 begins and ends as appeal to Yahweh; the appeal frames and is motivated by description of the city’s suffering.

1. **Prayer and Disappointment**

Genesis 12 lays out the original promises of God to Israel’s ancestors, which cover a country to possess, a people to become, and a blessing to embody. Samuel-Kings adds two further promises, of a city and a kingly line that God chose and made a commitment to. The Psalms put more emphasis on these two additional promises, and Psalm 132 issues a plea on the basis of them:

Yahweh swore to David in truthfulness,

 he will not turn back from it:

 “One from the fruit of your body

 I will put on your throne….

Yahweh chose Zion,

 which he wanted as a seat for himself.

For all time this is my place to settle down,

 where I will sit, because I wanted it….

There I will make David’s horn flourish;

 I am setting up a lamp for my anointed one.

Its enemies I will clothe in shame,

 but on him his crown will sparkle.” (Ps 132:11-18)

But protest psalms note the collapse of these two promises (see Pss. 74; 79; 80), and Lamentations 4 notes their failure:

The kings of the earth didn’t believe,

 or all the world’s inhabitants,

That adversary or enemy would come

 through Jerusalem’s gates.

The breath of our lungs, Yahweh’s anointed,

 was captured in their traps,

The one of whom we had said, “In his shade

 we will live among the nations.” (Lam 4:12, 20)

Lamentations 2:15, too, refers to the failure of the promise attached to Zion, and Psalm 48:3 [2]; 50:2 refer to the promise itself. The implication of Lamentations 4:20b is that we were mistaken to trust in the Davidic promise in the way we did. We had overestimated its significance. Maybe the implication is, we should never have treated the Davidic king as a shade who could protect us. In Jotham’s parable, it is the thorn-bush that speaks in terms of offering such shade (Judges 9:15). Yahweh is the only true shade (e.g., Ps 91:1; and contrast Isa 30:2-3).

Both Lamentations 4 and Psalms 74, 79, and 80 look to Yahweh’s acting against the people who trampled Zion and dethroned the one Yahweh put at his right hand:

Celebrate and rejoice, Miss Edom,

 you who live in the country of Uz.

To you, too, the chalice will pass;

 you’ll get drunk and you’ll strip naked. (Lam 4:21)

Both the psalms and Lamentations say little or nothing about Israel taking redress. They do look forward to Yahweh’s doing so for Israel (cf. Deut 32:35; Prov 20:22). It is in this sense that Lamentations is concerned about justice.[[23]](#footnote-23) But its giving more prominence to Israel’s guilt than the psalms do generates an unresolved tension between deserve and injustice. While this tension is also present in the Prophets, it is missing from Psalms 74, 79, and 80. They make virtually no reference to Israel’s deserving the trouble that has come to it. Paradoxically, however, Lamentations 4 includes no actual prayer at all. It doesn’t follow that it should not be read in isolation from chapter 5.[[24]](#footnote-24) Rather, its distinctiveness needs to be honored.

1. **Prayer and Hopelessness**

Lamentations has no Hollywood ending. Printed Hebrew Bibles repeat 5:21 after 5:22 to take the edge off the work’s dark closure. If Lamentations became a Hollywood script, the midpoint would have to become the end. But Lamentations 5 is the community’s real articulation of grief, “to which the earlier poems have been a preamble.” Here the community speaks for itself, and does so in prayer, which is maybe now possible after grief has been expressed.[[25]](#footnote-25)

Be mindful, Yahweh, of what happened to us;

 look, and see our reviling. (Lam 5:1)

Bring us back to yourself, Yahweh, so we may come back;

 make our days new, as before.

But you have totally rejected us,

 you have been utterly furious with us. (Lam 5:21-22)

Lamentations 5 “breaks the bounds even of the sanctioned complaint of the communal lament.” It is an oversimplification to go on to say that “Israel does not protest here in order to move YHWH to respond, but rather because the extent of its degradation can no longer be contained…. In the daring honesty of unedited speech, Israel reclaims its dignity,” so that thereby Israel is “making possible a viable future with YHWH.”[[26]](#footnote-26) It is both a self-assertion and a prayer.

The same applies to Psalm 88:

Yahweh, my God who delivers,

 by day I have cried out, by night in front of you.

May my plea come before you;

 bend your ear to my resounding noise. (Ps 88:1-2)

Your acts of rage have passed over me,

 your acts of terror have destroyed me.

They are round me like water all day,

 they’ve encircled me altogether.

You’ve taken friend and neighbor far from me,

 my acquaintances – darkness. (Ps 88:16-18)

There the psalm stops. By stopping rather than finishing, it mirrors the reality that it reflects. As Lamentations 5 closes with a line that we don’t know how to translate,[[27]](#footnote-27) the psalm closes with a line that does not construe.

“The reader is not so much engaged by the book of Lamentations as assaulted by it.”[[28]](#footnote-28) Psalm 88 shares the distinction of being among the simultaneously most uncomfortable and most comfortable reads in the Scriptures. It does not create pain, but it does reveal pain.[[29]](#footnote-29) While Lamentations 3 and Psalm 22 open up one way of relating to God in the midst of suffering, Lamentations 5 and Psalm 88 open up another way. There is no indication that the first is better. Both texts are uncomfortable because we don’t want to think that life might be as they describe. We prefer to say that God seems to have abandoned us than that God has abandoned us. They are comforting because life can be as they describe and God sometimes has abandoned us, and they give us the opportunity to face the fact and to talk to God about it. They acknowledge that in the midst of life we are in death. “The need to lend a voice to suffering is a condition of all truth.”[[30]](#footnote-30) As is typical of the Scriptures, they do not seek to solve the theodicy problem, by dealing with the theological and philosophical question. They do give voice to the reality that generates the theodicy problem and they challenge God to solve it. They engage in theodicy as “an existential struggle against the practical realities of lived experience.”[[31]](#footnote-31)

Lamentations actually “is primarily concerned to engender a response from God,”[[32]](#footnote-32) and Psalm 88 is not just designed to enable the suppliant to feel better through letting it all hang out. But in Psalm 88 and in Lamentations, God does not respond. There are one or two psalms that presuppose an answer from God, but only one or two, and “the silence of God in Lamentations is inspired” in that “it shows a brilliant restraint”; for “if God were to speak, what could God say?” Actually the Book of Job shows the answer, but supplying it would dissipate Lamentations’ capacity to house sorrow. Lamentations “denies ‘denial.’”[[33]](#footnote-33) Lamentations is incomplete, like Psalm 88. A conclusion can only come with a response from God. But “until God responds, the people’s lamentations go on.”[[34]](#footnote-34)

As is the case with Psalm 22 and other protest psalms, the suppliant’s speaking as an “I” should not make one infer that it speaks only on behalf of an individual—like Lamentations 3. And like Lamentations 3, it is a prayer that can be used as an intercession and not just as a prayer for oneself. Indeed, “the *way* in which Lamentations engages politically is in *prayer.*”*[[35]](#footnote-35)* If we don’t need to pray Lamentations for ourselves, it “still calls us urgently to prayer for and with those whose lives too readily coincide with the brutish conditions that punctuate the book.”[[36]](#footnote-36)
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