

the periphery of the semantic field. This act again invokes the DIVINE COUNCIL domain, but specifically to renegotiate it. This would have been a significant paradigm shift for someone experiencing this upheaval of the structures of deity for the first time.

In the final verse, the psalmist calls upon the deity to rise up and inherit (*nḥl*) all the nations. The use of *nḥl*, particularly in connection with *'elyôn*, alludes to the description in Deut 32:8–9 of the people/nation of Israel as YHWH's *nahālā*, “inheritance” (Forschey 1975; Sanders 1996, 368–69). This would activate PATRONAGE, PATRON DEITY, and NATIONAL DEITY. While the “second-tier deity” profile should also be activated, since YHWH receives that inheritance from *'elyôn* in Deut 32:9, the two were long conflated by the time of Ps 82, and “second-tier deity” had little currency at that time in connection with YHWH. Whether or not it was activated vis-à-vis the other deities is a question of how far back into the past the authors were reaching for this motif. It is likely there were some for whom the notion of second-tier deities would have been activated, even if others had long consigned them to a conceptual grab-bag of angels, demons, or some other diminutive category. The suggestion that YHWH will now directly rule over all nations also fronts the “high deity” profile (cf. Ps 83:19). The psalm thus combines the divine council type-scene with the complaint genre to rhetorically bring about the deposition of the deities of the nations and YHWH's usurpation of their purviews, entirely restructuring the divine council.

Because Ps 82 consolidates so many different domains and profiles of deity, it will be instructive to hierarchize its domains and profiles. The unseen agency base is presupposed, as are the domains of DEITY and PATRONAGE, and likely KINGSHIP. SOCIAL MONITORING and PATRON DEITY are somewhat salient in the psalm, but DIVINE COUNCIL and FAILURE TO ACT are front and center. The “deity” and “YHWH” profiles were surely activated by the psalm, but as part of the Elo-histic Psalter, *'ēlōhîm* was given preference at some point during the editorial process (cf. Zenger and Lohfink 1998; Joffe 2001; Burnett 2006). *'Ēlōhîm* feels to us a bit redundant in verse 1, which has compelled some scholars to posit that it replaces an original YHWH (e.g., Morgenstern 1939). Whether the psalm was composed by those giving preference to *'ēlōhîm* or at some earlier point is unclear from the available data (the redundancy is not determinative), but YHWH would have been presumed to be the active deity.⁶⁴ “Judge” also appears to be activated within the juridical context, as well as “high deity” (as part of the divine council framework, but not particularly salient in the psalm). “Second tier deity” is activated in reference to the deities being condemned.

Psalm 82 evokes a number of profiles and domains associated with deity, and largely in order to reconfigure them in response to the crisis of exile and the loss

⁶⁴ The titular use of *'ēlōhîm* was likely close enough to lexicalization in reference to YHWH in this period that it could function (a bit idiosyncratically) as a substitution for it.