CHAPTER THREE
Images

In the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, imagery was viewed as "ornament, mere decoration" of the poem "like cherries tastefully arranged on a cake". Aristotle's theory of metaphor had been forgotten, and until the Romantic Movement few if any realized that "imagery is at the core of the poem".[1]

This conception of the image has been expressed most fully and adequately by modern literary scholarship, which is vigorously opposed not only to viewing the image as "a grace or ornament or *added* power of language"[2] but equally to seeing it as solely a didactic device, which clarifies the subject matter of the work.[3] "Metaphor is one of the best means of bringing out the meaning of the text. At the same time it will become clear through a profound understanding of metaphor that it not only assists understanding, but it can also activate all kinds of emotional and conceptual overtones."[4]

1. C. Day Lewis, *The Poetic Image*, London [1965, repr. 1966], p. 18.
2. I. A. Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, New York [1965], p. 90 (italics in the original).
3. W. K. Wimsatt & C. Brooks, *Literary Criticism*, New York 1957, p. 644.
4. Kayser, p. 125.See also C. Brooke-Rose, *A Grammar of Metaphor*, London 1958, *passim*; W. Emrich, "Das Problem der Symbolinterpretation im Hinblick auf Goethes 'Wanderjahre' ", *Protest and Verheissung*, Frankfurt/M. – Bonn 1960, pp. 48-66 (= *Die Werkinterpretation*, pp. 169-197); C. Lewis, "Blusfeld and Flalansfers", in: M. Black (ed.), *The Importance of Language* [New Jersey 1962], pp. 36-50; O. Barfield, "Poetic Diction and Legal Fiction," *ibid.*, pp. 51-71; M. Black, *Models and Metaphors*, New York 1962, esp. pp. 25-47; H. Weinrich, "Semantik der kühnen Metapher", *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte*, XXXVII (1963), pp. 324-344; C. Brooks, "Metaphor, Paradox and Stereotype", *British Journal of Aesthetics*, V (1965), pp. 315-328; H. Khatchadourian, "Metaphor", *ibid.*, VIII (1968), pp. 227-243. From the extensive literature on the subject of metapor and related topics generally in the last years we note for example: S. J. Brown, *The World of Imagery*, New York 1966; W. Nowothny, *The Language Poets Use*, London [1968], pp. 48-49; N. Frie[dman], "Imagery", in: *Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, (see above. p. 1, note 2), pp. 363-370; G. W[halley], "Metaphor", *ibid.*, pp. 490-495; idem "Simile", *ibid.*, pp. 767-769; W. Abraham, *A Linguistic Approach to Metaphor*, Lisse 1975; T. Hawkes, *Metaphor*, London 1977; P. Ricoeur, *The Rule of Metaphor*. Toronto [c. 1977].

Brooks & Warren exemplify the function of image with the simile of Ecclesiastes 7:6: "For as the crackling of thorns under a pot, so is the laughter of the fool". This comparison — they write — uses the sound of the crackling of dry thorns when they catch fire to describe the laughter of the fool. Now it cannot be denied that there is real acoustic similarity between the sound of thorns under the pot and that of the fool's vain laughter (the similarity is even more pronounced in the English translation of the verse, which was all that these scholars knew, than in the original). However, this image has a powerful effect apart from its phonetic descriptiveness. It also pronounces judgment upon such laughter as hollow, empty and meaningless. The image "as the crackling of thorns under a pot" asserts: the thorns have no value, they are consumed and perish in smoke, only to be carried away by the wind. The image, in effect, justifies what is said at the end of the verse: "This also is vanity". Even more to the point: the image is not only an illustration of the "vanity", it is itself the vanity. Vanity is embodied in it: the light of the flame is bright and clear, the explosive crackling deafens the ears — but within there is but emptiness; it is essentially nothing.[5]

That is to say: the image expresses what would not be expressed, because it could not have been expressed, without it. "Metaphor is the

5. C. Brooks & R. P. Warren, *Fundamentals of Good Writing*, London 1952. p. 376. Compare also the analysis of the simile in Numbers 22:4, "as the ox licks up the grass of the field", by the author of *Aqedat Yizhaq*, Rabbi Yizhaq Arama: "All my life I wondered at this comparison till I saw cows pasturing in the field and understood its meaning. It is the habit of the ox to stick out its tongue from the side and stretch it out far, and with its long sharpness — like a sickle — to tear up all the grass and bring it to its mouth so that the point where the ox's mouth is located is his centre of activity, and from which he wreaks havoc all around. This is the meaning of the verse — that even if [the Midianites] are certain that [the Israelites] will not make war upon them, they still fear that the land about their place of settlement will share the fate of the land about the mouth of the ox" (Taken from N. Leibowitz, *Studies in the Weekly Sidra*, "Balak", 1942).

greatest power available to man; it borders on magic; it is like a creative tool left by God in the minds of His creatures".[6] If the word itself is the medium whereby man subdues the objective external world,[7] in metaphor he creates out of words the reality of his inner world. Hence it follows that delving into the meaning of metaphor reveals something of the writer's inner world. Metaphor is therefore of the very essence of poetry. "It is a completely adequate expression in language of a writer's mode of feeling".[8] "In his images — the trivial as well as the important — we encounter the poet as a poet and receive from him what he, as a poet, has to give us".[9]

At the same time, however, it is well known that the world of representations, forms and linguistic expressions in poetry is not a world created *ex nihilo*. Poetry is created out of forms that have been fixed and stabilized from early times. It uses images and combinations of ideas which are taken from the world of external reality and from the store of human expressions which are a part of man's universal heritage, in part the heritage of the cultural traditions of generations. But even those ideas, linguistic expressions and "rhetorical tropes" which are not the original creation of the poet, but are part of his heritage, nevertheless take on an original meaning in the new context of the individual poetic creation. This has been said about all linguistic expressions,[10] about *topoi*, symbols, motifs, and even about the actual subject-matter of the poem.[11] Thus even with regard to the modern poem, which, as opposed to the

6. José Ortega y Gasset (cited by H. Friedrich, *Die Struktur der modernen Lyrik*, Hamburg [1961], p. 151).
7. Compare H. Seidler, *Allgemeine Stilistik*, Göttingen 1953, pp. 14ff; idem, *Die Dichtung*, Stuttgart 1959, pp. 22ff.
8. J. M. Murry, *The Problem of Style*, London–New York–Toronto 1952, p. 13.
9. H. O. Burger, *GRM*, XXXII (1950-51), p. 56. Compare also Day Lewis: "Trends come and go, diction alters, metrical fashions change, even the elemental subject-matter may change almost out of recognition: but metaphor remains, the life-principle of poetry, the poet's chief tool and glory" (*op. cit.* [note 1, above], p. 17).
10. See above pp. 24f.; 74ff. For extensive research on the *topos* see O. Pöggeler, "Dichtungstheorie and Toposforschung", *Jahrbuch für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft*, V(1960), pp. 89-201; W. Weit, "Toposforschung", *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte*, XXXVII (1963), pp. 120-163.
11. See below pp. 150 f.

creations of literary art in antiquity, or even in the Middle Ages, is not conditioned by a literary tradition or by social mores, it is stated that "The poet's mind is in fact a receptacle for seizing and storing up numberless feelings, phrases, images, which remain there until the particles which can unite to form a new compound are present together. If you compare several representative passages of the greatest poetry you see how great is the variety of types of combination ... it is not the 'greatness', the intensity, of the emotions, the components, but the intensity of the artistic process, the pressure, so to speak, under which the fusion takes place, that counts".[12] Coleridge maintains: "Images, however beautiful ... do not of themselves characterize the poet. They become proofs of original genius only as far as they are modified by a predominant passion; or by associated thoughts or images awakened by that passion".[13] Hence the methodological conclusion formulated by Kayser: "It is part of the scholar's task to scrutinize in each case what is the effect of the image on the reader, what has been rendered vivid by it in the concrete context in which it was presented and what is its functional role in the whole creation".[14]

The different types of imagery are among the important stylistic devices in Biblical literature as well. D. Yellin asserts: "There are about a thousand images in the books of the Bible".[15]

However, Yellin's work, and the much more scholarly study of König[16]

12. T. S. Eliot, *Tradition and Individual Talent — Selected Essays*, New York 1950, p. 8. Compare Burger, *art. cit.* (note 9, above), p. 87; H. Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence — A Theory of Poetry*, New York 1973.
13. C. Day Lewis, *op. cit.* (note 1, above), p. 19.
14. Kayser, pp. 122-123.
15. *Ketavim Nivḥarim*, II, Jerusalem 1939, p. 41. See also R. Gordis, "Lisegulot Hameliza Bekhitve Haqodesh", in: *Sefer Seidel*, Jerusalem 1962, pp. 253-267.
16. König, *Stil*, pp. 77-110. For an evaluation of this work of König see L. Alonso Schökel, *SVT*, VII (1960), p. 154. To the bibliography of research on the metaphor in the Bible in Alonso Schökel's book on Hebrew Poetics (*op. cit.* [p. 40, note 42], pp. 273-277) the following should be added: Ramḥal (R. Moshe Ḥaim Luzzatto), *Leshon Limmudim*, Section 8; S. Levisohn, *Meliẓat Yeshurun*, Metaphor; M. Weiss, "Beiqve Metafora Aḥat Bamiqra", *Tarbiẓ*, XXXIV (1965), pp. 107-128, 211-233, 303-318; idem, "Methodologisches über die Behandlung der Metapher dargelegt an Am. 1.2", *ThZ*, XXIII (1967), pp. 1-25; E. Hessler, "Die Struktur der Bilder bei Deuterojesaja", *Ev. Theol.*, XXV (1965), pp. 349-369; E. M. Good, "Ezekiel's Ship — Some

which preceded it, serve only as classified lists of the images which occur in the Bible.[17] In addition to this statistical research, there have been comparative studies of the image, attempting to discover influences, to determine the dates of composition, etc. This is another manifestation of the dominant trend in modern Biblical scholarship, of looking for remains of earlier worlds beneath the upper layers of the text. Until now, however, Biblical imagery, like the literary, poetic aspect of the Bible in general, has not been investigated according to the principles of Total Interpretation. It is true that in Alonso Schökel's *Estudios de Poética Hebrea*, which (as already noted) aims to apply the methods of *Werkinterpretation* and New Criticism to the literature of the Bible, the eighth chapter is devoted to imagery and contains a theoretical discussion, along the lines of these schools, of imagery in general and of water-imagery in particular. He discusses water and mountain imagery in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel and deals also with the fusion of images; fire; tension of images; instruments and inversion of images; the "stumbling-block". At the same time, the images are not subjected to a thorough analysis. Moreover, the analysis of each metaphor treats it in isolation; in not one instance is its style and structure considered in the light of its mutual relation with the passage as a whole.[18]

Extended Metaphors in the Old Testament", *Semitics*, I (1970), pp. 79-103; D. F. Payne, "A Perspective on the Use of Simile in the Old Testament", *ibid.*, pp. 111-125; I.K. Crenshaw, "'Vedorekh al Bamote Arez'", *CBQ*, XXXIV (1972), pp. 39-53; R. Lack, *La Symbolique du livre d'Isaie*, Rome 1973; D. Rosner, "The Simile and its Use in the Old Testament", *Semitics*, IV (1974), pp. 37-46.

17. About this type of research into images Day Lewis writes of a "scientific" work, in which an American professor "pins down, classifies, and christens some two dozen varieties of image found in Elizabethan poetry": "That sort of performance is too like an anatomy lesson: if the subject is not a cadaver before you start dissecting, it soon becomes one. The imagery of a poem is part of a living growth; even decorative or conventional images can hardly be detached for examination, without losing some of their sparkle. Moreover, it is in practice impossible to lay down categories to one of which any given image will conform ... when we try to go below the surface, equipped with notions of the intellectual and the sensuous, say, or the decorative and the functional, we find the images eluding us. Images are invented, after all, to compose poems, and not for the convenience of American professors" (*op. cit.* [note 1, above], p. 40).

18. Pp. 269-307.

In attempting to illustrate adequately the application of the method of Total Interpretation to Biblical poetic imagery, we shall begin by examining Psalm 1:2-4, considering first, in the light of the requirements of modern literary theory, what recent scholars and critics have said about the similes these verses contain and the conclusions they have drawn from them. Then we shall attempt to re-examine the similes and to discover, again according to modern literary methods, the true meaning they convey. Next we shall apply the same method to the images in Job, chapters 4,5. Thirdly we shall consider Amos 8:12, an example of a metaphor with double meaning. And finally we shall follow up one metaphor which appears thrice in prophetic literature — Amos 1:2, Joel 4:16; Jeremiah 25:30 — and clarify its meaning, while discussing also the opinions of commentators and scholars on each of three passages.

1

וְהָיָה כְּעֵץ שָׁתוּל עַל־פַּלְגֵי מָיִם
אֲשֶׁר פִּרְיוֹ יִתֵּן בְּעִתּוֹ וְעָלֵהוּ לֹא־יִבּוֹל
וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר־יַעֲשֶׂה יַצְלִיחַ.
לֹא־כֵן הָרְשָׁעִים כִּי אִם כַּמֹּץ אֲשֶׁר תִּדְּפֶנּוּ רוּחַ

He is like a tree planted beside streams of water,
that gives its fruit in its season, and its foliage does not fade,
wĕkol 'āser-ya'ăśeh yaṣlī^{a}ḥ.
Not so the wicked; rather, they are like chaff that wind blows away.
(Psalm 1:3-4)

Images from the plant world are among the most common Biblical images. "We find", Yellin writes, "about two hundred and fifty of this type; that is to say, a quarter".[1]

The understanding of our psalm depends to a large extent on the correct interpretation of the images. They are the key to the psalm by which its conceptual and its aesthetic world can be opened. Most scholars

1. *Op. cit.* (p. 133, note 15), p. 55.

also believe that the images enable them to determine when our psalm was written, and some even believe that with the help of the images they will succeed in discovering the origin, "source" of the psalm.

On the basis of its images, our psalm is apprehended as a didactic poem,[2] the purpose of which is to teach us something about recompense[3] or the way of life a person should choose.[4]

The images are also used as a criterion by which the psalm is evaluated. For example, Gunkel asserts: "This psalm is a creation of but little value: both the idea and the style follow the beaten path. The central idea of the psalm — the fate of the righteous and the fate of the wicked — is expressed in the Bible in many places, and also the images, the green tree and the driven chaff, are frequent and hackneyed. The psalm is most analogous to the prophecy in Jeremiah 17:5-8 ... but how superior Jeremiah is in beauty! In contrast to the righteous who trust in God Jeremiah sets the wicked who trust in their own might, and in contrast to the tree planted by the waters, the tamarisk in the desert. The psalmist, however, has not successfully developed the contrasting aspects of the image. He compares the fate of the wicked to chaff "which the wind blows away" — a common image in the Bible, but not an appropriate

2. An exceptional view is that of I. Engnell (see below). W. H. Brownlee feels that Psalm 1 was initially a didactic poem (see below) but was later combined with Psalm 2 for the occasion of the coronation of one of the later, post-Deuteronomic kings of Judea ("Psalm 1-2 — A Coronation Liturgy", *Biblica*, LII [1971], pp. 328-336).
3. This is the aggadic interpretation (*Shoher Tov, ad loc.*), followed by the mediaeval Jewish commentators, e.g. Ibn Ezra, as also the *Biur*. Of modern scholars: Chajes, Gunkel, Kittel, Kaufmann (II/2, p. 705), P. Auvray ("Le psaume I. — Notes de grammaire et d'exégèse", *RB*, LIII [1946], pp. 365-371), G. J. Botterweck ("Ein Lied vom glückseligen Menschen, Ps. 1.", *Tübinger Theologische Quartalschrift*, 1958, pp. 129-151), Kraus, Dahood and others.
4. Rashi, Meiri, Malbim, Schmidt, Weiser, M. Buber ("The Ways", *Right and Wrong — An Interpretation of Some Psalms* [transl. by R. G. Smith], London [1952], pp. 53-62), R. Lack ("Le psaume I — Une analyse structurale", *Biblica*, LVII [1976], pp. 154-167). Against Lack, see W. Vogels ("A Structural Analysis of Ps 1", *Biblica*, LX [1979], pp. 410-416), R. P. Merendino ("Sprachkunst in Psalm I", *VT*, XXIX [1979], pp. 45-60), etc. A somewhat intermediate position between these two conceptions is adopted by Radak and König, and apparently by Nic. H. Ridderbos (*Die Psalmen — Stilistische Verfahren und Aufbau — Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Ps 1-41* [*BZAW*, CXVII], Berlin–New York 1972, pp. 120-121).

contrast to "the tree planted beside streams of water".[5] Auvray, twenty years after Gunkel, adapts this same method of comparing the images in the psalm to those of Jeremiah 17, and reaches the same conclusion.[6] More recently, Merendino, discussing Gunkel's negative evaluation, admits that "Psalm 1 may still be considered a true work of literary art, as the artistic character of a text is not expressed only in singularity of thought, message, expression and imagery, but also in the manner in which the separate elements combine into a meaningful, unified whole ... Compositionally Psalm 1 is an artistic creation ..., the form of [which] is appropriate to its thought and intent".

Again on the basis of the images, a whole generation of scholars established the origin and date of the psalm. Baethgen still speaks cautiously: "It is difficult to decide whether the psalmist used the words of the prophet, or, on the contrary, the prophet used the words of the psalmist. The differences tend to support the hypothesis that Jeremiah drew upon the psalm". Gunkel asserts quite positively, on the basis of his previously mentioned conclusions: "There is no doubt that the psalmist imitated the prophet, but his imitation cannot be compared with the work of the prophet who served as his source". Merendino believes that it was not the psalmist who was influenced by the verses in Jeremiah but rather an interpolator, who added verses 1b, 3aαγ-b to the psalm.[8]

Even though Gunkel admits that it is not possible to determine the exact time of composition of our psalm, he voices the opinion that the psalm's dependence on Jeremiah proves its late date. H. W. Wolff discusses possible references to conditions under the Ptolemaic Empire in

5. Gunkel notes of the whole psalm: "The poet has also disturbed the balance of the parallel sections by not describing the actions of the wicked. It can further be noted in Jeremiah's favour that he emphasized and set forth in a parallel fashion blessing and curse, whereas the psalmist retained only the blessing, and there is no trace of the curse in his psalm".
6. "Sa banalité lui valut être placé, tel un portique de stuc à l'entrée d'un riche musée, comme préface à tout le psautier", *art. cit.* (note 3, above), p. 371.
7. *Art. cit.* (note 4, above), p. 45. That the psalm is artistically a whole is evident both from Lack's structural analysis (note 4, above), and P. Auffert's semantic and metric study ("Essai sur la structure littéraire du psaume 1", *BZ*, NF, XXII [1978], pp. 27-45).
8. *Art. cit.* (note 4, above).

the 3rd century B.C.E.[9] According to Kraus, "considering the tendency of the Psalm as a whole we might assign to it a post-exilic date".

Kittel saw in the image of the "tree planted" a hint of the place where our psalm was composed: "The comparison of the righteous to a 'tree planted beside streams of water' shows that the psalm was created in Babylonia, a land of streams, rich in canals. It is not reasonable to believe that the psalm was created in the land of Israel, a hilly country, poor in water and with few streams". This theory of a Babylonian origin for the psalm has not been echoed in scholarship; instead, many scholars are of the opinion that the image in our psalm is of Egyptian origin. The similarity between the image of the "tree planted" in our psalm and the image of the tree in the proverbs of Amen-em-opet[10] has supported the view that the Egyptian wisdom literature influenced the Wisdom literature of the Bible.[11] Gressmann, comparing the image in Egyptian literature to the image in Psalms and Jeremiah, reaches the conclusion that "despite the differences between the three poems, we cannot deny that there is an historical connection between them, because the similarity is so great. In addition, the wisdom of Amen-em-opet was familiar to the Israelites. However, while Jeremiah has completely adapted the image to his religious needs and ideals, in Psalm 1 the Egyptian origin is still quite palpable. Above all, the idea of the judgment of the dead[12] ... is a reference to Egypt, as is almost certainly the image of the tree which 'is planted beside streams of water' or the canals".[13]

9. "Psalm I", *Ev. Theol.*, IX (1949-50), pp. 385-394.
10. IV. 1-12 (*ANET*, p. 422 a,b).
11. J. Hempel, *Die althebräische Literatur und ihr hellenistisch-jüdisches Nachleben*, Wildpark-Potsdam [1930], pp. 50-51.
12. So Gressman comprehends, it would seem the word *bammišpāt* in verse 5. This interpretation of the word is already discernible in the Septuagint and the Vulgate as they translate *yāqūmū*: ἀναστήσονται, *resurgunt* ("resurgent") (see Botterweck, *art. cit.* [note 2, above], pp. 148-149); compare also Ibn Ezra: "It refers to the Day of Judgement for all or to each person at his death". According to Dahood, who adduces parallels to these images taken from Ugaritic literature, when the psalmist compares the righteous to "a tree planted beside streams of water" he has in mind "the story of the streams of Eden, the land of bliss" with the intention to say that the just's lot is immortality. While in comparing the wicked to "chaff that wind blows away" he means that the wicked will be driven into the nether world.
13. H. Gressman, *Israels Spruchweisheit im Zusammenhang der Weltliteratur*, Berlin 1925, p. 32.

A changed conception is evident in the view of Brownlee: "The alleged similarities between Jer 17:5-8 and Ps 1 do not necessarily prove dependence in either direction, for the differences are as great as the similarities, and the similarities are sufficiently general as to point to a common source. We may even know the common source as Chapter IV of the Instruction of *Amenem-opet*".[14] Similarly Botterweck argues: "Though the assumption that the psalmist borrowed the two-fold comparison from Jeremiah is widespread, this assumption should be viewed with great reservation. In both cases we are dealing with images borrowed from the store of Israel's Wisdom literature. The great difference between the two similar passages rather testifies to the degree of independence with which the authors controlled the traditions and idioms of the Wisdom literature".[15] And B. D. Eerdmans writes: "In an oriental country like Palestine, where the summer heat dries up vegetation, the comparison is so self-evident that we cannot conclude from the likeness literary dependence".[16] As for the parallels between the proverbs of Amen-em-opet and the image of the tree, Botterweck claims that we can learn from them how analogous or similar linguistic forms which are found in different spheres of life may well have different meanings and independent origins.[17]

Engnell[18] has adopted a completely different and unprecedented approach. He believes that the image of the "tree planted" in our psalm serves as a "king's witness" to his theory. Since Engnell is the standard-bearer of the "Scandinavian school" or the "Uppsala school" of *Ritual-pattern-Forschung*, whose starting-point, Gunkel's *Gattungsforschung*,[19] is the basis of Biblical scholarship even today, in this chapter which deals with imagery we shall devote our attention to his theories which are con-

14. *Art. cit.* (note 2, above), p. 326.
15. *Art. cit.* (note 3 above), p. 147.
16. "The Hebrew Book of Psalms", *OTS*, IV (1947), p. 93.
17. *Art. cit.* (note 2, above), pp. 147-148.
18. I. Engnell, "'Planted by the Streams of the Water' — Some remarks on the problem of the interpretation of the psalms as illustrated by a detail in ps. 1", in: *Studia Orientalia Joanni Pedersen Dicata*, Hauniae MCMLIII, pp. 85-96. Compare A. R. Johnson, "Hebrew Conceptions of Kingship", in: S. H. Hooke (ed.), *Myth, Ritual and Kingship*, Oxford 1958, p. 232, note 3. On Engnell's methodology in general see his paper: "Methodological Aspects of OT Study", *SVT* VIII (1960), pp. 13-30.
19. See above, pp. 54ff.

cerned particularly with the central topic of poetics — imagery. Even though many in the Uppsala camp itself do not agree with Engnell's extreme positions, we have not refrained from disputing with him at length, because his extremism points up this approach as would a microscope.

In the programmatic introduction with which Engnell prefaces his commentary on Psalm 1:3, he expresses his view that "it is no doubt true that many psalms have been understood and interpreted in a didactic way by the final collectors and editors and, not least, by the Masoretes. But this is one thing; quite another is what the single psalms, thus also the so-called 'didactic' ones, have been from the beginning, in their original *Sitz im Leben*. To take them as products of a laity piousness, disengaged from the cult and of the 'conventicle' type is a horrible modern anachronism, a manifestation of a solid unfamiliarity with the world in which old Israel belonged". Engell asserts positively: "there are no 'wisdom psalms' at all in the Psalter. Even those psalms that are considered to be the most typical specimens, Ps. I, CXII, and CXXVII". In order to establish this uncompromising verdict, Engnell argues: "The fact that later on, not too long after the time in which the most radical scholars of the literary-critical school place the psalms of the Psalter, the need was felt of imitating this type of poetry, is the best proof that these so-called 'Wisdom psalms', too, must have been connected with the temple and its cult".

According to his view, this psalm was intended from the beginning for a specific cultic occasion. This is shown by a number of characteristic expressions and cultic idioms as also by its ideological content. Psalm 1 belongs to the type which is called "*tora*-liturgy", "and as such originally linked to the person of the sacral king" as shown by the expression "like a tree, planted beside streams of water", if the original significance of the image is correctly interpreted. The widespread opinion that Psalm 1 is influenced by Jeremiah 17 "is an instance of the usual conception of the relation between the prophets and the psalms, based on the *a priori* Kuenen-Wellhausen view of Israel's religion and its historical development". In Engnell's opinion: "Jer. XVII:5-8 is by no means the model of Ps. I, but on the contrary a secondary prophetic paraphrase in comparison with our psalm, though perhaps not directly dependent or founded on exactly this specimen".

In order to clarify the original meaning of the image Engnell argues: "It ought to be a well-known fact by now that a very close connexion existed

in the Ancient Near East between the 'Tammuz' god, the king, and the tree of life, reflecting an ideology spread over the whole Near East and based in its turn upon cult practices, according to which the sacral king was conceived of, and represented as, the corporeal 'Tammuz' god (the 'young' god, the dying and rising god), and with the tree of life, planted at the spring with the water of life, as the intermedium between the two". Thus it is said of the king Shulgi of the first dynasty of Ur: "Shulgi, the king the graceful lord, is a date-palm, /planted by the water-ditch". And Engnell emphasizes: "We need not doubt that these words mirror ideological and cultic realities, and are not to be judged as pure metaphors".

As an "other perhaps still more interesting parallel" to the image of our psalm, Engnell cites "an oft-quoted 'Tammuz-liturgy'", in which, from the negative point of view, it is said of Tammuz during his "withering-away" aspect:

> A tamarisk that does not drink water in the garden . . .
> a sapling that does not thrive at the water-ditch,
> a sapling whose root is torn away,
> a plant that drinks not water in the garden.

If we transpose this into the positive we have a very telling background to Ps. 1:3, where it is said of the righteous who has his delight in Y' . . . 's tora, "reciting it day and night". Hence the psalmist is not comparing the fate of the righteous to "a tree planted beside streams of water" but rather the king, and the tree is the tree of life. Engnell admits that the psalm does indeed speak about the righteous, but, just as he says with respect to Psalm 92:13, it speaks of course, about the king as well. " 'The righteous' in the Psalms is not seldom a qualified royal term." Engnell emphasizes the fact that the word for "planted" is the Hebrew *šātūl* and not *nāṭū'*. The verb *nāṭa'* is, in his view, "a specific Canaanite-Israelite word", whereas the verb *šātal* represents "a common Semitic" one and "has evidently had a rather specific meaning and use in the O.T.". This precise meaning of *šātal*, he believes, can be understood from its use in Ezekiel 17:8-10. "In this text satiated with the ideology and terminology of 'the tree of life' the verb *štl* is used in vv. 8 and 10 about the king as the tree of life, to wit, as a vine."

At the conclusion of his study Engnell writes: " . . . after the confronta-

tion with the comparative material . . . , and after the internal investigation of the term *šatūl* in its whole occurence in the O.T., in texts, as we have seen, loaded with a royal tree of life ideology, have we not the right to ask, already on this basis: is it really certain that the usual, not to say unanimous, opinion of Ps. I as a late and trite product of a reflective-didactic type, belonging in a quite another situation than the cult is justified? Have we not on the contrary to admit that there are criteria speaking in favour of a cultic, even a — of course primarily — royal-sacral interpretation also of this psalm?"[20]

After this survey of the interpretations that have been given to the images of Psalm 1, it seems to us that an examination of their accuracy from a methodological standpoint is the first step towards clarifying their actual meaning. We will begin by the interpretation with which we concluded the survey, that of Engnell.[21]

Engnell, like his "Patternist" colleagues, attempts to "deal with the psalm in a manner analogous to the ultra-violet treatment of a palimpsest, in order to reveal the early writing hidden beneath the visible later

20. Engnell, *art. cit.* (note 18, above), pp. 90, 91, note 20; pp. 92, 93, 95-96 (italics in the original). Though our view of Engnell's interpretation and generally of his approach will be discussed further on (pp. 143ff.), we cannot refrain from bringing our reader's attention to the scholarly method he employs (this method, in the final analysis, is the one adopted today by all Biblical scholars, including opponents of Engnell and his colleagues, despite their attempts to attain goals other than those of the "Scandinavian School"). *A priori* Engnell assumes the existence of the "*tôrâ*-liturgy" (what is the proof of its existence?), then he asserts that our psalm belongs to this genre, a genre created *ad hoc* at the same time (the term "*tôrâ*-liturgy" is indeed Mowinckel's, but Engnell uses it in a new sense, see his study, p. 91, note 19). And thence he deduces that since our psalm belongs to this "type it [is, as such originally linked to the person of the sacral king" (p. 91).

21. Most Biblical scholars, including members of his school, disagree both with Engnell's interpretation of our psalm and with the basis of his interpretation which he sets out prior to it. The attacks are directed against three aspects of his study: (a) against his apprehension of the image literally and not as a metaphor (H. Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods*, Chicago [1948], p. 408, note 67; J. Gray, "Canaanite Kingship in Theory and Practice", *VT*, II [1952], p. 194; A. R. Johnson, "Hebrew Conceptions of Kingship", in: Hooke, *op. cit.* [note 18, above], p. 232, note 3. Compare J. A. Soggin, "Zum ersten Psalm", *ThZ*, XXIII [1967], pp. 90-92. Soggin agrees with Engnell that the metaphor originates in Sumero-Akkadian myth; however, he says, as the context shows, the original, mythic sense is no longer present in the psalm); (b) against his attribution of the image to the ideology of the god Tammuz (S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, Oxford 1956, p. 454); (c) against his attributing sacral significance to the verb *šâtal* (Botterweck, art. cit. [note 3, above], p. 144).
In fact the criticism directed against "patternism" (see below, pp. 421ff.) is valid also as a refutation of the view of Engnell. All the novel suggestions propounded by Engnell, however (including his new theory about the date of composition of the psalm), are based on two presuppositions: (1) our psalm — as is true of the psalms generally — was connected with the Temple cult; (2) the ideology of "sacral kingship" prevailed in Israel, as in neighbouring cultures. These assumptions are, as is well known, accepted as basic axioms in Engnell's school (H. H. Schrey, "Die alttestamentliche Forschung der sogenannten Uppsala-Schule", *ThZ*, VII [1951], pp. 321-341; A. Bentzen, "Skandinavische Literatur zum Alten Testament", *ThR*, XVII [1948-49], pp. 273-328; J. de Fraine, *L'aspect religieux de la royauté israélite*, [*Analecta Bibl.* III], Roma 1954, pp. 26-54; idem, "Les implications du 'patternism'", *Biblica*, XXXVII [1956], pp. 59ff. See also above p. 83, note 23; especially Bernhardt's work cited there, particularly pp. 51-66). See further Appendix IV, pp. 421ff.

script".[22] But in a palimpsest the later writing merely covers the original, without changing it. The elements that might have served as the "raw materials" for the psalm, on the other hand, are utterly transformed by the poet's expressive vision. Instead of comparing the psalm to a palimpsest, perhaps we should think of an intricately woven cloth, made in part with older threads, but in a new and original pattern. Even if the pattern into which these old threads had originally been woven could be recovered — which is doubtful enough — that reconstructed cloth would hardly enhance our appreciation of the new one. The act of recovery, in fact, might necessitate the destruction or obliteration of the new design.

A careful examination of Engnell's method of interpretation will show that it does not come from the text itself, but rather from associations aroused in him by his reading of the text. His argument that, because these associations have their basis in the text, the interpretation too has a basis in the text, is only plausible if one accept Engnell's own verdict: "After Mowinckel's *Psalmenstudien* it is simply out of the question *in principle* to apply any other interpretation method than the cultic",[23] that is to say, it must be assumed *a priori* that it is impossible to find in the text anything that is not linked to the cult, which is, in turn, itself defined

22. Fraine, *art. cit.* (note 21, above), p. 70.

23. *Art. cit.* (note 18, above), p. 86.

and limited *a priori*. In other words: before Engnell even reads the text, he determines as a matter of principle what it may contain and what we are "forbidden" to find in it.

It seems obvious to us that in principle anything can be found in the text, so that clearly — despite Mowinckel's Law — the one method that in principle *must* be used to explain a literary work is the method which derives from categories related to the nature of the poem, not from categories connected with something external to it. We must therefore argue first and foremost against Engnell that his approach does not meet the demand for exact and careful close reading — it does not meet the demand for any reading, for any consideration of what is actually written.

We will add to this argument what we argued above against interpretation based on the historical background of the passage:[24] even if the theories of patternism were incontrovertibly proved (as Engnell holds), even if we had decisive proof that the *Sitz im Leben* of all the psalms — including Psalm 1 — was the cult; even if it were beyond any doubt that the "sacral kingship" existed in Israel — even the knowledge of these facts would not release us from the obligation to explain the images of the psalm in accordance with what is written in the psalm, and only on the basis of what is written. And since nowhere in the psalm itself — neither in its "content" nor in its "form" — is there any indication of its connection with the cult or to the sacral king, we must conclude that it was not the intention of the psalmist to express any such connection, even if we agree that it was composed to serve as a text in a ritual at which the sacral king officiated. The use of the psalm is one thing; what it says may be — and in this case is — quite another.

Engnell's opinion "that the cultic interpretation alone is able to solve in a satisfactory way all the problems of content, form, and language with which we are faced in the Psalter", according to his argument, "is confirmed by the cultic allusions and the cultically saturated language that is actually found in so many psalms".[25] However, what are the cultic expressions and "the cultic allusions" which he finds in Psalm 1?

(1) The image of the "tree planted" — if it is "properly" interpreted, that is, not figuratively;

24. p. 52.
25. *Loc. cit.* (note 23, above).

(2) the verb *šātal* — in its "original" sense.

These "cultic symbols" are certainly no symbols at all. Why, even adherents of the "patternism" school emphasize that assigning a creation to a certain "pattern" must be based on an expression or motif which is characteristic, integral in the passage and which leaves its impress on its whole structure. An individual word or motif does not establish a family relationship in the world of "patterns".[26]

Moreover, how does Engnell know that the image in our psalm cannot be "properly interpreted" unless it is explained "not figuratively"? In his view the function that the "sacral kingship" filled in the ancient Near East and also in Israel is already determined and proven, and, therefore, he rules out any interpretation which assumes the existence of metaphors in the psalm. "It is a doubtful expedient" — he asserts — "to get rid of intricate problems by referring to 'poetic usage and imagery' ". Our knowledge of the cultic situation allows us to understand the expressions literally, and the burden of proof is upon anyone who wishes to deprive them of a "living content"[27] — that is, to pervert their meaning by apprehending them as metaphors.

However, first of all, the content of a literary work, particularly one of a composite nature such as the book of Psalms, cannot be determined in advance of the detailed examination of the work. It cannot, therefore, be asserted *a priori* that any interpretation which assumes the existence of figurative language in the book of Psalms, must be rejected out of hand. Nothing may be asserted *a priori*.

Secondly, the vitality of an expression does not rule out the possibility that it is used figuratively. On the contrary, the living image is the clearest sign of the vitality, the freshness, the ebullient energy of the idea expressed. The originator of the idea does not conceive it in abstract terms, but rather sees it in concrete images. All theories of imagery from the earliest scholarship to the most recent have proved this.

Above all: even if we had much more material containing mythical narratives and more adequate knowledge of the cultic ceremonies of an-

26. J. Lindblom, "Einige Grundfragen der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft", in: *Bertholet-Festschrift*, Tübingen [1950], pp. 331f. See also below p. 421ff.
27. *Art. cit.* (note 18, above), p. 88, note 10.

cient days — who could say that the expressions borrowed from them still bear all their ancient, original, cultic meaning?

To this day, for example, the Englishman calls the first day of the week Sunday — viz. day of the sun. That day is for that Englishman the Lord's Day. Does anyone imagine that we can conclude from the name of the Lord's Day that the Englishman still worships the sun as his god? Can anyone imagine that the name Sunday still retains that ancient, original, idolatrous meaning?[28] Moreover, is it possible to determine in the course of the transformations of meaning of an expression just when the original, cultic meaning disappeared completely and gave way to the spiritual, symbolic meaning, the transferred sense, the metaphor?

Therefore, the remarks of E. Bevan are very sensible: "No doubt the process by which what was once understood literally came to be understood symbolically was a gradual one". In the realm of ideas change is always slow. "It is impossible to trace the process by which the cruder anthropological conception gave place to a more spiritual conception in the Hebrew writers, because the old anthropologic language continued to be used as symbolic imagery long after the belief in its literal truth had disappeared, and the change in idea took place invisibly below the apparent uniformity of the language".[29] However, it is difficult from a scholarly standpoint to accept Bevan's decisive affirmation: "We can be pretty sure that the Hebrew who first put into writing the story of Babel, how Y' came down from heaven to see the city and the tower which the children of man had builded, or the story of Sodom, how Y' said: 'I will go down now, and see whether they have done altogether according to the cry of it, which is come unto me; and if not, I will know', understood it quite literally, and the later Hebrew who incorporated these old documents in the book of Genesis understood them as figures".[30] Whence this absolute certainty? Is there no ground at all for assuming the possibility that even "the Hebrew who first put into writing" the anthropomorphic expressions understood them not literally but metaphorically? After all "the use of metaphorical speech has been customary among human beings since the most ancient times, even the primitive stages of development. Almost

28. M. H. Farbridge, *Studies in Biblical and Semitic Symbolism*, London 1923, p. 18.
29. *Symbolism and Belief*, Boston [1957], pp. 45, 44f.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 45.

always you will find at the root of a word a poetic image that has been effaced. All speech is originally poetic".[31] J. Pedersen has argued rightly: "If one sees in anthropomorphism a proof of the antiquity of a Hebrew book, the Talmud is more ancient than any book among the books of the Bible".[32]

If we cannot determine just when the literal meaning was displaced by the metaphorical sense, what is then the objective means by which the commentator can ascertain whether the literal or metaphorical meaning of a given expression in the work is intended, whether it is mythological or symbolic? The only means we have is the general rule we have mentioned more than once: understand every expression — even the commonest — only on the basis of the context. Consider it not in isolation, divorced from its context, but rather in its interaction with all the structural details of the passage.

This principle is also valid in relation to the second "proof" that Engnell cited to support his claim that the psalm is a cultic one: the "original" meaning of the verb *šātal*. Even if Engnell had proved decisively that the "tree of life" of the myth was the source of the image "tree planted" in the psalm, and even if he had proved that the original sense of the verb *šātal* was connected with ritual, he would still not have accomplished anything towards an understanding of the image in our psalm, because he would not have clarified whether the psalmist used his "source" in the original sense or in a new sense. This clarification, as J. Wellhausen[33] emphasized long ago, is the first task of the commentator

31. F. Torm, *Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments*, Göttingen 1930, p. 109. Compare F. Vonessen, "Die ontologische Struktur der Metapher", *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung*, XIII (1959), pp. 397-416.
32. *ZAW*, XLIX (1913), p. 178.
33. In connection with Gunkel's early studies of apocalyptic literature, Wellhausen wrote: "Gunkel attributes a Babylonian origin to passages whether possible or not. His main error is that he assigns excessive importance to the question of origin. From a methodological standpoint it is important to know that the apocalyptic literature contains material which was not quite grasped by the author's conception, and even more frequently remains obscure to the commentator. But the origin of this material is methodologically speaking quite irrelevant. The authors of the apocalypses themselves certainly did not draw their material from the primary sources, nor were they interested in their original meaning, but rather they imbued it with their own spirit to the best of their ability. And it is this meaning, which they imparted, that we must try

and it is precisely this task that Engnell has not executed.[34]

Engnell addressed himself to the interpretation of the image "a tree planted", in the light of prior assumptions, the well-known assumptions of "patternism", which guided him in looking at the text and listening to what the psalm has to say. It would thus seem that the Talmudic dictum that "a person is only shown his own thoughts" (said of dreams in the Talmud), applies to philological study as well. In literary research, only he who seeks the kingdom finds the kingdom, not one who seeks asses. Engnell sought in the image of a "tree planted" the "tree of life" — supposedly identical with the sacral king — and found it, but he did not find the meaning of the verse.

But is the alternative with which Engnell confronts the commentator on Psalm 1 accurate, either to follow his footsteps and accept a cultic interpretation of the psalm, or else to accept the usual banal, didactic interpretation, which sees in the psalm an epigonic creation without depth, imagination or originality?

to understand. Gunkel is trying ... to restore the original meaning, a matter of interest to the antiquarian perhaps, but quite irrelevant to the task of the theologian or the commentator" (*Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, VI, Berlin 1899, p. 23. Compare A. Bentzen, *Messias, Moses redivivus, Menschensohn*, Zürich 1948, p. 24). Compare also pp. 421ff.

34. Engnell behaves like those philologists about whom Chiron said to Faust:

Ich seh' die Philologen,
Sie haben dich so wie sich selbst betrogen.
Ganz eigen ist's mit *mythologischer* Frau:
Der Dichter bringt sie, *wie er's braucht*, zur Schau.

(*Faust*, II, 2, 7427-7430. Compare W. Emrich, "Symbolinterpretation und Mythenforschung", *Euphorion*, XLVII [1957], pp. 38-57). There is an instructive parallel to Engnell's methodological error in attributing to the expressions in our psalm their original, sacred significance, in M. Galpert's article: "Hanima Hadatit Basifrut Haivrit Haḥadasha" when he writes: "Religion and Hebrew Literature, these two expressions religion and Hebrew are in fact one and the same ... Whoever examines Hebrew writing must perceive the religious currents running through it" (*CCAR Yearbook*, LX [1950], p. 390). Galpert "proves" this view about the religiosity of modern Hebrew literature with expressions, locutions and motifs which are derived from the Bible and the religious literature of Judaism. But it is clear to everyone who understands modern Hebrew literature that all these are only expressions and motifs that have been drained of their original significance (See the article by my late son, R. Weiss, "Miqodesh Leḥol", *Beshut Lashon*, Jerusalem [1982], pp. 161-174).

We believe, as we said at the beginning of our study of Psalm 1:3-4, that the key to the understanding of the psalm and its evaluation is in the images it contains.

He is like a tree planted beside streams of water,
that gives its fruit in its season, and its foliage does not fade,
wĕkol 'ăšer ya'ăśeh yaṣli^{a}ḥ.
Not so the wicked; rather, they are like chaff that wind blows away.

What is the meaning of these images?

The two basic assumptions generally accepted about the teaching intended by this didactic psalm[35] rest upon different conceptions of the images employed by the psalmist.

According to one opinion the tree and the chaff represent reward and punishment respectively; according to the other opinion they represent the nature and character of the righteous and the wicked. The former view is based on (a) the last clause of verse 3: *wĕkol 'ăšer ya'ăśeh yaṣli^{a}ḥ*, where *hā'īš* ("the man") mentioned in verse 1 is taken as the subject and the sentence is translated: "and whatever he does, he prospers";[36] (b) the frequent use of the verdant, fruitful tree in the Bible as an image of human success and prosperity;[37] (c) the well-attested use of chaff that the wind blows to represent the punishment of the wicked.[38]

The second interpretation is favoured by only a few scholars; of these only Weiser gives his reason: "The image of the tree does not speak here of the reward which the God-fearing man will receive by way of the recompense to which he can look forward ... but it speaks of the meaning and the value of life which the goodly man discovers by living his life in obedience to God". Why is the first, the generally accepted interpretation, incorrect? To this question Weiser replies in the parenthetic clause: "it would be altogether unsuitable for conveying such a meaning". This

35. See above, pp. 24f.; 74ff.
36. Those who see the phrase as an interpolation (see below) agree that the interpolator understood the image correctly.
37. Jeremiah 17:8; Psalms 52:10; 92:13; Job 8:16; 29:19 and others. For an analysis of the psalm see my article: "Darka shel Hatora Bemizmor 'Ashre Haish'", *Maayanot*, VI (1957), pp. 187-210. See further *SVT*, XXII (1972), pp. 106-112.
38. E.g. Hosea 13:3; Zephaniah 2:2; Isaiah 29:5; Psalm 35:5.

he says without futher explanation. But the reason he regards his own interpretation of the tree-image as the correct one can be inferred from his explanation of the psalm. Is it correct according to the principle of Total Interpretation? Is it not refuted by the mere fact that he translates the sentence *wĕkol 'ăšer ya'ăśeh yaṣliᵃḥ:* "in all that he [the godly man] does, he prospers", i.e. just like the adherents of the view which he dismisses as "unsuitable"?[39] Explaining this sentence, he observes: "We are confronted with a strong faith which optimistically assumes that the God-fearing man cannot fail to be successful in all that he undertakes". But even if this sentence does express such a belief, can one indeed call this suitable in the psalm that "speaks of the meaning and the value of life which the godly man discovers by living his life in obedience to God"? Or does the "value of life" according to the psalm include the "strong faith . . . that the God-fearing man cannot fail to be successful in all that he undertakes"?

Both this question and the main question as to the intention of the psalm's use of these images can be answered by examining the two aforementioned views in the light of the method of Total Interpretation. Let us begin with the first opinion, which is now, as already indicated, the one more generally accepted. First of all, we shall consider the method employed by the proponents of this opinion. According to this method a figurative expression is explained by reference to some other passage, which is assumed to be the "key text",[40] as if by reference to a dictionary which lists the exact, universally valid equivalent of each and every metaphor in the broadest sense of the word. It is alleged that "as long as the 'image' is not recognized as belonging to a particular type, all doors to its interpretation are laid open",[41] i.e. full license is given to every interpretation. Against this view, we have repeatedly brought up the incisive principle of modern literary theory: the fact that an expression generally conveys one idea in most places does not mean that the expression has become a stereotyped formula, a linguistic counter that can convey only

39. Merendino, who explains the image as referring to the righteous life (see note 4, above), views the clause as an interpolation.

40. Compare E. Hessler, *art. cit.* (above, p. 133, note 16).

41. *Ibid.*, p. 369. Compare Engnell's plan for elucidating Psalm 1: "The first task is . . . to work out and register the specific types, modes of expression, ideological contents, details of language etc. of these psalms in order then to confront and compare them with also less pronouncedly royal psalms" (*art. cit.* [note 18, above], p. 89).

this one idea. There is always the possibility that in a specific context the poet might use a common expression in a different sense from the usual, with a completely new intention.[42] Only rigorous adherence to this principle will prevent fundamental errors in the explanation of figurative expressions. In living speech, of course, metaphors do not just happen — they always form part of a context. Yet, by definition, "A metaphor . . . is a word in a context by which it is so conditioned as to convey an intention different from its normal meaning".[43] Since this is how metaphor works, it is impossible to interpret it otherwise, even if " 'the image' is recognized as belonging to a particular type". It is totally unacceptable to assert that by explaining a figurative expression in the light of a single context "all doors to its interpretation are laid open". After all, Total Interpretation ensures that only one door is opened, the one that leads to the precise understanding of what the image is meant to convey in this specific context.

Having once more established this methodological principle, let us examine the two basic opinions on the intention of the images of this psalm by elucidating their precise meaning, considering them strictly in context. We shall first compare them with their parallels in what appears to be the nearest parallel passage, Jeremiah 17:5-8. Let us compare these two passages, which, according to most scholars exhibit a literary connexion, studying each one by viewing it against the background of the other

(See next page.)

Both the psalmist and Jeremiah compare the righteous to a tree planted, but they do not both compare the wicked to the same image. In Psalm 1 — the wicked are "like chaff that wind blows away", whereas in Jeremiah "like a tamarisk in the desert".

Is this difference only fortuitous? From the standpoint of literary theory such an assumption is certainly invalid. The choice of an image is never fortuitous. Every image clarifies one quality, one characteristic, one aspect of the object (like a flashlight which illuminates one point in the darkness and brings it into prominence for the observer). The choice of the image is always determined by what had seemed to the author at that moment to be characteristic of the object, to be its main characteristic. But it is also possible that the image was chosen in accordance with the

42. Compare Y. Blau, "Hashibuẓ Shone Hahoraa Beshirat Hamiqra", in: *Sefer Biram*, Jerusalem 1956, pp. 181-188.

43. Weinrich, *art. cit.* (above p. 130, note 4), p. 340.

Psalm 1	Jeremiah 17
The image of the righteous	
He is like a tree planted beside streams of water	He is like a tree planted by the waters,
	sending forth its roots by a stream: it does not sense the coming of heat, and its foliage is luxuriant.
that gives its fruit in its season	And is not anxious in the year of drought,
and its foliage does not fade	and does not cease from bringing forth fruit.
The image of the wicked	
they are like chaff that wind blows away	He is like a tamarisk in the desert, and does not see when good comes; and dwells in the parched places of the wilderness, in a salt land and not inhabited.

poet's didactic intention, to show his readers the object in a specific light, to emphasize a certain trait, to awaken in their minds, by means of the poem, the desired impression. Since in poetry the main function of the word is not to be informative, but to arouse an emotional response, the poet will choose that image which is most likely to arouse such a response. The difference between the description of the wicked in the psalm and in Jeremiah must, therefore, be explained.

What is the meaning of the contrast between the pair of images in Jeremiah? The contrast cannot be confined to the fact that one tree is fruit-bearing and the other is barren. Had the prophet intended this, he would have set in contrast to "and does not cease from bringing forth fruit" the tamarisk, which never brings forth fruit. But that is not what is said. The contrast between them is different: one plant does not suffer from a lack of water even in "the year of drought", whereas the other plant has insufficient water even in the rainy season. That this is the intention of the prophet in the two contrasted images is shown by the common predicate of the two descriptions:

> And *does not see* when good comes (verse 6)
> And *does not see* when heat comes (verse 8)

that is to say, the tamarisk never enjoys the good that comes to the world, whereas the tree planted by the waters does not suffer from any affliction.

What, however, is the contrast between the two images in our psalm?

Let us begin with the image of the chaff. Let us assume that the idea here expressed — as usual with this image in the Bible — is that the wicked will quickly and easily disappear from the world like the chaff "that a wind blows away". Had this been the intention of the psalmist, he should have cited as the contrast to it a tree which is firmly rooted in the earth. So, indeed, did the Talmudic Sages interpret the image in verse 3, when they said about the words "like a tree planted": "It does not say *nāṭū*[a]' but *šātūl* to teach you that even if all the winds in the world were to come and blow on it, they would not move it from its place" (Yalqut). The Midrash would correspond to the intended meaning of the image if there were a linguistic basis for its assumption that the difference between *nāṭū*[a]' and *šātūl* is that *šātūl* refers to a tree whose roots are deep. But this assumption has no linguistic basis. Moreover, were the intention of the image to suggest that the righteous are firmly rooted, the yielding of fruit and luxuriance of foliage would be at most secondary details in the image, whereas in the verse they are the main point.

If the stability of the happy man is not the object of comparison, perhaps the image refers to another reward?

Let us continue to compare the image of the tree in our psalm to that in Jeremiah as far as the other parallel details are concerned:

Psalms	Jeremiah
that gives its *fruit* in its season,	and its *foliage is luxuriant.*
and its *foliage does not fade*	and does not cease from bringing forth *fruit.*

Though the same elements are present, there are still differences in the mode of expression:

(a) The order is reversed. In the psalm the fruit is mentioned first

and the foliage afterwards, whereas in Jeremiah the reverse is true;

(b) The psalm says *piryō yittēn* ("*gives* its fruit"), whereas in Jeremiah we find *mē'ăśōt perī* ("*bringing forth* fruit");

(c) According to the psalmist: the tree gives "*its* fruit"; according to the prophet: the tree will not cease from bringing forth "fruit";

(d) the happy man in the psalm is compared to a tree that "gives its fruit *in its season*" only, whereas "the man that trusts in God" in Jeremiah is like a tree that "does not cease from bringing forth fruit", that is to say, it *always* brings forth fruit.

(e) in the psalm the foliage "does not fade";[44] in Jeremiah it "is luxuriant".

Indeed, as Maimonides would say, "this requires subtle penetration to understand it".

The expression *'āśāh pĕrī* ("brings forth fruit") is familiar to us from Genesis "a fruit tree bringing forth fruit" (Genesis 1:11-12). In an applied sense it recurs in Isaiah's words to Hezekiah: "And the remnant that is escaped of the house of Judah shall again take root downward and bring forth upward" (II Kings 19:30; Isaiah 37:31). Whereas the expression *nātan pĕrī* ("gives fruit") appears in threats and promises, for example "If you walk in my statutes . . . the earth will give its fruit and the tree of the field will give its fruit" (Leviticus 26:3-4); "If you do not obey me . . . the tree of the earth will not give its fruit" (Leviticus 26:14, 20); "and the tree of the field will give its fruit" (Ezekiel 34:27); "for as the seed of peace, the vine will give her fruit" (Zechariah 8:12). That is to say, when the tree is spoken of intrinsically, from a botanical or biological standpoint, as in Genesis, it is described as *'ōśeh pĕrī* ("bringing forth fruit") whereas when the theme is the tree from the perspective of its blessing to man, then it is an *'ēṣ nōtēn pĕrī* ("tree giving fruit"). The giving of fruit is the role assigned to it.

When the psalmist compares the righteous to a tree that *gives* fruit, he does not have in mind the *fate* of the tree, which would symbolize the reward of the righteous, but rather the fulfillment of its function: it gives

44. Merendino sees the phrase as an interpolation influenced by Jeremiah 8:13 (*art. cit.* [note 4, above], p. 48).

its fruit in its season. Jeremiah, on the contrary, since he is speaking of the *reward* of the man who trusts in God, uses the expression "bringing forth fruit".

The image of the tree in the psalm is not intended, therefore, to describe the fate of the righteous, his reward, but rather his essential nature.[45] It is not a symbol of his lot, but rather of his actual being. This will account for the other differences in the way the image is expressed in the Psalms and in Jeremiah. The tree *gives* its fruit, its blessing to man, only in *its season* (Psalms); but intrinsically, when it is blessed with favourable conditions of growth, "it does not cease *bringing forth* fruit" (Jeremiah), for there is no season for the bringing forth of fruit, it is an incessant activity as long as the tree lives. The tree gives "*its* fruit", its own. When the tree *brings forth*, it brings forth for itself, and what it brings forth is called simply "*fruit*". Only when the tree *gives* for others is what it gives called "*its* fruit".[46]

Further, the tree's blessed, good fate is described according to the order of the time of blossoming and ripening: first its foliage and then its fruit. That is the order in Jeremiah. The psalmist, however, speaks of the tree's providing its blessing for man, so he praises the tree's virtues in the order of their importance to man: first the fruit and then the foliage which gives shade. (With this difference in the order one can compare Ezekiel 47:12. The first half of the verse says: "And on the banks . . . there will grow all kinds of trees for food; their *foliage* will not fade, their *fruit* will not fail". First: foliage, then: fruit, since this part of the verse speaks of the tree with regard to the botanical order. On the other hand, the second half continues: "their *fruit* will be for food and their *foliage* for healing". Here we have a description of the benefits conferred upon man by the tree.) Finally, Jeremiah, speaking about the blessing of the tree, says: "its foliage is luxuriant" because *for the tree* it is not enough that the "foliage does not fade", whereas concerning the tree's gift *to man*, the main thing is that the "foliage does not fade".

45. According to this view, the image is fused with the idea conveyed by the psalm and is more deeply rooted in its wording than according to Weiser's view; the latter holds that the subject of the psalm is "the meaning and the value of life which the godly man discovers".

46. Ehrlich *ad loc.*

The image of the tree in our psalm, therefore, is intended to express the idea that just as the nature and value of the tree are determined by its fruit and green foliage, for that is its function as established by its Creator, so too the nature and value of the righteous man in his fulfillment of the will of his Creator. Verse 3 is thus the direct continuation of verse 2. The man who meditates "on the Torah of God day and night" is not affected even if all the slings and arrows of fortune smite him. He fulfills his function and always gives his fruit in its season.

"Not so the wicked" (verse 4) means, as Radak explained, "men will have no benefit from them or from their goodness". "Rather, they are like chaff that wind blows away". Here again, it is not the punishment of the wicked that is intended, but rather the image of the farmer, who gathers his sheaves into the granary, threshes the grain, and when the kernels remain mixed with the chaff, he winnows them with a winnowing fan to the wind. The heavy grain kernels fall to the ground and the light chaff, which contains no grain and is merely worthless straw, flies away. This is comparable to the life of the wicked. Life without Torah is similar, in the eyes of the poet, to beaten chaff, with no grain, without any value or content — "like chaff that wind blows away".[47]

From here it follows that the main force of imagery is that it not only assists the understanding, but it also activates and stimulates all kinds of emotional overtones and ancillary ideas. The function of the image is not only to clarify the meaning; it says what is not said, because it could not be said, without it. We might be able to express in prose sentences what the psalm's images signify; for example: the man who is wholly devoted to Torah lives a life of value for the world, since he fulfills his function at the proper time, without giving way to external circumstances; whereas the wicked man's life has no value for the world. But when we express the idea of the images in these sentences, we have not only omitted linguistic embellishment, but we have also destroyed the vitality and even to some extent the very essence of the text. For example, the image in the psalm

47. Compare Weiser, whose view is similar to one of Radak's two explanations: "Men will get no profit from the wicked nor from their favours, but they [the wicked] will only harm them ... like the chaff ... from which people derive no advantage but the wind drives it quickly away; it harms passers-by in their faces and their eyes, or else [the wind] drives it into houses and gardens, where it does harm".

also conveys the idea that the sources from which the righteous man draws his sustenance will never run dry, because they are "streams of water", with all their refreshing associations. It also includes an expression of the fresh green colour which delights the eye and indicates the freshness in contrast to any sense of withering and wilting ("does not fade"). What was expressed here is not mere utility but also that which refreshes and delights the eye. Where is all this in our prose version?

Furthermore, what the psalm has to say is expressed not only through the "content" of the images, but also through their "form". First we note that only the righteous — and the LORD — are active; only they, and never the wicked, are subjects of transitive verbs.[48] The description of the righteous extends to twelve words, the description of the wicked is limited to four,[49] so that an evaluation of the lives of the two types about which the psalm speaks is expressed through this literary means as well. Twelve — a round number; four, unlike three or five — an incomplete number. Twelve — many. Four — a few. The life of the wicked is not like the life of the righteous. It is imperfect, incomplete, and this is why the psalmist need not waste words on it,[50] not only because the wicked are not the main theme of the psalm.[51]

48. Lack, *art. cit.* (note 4, above), p. 159: "Les impies ne réalisent rien, leur vie ne débouche sur rien, ils ne sont sujets d'aucun verbe transitif".

49. Words connected by a *maqef* (hyphen) are considered as one word. Merendino sees the disproportion as the result of interpolations (*art. cit.* [note 4, above], pp. 46-49).

50. Yellin notes the striking difference between the length of the descriptions, but his explanation is based on the widespread conception that the images are a description of retribution. Yellin writes: "The number of words devoted to each of the comparisons corresponds to what the author wished to express: the image of the righteous, whose good fortune will be long and continuous is detailed at length. In contrast to this, the image of the wicked, whose success is transient, and vanishes quickly, is presented briefly and disposed of with one short statement ... as though this wind drove the wicked away in a moment and he is no more to be spoken of" (*op. cit.* [p. 133, note 15], p. 52). Certainly it might be asked: if there is so great a difference between Yellin's interpretation and ours, is this not a proof that such conclusions or those similar to them, deduced from stylistic aspects, are no more than subjective effusions? Is this not a proof that this method leads to interpretations which are simply the product of the commentator's imagination?! What proof is there that our interpretation of the difference between the description of the righteous and the description of the wicked is the valid one and not Yellin's? Are we at all permitted to assume that this difference expresses a specific intention? To such questions we respond with the

Thus it follows from the stylistic and structural characteristics of the tree-image that this psalm depicts not the destiny but the lifestyle of the righteous and the wicked. But is not this view disproved by the continuation of the image in verse 3bβ: *wĕkol 'ăšer ya'ăśeh yaṣlī^{a}ḥ*? It is indeed if *yaṣlī^{a}ḥ* is taken as a transitive verb with *kol* as its direct object, or if *yaṣlī^{a}ḥ* is taken as intransitive and *kol* as dative, i.e. if we translate (with most modern scholars[52]): "Whatever he does he [the man] prospers", or (with most earlier commentators[53]): "Whatever it [the tree] does, it brings to a successful issue", or: "In all that he (or: it) does, he (or: it) prospers". In fact, however, the whole context demands and indicates a different syntactical construction. *Kol* is the subject of the main clause and its predicate *yaṣlī^{a}ḥ* is intransitive; the subject of the relative clause is *hā'īš*.

words of Staiger: "The first conception of the text that arises in the mind of the interpreter and the testing of this interpretation — they constitute the hermeneutic circle .... Let us assume that my conception is invalid, suddenly my interpretation confronts an obstacle, till here and no further. I cannot adjust the verse to the motif, the structure of the sentence, the image to the verse .... If I proceed on the right path, if my first conception has not led me astray, then wherever I turn I shall succeed in finding the proper relationship of the parts. Everything fits together; from all directions there is agreement. Each detail that comes into view confirms what is already known. The interpretation is certain" (Staiger, pp. 18-19 [= *Die Werkinterpretation*, p. 155]).

51. As we indicated above (note 5), Gunkel finds fault with the fact that the psalmist, in contrast to Jeremiah, refrains from describing the acts of the wicked and omits any explicit expression of the curse. But the psalmist does not intend to speak in a symmetrical fashion about the righteous and wicked; he rather wishes to speak of the righteous and of his happiness. The wicked is mentioned only as the antithesis, to serve as a dark background for the sake of emphasis, in conformity with the psalmist's didactic purpose. According to J. Hempel, the characteristic tendency of the didactic psalms and of the wisdom literature in general is the black-and-white technique (*Das Ethos des Alten Testaments* [*BZAW* LXVII]^{2}, Berlin [1964], p. 92). Jeremiah, on the other hand, intended explicitly to describe both the curse of the wicked and the blessing of the righteous.
52. Dahood writes *ad loc.*: "Though ancient and modern versons assume that the subject changes from 'tree' to 'the just man' the shift is abrupt and unnecessary". Among Jewish exegetes Ibn Ezra mentions, *inter alia*, that this sentence refers to man, who is compared to a tree.
53. The Targum makes "its foliage" the subject of the sentence. This view is also mentioned by Ibn Ezra and is the explanation given by Malbim. Ibn Ezra also mentions: "Some say" that the sentence in verse 3b refers to the tree.

Thus we should translate: "Whatever he does is successful" — it is not the man but whatever he does that succeeds. Verse 3 is a direct continuation of verse 2: he who "meditates on His Torah day and night, he is like a tree planted beside streams of water, that yields its fruits ... and whatever he does is successful".

According to this view there is no place for the suggestion that the words at the end of verse 3 are an interpolation from Joshua 1:8 and should be erased.[54] Gunkel indeed believes that these words are a "redundant and prosaic interpretation of the image", but as we have seen, this sentence is not at all a "redundant interpretation" of the images and still less is it "prosaic". Without it we might have taken the comparison to mean that just as the tree planted by streams of water brings forth fruit whose goodness is easily visible, so will the righteous succeed in performing actions the goodness of which is immediately visible to everyone. But this is not the case. "Whatever he does is successful", all that the righteous does — all, including his failures and even his downfall.[55] It is sometimes the case that the righteous man is unsuccessful, but in the end it becomes clear that even his downfall, even his failure, is actually success and victory. If, indeed, the psalmist has used here the words of Joshua 1:8 (as is asserted by the scholars who regard verse 3bβ as an interpolation) — where undoubtedly the verb *taṣlī^{a}ḥ* has a different meaning — he has used it only as raw material, for he has infused it with a new content and idea, which is not at all "prosaic".

Careful consideration of the exact wording of the images in the psalm has shown us that they do not deal with the fate of the righteous and the wicked, nor do they speak of retribution, and that commentators who thought they did were misled by associations with Jeremiah 17. Such associations, as has been said,[56] constitute a great danger to the commentators, which they would certainly have escaped if they had treated

54. E.g. Gunkel, Kittel, Kraus, and Merendino, who feels that the interpolator refers to such verses as Jeremiah 2:37; 32:5; perhaps also 5:28, 12:1 and even II Chronicles 31:21; 33:30 (*art. cit.* [note 4, above], p. 49). See also *BH*.
55. Compare Buber: "However cruel and contrary this destiny might appear when viewed apart from intercourse with God, when it is irradiated by His 'knowing' it is 'success', just as every action of this man, his disappointments and even his failures are success" (*art cit.* [above, p. 136, note 4], p. 59).
56. See above, pp. 90-91.

seriously not only the "content" of the images but also their "form", paid attention not only to what they have in common but also — above all — to the differences between them.

Further support for our interpretation is supplied by the next verse: "Therefore the wicked will not stand in the judgment" (verse 5).

If the common interpretation of verses 3 and 4, that they describe the *fate* of the righteous as a "tree planted" and the wicked as "chaff", is correct — what then is the meaning of the continuation "therefore . . ."?

The mediaeval Jewish commentators saw in verses 3-4 a description of the fate of the righteous in this world, and in verse 5 a description of retribution in the world to come (Ibn Ezra, Radak). Critics who accept the traditional text and do not omit the conjunction "therefore" at the beginning of the verse[57] see in verse 4 either the description of the condition of the wicked which causes further consequences as described in verse 5: since the fate of the wicked is "like chaff which wind blows away", therefore (also) the wicked shall not stand in the "judgment" (Gunkel); or else they understand what is described in verse 4 as the cause of what is described in verse 5: "Since the wicked are like chaff which wind blows away, therefore the wicked . . . " (Kraus); "and so the wicked shall not stand . . . " (Dahood).

But these interpretations are extremely forced. If it is agreed that the images do not represent the reward of the righteous or the retribution of the wicked but rather their essential character, then the connexion between verses 3-4 and verse 5 is perfectly clear and requires no further explanation. Since the nature of the wicked is as described in verse 4, their fate will be as described in verse 5.

Thus we see that an incorrect interpretation of the images leads to an unjustified evaluation of the whole psalm. At the root of the error, some

57. Duhm states simply — without explaining — "Verse 5 is the explanation of verse 4; hence the connecting word 'therefore' in the Masoretic Text is not at all appropriate." But Chajes, who reaches the same conclusion, explains his view: "And I am inclined to say that the original form of our verse was 'the wicked shall not stand' etc. 'Therefore' comes from verse 3, which is its proper place, while we should here read *lō kēn* ('not so')." (Let it be noted: the text, the objective datum, is not the basis for the interpretation, but rather the contrary: there is an interpretation — whose validity has not been at all established — and according to this subjective interpretation the "correct" text is determined.)

claim, is antisemitic prejudice,[58] while others assert that it was dogmatic theological assumptions that blinded the commentators,[59] and yet others say — just as we heard from Engnell — that historical views and general attitudes which have dominated Biblical research perverted the critical opinions of the psalm. It is indeed highly probable that all these factors exerted some influence in perverting judgment on our psalm. After all, it is true that absolute objectivity in interpretation is not possible and it is impossible to free oneself entirely from preconceptions, but it is equally true that careful scrutiny of the text is a safeguard against such errors.

Now that an understanding of the exact meaning of the "tree planted" image in the speech of the prophet and the poem of the psalmist has been

58. M. Steckelmacher, "Die Psalmen in der Beleuchtung einiger ihrer aelteren und neuen Interpreten", in: *Judaica - Herrmann Cohen-Festschrift*, Berlin 1912, pp. 49-73; especially p. 62 for Gunkel's view of Psalm 1.

59. A. Kaminka ("Hashegagot Vehazedonot Beviure Kitve Haqodesh", *Sinai*, III [1938-39], pp. 201-206, 401-448; about Kittel's view of our chapter see p. 448) speaks of "errors due to faith which become deliberate misinterpretations". Just as attitudes in Protestant theology — and most Biblical scholars are Protestants — are reflected, as we said above (p. 32) in Biblical scholarship in general, so are they mirrored in the religious evaluation of Psalm 1. According to Duhm: "This ideal of piety, which corresponds to that of the Pharisees in the New Testament, prevents us from unconditionally accepting the content of Psalm 1". According to Gunkel: "The righteous spends all his days in the study of the Torah with perfect joy in order to know more and more the will of God: this is a description characteristic of the piety of Judaism." According to Kittel: "The psalm changes the saying of the prophet in the spirit of Torah Judaism. We have no doubt with which of the two views about the behaviour pleasing to God Jesus and Paul would have agreed." Whereas Weiser's opinion is: " . . . this rigid one-sidedness of the psalmist's view must be understood in the light of the faith which inspires the psalm and also in the light of its educational purpose which presses for a decision. There is therefore no need to regard the psalmist's one-sided view as the utterance of a religious arrogance bearing the stamp of the Pharisaic attitude." And according to Kraus: "The 'Pharisee' . . . is not the embodiment of this image of the righteous in the psalm. The New Testament teaches us that it was Jesus who embodied the figure imagined by the psalmist." (In the history of the commentary on our psalm, Kraus' conception is not altogether new. Several of the church fathers [Origen, Eusebius, Augustine, and at first also Jerome] identified the righteous with Jesus. See R. Loewe, "The Jewish Midrashim and Patristic and Scholastic Exegesis of the Bible", in: *Studia Patristica*, I, Berlin [1957], p. 500.) And so, for some proponents of historical-critical research, the righteous in Psalm 1 and Jesus are direct opposites, whereas, for others the latter is the incarnation of the former.

arrived at, the Egyptian analogue can serve the Biblical scholar as material for comparison. It can make him aware of changes in the use of this image, which is the concern of research in the field of the history of literature and culture.[60] It can also make him aware of changes in the conception of the ideal man, which is the concern of the history of religion. So I. L. Seeligmann perceives the use of the images in these three places (the Amen-em-opet proverbs, Jeremiah, and Psalms) as an expression of the changes in the ideal, as a mirror of different world-views. The Egyptian sees as the object of comparison the self-controlled, reserved individual, Jeremiah the man who trusts in God, while the psalmist, in consequence of a development in religion, views the tree as symbolizing the man who meditates on God's Law.[61]

However, this conclusion which Seeligmann draws from the differences in the use of the image does not seem to us irrefutable. Even if Psalm 1 is later than Jeremiah 17 (which is what Seeligmann assumes, though it can be neither proved nor refuted), it is impossible to determine scientifically that our psalm mirrors a change of the ideal of the righteous as the result of religious development. It is not necessary to say that he who trusts in God is a different religious type from the one who meditates on the Torah of God. It is more reasonable to say that both he who trusts in God and he who meditates on the Torah of God are representations of the *ṣaddiq* ("righteous"), who is described in two places in two different aspects. Typologically, it is only reasonable that the two traits should belong to the same character. Furthermore, we can now see the reason for the different traits of the righteous man in the two passages.

Since we have shown that the prophet speaks of the fate of the righteous and wishes to illustrate with his image that the righteous does not suffer even in the most difficult times, it is natural that he should speak of the righteous as one who trusts in God, emphasizing by the metaphor just that trust in God.[62] The psalmist, on the other hand,

60. Compare, for example, the uses of Homer's imagery in the latter literature. See E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (transl. by W. R. Trask), London [1953], p. 186.

61. "Voraussetzungen der Midraschexegese", *SVT*, I (1953), pp. 168f.

62. According to R. Davidson the section in Jeremiah 17:5-8 is "a prophetic warning against the policy which led to [the disaster in] Megiddo.... To Jeremiah the interests of true religion could not have been advanced by this type of political adventure". Davidson goes on to say that this is why the text here deals with "the man who trusts in God" ("The Interpretation of Jeremia XVII: 5-8", *VT*, IX [1959], p. 205).

wishing to illustrate the lifestyle and value of the righteous man, speaks of his meditation on the Torah of God.

Finally, let us pay attention to the full harmony of all the details, both in the words of the prophet and in those of the psalmist. In both passages, the correspondence between the whole and the parts is complete and definite. This is expressed also by the frame of the images. Jeremiah speaks unambiguously about punishment and reward, for which reason he begins with *'ārūr* ("cursed") and *bārūk* ("blessed"). Our psalm describes the nature of the two types, and for this reason the psalmist exclaims: *'ašrē* ("happy"). Moreover, since Jeremiah teaches retribution, he represents the man who trusts in God as untroubled, even to the extent that he is spared pain in the worst times. The psalmist teaches the right way to live, and so he shows us the man who meditates on God's Torah day and night and how he then gives the fruit of his "meditation" — "*his* fruit" — to his fellow man. Hence also, certainly, the use of the word *geber* (root of *gibbōr* — "hero") in Jeremiah as the prophet depicts the lot of the man who trusts in God and the use of the word *'īš* ("man" in general) in the psalm, as the psalm acclaims the one who delights in God's Torah.

We conclude that the scholar who uses our psalm as a document illustrating a religious outlook will not draw accurate conclusions unless he interprets the psalm according to the method of Total Interpretation. Only in this way is it possible to understand the meaning of the psalm, to evaluate it and to draw logical historical conclusions.

2

K. Fullerton has demonstrated the special artistry in the composition of the first speech of Eliphaz (Job 4-5).[1] Indeed, as H. H. Rowley has said, "the speech of Eliphaz is one of the masterpieces of the book".[2]

However, when we attempt to base our evaluation not on a general im-

1. "Double Entendre in the First Speech of Eliphaz", *JBL*, XLIX (1930), pp. 320-374; see also the recent sequel, Y. Hoffman, "The Use of Equivocal Words in the First Speech of Eliphaz (Job IV-V)", *VT*, LXX (1980), pp. 114-119.

2. "The Book of Job and Its Meaning", *EJRL*, XLI (1958), p. 199, note 1.