## Psalm 80— Logotechnical Analysis

## Guidelines

- Please read the General Introduction as well as the Introduction to Book I and Book III.
- For common features found in the numerical analysis charts, see the "Key to the charts".


## Specific features of Psalm 80

- The divine name numbers as a structuring device underscores the regular poetic framework of Psalm 80. The central core of the poem, the 52 -word lament over the vine and the vineyard (vs. 9-16) is surrounded by the 78 -word ( $3 \times 26$ ) prayer for restoration, which is in two parts:

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
\text { vs. 2-8 } & \text { First part of the people's prayer for restoration } & & 49 \\
\text { vs. } 9-16 & \text { Lament over the vine and the vineyard } & 52 & \\
\text { vs. 17-20 Second part of the people's prayer for restoration } & 29 \\
\hline
\end{array}
$$

vs. 2-20 Total: $\mathbf{1 3 0}=2 \times 26+3 \times \mathbf{2 6}=52+78$

This is reminiscent of the envelope technique used in Psalms 77, 81, and 83, and significantly also in Deuteronomy 33. See below Observation 3.

- A special feature of Psalm 80, which it shares with other Asaphite Psalms, 76, 78, 81, and 82 , is the use of the numerical value of a keyword to help structure the text. Here, two words serve this purpose: first, 㖊, 'vine' (34), additionally functioning as inclusion to demarcate the lament over the vine and the vineyard (vs. 9-16), and second, הֲשִׁיבֵנוּ, 'restore us!' (58), which features also in the refrain (vs. 4a, 8a and 20a).
- In line with the compositional technique used in all Asaphite psalms analyzed so far, the meaningful centre of Psalm 80 - the 'metaphor of the vine' in vs. 9-12-is not found on word level, but in terms of the poetic structure: the middle canticle $(5=2+1+2)$, the 2 middle strophes $(10=4+2+4)$ and the 4 middle verselines $(20=8+4+8)$.
Strophic structure - Canto/Stanza boundary: || Canticle boundary: |
- Van der Lugt: 2-3a, 3b-4 | 5-6, 7-8 || 9-10, 11-12 | 13-14, 15-16 || 17-18, 19-20 (5 subsections -3 cantos, of which the first 2 are divided into canticles), with 10 strophes, 20 verselines and 40 cola (rightly excluding v . 16 b as dittography).
- Fokkelman: 2-3a, 3b-4 || 5-6, 7-8 || 9-10, 11-12, 13-14 || 15-17, 18-20 (4 stanzas with 9 strophes - taking vs. $15-17$ and 18-19 as the $8^{\text {th }}$ and $9^{\text {th }}$ strophes -20 verselines and 42 cola, regarding not only v. 10, but also v. 15 as a tricolon).
- Labuschagne: 2-3a, 3b-4 | 5-6, 7-8 || 9-10, 11-12 | 13-14, 15-16 || 17-18, 19-20 (as Van der Lugt, except that I find 41 cola, taking v. 10 as a tricolon).


## Logotechnical analysis

- Columns $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ show the number of words before and after the atnach.
- Column c: the prayer for restoration; d: the lament over the vine and vineyard.
- The numbering of the verselines is in brown.

|  |  |  |  | otal | a | b | c | d |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 6 | 3 | 3 |  |  |
| $2 \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{b}$ |  |  | 1 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |  |
|  |  | Total, v. 2a-b |  | 6 | 6 |  | 6 |  |
| 2 c |  |  | 2 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  |
| $3{ }^{*}$ |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |  |
|  |  | Total, v. 2c-3a |  | 6 | $=3$ |  | $=6$ | + 0 |
|  |  | Strophe 1 Total, v. 2-3a |  | 12 | $=9$ | + 3 | $=9$ | + 0 |
| 3b |  | עוֹרְרָה אֶת | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  |
|  |  | Total, v. 3b-c |  | 6 | $=3$ | + 3 | $=6$ | + 0 |
|  |  | Total, v. 2-3c |  | 18 | $=12$ |  | $=18$ | + 0 |
| 4 | 58 = הֲשִׁירֵנוּ |  | 4 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  |
|  |  | Total, v. 4 |  | 5 | $=2$ | + <br> + | $=5$ | + 0 |
|  |  | Strophe 2 Total, v. 3b-4 |  | 11 | $=5$ | + 6 | $=11$ | + 0 |
|  |  | Canticle l. 1 Total, v. 2-4 |  | 23 | $=14$ |  | $=23$ | + 0 |
| 5 |  |  | 5 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |  |
|  |  | Total, v. 5 |  | 8 | $=3$ | + 5 | $=8$ | $+0$ |
| 6 |  |  | 6 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  |
|  |  | Total, v. 6 |  | 6 | $=3$ |  | $=6$ | + 0 |
|  |  | Strophe 3 Total, v. 5-6 |  | 14 | $=6$ |  | $=14$ | + 0 |
|  |  | Total, v. 2-6 |  | 37 | $=20$ | + 17 | $=37$ | $+0$ |
| 7 |  |  | 7 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  |
|  |  | Total, v. 7 |  | 6 | $=3$ | + 3 | $=6$ | + 0 |
|  |  | Total, v. 3-7 |  | 34 | $=17$ | + 17 | $=34$ | + 0 |
| 8 | 58 = הֲשִׁיבני |  | 8 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |  |
|  |  | X : וְהָאר |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  |
|  |  | Total, v. 8 |  | 6 | $=3$ | + 3 | $=6$ | + 0 |
|  |  | Total, v. 4-8 |  | 31 | $=14$ | + 17 | $=30$ | + 0 |
|  |  | Strophe $4 \quad$ Total, v. 7-8 |  | 12 | $=6$ | + 6 | $=12$ | + 0 |
|  |  | Numerical Total, v. 2-4 |  | 23 | $=14$ | $+9$ | $=23$ | $+0$ |
|  | Canticle I. | . 2 Chiasmus Total, v. 5-8 |  | $\underline{26}$ | $=12$ |  | $=26$ | + 0 |
|  | Canto I | First part of prayer, v. 2-8 |  | 49 | $=26$ | + 23 | = 49 | + 0 |




- V. 3a: many commentators have pointed out that there might be a problem with one of the three tribes mentioned, Ephraim, Benjamin and Manasseh. In BHS it is noted that one Hebrew manuscript lacks the name Benjamin, while two others lack Manasseh. Since Ephraim and Manasseh is a pair, Benjamin is certainly the odd one out. Additionally, in light of the fact that in v. 2 b , Joseph is mentioned explicitly as representing Northern Israel (cf. Ps. 77:16), the reference to Benjamin, positioned between Ephraim and Manasseh, is highly questionable. In my opinion, the name of Benjamin, as the most northern Judean tribe, which always lived in close association with Judah, was inserted later by a scribe who interpreted the reference to Israel in v. 2a as not exclusively referring to the Northern Kingdom. Moreover, it is very likely that the insertion was also inspired by the words of אִישׁ יְזִּיֶֶָ, 'the man of your right hand' in v. 18a. These considerations lead to my decision to exclude 'Benjamin' from the word count.
- V. 14a: in the Leningrad Codex the ע of letters' - so designated by the Masoretes in the margin - is in most cases to indicate a correction of an earlier text, but here it may denote the middle letter of the Psalter. See Emanuel Tov, Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Fortress Press: Minneapolis, Van Gorcum: Assen/Maastricht, 1992, p. 57.
- V. 8b: at the end of the verse the LXX has a סֶלָה, most probably in order to demarcate vs. 2-8.
- V. 16b: I exclude these four words from the word-count. Many scholars rightly regard them as a case of dittography based on v. 18b (see BHS). The two emendations (in v. 3a and 16b) bring the total number of words to $130(5 \times 26)$. The latter number is particularly significant, because Psalm 79, a sister poem of Psalm 80, is also made up of exactly 130 words!


## Observations

1. The arithmetic centre of the $130(5 \times 26)$ words of the emended text of the poem is
 $(130=64+2+64)$. The two words can hardly be regarded as the meaningful centre. It must lead to the conclusion that the meaningful centre is not to be found on word level, but in terms of the poetical structure, as is the case in all Asaphite psalms studied so far. See below, and also Observations 1-3 in my analysis of Psalm 79.
2. In search of the meaningful centre, I found it in vs. 9-12, the metaphor of the vine. These four verses constitute the middle canticle ( $5=2+1+2$ ), coinciding with the 2 middle strophes $(10=4+2+4)$, the 4 middle verselines $(20=8+4+8)$ and the 9 middle cola ( $41=16+9+16$ ). The pivotal position of the middle canticle is buttressed by the fact that it is the only canticle with 9 cola (the others are all made up of 8 cola):

A vine from Egypt you dug out // you drove out nations and planted it.
You cleared the ground for it // so that it struck root // and filled the land.
The mountains were covered with its shade // and its branches were divine cedars.
It put out its boughs all the way to the Sea // and to the River its shoots.
There is no doubt in my mind that the text has purposefully been so arranged that the passage dealing with YHWH's transplanting of the vine from Egypt to the promised land, was positioned at the arithmetic centre on the level of sub-sections (cantos and canticles), strophes, verselines and cola. Needless to say, the 'vine-passage' is very meaningful, because it focuses on the ideal situation in the land before the catastrophe of the exile.
3. The overall framework based on Van der Lugt's rhetorical analysis: 5 sub-sections, 10 strophes, 20 verselines and 40 cola (in my view 41 ), is significantly underscored by the numerical structure based on the logotechnical analysis: the 52-word ( $2 \times 26$ ) lament $(25+27)$ is surrounded by the $78(3 \times 26)$ words of the prayer $(49+29)$. See Psalm 77 for a strikingly similar feature, where we find $78(3 \times 26)$ words in the central section, surrounded by $68(4 \times 17)$ in the framework. Compare also the 69word central section of Psalm 81 surrounded by $51(3 \times 17)$ words, as well as the 51word ( $3 \times 17$ ) central canto of Psalm 83!

| $2-4$ | 1 Canticle | 2 strophes | 4 vs.lines | 8 cola | 23 w. |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $5-8$ | 1 Canticle | 2 strophes | 4 vs.lines | 8 cola | 26 w. |  |
| $9-12$ | 1 Canticle | 2 strophes | 4 vs.lines | 9 cola |  | 25 w. |
| $13-16$ | 1 Canticle | 2 strophes | 4 vs.lines | 8 cola | 27 w. |  |
| $17-20$ | 1 canto | 2 strophes | 4 vs.lines | 8 cola | 29 w. |  |
| $2-20$ | 5 canticles | 10 strophes | 20 vs.lines | 41 cola | 78 w. | 52 w. |

Finally, note that the vine and the vineyard are evidently a metaphor for Joseph, who is specifically mentioned in v. 2! The conspicuous way in which the 52 -word lament over the vine(yard) is enveloped by $78(3 \times 26)$ words, reminds us of the 52 -word Blessing for Joseph in Deuteronomy 33 (vs. 13-17), which is strikingly encompassed in a comparable way:

| Deut. 33:1-12 | $\mathbf{1 4 6}$ words |
| :--- | :--- |
| Deut. $33: 13-17$ | $2+52(3 \times 26)$ words |
| Deut. $33: 18-29$ | $\mathbf{1 3 6}(8 \times 17)$. |

Since this cannot be a matter of coincidence, it strongly suggests that Psalm 80 and Deuteronomy 33 are interdependent. In my opinion, the author of Deuteronomy 33 (an Asaphite Levite?) was familiar with Psalm 80, and used the central positioning and the size ( 52 words) of the 'Joseph passage' as a model to give structure to the Blessing of Moses with the Joseph blessing at the centre. See Observation 4 in my Analysis of Deuteronomy 33.
4. Note that the 49 words of vs. 2-4 and 5-8 together form a numerical chiasmus, and that vs. 5-8 and 9-12 together have $51(3 \times 17)$ words.
The fact that the word $\}$ ְֶֶ, 'vine', is the very first word of the passage (v. 9a), and that it recurs at the end ( v .15 c ), shows that it functions as an inclusion, emphasizing the unity of the entire vine-passage vs. 9-16.
When I counted the letters in the meaningful centre, which I did intuitively, I found 26 letters in v. 9, and $102(6 \times 17)$ altogether in 9-12. There is every reason to believe that this is not a matter of coincidence, but consciously so designed. This has to do
with the numerical value of the crucial keyword $\bar{\square}$ :ु, 'vine', which is $34(3+17+14)$, and $\mathbf{1 0 2}$ is $3 \times 34$. Significantly, vs. 3-7, a substantial part of the prayer, is made up of 34 words, with 17 before, and 17 after atnach. That this is not a matter of chance either, gains in credibility in light of the fact that vs. 9-18 have $68(2 \times 34)$ words. See the General Introduction, "The numerical value of a keyword in the text".
5. The assumption about the numerical value of the keyword is underscored by the conspicuous presence of another keyword, הֲשׁׁירֵנוּ, 'restore us!', which expresses the leading idea of the prayer. It features in the refrains concluding the three sections of the prayer in a striking, gradual progression: 2 words, 3 words, 4 words:

```
Canticle I.1, vs. 2-4 (in v. 4a) God, restore us!
Canticle I.2, vs. 5-8 (in v. 8a) God of Hosts, restore us!
Canto III, vs. 17-20 (in v. 20a) YHWH, God of Hosts, restore us!*
```

Its numerical value, $58(5+21+10+2+14+6)$, is used - as in the case of define the total number of words in part of the text, in this case, vs. 9-17. The compositional formula of this passage is highly significant: $58=32+26$, being an exact presentation of the kebod-YHWH formula! See the General Introduction, under "Special patterns".
6. The divine name numbers feature in the following way:
vs. 2-6 $\quad 17$ words after atnach
vs. 3-7 $\quad 34$ words, with 17 before, and 17 after atnach
vs. 4-8 $\quad \mathbf{1 7}$ words after atnach
vs. 5-8 $\quad 26$ words in total
vs. 2-8 26 words before atnach
vs. 5-12 $\quad 51$ ( $3 \times 17$ ) words in total
vs. 11-14 $\quad 26$ words in total
vs. 9-16a 52 ( $2 \times 26$ ) words in total
vs.13-16a $\quad 17$ words before atnach
vs. 9-17 $\quad 26$ words after atnach
vs. 9-18 $68(4 \times 17)$ words in total
vs. 15-20 43 words in total, with 26 before, and 17 after atnach
vs. 5-20 $\quad 51(3 \times 17)$ words after atnach
vs. 2-20 $\quad 78(3 \times 26)$ words in the prayer for restoration (column c)
vs. 2-20 $52(2 \times 26)$ words in the lament over the vine (column d)
vs. 2-20 $\quad 130(5 \times 26)$ words in total, as in Psalm 79
vs. 1-20 $\quad 136(8 \times 17)$ words including the heading.
7. The name יהוה occurs twice in the designation יְהוָה אֶלדִים צְבְאוֹת (vs. 5a and 20a). The epithet צְבָאוֹת features $4 x$ (vs. 5a, 8a, 15a, and 20), in two instances in the combination אֶלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת. (vs. 8a and 15a). The designation אֶלהּתִים occurs 5 times (vs. $4 \mathrm{a}, 5 \mathrm{a}, 8 \mathrm{a}, 15 \mathrm{a}$, and 20a). The word k , occurring in v. 11b, functions as a superlative in the expression אַרְזי־אֵל, 'divine cedars', i.e., 'mighty cedars'.
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[^0]
[^0]:    * Compare the stepped tower structure $(3+5+7)$ of the Priestly Blessing. For the refrains in the Book of Psalms, see Pieter van der Lugt, CAS, 2006, pp. 490ff.

