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ABSTRACT

The thesis presents one approach to reading the Song of Songs as a unified composition. The first chapter examines the various arguments for unity and disunity that have been put forth in the history of the Song's interpretation. Although no definitive structure based on patterns of repetition seems possible in the Song, the chapter argues that the complex web of repetition in the text points to a unified composition. The second chapter explores the possibility of a regulating structure based on the interaction of voices in the Song. After outlining the various genres evident in the Song, as well as the speaker-addressee relationships within these genres, the chapter argues that such a regulating structure is to be found in the Song's unified discourse setting. This discourse setting consists of two lovers who interact with the Daughters of Jerusalem. The third chapter examines some of the implications of such a unified discourse setting for the interpretation of the Song. The chapter suggests that while the discourse setting is consistent throughout the work, two distinct fictive realms are apparent within the text: one fictive realm deals with the escapades of two lovers; a second fictive realm presents the endeavors of Solomon. The chapter argues for an explanatory relationship between the block of material pertaining to Solomon and the discourse setting of the work. The block of material pertaining to Solomon, because it features the Daughters of Jerusalem as characters, has particular relevance for the Daughters as they reside in the discourse setting of the work. The chapter also argues for a thematic relationship between the stories about Solomon and the narratives and lyrics which deal with the two lovers. The love poetry serves to mold the reader's evaluation of particular images which recur within the Solomonic material. The discourse setting and the two distinct fictive realms work together to convey a negative evaluation of Solomon's treatment of the Israelites, represented metaphorically as the Daughters of Jerusalem within the Song.
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I. THE UNITY OF THE SONG OF SONGS

Within contemporary scholarship the unity of Song of Songs is a matter of some debate. Unlike the Psalter, however, in which individual units are usually clearly marked, the Song in its present form is a continuous composition. The issue of the Song's unity, then, focuses not on the unity of the text per se, but on the historical development of this unity, its nature, and the means by which it is achieved. While these three aspects of the issue are related, the first maintains a degree of autonomy from the remaining two. The historical perspective focuses on unity or disunity of authorship; the literary perspective, on the interpretive coherence of the received text. As far as any given text is concerned, unity of authorship need not imply interpretive coherence, just as interpretive coherence need not imply unity of authorship. While the primary focus of this chapter will be the interpretive coherence of the poem, the implications of authorial unity for such coherence should perhaps first be examined in more detail.

Numerous positions are possible on the issue of authorship. On the one hand, the Song may have been composed by a single individual, who wrote without drawing upon previous sources. One might tend to assume that a single author guarantees interpretive coherence, but such is not the
case. The Song may represent a collection of that author's poetry, compiled by the author himself or by a later compiler. While generally speaking, the theme of the poetry seems to be human love, the poems may represent individual expressions of this theme, with no overarching intention of coherence. The unity of the Song would then reside in the character of the author. While the reader might be justified in examining one poem in light of another in order to grasp particular features of that author's style, the poems would have to be interpreted on an individual basis. The reader's task, then, would be to identify the individual units and to interpret them apart from their context in the larger continuous work.¹

A second possibility is that the Song represents a collection of poetry by diverse authors, who may have lived in various historical periods and geographical settings. From the point of view of coherence, the same interpretive

¹H. H. Rowley (1952:212-213) advocates such a position when he states:

[The songs] appear to be a series of poems in which a lover enshrined the love he gave and the love received. But, unlike some of those who have treated the book as a collection of amorous poems, I am not able to distribute the poems amongst several authors.... The repetitions that occur leave the impression of a single hand, and there is a greater unity of theme and of style than would be expected in a collection of poems from several hands, and from widely separate ages.
strategy applies as for single authorship. In place of the author stands the compiler, who must have collected the poetry for some reason, whether it be similarity in theme, origin or usage in a particular life-setting, or merely his own particular tastes. As Michael V. Fox (1985:219) suggests, the reader would still be justified in examining one poem in light of another, in order to isolate the various genres presented, or perhaps to identify the rationale for their being collected. The reader would have to determine the meaning of the poems, however, by examining them individually, apart from their context in the Song.

A third possibility is that a writer might incorporate segments or entire poems from previously composed sources into a composition of his own. His own contribution to the work might consist merely in arranging the individual units, with perhaps a few original lines introduced to cement these units together. On the other hand, the majority of the work may be his own creation, with only small portions drawn from previous sources. In any case, because of the influence of previous sources, or the actual incorporation of parts of these sources into the work, one would not speak of a unity of authorship. Still, the literary integrity of the composition remains intact. While the poems or segments borrowed would have particular meanings in their original context, their significance for the work into which they had been incorporated would depend on their relationship to the
rest of that work. In spite of his borrowings, the writer, functioning not merely as a compiler but as an author in his own right, would have imbued his work with an intent of its own. The interpretive strategy for such a work would be very different from that discussed in the two previous examples. While the isolation of units may still play a small role, ultimately one's goal would be to understand the significance of individual units for the meaning of the whole. Since this whole is a combination of all such units, reading one passage in light of others in the text would be essential to grasping the meaning of the text.

The same interpretive strategy applies to a unified work, written without recourse to previous sources. While unity of authorship suggests a uniformity in style that the text of composite origins may not exhibit, such uniformity in style does not exclude the possibility of embedded genres, which would function in much the same fashion as poems or segments incorporated from other sources. Even without instances of distinct genres within the work, the interpreter must be prepared to examine the relationship between the text's various parts in order to grasp the impact of the whole.

While the examples discussed above by no means exhaust the possibilities concerning unity or disunity of authorship, they do help to clarify the relationship between the issue of authorship and that of interpretive coherence.
Such interpretive coherence depends not on unity or disunity of authorship, but rather on a principle of organization, by which individual portions of the text, whether from one author or from many, are related to each other and thus to the whole in a meaningful way. The issue of authorial unity reflects a modern preoccupation with originality which is not apparent in the ancient world. Deliberate reworkings of previous texts to meet the needs of later historical contexts are common in the literature of the Hebrew Bible. While, generally speaking, within modern circles blatant borrowings are looked upon with disdain, there is a growing consciousness of the impossibility of absolute originality.

Francis Landy (1983:34, 293-394) notes that this understanding of textual unity finds its source in Plato:

Every discourse must be composed like, or in the likeness of, a living being, with a body of its own, as it were, so as not to be headless or footless, but to have a middle and members arranged in fitting relation to each other and to the whole (Phaedrus 264 C, tr. Giordana-Orsini).

The most blatant example is probably that of the Chronicler, who reworks much of the material in Kings to suit the needs of his own historical setting.

Two scholars of note here are Harold Bloom (1973) and Linda Hutcheon (1985). Hutcheon (1985:4) notes:

...since Eliot's valorization of the 'historic sense', and the formalist (New Critical, Structuralist) complementary, if very different, turning to the text, we have witnessed a renewed interest in questions of textual appropriation and even influence... Parody is one mode of coming to terms with texts of that 'rich and intimidating legacy of the past' (Bate 1970,4).
Whether an author's dependence on his predecessors lies in the realm of direct borrowings of actual texts or passages, the conventions associated with particular genres, the use of imagery and metaphors whose meanings have been established in other contexts, or the conventions of language itself, his indebtedness to his forerunners cannot be denied. Successful communication of any kind depends on a degree of conventionality. Some cultures may find greater degrees of such conventionality more acceptable than others; but adherence to conventions, even in the form of direct borrowings, does not affect the interpretive coherence of a given text.

Both the definition of interpretive coherence given above, and the phrase "interpretive coherence" itself, however, suggest a direct connection between interpretation and the discernment of unity in a text. Determining a text's interrelatedness, the relationship between its individual parts and between the parts and the whole, is itself an interpretive activity. One must decide what constitutes a significant relationship and what the nature of that relationship is. As Marvin Pope (1977:40) notes: "The

Bloom (1973:7) notes:

...poetic influence need not make poets less original; as often it makes them more original, though not therefore necessarily better.

What is at stake for both Bloom and Hutcheon is the creative use of previous materials.
question of literary unity or integrity is bound up with the problems of form and purpose of the book, and on all these points there has been and remains a wide variety of opinion". As the history of interpretation has shown, the elements which constitute the Song's coherence have been identified variously.

The unity of the Song was never questioned in the allegorical mode of interpretation. The transferral of the primary meaning of the text to referents external to it made the internal consistence and overall movement of the text at the literal level of secondary importance. Within Jewish circles, the text was read as an exposition of the love between God and Israel; Christian exegetes expounded the text in terms of the love between Christ and the Church.


Marvin H. Pope (1977:114) notes that the first Christian known to have allegorized the Song was the Roman Hippolytus who lived around 200 C.E. H. H. Rowley (1952:195) traces Christian allegorical interpretations through to the early twentieth century, noting the work of E. Tobac, "Une page d'histoire de l'exégèse" in Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique xxi, part I, 1925, pp. 510-524.
While there is some evidence for a blurring of the distinction between the two lovers and the natural and cultural aspects of Israel, the textual evidence for identifying the man with God is oblique, if present at all, and the only possible direct allusion to God, found in 8:6, is again dubious. Thus while the allegorical exegetes did not question the unity of the Song, the means by which they maintained the text's unity were extra-textual; in essence, the text served merely as a proof-text for a preconceived theory of human-divine interaction.

The integrity of the text fared only slightly better within the typological approach. Here, while the value of human sexuality was exonerated along with the text's "higher" allegorical meaning, any problems concerning the consistency

See the discussion of the lyric poems in Chapter Two.

Robert Gordis (1974:26-28) suggests that there may be an indirect reference to God in the expression bišəḇā'ōth tō be'ayēlōth hassādeh, "by the gazelles or the hind[s of the field]", in the oath formulae of 2:7 and 3:5. The phrase sounds very similar to the expressions be'löhei səḇāhə'ōth, "by God Sabbaoth", or bə'el šaddai, "by El Shaddai", which one would expect in an oath context.

Again the reference is oblique, drawing upon the yāh suffix in šalhebetyāh as a reference to God. Robert Gordis (1974:26) and Marvin H. Pope (1977:670-671) suggest that this suffix may simply be used to designate a superlative, with no reference to Yahweh intended.

William E. Phipps (1974:84f) sees the typological approach to be the dominant mode of traditional Jewish exegesis. He (1974:85) notes: "Even Philo of Alexandria, who was the most allegorically prone of all Jews, did not discard its literal meaning". As recently as 1982, Edwin C. Webster writes in support of the typological approach.
or movement of the text at its literal level were not considered important. Because of the dual function of the text, discrepancies at the literal level merely highlighted the need for a "higher" level of interpretation. Ultimately, the unity achieved by this approach also proved to be extratextual.

The dramatic theory approached the issue from a different angle: the key to the book was to be found in its multiplicity of voices. The dramatic theory, in its various forms, attempted to find a consistent plot running throughout the book. The problems were manifold. First of all, although in the Song there are many indications of the identity of the speakers and addressees, found in the personal verb forms which indicate at least whether the speaker is singular or plural, pronominal suffixes which indicate the gender and number of the person or persons addressed, and adjectival forms which indicate gender and number, there are still many verses in the Song in which the speaker cannot be determined, even by context. Second,

There are two main versions of the dramatic theory. The first sees two main characters, Solomon and the Shulammite. H. H. Rowley (1952:203) cites Delitzsch, Biblischer Commentar über die poetischen Bücher des Alten Testaments, iv, Hoheslied und Kohe leth, 1875, and Das Hoheslied untersucht und ausgelegt, 1851, as the most notable advocate of this version. The second version sees three main characters in the Song, Solomon, a rustic lover, and the Shulammite. H. H. Rowley (1952:203) notes H. Ewald, Das Hoheslied Salomo's übersetzt mit Einleitung, Ammerkungen und einem Anhang, 1826, as the first to popularize this view. More recent advocates of the dramatic approach include: Moritz Friedlander (1894), S. R. Driver (1913), Louis Golding (1942), Leroy Waterman (1948), and Calvin Seerveld (1963).
attempts to find a consistent plot running throughout the Song resulted in radical reorderings of the text, which changed its character, sometimes beyond recognition. The rationale given by those who advocated the theory was that the text had gone through extensive revisions as it was transmitted, so that its nature as a drama is no longer obvious in the received text. According to the dramatic theory, then, the true unity of the text is pre-textual. But just why the text would have been revised so as to make it less intelligible is seldom discussed. And as H. H. Rowley (1952:205) notes: "So much has to be read between the lines and such complicated stage directions have to be supplied, that its critics feel almost as much has to be brought to the book on this interpretation as on the allegorical". Thus while the theory would see the text's unity to be pre-textual, the unity which advocates of the theory created for the text is extra-textual.

The unity which the cultic interpretation saw in the Song was also both pre-textual and extra-textual. The cultic theory was based on the alleged similarities between the Song and the Mesopotamian texts dealing with the Tammuz cult. The Mesopotamian texts recount a ritual in which human representatives of the god Tammuz and the goddess Ishtar engage in ritual copulation, an action which was to entice

\[1\] Among the earliest to advocate the cultic approach are Theophile J. Meek (1922–1923, 1924a, 1924b, 1956) and Wilfred H. Schoff (1924).
their heavenly counterparts to do the same. Divine copulation resulted in the coming of the spring rains and ensured the fertility of the land. The theory suggested that the Song was originally an expression of a similar ritual, but that it was later revised to conform to Yahwistic religion. Thus Theophile J. Meek (1924:53) states: "As Canticles came to be incorporated into the Yahweh cult, the symbols and material allusions were supplemented by others drawn from the Temple cultus". One of the major problems with the theory is that the Song shows very little evidence of being related to cult activities of any kind, whether it be the Mesopotamian fertility cult or the Israelite Yahwistic cult. Many of the words which Wilfred H. Schoff (1924) argued formed the basis of the relationship between the Song and the Tammuz ritual were common to many contexts and thus not distinctive to the Mesopotamian ritual.\(^2\) Many of the images are found in the Egyptian love poetry as well,\(^3\) where there are no indications of a cultic context. The unity which the cultic interpretation saw in the Song was extra-textual in the sense that it drew a cultic context into the

\(^2\)H. H. Rowley (1952:226) notes the following examples: shepherd, vine, vineyard, dove, gazelle, apple, cedar, palm tree, garden, and hyacinth.

\(^3\)John B. White (1978:118) notes the pastoral, idyllic quality of the imagery within the Egyptian love songs. The emphasis on nature, in imagery such as trees, the delta, plants and animals, and the rustic settings such as the garden house and under trees is very similar to nature imagery in the Song.
debate with insufficient warrant from the text. But again, for those who advocated the theory, the text's true unity was considered pre-textual, since it lay in previous versions of the text in which allusions to the Mesopotamian fertility cult were explicit. Either way, the cultic theory saw the Song's unity as residing in its Sitz im Leben rather than as a textual phenomenon. Theophile J. Meek (1956:97), in this context, expresses the view that the Song is an anthology.

The unity of the Song, according to the wedding week interpretation, is also both pre-textual and extra-textual, grounded in Sitz im Leben as opposed to the text itself. Karl Budde (1894:72), the most influential advocate of the theory, saw the origins of the individual poems to be a wedding context. As such, the Song's unity was pre-textual, residing in the poems' common Sitz im Leben. While Budde (1894:70) suggested that the order of the poems in the Song had been altered, since they no longer reflected the order of events found in the supposedly analogous Syrian practices, other scholars\(^1\) divided the text into seven portions and suggested that the received text reflected the Syrian practice of celebrating a wedding for seven days, allotting one poem for each day. To be sure, there are some parallels between incidents in the Song and the Syrian wedding

practices: the bridegroom being designated as a king (although the parallel designation of the bride as queen is not reflected in the Song), the wasfs or description songs, and the bride's performance of a dance. But as John B. White (1978:146) has noted, the Egyptian love poetry also portrays the male lover in royal terminology without a wedding context. There is evidence of pre-nuptial wasfs in both Arabic and Egyptian poetry. While the dance within the Syrian practices is specifically a sword dance, done to the accompaniment of war songs, the context of the dance in the Song (7:1ff) is not explicit. Another problematic aspect of the theory lies in the fact that the Song makes explicit mention of a marriage only in 3:11, and here, the marriage appears to be an event of the past. Furthermore, the connection between the Song and the Syrian wedding practices is problematic in itself, since these are nineteenth-century practices of people of very mixed origins. The unity of the


19The reference to a marriage in 3:11 does not necessarily suggest that the poem recounts a wedding celebration. Rather, the verse indicates that the crown which Solomon wears in the procession scene of 3:6-11 was given to him on his wedding day. But the wedding day itself appears to be a past event. For further discussion, see Chapter Three.
Song, according to this theory, is pre-textual in that it supposedly lies in the wedding practices of ancient Israel, and extra-textual in that it relies on the analogy of nineteenth-century wedding practices which have no direct historical relation to the Song. But again, both its pre-textual and extra-textual unifying factors lie in Sitz im Leben as opposed to the text itself.

The theories which have been discussed to this point have all more or less fallen out of vogue within the last fifty years. Recent scholarship has stressed a more literal approach to the Song, advocating that the Song represents an expression of secular human love. As far as the unity of the text is concerned, two major theories prevail. The first is that the Song in its present form represents an artificial or contrived unity, which in itself is insufficient to form the basis of a unified interpretation. This interpretation sees the text as an anthology of disparate poems which have been brought together and placed in continuous form. The second theory sees the text as a unified composition, and thus postulates the existence of a unified intent embodied in that composition. On the whole, both approaches advocate a secular context and a general theme of human love. The grounds for asserting or denying interpretive coherence thus depend less on divergent interpretive frames of reference than on the interpretation of various literary phenomena within the text.
The theory that the Song is an anthology of secular love poems first appeared on the scene in the eighteenth century, when Johann Gottfried von Herder expressed the view that the Song represents a sequence of independent ditties extolling sentimental and physical love as pure.²⁰ The view that the Song is an anthology is not unique to the secular interpretation, since advocates of both the cultic theory and the wedding week theory had maintained the Song was in essence a collection of separate poems. But while both the cultic and the wedding week theories maintained some pre-textual unity to the Song, that unity residing in the poems' similar Sitz im Leben, unity within the secular love poetry approach is essentially a textual phenomenon. According to this view, the present text is an anthology of poetry whose origins may lie in a wide variety of life-settings. The reason they have been brought together is their similar theme, human love.²¹

Michael V. Fox (1985:203-204) has recently summarized six arguments which have been advanced in support of the anthology approach. These arguments include:

(1) the Song depicts a variety of life settings [see, for example, Robert Gordis (1974:17-18) and Marcia Falk (1982:64)]


(2) the Song contains a variety of geographical references [see, for example, Robert Gordis (1974:25) and John B. White (1978:33)]

(3) the Song is said to display varied linguistic characteristics [see, for example, M. H. Segal (1962:476, 484, 488), Robert Gordis (1974:25), and John B. White (1978:33)]

(4) the Song contains doublets [see, for example, M. H. Segal (1962:477) and Georg Fohrer (1970:303)]

(5) the Song is said to present a variety of personae, both as speakers and as addressees [see, for example, Franz Landsberger (1954:206), M. H. Segal (1962:477), and Marcia Falk (1982:64)]

(6) analogies with love poetry from other cultures are thought to show that ancient Near Eastern love poetry consisted of short poems that were often collected in anthologies [see, for example, Roland E. Murphy (1977:487)].

Fox argues that none of these factors is conclusive in demonstrating the composite nature of the book. The argument from varied life setting rests on the presupposition that some of the poems originated in a wedding context, a presupposition reminiscent of the wedding week theory. Fox (1985:203) argues that only 3:11 and 8:8 even allude to marriage, and that such allusions do not in themselves necessitate a wedding context as the origin of these sections. The passage in 3:11 has already been discussed (see footnote 19) and will be discussed in further detail in Chapter III. One might add that even if 8:8 does allude to marriage, this marriage appears to be an event of the future, since the group debates what they will do for their sister on
that day. As such, the verse may foreshadow a wedding context, but it need not have originated in one.

That the Song contains a variety of geographical references is also inconclusive for demonstrating the disunity of the book. As Fox (1985:203) notes, the fact that various parts of Syria-Palestine and Transjordan are mentioned need not imply that the poetry originated in these various settings. One must distinguish between the dramatic setting of a work and the geographical location in which a poet writes. Changes in location are entirely feasible within the context of the dramatic setting of a work, and may in fact be crucial to development in plot or character within a work. The argument that there need not be a one-to-one correspondence between a passage's mention of a geographical location and the geographical origins of that passage is especially pertinent in the Song, where geographical references tend to be used, not so much as an indication of dramatic setting, but as points of comparison in similes and metaphors, highlighting the various aspects of the lovers' physiques.²²

That the Song displays linguistic characteristics from various literary periods also fails as definitive evidence for the Song's anthological character, since, as Michael V. Fox (1985:203) suggests, the mixture of linguistic

²²The effect of this description of the lovers in terms of geographical references will be examined in more detail in Chapters II and III.
traits is consistent throughout the Song. M. H. Segal (1962:478,489), on the basis of this mixture of linguistic traits, postulates a complex history of the collection and transmission of the poems, which spans from the Solomonic era to the third century B.C.E.. Segal notes, however, that both those linguistic elements which give the Song its Solomonic flavor and those linguistic elements which give it its Hellenistic flavor occur rather homogeneously throughout the poem. At most, Segal's evidence points to composite authorship of the Song. But as discussed earlier, composite authorship does not in itself imply a lack of interpretive coherence. Furthermore, the fact that late as well as early linguistic features are used so consistently throughout the book would suggest that if a late author did draw on earlier sources in composing his work, he reworked them considerably and thus used them with a particular purpose in mind. Finally, one must allow for the possibility that the author intentionally archaized certain elements of his work in order to imitate literary features from an earlier period, and thus give credence to a dramatic setting temporally far removed from his own.

The argument for disunity on the basis of doublets in the poem is also problematic. Fox (1985:203) notes that doublets can be used as an argument for composite origins only when these doublets differ in style, as they allegedly do in the Pentateuch. The doublets found in the Song do not
differ in style, but sometimes are simple repetitions. Fox, along with Leo W. Schwarz (1964:72) and Marvin H. Pope (1977:50-51) indicates that a similar phenomenon can be seen in the Ugaritic texts and that such doublets need not be taken as a sign of multiple authorship. But Fox's treatment of the argument deals only with the issue of unity or disunity of authorship. From the point of view of interpretive coherence, the problem with the doublets argument is that it presupposes that repetition is mere redundancy and thus fails to acknowledge the various functions and cohesive force repetition has in literary works. As Peter Brooks (1984:123-124) notes:

Repetition is clearly a major operative principle of the system, shaping energy, giving it perceptible form, form that the text and the reader can work with in the construction of thematic wholes and narrative orders. Repetition conceived as binding, the creation of cohesion... may allow us to see how the text and the reader put energy into forms where it can be mastered, both by the logic set in motion by the plot, and by interpretive effort.

(By highlighting the relationship between repetition and form, Brooks points to the importance of repetition for the discernment of unity in a text.) (According to Brooks, repetition helps to "bind" a text, providing the links by which a text is tied together.) As such, it serves as a major signalling device which guides the reader in discerning the relationship between the various parts and the whole.

The fifth argument for disunity, the various personae
found in the Song, is also in itself inconclusive. Fox
(1985:204) deals with the argument by noting:

There are to be sure a variety of characters
in the Song, but it is no sign of disunity
that sometimes a female lover speaks,
sometimes a male, and at other times a group
of females, for there is no hint that
different female lovers speak in different
units or that different male lovers are
addressed in different units, and so on.

But strictly speaking, the argument from various personae is
based more on the complexity of interaction between the
voices present than on the number of characters per se.
Marcia Falk (1982:69, 73-79) perceptively notes not only that
there are different speakers in the Song, but that they
address different audiences. But while Falk’s observation is
insightful, the conclusions she draws remain problematic,
since she postulates that multiple audiences implies no
principle of organization behind the interaction between
speakers and audiences. Falk (1982:71-72), by characterizing
the Song as a collection of lyrics, rules out the possibility
of any such organized interaction, since the lyric, according
to her definition, "tends to be a subjective form, expressive
of personal feeling toward specific subject matter and
addressed to a particular listener". The obvious conclusion
is that if a principle of organization can be found in the
interaction of speakers and audiences in the Song, the Song
need not be lyrical in Falk's sense of the term. 

The final argument for disunity which Fox cites, the tendency within the ancient Near East for love poetry to be collected into anthologies used as an argument a priori for the anthological character of the Song, is also less than convincing. Fox (1985:204) adequately counters this argument when he states:

First of all, no group of Egyptian love poems is organized quite like Canticles. In the anthological collections (P. Harris, groups A and B; Chester Beatty 1, group C), the units are manifestly independent and autonomous songs, with only occasional thematic ties between adjacent units. Certainly these collections show nothing like the uniformity of style and frequency of repetitions that characterize Canticles. Nor do these collections evidence any attempt to join the songs by means of key-words or motifs - a hypothesis advanced by some commentators in order to explain the homogeneous style and the high frequency of repetitions in the Song. These three Egyptian collections show what an anthology of love songs looks like, and it does not look like Canticles.

Fox's discussion of arguments for disunity is by no means all-inclusive. Several other arguments have been advanced in support of the anthology position:

(1) the Song contains a variety of genres [see, for example, Roland E. Murphy (1977:488)]

(2) the Song reflects a wide gamut of emotions [see, for example, Robert Gordis (1974:18)], tones and moods [see, for example, Marcia Falk (1982:69)]

23 On the issue of voice and the complex interaction of voices in the Song, see Chapter Two.
(3) there is no apparent sequence of action within the Song, but rather sudden transition in dialogue and scene (see, for example M. H. Segal (1962:483), Roland E. Murphy (1977:487), and Marcia Falk (1982:64)).

(4) the consecutive use of words and images in different contexts and with different connotations in the Song suggests an arrangement of individual poems on a catchword principle (see, for example, Franz Landsberger (1954:206), Otto Eissfeldt (1965:490), and Marcia Falk (1982:69)).

(5) the Song's varied subject matter and the role of Solomon are difficult to reconcile with the Song's more general theme of human love (see, for example, Robert Gordis (1949:254-265), M. H. Segal (1962:477), and Marcia Falk (1982:69)).

The first two of these arguments are the least persuasive. The co-existence of various genres within a unified work is common in literary texts. One often finds a poem or a letter embedded within the context of a larger narrative or poetic structure; similarly, it is not unusual to find descriptive passages delivered in the third person alongside reported speech or first person accounts. As far as the wide gamut of emotions or moods is concerned, it is hard to conceive of a poem of this length which did not provide some such variety in order to sustain interest.

The remaining three arguments, however, raise important issues regarding the nature of a unified text. In response to the first, the text's lack of sequential development, Francis Landy (1983:34-35) states:

Thus the only irrefutable ground for rejecting the unity of the song, that it
lacks logical sequence, rests on a false premise, namely that logical sequence is an indispensable requirement of lyric poetry....Aristotle did a grave disservice to poetics and in particular to critics of the Song by confining organic unity to the level of mythos or plot.

By indicating the origins of the Western preoccupation with logical sequence, Landy implies that such preoccupation is in fact culturally bound. Works which are organized according to principles of coherence other than logical sequence can be appreciated only if these principles are identified and understood.

The second argument, the consecutive use of key-words and images in diverse contexts and with different connotations, is one that has been popular among those who advocate that the Song is an anthology. Otto Eissfeldt²⁴ was the first to advocate that the Song consists of a collection of poems arranged according to a principle of catchword construction. The theory finds its clearest expression in Franz Landsberger (1954:204):

...in the Song of Songs, the verses have often been joined to one another by virtue of similar words or motives....we may assume that a compiler who puts into one collection poems which have hitherto circulated by way of mouth, would write them down according to the principle of association. Writing down one poem he would remember the next and write down next another with a similar key word.

But if one admits the possibility of a unified text arranged

non-sequentially, that is to say without logical or temporal sequence, then these key-words and motifs used consecutively in different contexts and with different connotations may provide one of the keys to understanding the text's own principle of coherence. Development within the text would then reside not primarily within the realm of plot or character, but rather in the evolution of certain key-motifs as they journey through diverse contexts within the Song. Such a shift in emphasis, away from development in character or plot to a development in the use of key-motifs, helps to counter the third argument, the varied subject matter in the poem and the role of Solomon in a text which otherwise deals with lovers' escapades. The passages which deal with the lovers and those which deal with Solomon provide diverse contexts through which these key motifs journey and develop.

The preceding excursus provides a glimmer of the interpretive strategy to be employed in this study. This strategy will be examined in more detail in the following chapters. It is presented here in the context of arguments for the text's disunity to emphasize that these arguments are based on a very limited notion of what constitutes a unified text. As Leo W. Schwarz (1964:72) states: "To force the poem into a logical construction or to impose Aristotelian symmetry is alien to the Hebrew poetic genius". But it is misleading to speak of a "Hebrew poetic genius" as if it were a concrete set of principles to which one need only gain
access in order to understand the dynamics of the Song. As was the case with those who argued for the Song's disunity, those who advocate the Song's unity have done so on many different grounds:

(1) unity of theme [see, for example, Leo W. Schwarz (1964:73)] and repetition of themes [see, for example, Roland E. Murphy (1979:437-439)]


(3) repetition of situations [see, for example, Roland E. Murphy (1954:2) and Cheryl J. Exum (1973:49)]

(4) dialogic structure from beginning to end [see, for example, Leo W. Schwarz (1964:73) and Roland E. Murphy (1979b:99)]

(5) consistent character portrayal [see, for example, Michael V. Fox (1985:217)]

(6) interplay between the man and woman, a description used to praise one being used at another point in praise of the other [see, for example, Donald Broadribb (1961-1962:15)]

(7) associative sequence, the tendency for groups of words, sentences, or motifs to occur in the same order even though that order is not required by narrative sequence or logical continuity [see, for example, Michael V. Fox (1985:215)]

(8) a narrative frame, the beginning and end of the piece having close affinities in terms of phraseology and theme, indicating a development in the woman's relationship to her brothers [see, for example, Michael V. Fox (1985:209,217-218)]

(9) schematized formal arrangement [see, for
example, Cheryl J. Exum (1973), William H. Shea (1980), and Edwin C. Webster (1982)].

These arguments can be grouped into three main categories: those based on the text's dialogical character and dramatic mode; those based on the extensive repetition of textual elements in the Song, whether they be words, phrases, motifs, themes, verses, or situations; and those which advocate a formal arrangement of these repetitive features.

The arguments from the text's dramatic mode include its dialogical character, consistent character portrayal and verbal interplay between characters. Scholars who advocate this position suggest not that the Song is a drama for stage production, but rather that its dramatic mode itself constitutes a principle of coherence. Although the movement that takes place within this structure cannot be regarded as a coherent plot, the Song displays two coherent personalities whose speeches are more than mere monologues, since images and phrases used by the man to describe the woman are later picked up by the woman and used to describe the man. The issues of character portrayal and verbal interplay between characters cannot be divorced from linguistic considerations. Michael V. Fox (1985:217) rightly notes that it is difficult to separate character portrayal from style, phraseology, and imagery, since the characters in the Song can be known only by the language that is used. Nonetheless, nothing in the Song necessitates the presence of more than one male lover or more than one female lover. But there is one problem with
arguments based on the text's dialogical and dramatic mode: the passages which pertain to Solomon, most notably 3:6-11 and 8:11-12. The third-person narrative style of these passages interferes with the dialogical form of the remainder of the text, and the content of these passages does not fit well with the remainder of the lovers' speeches. The arguments for unity based on dialogue and dramatic form cannot account for these passages.

The argument from repetition is a complex one, since there are so many different types of repetition in the Song. At the linguistic level, one finds repetition in key-words, phrases, and even entire verses. The following chart from R. Kessler (1957:47-48), although far from all-inclusive, indicates some of the most significant of these repetitions:

1. thy caresses are better than wine (1.2 and iv.10).

2. behold thou art fair, my love, behold thou art fair, thine eyes are doves (1.15 and iv.1).

3. I am sick with love (11.5 and v.8).

4. his left hand under my head and his right hand embraces me (11.6 and viii.3, both being part of the day-reveries).

Although there are other poems in the Song which are narrative in style (see 1:5-6, 2:4-7, 3:1-5, 5:2-6:3, 6:11-12, and 8:8-10), these narratives are all delivered in the first person, and all but 6:11-12 make the presence of a narratee explicit. These poems thus maintain at least the semblance of a dialogical form; 5:2-6:3 and 8:8-10 are explicitly dialogical. Furthermore, the subject matter in all six of these instances pertains to the lovers and their escapades. For further discussion, see Chapter II.
(5) I adjure you, Daughters of Jerusalem, by the gazelles or by the hinds of the field (not to rouse and not to stir up the beloved until she pleases) (ii.7, iii.5, v.8 and viii.4, all four being conclusions of love-dreams).

(6) voice of my beloved (ii.8 and v.2).

(7) my beloved is mine and I am his who feeds (his flock) among the lilies (or roses) (ii.16 and vi.3) and similarly "I am my beloved's" (vii.11).

(8) until the day breathes forth and the shadows flee away (ii.17 and iv.6).

(9) be like a gazelle or a young hart upon mountains of spice (Bether) (ii.17 and viii.14).

(10) I sought him but I found him not. The watchmen that go about the city found me (iii.2 ff. and v.6 ff., both being part of the night-dreams).

(11) to my mother's house (iii.4 and viii.2).

(12) Who is she, coming up from the country...? (iii.6 and viii.5) and similarly "Who is she who looks forth as the dawn....?" (vi.10).

(13) Thy hair is like a flock of goats that come down from Gilead. Thy teeth are like a flock of shorn (mother) sheep which have come up from the washing; whereof every one has twins and none is barren among them....Thy temples are like a piece of pomegranate behind thy veil (iv.1b-2 and 3b and vi.5b-7).

(14) Thy two breasts are like twin fawns of the gazelle (iv.5 and vii.4).

(15) ...see whether the vine has budded...and the pomegranates are in flower (vi.11 and vii.13).

Kessler describes these phrases and verses as "distant repetitions". To demonstrate their equal distribution
throughout the text, he divides the Song into four two-
chapter sections and notes (1957:48) that if a phrase or
sentence is repeated, the repetition is never found in the
section in which the phrase or sentence first appeared.

Apart from the repetition of extended phrases and
verses, the Song exhibits several other types of repetition.
Key words and images tend to recur several times, often in
diverse contexts. A partial collection of these include:
vineyard (1:6,14; 2:15; 7:13; 8:11,12); wine (1:2,4; 4:10;
5:1; 7:10; 8:2); garden (4:15,16; 5:1; 6:2; 8:13); lily
(2:1,2,16; 4:5; 5:13; 6:2,3; 7:3); gazelle (2:7,9,17; 3:3;
4:5; 7:4; 8:14); house (1:17; 2:4; 3:4; 8:2,7); and love
(1:3,4,7; 2:4,5,7; 3:1,2,3,4,5,10; 5:8; 7:7; 8:2,4,6,7).
Various situations also recur, such as the lovers' tryst in
the field (2:8ff; 7:12ff), the search through the city
(3:1ff; 5:6ff), and the entry into a house (2:4) or express
wish to enter a house (3:4; 8:2). Another form of repetition
is the recurring wasfs or extended descriptions of the lovers
in terms of natural and cultural phenomena (4:1ff; 5:10ff;
6:4ff; and 7:2ff). These repetitive features give the text a
sense of homogeneity.

The final category of arguments for the unity of the
Song is based on patterns of repetition in the text. Fox
(1985:209) suggests two ways in which the material is
organized. The first is by associative sequences, which are
"groups of words, sentences or motifs that recur in the same
order, even though that order does not seem required by narrative sequence or logical continuity", (1985:215), or more generally, "the tendency for certain ideas or motifs to cluster together and reappear in a certain order" (1985:217). What Fox is referring to is a tendency for individual units within the Song to have close parallels with other individual units. These parallels extend beyond individual instances of repetition to series of repetitions presented in similar order. The second device which Fox (1985:217-218) discusses is a narrative frame. Fox suggests that this narrative frame highlights the development of the woman's relationship with her brothers. While at the beginning of the text (1:5-6) the woman expresses vexation at the restrictions her brothers place upon her, at the end (8:8-10) she asserts her independence. Although in the intervening chapters, no step-by-step development is apparent, the narrative frame provides a context in which to view the intervening material.

Fox's position concerning pattern in the Song represents a reaction to several scholars who have asserted more rigidly defined patterns in the Song. The three studies which advocate such patterning are those of Cheryl J. Exum (1973), William H. Shea (1980), and Edwin C. Webster (1982). Based on repetition of phrases, key-words, and motifs in particular sequence, each suggests a schema by which the textual surface is structured. A representation of their findings can be found in Appendix I and Appendix II.
Cheryl J. Exum's study, perhaps because it is the earliest, has received the most attention. Beginning with the close parallels between 2:7-3:5 and 5:1-6:3, and the inclusios evident at the beginning and end of the book, she divides the Song into six individual poems arranged in an A B C B C A pattern. As criteria for determining the limits of the poems, Exum (1973:49) cites, "the repetition of key phrases, words and motifs and the contextual coherence of the poems", although she notes that "sometimes the limits of a poem are not apparent and we must rely on its parallel as a guide". On the basis of the design which she discerns, Exum (1973:49,78) advocates two conclusions: "a unity of authorship with an intentional design and a sophistication of poetic style". While the first of these, "unity of authorship", she qualifies as "either a single author or a school of poets working closely together" (1973:49), in a later article (1981:418) Exum further qualifies her previous position:

I maintain essentially the same poetic structure outlined in "A Literary and Structural Analysis". I would not, however, argue so categorically for a unity of authorship. By unity of authorship I do not mean to suggest a de novo composition. Rather it seems to me a poet (perhaps poets/redactor[s]) may well have taken over love songs from oral tradition and with additions of his own, worked them into an artistic whole.

Even in the original study (1973:78), however, Exum's position does leave open the possibility that other texts or
traditions have influenced the Song: "If the poet based his work upon extant love songs, he has reworked them and appropriated them so that they are uniquely his own". Exum's primary concern, then, appears to be not so much unity of authorship as unity of intent. This unity of intent is suggested by the text's "intentional design" and "sophistication of poetic style". While William H. Shea does not address the issue of authorship, in his concluding remarks Edwin C. Webster (1982:87) suggests the text's unity to be the product of a later redactor who incorporated previous materials into his composition. Webster maintains, however, that the unity achieved is indicative of a unified intent, which he links to the acrostic that emerges from his particular schema. The acrostic, "Judah the motherland again Yah loves", would suggest a typological interpretation.

The same criticisms which have been levelled against Exum's approach apply equally well to Shea and Webster. These criticisms include:

1. the hierarchy between "poems" and "strophes", which is crucial to the overall design she propounds, is arbitrary, with no apparent criteria determining when a break in the text marks a division between strophes and when it marks a division between poems (see Marcia Falk (1982:65-66), Francis Landy (1983:40), and Michael V. Fox (1985:208))

2. the points at which the poems are divided are not always the most natural, given the flow of the text (see Marcia Falk (1982:66), Francis Landy (1983:40), and Michael V. Fox (1985:208))

3. there are many parallels which are not
acknowledged in the suggested schema [see Francis Landy (1983:40) and Michael V. Fox (1985:208)].

The first two criticisms relate to the contextual coherence which Exum advocates as one of the criteria used to delineate the poems. But as Marcia Falk, Francis Landy, and Michael V. Fox point out, the units which she delineates are in no way the most natural units in the text. Marcia Falk (1982:66) suggests:

...in the search for parallel poems, Exum overlooks literary features not relevant to her analysis and thus fails to recognize smaller boundaries within the larger poems she delineates. She pays little attention, for example, to changes in setting, argument, tone of voice and speaker-audience relationships, all of which strongly suggest the presence of smaller compositional units.

Exum, Shea, and Webster all suggest not only that individual strophes are related to other individual strophes in the Song, but also that entire series of strophes or extended poems are related to other series of strophes or extended poems. While in principle, evidence of such relationships between longer blocks of material argues more convincingly for unity than does evidence for similar relationships between individual strophes, the combination of strophes into larger poems seems unwarranted if these poems are not stitched together internally. The combination of 2:7-17 and 3:1-5 into a poem, as found in both Exum's and Webster's analysis, is, in my view, forced. 2:7-17 depicts a lovers' tryst in the country; 3:1-5, a woman's search for her lover
in the city. Both the change in setting and the change in situation of the lovers, with no explanation for the change, suggests two individual episodes and not a coherent unit. Similarly, the combination of the passage concerning Solomon in 3:6-11 and the wasf in 4:1-5 into a unified poem, as all three scholars suggest, is, in my view, unwarranted. But although I maintain that the combination of these strophes into extended poems is unwarranted, because the strophes do not appear to be stitched together internally, I do not mean to suggest that these individual strophes cannot work together in a unified text. Rather, on the basis of "contextual coherence", there is no apparent reason for combining them.

The third criticism, that there are many parallels between passages which the schemata ignore, suggests that the intratextual patterns of correspondence are more complex than these scholars are ready to acknowledge. A simple test of each schema's ability to account for the repetitions within the text can be made by taking Kessler's (1957:47-48) table of distant repetitions and tabulating how many of these repetitions each schema takes into consideration (see Appendix III). Admittedly, such a test accounts for only the most blatant repetitions, and not the more elusive associations evident from parallel usage of series of keywords and motifs. Nonetheless, for the argument for a schematized textual surface to be conclusive, it must be able
to account for both blatant and more subtle repetitions.

As the table in Appendix III indicates, none of the schemata can account for all of Kessler's instances of distant repetition. Even if one takes into consideration the weak correspondences (evident when a phrase is repeated more than once, sometimes with variations, and the schema accounts for only one of the repetitions), the best of these studies can account for fewer than two-thirds of the repetitions. Exum's study accounts for the highest number of repetitions. Of the eighteen possible repetitions (twelve with one repetition, three with two repetitions), Exum's schema accounts for seven strongly and three weakly. In addition, one repetition occurs within the same unit. Shea's schema accounts for five repetitions strongly and two weakly. Webster's study fares worst, with only three repetitions accounted for strongly and one weakly.

The above analysis suggests that the surface structure of the text is more complicated than any of the three scholars acknowledges. One might argue from the illustration in Appendix I that the three studies cancel each other out, since for any given unit within the Song, various correspondences with other units can and have been made. If one takes 2:7-17 as an example, one finds that all three scholars indicate a corresponding unit, but that this corresponding unit is different in each case. Exum (1973:59), who connects the section with 3:1-5 to form Poem
II of her schema, sees the parallel section to be the opening of Poem IV, 5:2-6:3. Her evidence for this connection can be summarized as follows:

2:7-17

"voice of my lover" (2:8)
the man is outside: coming, standing at one of the windows
he calls to the woman: "arise" (2:10,13)
epithets: "my companion", "my fair one", "my dove" (2:10,13f)
reason for call: it is spring time
he wants her to come outside
winter has gone ('br); rain has passed away (hlp hlk) (2:11)

5:2-6

"voice of my lover" (5:2)
the man is outside: knocking
epithets: "my sister", "my companion", "my dove", "my perfect one"
reason for call: it is wet and night
he wants to come in
her response: "I shall arise" (5:5)
the lover has gone (hmg 'br)

Webster (1982:75-76) also combines 2:7-17 and 3:1-5 into a unit, or at least a subunit which he designates as A.2. For Webster, the parallel passage is A1.2, 8:4-14. His argument for this connection is based on a ring construction, employing the adjuration: "I adjure you, O daughters of Jerusalem,...that you stir not up nor waken love until it pleases". 2:7-3:5 exhibits the adjuration at both the beginning and the end of the unit; 8:4-14 opens with the adjuration, but closes with what Webster considers to be the response to the adjuration: "Make haste, my beloved, and be like a gazelle or a young stag upon the mountains of spice" (8:14). Webster argues further that 2:15-17, which bears
close resemblance to 8:14, stands as the middle figure in the unit 2:7-3:5; the unit thus begins with the adjuration, the reply to which is given in 2:15, then mirrors the pattern, beginning with the reply in 2:16-17 and closing with the adjuration in 3:5. Webster bases his argument entirely on the ring construction, giving no consideration to correspondences or lack of correspondence between the intervening material in each unit.

Shea (1980:385-387) incorporates 2:7-17 into his unit B, which extends from 2:3-17. He sees the parallel unit, B.1, to be 7:11-8:5, arguing for a chiastic relationship between the elements of the two poems. He schematizes the correspondences under the following headings:

- under the apple tree: 2:3-5/8:5
- refrain: 2:6-7/8:3-4
- the lover's approach: 2:8-9b/8:1
- to her house: 2:9c-e/8:2
- come to the fields: 2:10-15/7:12-14
- the beloved possession: 2:16-17/7:11.

While in some instances the correspondences carry conviction, notably the sections labelled "under the apple tree", "refrain", "come to the fields", and "the beloved possession", the connection between 2:8-9b and 8:1 is dubious, and one would expect 8:2 to correspond to 2:4 rather than 2:9c-e.

One correspondence which all three scholars miss is the connection of 2:7 to the three verses which precede it, and the parallel connections of an entry into a house, or the desire to enter a house, with the adjuration formula in 2:4-
7, 3:4-5, and 8:2-4. Granted, Shea begins his unit at 2:3, and thus does not break up the unit as do Exum and Shea. Yet not one of the scholars makes note of the connection of entry into a house and the adjuration, and none of them accounts for the three parallel passages in his or her schema.

A second passage which is treated variously by the three scholars is 3:6-11. Exum (1973:65-67) sees the strophe as the introduction to Poem III, which extends to 5:1. The corresponding passage in Poem V is 6:8-7:1. She relates the two passages on the basis of the rhetorical question, "Who is this...?" found in each, and on the basis of the similarity between the "sixty mighty men" who surround Solomon's litter and the "sixty queens, eighty concubines, and young woman beyond number" who praise the woman. Other similarities between the passages are the mention of "daughters" in both 3:11 and 6:9, the verb r'ḥ, "to see", in 3:11 and 6:11, the similarity between the nominal form markābot, used as "chariots" in 6:12, and merkābō, used as a seat or cushion in 3:10, and the mention of a "mother" in both 3:11 and 6:9. Exum also compares the exhortation for the Shulammite to turn in 7:1 with the exhortation for the Daughters to view King Solomon in 3:11.


---

But see Chapter III for a discussion of the noun merkāb in 3:10, since the noun may also designate a fleet of chariots.
divided, but both are found in C.1: the description of the man in 5:10-6:3 corresponds to the praise of Solomon element in 3:6-11; the procession in 6:12-7:1 corresponds to the procession element in 3:6-11. Shea relates the question "Who is this...?" in 3:6 to the questions "What is your beloved above another?" in 5:9, and "Whither has your love gone?" in 6:1. He suggests that Solomon's coming up ("lh") from the steppe toward the city in the procession scene of 3:6ff corresponds with the bride's coming down ("yr") from the city to the walnut grove in the procession in 6:11ff. The troops who escort Solomon in 3:7-8 are compared to the occupants of the chariots in 6:12. Finally, there is the similarity between the names Solomon in 3:9,11 and Shulammite in 7:1.

Webster (1982:82) labels 3:6-11 an interlude within his B section, with no corresponding interlude in his B1 section. He does not derive a letter from this passage for his acrostic, as he does from the other sections of the Song. In effect, Webster is admitting that his schema cannot account for this passage.

If one examines 3:6-11 carefully, without any of the above schemata in mind, the most obvious passage with which to make a comparison would seem to be 8:11-12. These are the only two extended passages which make explicit mention of Solomon. They are also the only two extended passages which are told from the perspective of an outside observer, as opposed to being related by one of the story characters.
Both passages conclude with an address to a character or characters who have been explicitly named in the preceding narrative section, and in both instances the address appears to chide that particular character or characters: in 3:6-11, the Daughters of Jerusalem/Zion; in 8:11-12, Solomon himself.

The preceding discussion of 2:7-17 and 3:6-11 has attempted to demonstrate that the issue of patterns of correspondence within the Song is far more complex than any one of these scholars is willing to admit. In both cases, each of the passages which the various studies advocates as a parallel does have some degree of similarity with the passage in question. Yet even in the three studies as a whole, the range of possibilities is not exhausted. Due to the complexity of the patterns of repetition in the Song, the possibility of adequately schematizing the textual surface in terms of these repetitions seems remote. But if one sets aside the particular schemata in favour of the more basic issue of unity, it becomes clear that Exum, Shea, and Webster have made valuable contributions to the scholarly debate. Their studies have demonstrated that there is sufficient correspondence among the various sections of the Song to suggest that the Song is in fact a unity. Although it may not be possible to schematize the textual surface in such a way as to account for every instance of repetition, the impossibility of such schematization does not in itself negate the text's coherence. Rather, lack of conclusive
schematization points to the intricacy of the Song's coherence, its complex web of associations, and the need for finely-tuned interpretive strategies. Exum, Shea, and Webster may provide sufficient evidence for accepting interpretive coherence as a working hypothesis in approaching the Song, but ultimately, any argument for unity stands or falls with the cogency of the interpretation which accompanies that argument for unity.

In dealing with the issue of the Song's unity, this chapter has focussed on the lack of correlation between unity of authorship and interpretive coherence, the role of interpretation in the discernment of unity, and the arguments which have been advanced for and against the text's unity. Special attention has been given to the role of repetition and patterns of repetition in establishing relationships between various segments of the text, a process which is crucial if one wishes to come to some understanding of the whole. Such patterns of repetition are rampant within the Song, and the complex web of associations which they spin speaks against the possibility of adequate schematization. But without such a schematization, the reader is left without a structural starting point from which to begin an exegesis of the text. It is in pursuit of such a structure that the following chapter will turn to the issue of voice and the relationship among the voices found in the Song.
II. LITERARY GENRES AND THE POSSIBILITY OF A UNIFIED DISCOURSE SETTING IN THE SONG OF SONGS

In the preceding chapter, I examined the evidence for the unity of the Song, and concluded that its complex web of repetitions suggests the individual sections of the Song are interrelated. But this web of repetition is so complex that no adequate schematization of the Song's textual surface in terms of these repetitions seems possible. Yet, rigid patterning of imagery is not the only principle of organization which can regulate the dynamics of a literary text; several other organizing principles are possible. In this chapter, I shall examine speaker-addressee relationships in the Song, in order to determine whether there is an organizing principle which regulates speech acts in the text. The most detailed treatment of the issue in the scholarly literature is that of Marcia Falk (1982:71-79). I shall begin, therefore, with a brief summary and critique of her approach, then proceed to an analysis of speech acts in the various genres in the Song. Once the organization of speech acts within individual units in the Song has been determined, it will be possible to examine the evidence for an overarching principle of organization governing speech acts in the text as a whole.

Marcia Falk (1982:71) maintains that the Song is not
a unified composition, but rather a collection of lyric love poems. Her arguments for the Song's disunity (1982:69) include its wide gamut of emotions, several distinct settings, range of situations and subject matter, and considerable variety of tone and mood. Yet she advocates that the strongest argument for disunity is the presence of many different speakers who address different audiences in the Song. In her analysis, she divides the Song into thirty-one individual poems which she characterizes as lyrics. This designation is based partially on the poems' brevity, sensual quality, and song-like character (1982:71), and partially on a more specific definition of the genre (1982:72):

The lyric tends to be a subjective form, expressive of personal feeling toward specific subject matter and addressed to a particular listener. The speaker of the lyric is usually an individual I-speaker, although as we shall see shortly, more than one voice may speak a lyric. The subject matter of the lyric can vary widely....And the audience of the lyric (by which I mean the listener whom the speaker addresses, not necessarily the readership of the poem) may be almost anyone...

Using the elements of speaker(s), subject matter, and audience, Falk (1982:73) distinguishes six types of lyric in the Song:

(a) the "love monologue" - a poem by an I-speaker to and/or about a beloved, in which the beloved is the implicit audience, whether or not s/he is also the explicit audience [poems 1(1:2-4), 4(1:9-11), 5(1:12-14), 8(2:4-7), 10(2:14), 12(2:16-17), 13(1-5), 15(4:1-7), 16(4:8), 17(4:9-11), 20(6:4-10),
21(6:11), 23(7:7-10), 24(7:11-14), 25(8:1-4),
27(8:5b), and 28(8:6-7)]

(b) the "love dialogue" - a conversation
between two lovers [poems 3(1:7-8),
6(1:15-17), 7(2:1-3), 9(2:8-13),
18(4:12-5:1), and 31(8:13-14)]

(c) a monologue spoken by an I-speaker in a
love relationship, to an audience outside
that relationship [poems 2(1:5-6) and
30(8:11-12)]

(d) a monologue spoken by an unidentified
speaker (probably a group of speakers) to an
unspecified audience, about erotic subject
matter, either direct or symbolic [poems
11(2:5), 14(3:6-11), and 26(8:5a)]

(e) a dialogue between an I-speaker and a
group of speakers, about erotic subject
matter [poems 22(7:1-6) and 29(8:8-10)]

(f) the composite poem [poem 19(5:2-6:3)].

The strength of Falk's analysis lies in the emphasis she
gives to voice in her categorization of the poems, and in her
observation that in the Song, not only do speakers alternate,
but also the audiences to whom they speak.

But in my view, Falk overlooks several of the
rhetorical features evident in the poems she delineates. In
her "love monologue" category, for example, while she asserts
that the love partner is the intended audience in all
seventeen of the poems, she must rely on a distinction—
between explicit and implicit audience (1982:73) to maintain
this assertion:

Often, in the love monologues, the beloved is
directly addressed, and therefore, is the
explicit audience of the speech. Even when
the beloved is not directly addressed,
however, we might say that s/he remains the
implicit audience because s/he is the real
focus of the speaker's feelings. Thus, the love monologues may sometimes have a double audience: an apparent (explicit) audience such as a group of outsiders, and the real (implicit) hearer, who is always the beloved.

In my view, it is arbitrary to suppose that the love partner is present as an actual addressee merely because the speaker talks about him or her. In at least two of the poems [poems 8(2:4-7) and 13(3:1-5)] the third person references to the love partner, along with the direct appeals to the Daughters of Jerusalem, would suggest that the Daughters are the addressee, while the love partner belongs to the "subject matter" of the poem. In poem 5(1:12-14), although the identity of the addressee is not explicit, the third person references to the love partner may reflect the presence of an audience who stands outside of the love relationship. In five other poems [poems 1(1:2-4), 12(2:16-17), 20(6:4-10), 24(7:11-14), and 25(8:1-4)], the transition from second to third person references to the love partner may suggest that more than one addressee is involved in the poem. In poem 25(8:1-4), the identity of both of these addressees is explicit, the woman first addressing her lover (8:1-2), then making a direct appeal to the Daughters of Jerusalem (8:3-4). In the four remaining poems, although the outside audience is not identified, the transition from second to third person references to the love partner may suggest that both the love partner and an audience who stands outside the love relationship function as addressees. In eight of the
seventeen units in this category, then, Falk, by designating the love partner as the intended addressee, dismisses the explicit rhetorical features as insignificant for determining the "real" speaker-addressee relationships in the poems. Similar tendencies are evident in her analysis of the remaining units in the Song.

But in my view, Falk's failure to account for such rhetorical features reflects a basic inadequacy in her treatment of speaker-addressee relationships in the Song. At the root of the problem is her attempt to categorize all the poems in the Song as lyrics, and thus to analyze the speech acts within the poems according to the principles which govern speech acts in the lyric genre. Although the units which Falk delineates are, for the most part, convenient units with which to work, they do vary with regard to genre: some of the poems are lyrics; others belong to the narrative genre; a third category displays a combination of lyric and narrative features; one poem takes the form of a simple rhetorical question; one final category displays variations on the narrative form.\(^1\) Because speech acts are regulated differently within the narrative and lyric genres, it will be useful to examine these categories of poems separately, then proceed to the poems of composite genre. As will become clear in the discussion below, the primary difference between

\(^1\)For a complete classification of the units with regard to these genre categories, see pp. 115-117 below.
speech acts in the narrative and speech acts in the lyric is the position of both speaker and addressee in relation to the fictive world of the poem. Narrative poems make a clear distinction between those speech acts which take place within the fictive realm and those speech acts which take place outside of the fictive realm. In the lyric, on the other hand, although speech acts function both within the fictive realm and outside of the fictive realm, one and the same speech act functions at both levels. Because the function of speech acts is dependent upon their position relative to the fictive realm of the poems, and because the nature of this fictive realm proves to be an effective way of distinguishing the two genres, I shall begin my discussion of each genre with the nature of the fictive world in that genre, then proceed to a discussion of speech acts in the poems. Once the principles of organization regulating speech acts in the two genres and the poems in the Song have been identified, it will be possible to determine whether there is an overarching principle regulating speech acts within the Song as a whole.

But before I proceed to a discussion of genres, a brief note on the division of the Song into poems or working units is perhaps in order. For the purposes of this analysis I have maintained most of Falk's poem divisions, because, in my view, they are convenient units with which to work. \(^2\) But

\(^2\)Although I shall use Falk's poems as convenient working units, I do not mean to suggest that they have any ontological status as "poems" apart from this designation as
in two instances, I have combined several of her poems into extended units. In the first unit, 2:8-17, the repetition of the woman's comparison of her lover to "a gazelle or a young hart of the stags" in both 2:8-9 and 2:17 would suggest an inclusio, marking the boundaries of an extended unit. In discussing this poem, comprised of Falk's poems 9-12(2:8-13, 14, 15, and 16-17, respectively), I shall refer to it as poem X(2:8-17). In the second extended unit, 4:1-5:1, although no inclusio marks the boundaries, the poem would appear to record one encounter between the two lovers. The poem commences with the man addressing the woman, beginning with an extended description of her bodily features (4:1-5,7), proceeding to an invitation for her to join him in the mountains of Lebanon (4:8), and continuing with a recital of her bodily charms and their effect on him (4:9-11). In 4:12-15, the emotional intensity increases, the man continuing his description of his lover, but now addressing her with metaphorical epithets. After an appeal to natural phenomena to aid him in the fulfillment of his desires (4:16a) and a similar appeal to an unspecified audience by his love partner (4:16b), the man concludes, suggesting that the consummation has in fact taken place (5:1a-b). As a final testament to convenient working units. I do not rule out the possibility that these working units may, in the end, work together, each contributing to the dynamics of the work as a whole.

3For further discussion of this unit, see the section on poems of composite genre below.
the rapture of the experience, he invites "lovers", "lovers of the world" so to speak, to seek the fulfillment of their own desires: "Eat, O lovers, drink and become intoxicated on love" (5:1c). The passage 4:1-5:1, in my view, reflects a lovers' rendezvous, as seen through the eyes of the male lover. In my discussion of this poem, comprised of Falk's poems 15-18(4:1-7, 8, 9-11, and 12-5:1, respectively), I shall refer to it as poem Y(4:1-5:1).†

THE NARRATIVE POEMS

Seymour Chatman (1978:19), in his discussion of the narrative, distinguishes two basic components in the genre: the "story" is the "content or chain of events (actions, happenings), plus what may be called the existents (characters, items of setting)"; the "discourse" is the "expression, the means by which the content is communicated". Chatman notes further: "In simple terms, the story is the what in the narrative that is depicted, discourse the how". Technically, the distinction between these two components exists only at an aesthetical level; that is to say, the story has no autonomous existence apart from its expression, but rather, is an abstraction created by the reader in the

†For further discussion of this unit, see the section on the lyric poems in the Song, below.
reading process. But the distinction is a useful one, for it draws attention to two distinct realms which emerge in the reading of a narrative text, each with its own fictive personae and conventions which govern the interaction of these fictive personae.

The "story" is equivalent to what I have designated as the "fictive world" of the narrative. As Chatman (1978:19) notes, this fictive world is inhabited by "existents", items of setting, along with fictive personae who in their role in the story are known as "characters". But while these existents may be seen as the basic elements which combine to create the fictive realm, the distinctive feature of this realm consists not in the existents themselves, but rather in the way these existents interact. As E.M. Forster ([orig. 1927]:42) noted almost sixty years ago: "[A story] is a narrative of events arranged in their time sequence....Qua story, it can have only one merit: that of making the audience want to know what happens next". The fictive world of the narrative, then, is a time-bound structure; as a literary construct it constitutes an arena for working out those meanings which develop through time. The existents in a story contribute to the dynamics of the story by producing a sequence of events which propels the

"As Seymour Chatman (1978:41) notes: "Though this chapter has treated story as an object, I do not mean to suggest that it is a hypostatized object, separate from the process by which it emerges in the consciousness of the reader"."
story forward, allowing for development through time. The main impetus behind this development is a set of conflicts which disturb an initial equilibrium in the fictive realm, and which demand resolution in order to restore such equilibrium. Technically, the choice of which conflicts to highlight as central concerns of the narrative and which to relegate to subsidiary roles is a function of the discourse realm; but once the choices have been made, the conflicts are presented as integral to the fictive world of the narrative. This fictive world is thus characterized by conflict, actions and temporal sequence.

Like the fictive realm, the discourse realm of a narrative contains fictive personae, and, at times, elements of setting. The fictive personae of the discourse realm are known as "narratorial agents"; their primary function is to relate the story, disclosing the key elements of the fictive realm and guiding the reader in the construction and interpretation of this fictive realm. On one level, then, the discourse and story realms are closely intertwined. The interconnection can best be seen in the concept of "plot". E.M. Forster ([orig. 1927]:87) defines "plot" as "a narrative of events, the emphasis falling on causality". The inference of causality is an interpretive activity, and thus one associated with the telling of the story in the discourse realm, rather than with the actual events of the story in the fictive realm. But at the same time, this inference of
causality is one which pertains to the way the fictive realm operates. While the inference resides in the discourse realm, then, the causality itself is portrayed as inherent in the fictive realm. Peter Brooks (1985:27) thus defines plot as "the active interpretive work of discourse on story". He further suggests (1985:12):

Plot as we need and want the term is hence an embracing concept for the design and intention of narrative, a structure for those meanings that are developed through temporal succession, or perhaps better: a structuring operation elicited by, and made necessary by, those meanings that develop through succession and time.

Brooks' emphasis on plot as both a structure and a structuring operation highlights the role of both text and reader in determining the "design and intention" of a particular narrative; in interpreting a narrative, the reader must assemble the cues provided by the discourse into a meaningful structure.

But while story and discourse remain closely connected, particularly in terms of those structures which convey meaning in a narrative, in other respects, story and discourse represent distinct and autonomous realms. One feature which distinguishes the two realms is their respective time-frameworks. Seymour Chatman (1978:62) distinguishes between "story-time", which is "the duration of the purported events of the narrative", and "discourse-time", which is "the time it takes to peruse the discourse". The distinction is perhaps most obvious when looked at in
terms of duration. In poem 21(6:11-12), the length of time depicted in the story would depend upon how long it took the character to go down to the nutgrove, which in turn, would depend on the purported distance he had to travel in order to reach his destination. But the time required for the events to take place would probably be much longer than the few seconds it would take to recite or listen to the two verses which recount the event. In this case, then, the duration of story-time is longer than the duration of discourse time.  

A second means of distinguishing the two time-frameworks is in terms of their temporal order. In five of the six narrative poems in the Song [poems 2(1:5-6), 8(2:4-7), 13(3:1-5), 19(5:2-6:3), and 21(6:11-12)], discourse-time stands subsequent to story-time, the events of the story having reached their completion before the time of the discourse event.  

---

In terms of duration, the relationship between the two time-frameworks may take several forms. Seymour Chatman (1978:68) suggests five possible relationships: 
(1) summary: discourse-time is shorter than story-time; 
(2) ellipses: the same as (1) except that discourse time is zero; 
(3) scene: discourse-time and story-time are equal; 
(4) stretch: the discourse-time is longer than story-time; 
(5) pause: the same as (4) except that story-time is zero. 
The example above, poem 21(6:11-12), clearly falls into the category of summary, the discourse-time being shorter than the purported story-time.

Poem 8(2:4-7) is perhaps an exception, depending upon one's interpretation of the poem. But because an analysis of the speech acts in this poem requires concepts which I have yet to explain, I shall postpone the discussion of the speech acts and temporal frameworks evident in the poem to a later point.
[poem 29(8:8-10)], the poem begins with discourse-time being simultaneous with story-time: "We have a little sister who has no breasts" (8:8a). The group who tells the story then postulates an event which will supposedly take place in the future, "it shall be spoken concerning/against her", and debate what they will do to protect their sister at the time of this event (8:8b-9). In the second section of the group's speech, then, discourse-time is prior to story time.⁶ Although the amount of time which separates the story realm from the discourse realm is not indicated in any of the poems, the fact that there is a temporal gap between the actual events of the story and the act of telling the story indicates that story and discourse constitute distinct realms.

But the time-frameworks of the respective realms is not the only way of distinguishing story from discourse; the roles and abilities of the fictive personae also helps to distinguish the two realms. In some narratives, the fictive personae function exclusively in one realm or the other; that is to say, the fictive personae who tell or listen to the

⁶In terms of temporal position, Gerard Genette (1980:217) distinguishes four stances the act of narrating may take in relation to the story presented. These are: subsequent (the classical position of the past-tense narrative, undoubtedly far and away the most frequent); prior (predictive narrative, generally in the future, but not prohibited from being conjugated in the present...); simultaneous (narrative in the present contemporaneous with the action); and interpolated (between the moments of the action).
story in the discourse realm do not participate in the fictive realm of the story. But in other narratives, the same fictive personae may function in both realms, those who tell or listen to the story in the discourse realm also participating in the events of the story. As Marcia Falk (1982:72-73) rightly notes, most of the units in the Song are spoken by a speaker or speakers who identify themselves in the first person, relating thoughts, feelings and/or actions which in some way pertain to themselves. In all of the narrative poems in the Song [poems 2(1:5-6), 8(2:4-7), 13(3:1-5), 19(5:2-6:3), 21(6:11-12), and 29(8:8-10)] this first person form of narrating a story is evident. In these cases, a clear distinction between the fictive persona as character in the story and as narrator in the discourse realm is necessary. In each of these roles, the persona has certain capabilities and limitations. I shall discuss these capabilities and limitations in terms of what the persona can know and what the persona can do.

The amount of information which the persona, as character in the story, can have, is always determined by the workings of that story. At any particular point in the story, a character may have as much information as has been transmitted to him through the events of the story to that point, as well as any information which can be presupposed as his knowledge, prior to the beginning of the story. As a character in the story, the persona cannot know the outcome
of the story, at least, not until its close. As a narrator in the realm of discourse, however, the persona can have as much information about the story as the temporal position of his discourse event, relative to the time-framework of the story, allows. If the events of the story are all over by the time of the discourse event, the narrator can know everything there is to know about that story, including its outcome. He can know things in his role as a narratorial agent which he did not know in his role as a character. If the events of the story have not yet taken place by the time of the discourse event, the narrator may not know everything there is to know about that story. He may know less in his role as a narratorial agent than he will know in his role as character."

A couple of examples from the narrative poems in

Gerard Genette (1980:189) uses the term "focalization" to designate the vantage point from which a story is told. In first person narratives, narratives in which the entity who narrates is also a character in the story, Genette (1980:198-199) suggests:

The only focalization that [the narrator] has to respect is defined in connection with his present information as narrator and not in connection with his past information as hero....this distinction is relevant only for the classical form of autobiographical narrative, where the narrating is enough subsequent to the events for the narrator's information to differ appreciably from the hero's. When the narrating is contemporaneous with the story....internal focalization on the narrator amounts to focalization on the hero."

In the narrative poems in the Song, there is only one verse (8:8) in which "narrating is contemporaneous with the story". In the remainder of the group's story, in poem 29(8:8-10),
the Song will illustrate how what the narrator knows depends upon the temporal relation between his discourse event and the story he tells.

In poem 21(6:11-12), discourse-time stands subsequent to story-time; the narrator, who identifies himself as an I-speaker, tells a story which pertains to his own past actions. In 6:11, the I-speaker, in his role as narrator, tells how he, in his role as character, had gone down to the nut-grove to see if the spring blossoming had yet taken place. But in 6:12, the speaker reveals a knowledge of the situation from his vantage point as narrator which he did not have as a character: "I did not know I would set myself amidst chariots of the nobility." Although this verse alludes to an event which will take place in the story [I set myself amidst chariots of the nobility], the speaker, as character in the story, did not have knowledge of this event in the particular span of story-time represented in this portion of the narrative. By admitting knowledge of this event, the speaker, as narrator, stations himself in a time-framework which is clearly subsequent to story-time.

Poem 29(8:8-10) is the only narrative in the Song in which discourse-time stands prior to story-time. In this
case, the story is told by an unidentified group. This group tells a story in which they themselves figure as characters, although the main character in the story appears to be their little sister. They begin with a statement of fact which is contemporaneous with their act of telling the story: "We have a little sister who has no breasts" (8:8a). Although in the next line (8:8b) the group posits a future event, "it shall be spoken concerning/against her", in the telling of this event they display no reservations about whether or not it will happen; the group portrays this event as a fact, even though it is a future event. But the status of the woman at the time of the event is less certain. The group asks what they will do for their sister at the time of the event, proposing one means of protection "if she be a wall" and another means of protection "if she be a door" (8:9). The group, as characters within the story, will act in one way if she is a wall, "We shall build upon her a silver battlement", and in another way if she is a door, "we shall place over her a plank of cedar". Within the time framework of the story, they will know which of these actions is appropriate. But as narrators of the story, standing in a temporal position prior to the actual events, the group knows less about what will happen than they will know as characters. As narrators, they

---

10 In this line, then, as Gerard Genette (1980:199) suggests, focalization of the event through the narrator amounts to focalization through the characters in the story.
can only explore the possibilities and plan various strategies to deal with these possibilities.

In the first person narratives, then, the amount of information which the fictive persona can have in his role as character is dependent upon the inner workings of the story itself. The amount of information which the fictive persona can have in his role as narrator, however, depends on the temporal position of his discourse event, relative to the events of the story. But if one turns to the issue of what the fictive persona can do in each of his two roles, the temporal position of the two realms does not come into play. What the fictive entity can do depends entirely on the inner workings of the individual realms in which he functions.

In discussing the fictive world of the narrative, I noted that this fictive world entails conflict, action, and temporal sequence. The primary function of characters within this fictive realm is to perform actions. These actions may take many forms (e.g. physical acts, thought acts, speech acts, etc.). But the actions performed by these characters must remain entirely within the boundaries of the story; that is to say, both the doer of the action and the recipient of the action must reside within the fictive realm of the narrative. As a character in the story, the fictive persona can interact only with other characters in the story. Furthermore, the actions which the character performs must
contribute either to the conflict or to the resolution of the conflict in the story.

In contrast to his role as a character in the story, in which the fictive persona may perform many different types of actions, the fictive persona, in his role as narratorial agent, can perform only one type of action, that being the speech act. Although the persona may function either as speaker or addressee in this speech act, the speech act itself must be confined to the discourse realm; that is to say, in performing this speech act the fictive persona can interact only with other fictive personae in the discourse realm or narratorial setting. This narratorial setting consists of one or more narrators who tell the story, and one or more narratees who listen to the story. While both agents must be present in any given narratorial setting,\(^1\) the presence of a narrator is often more obvious than the presence of a narratee. The reason is that while the speech act of a narrator is an obtrusive event, one which catches the attention of the reader through language, the receptive

\(^1\)As Gerald Prince (1980:7) suggests:

All narration, whether it is oral or written, whether it recounts real or mythical events, whether it tells a story or relates a simple sequence of actions in time, presupposes not only (at least) one narrator, but also (at least) one narratee, the narratee being someone whom the narrator addresses. In a fiction-narration - a tale, an epic, a novel - the narrator is a fictive creation, as is his narratee.
act of the narratee is a silent event, and thus one that is easily overlooked. When the presence of a narratee is not made overt, there can be no discrepancy between the stance taken by the narratee and that taken by the implied reader.  

---

Seymour Chatman (1978:148-151), in his discussion of the narrative as a form of communication, sets up the narrative-communication situation as follows:

Real A → (Implied A) → (Narrator) → (Narratee) → (Implied Reader) → Real Reader

(A = Author; R = Reader)

The Real Author and the Real Reader exist outside of the text: the Real Author is the person who actually writes the narrative; the Real Reader, the person who picks it up and reads it. The Implied Author, Narrator, Narratee, and Implied Reader exist within the text itself. The Implied Author is the portrait of the author which the reader constructs on the basis of reading the narrative. This Implied Author is a structural principle which cannot be equated with the Real Author, since it is different in each narrative that the Real Author writes. The Implied Author has no voice; he is present and instructs his audience through the design of the narrative as a whole. But the Narrator, a fictive entity controlled by the Implied Author, does have a voice, and it is through his voice that the story is told. The Narratee, also a fictive entity controlled by the Implied Author, listens to the story told by the Narrator. The Implied Reader, like the Implied Author, is a structural principle, the stance which every Real Reader must take if he is to comprehend the narrative. In assuming this stance, the Real Reader may have to accept some things which he may not be prepared to accept in everyday life. In some narratives, there is no discrepancy between the stance of the Narrator and that of the Implied Author, the voice of the Narrator being a reliable spokesman for the Implied Author. Similarly, in some narratives, there is no discrepancy between the stance of the Narratee and that of the Implied Reader, both having only the voice of the Narrator to guide them in comprehending the narrative. But even in these cases, the Implied Author and the Implied Reader are not to be equated with the Narrator and Narratee; unlike the Narrator, the Implied Author has no voice, and unlike the Narratee, the Implied Reader cannot hear. The Implied Author and Implied Reader are structural principles and, as such, not fictive personae. The Implied Author is the structural principle which regulates the dynamics of the text, the Implied Reader, the stance which the Real Reader must take if
But the narratee's presence is still indicated by the narrator's very act of telling the story, which presupposes the presence of a fictive persona in the same realm who listens to that story. The presence of a narratee is made overt only when the narrator makes a direct appeal to his listener, or when the narratee verbally responds to the speech acts directed toward him. In such instances there may be a discrepancy between the stance of the narratee and that of the implied reader. In effect, the interaction between narrator and narratee itself becomes dramatized in the work, and the implied reader functions as the audience for this dramatization.

The discussion above indicates that even when the same fictive personae function at both the story and discourse levels in a narrative, there is a clear distinction between the roles and abilities which they may have in each of the two realms. But at the same time, the discussion provides valuable background information for an examination of speech acts in the narrative poems. While it is possible for the same fictive persona to function both in the story and discourse realms of a narrative, at any given time he can function in only one of these realms. Furthermore, although speech acts may be present both at the level of story and at the level of discourse, under normal circumstances speech acts cannot traverse the boundary between the two realms. He is to apprehend this regulating structure.
Like other actions in the narrative, speech acts are confined to one realm or the other. One reason for their being confined in this way is the temporal distance which separates the two realms. Speech acts, by their very nature, entail a certain immediacy. Both the speaker and the addressee of a given speech act must be present at the same time if an oral exchange is to take place. But as noted earlier, story and discourse entail separate time-frameworks which need not concur. Since there is only one verse in all the narrative poems in the Song in which story-time and discourse-time do concur (8:8), and in the remainder of this poem discourse-time precedes story-time, the temporal gap between the two realms militates against speech acts traversing the boundary which exists between the two realms.

A speech act found at the level of the story, then, must be spoken by one of the characters in that story and addressed to one of the characters in that story; a speech act found at the level of discourse must be spoken by one of the agents in the narratorial setting and addressed to one of the agents in the narratorial setting. A character in the story cannot address one of the narratorial agents in the discourse setting, nor can one of the narratorial agents in the discourse setting address one of the characters in the story. In narrative, the line of communication evoked by each speech act must reside entirely in one realm or the
other. In turning now to a more detailed discussion of the narrative poems in the Song, I hope not only to delineate clearly those speech acts which take place at the level of story and those speech acts which take place at the level of discourse, but also to indicate some of the implications of this distinction for the interpretation of the poems. A complete analysis of the plot structure of the poems must be postponed until the entire discourse setting of the Song has been established.

As noted earlier, the Song contains six narrative poems [poems 2(1:5-6), 8(2:4-7), 13(3:1-5), 19(5:2-6:3), 21(6:11-12), and 29(8:8-10)], all of which are narrated in

Gerard Genette (1980:234-235) notes that in some instances, an individual speech act may traverse the boundary between story and discourse. In such cases, a narrator may intrude into the level of the story, addressing one of the characters, in order to give the impression that he "himself brings about the effects he celebrates". Similarly, a character may intrude into the level of discourse, perhaps to implore the help of one of the narratorial agents, or perhaps to make some comment about what is happening in the discourse realm. While Genette indicates that such techniques, which he designates as "narrative metalepsis", are possible, he notes that they produce "an effect of strangeness, that is either comical...or fantastic". This narrative technique will be discussed in more detail in conjunction with two poems in Category D [poems 14(3:6-11) and 30(8:11-12)], below. For now, however, it shall suffice to note that the technique is, generally speaking, atypical of the narrative genre. In speaking of the narrative poems, then, I shall reserve the term "metalepsis-narrative" for those poems which display such techniques, referring to those poems which do not display metalepsis simply as "narratives".

Chapter III will provide some indication of how an examination of the Song's overarching plot structure would proceed. But a detailed examination of the workings of each of the units in the Song in the context of this plot structure is beyond the scope of the present study.
the first person, although in poem 29:8-10, the narrator is a group. Only two of these poems (poems 13:3:1-5 and 19:5:2-6:3) contain speech acts at the level of the story. In poem 13:3:1-5) the woman, in her narratorial role, reports a speech act which she delivered in her role as character: "Have you seen the one I love?" (3:3b). The speech act is addressed to the watchmen, who function as characters at the level of the story. Although there is no overt indication at the level of discourse that the speech act is, in fact, an instance of reported speech, the second person masculine plural form of address suggests that it is addressed to the watchmen. The watchmen's response to the question is not recorded in the poem, but the fact that the woman does not find her lover until after she has passed them (3:4a) suggests that it was in the negative.

The second poem which contains a speech act at the level of the story is poem 19:5:2-6:3). In this poem, the woman reports a speech act uttered by her lover in his role as character and addressed to her in her role as character. In her narratorial role, the woman indicates to her narratee that what is to follow is reported speech, using the phrase "Voice of my lover, as he knocks" (5:2a). A record of the man's speech follows: "Open [the door] for me, my sister, my companion, my dove, my perfect one, for my head is covered with dew, my locks with the damp of the night" (5:2b-c).
His pleading functions as a plot-significant event, for the woman's subsequent hesitancy to open the door results in his departure. Although in her own speeches in this poem, the woman addresses agents in the narratorial setting throughout (for further discussion of the poem, see below), in her function as addressee to her love partner's speech act, here in 5:2b-c, she clearly participates at the level of the story and in the time framework of the story.

The remaining speech acts in these six narrative poems all function at the level of discourse. In all of these poems, the narrator's act of telling the story presupposes an agent in the narratorial setting who listens to the story. In one of the poems [poem 21(6:11-12)], the presence of such a narratee is not made overt. The narrator makes no direct appeal to his listener, nor does the listener make any verbal response to the story he is told. But the very act of telling the story presupposes a listener. And just as the narrator is a fictive persona who resides in the narratorial setting, so, too, the narratee is a fictive persona, residing in the narratorial setting. If this poem is read in isolation from the rest of the narrative poems in the Song, one might argue that the stance of the narratee is the same as that of the reader, who listens to the narrator from the stance of the implied reader. But even though the reader may take the same stance as the narratee, the narrator's act of telling the story presupposes that a
narratee is present in the discourse realm to listen to that story. As will become clear in the section on the discourse setting of the Song, it is possible that the same narratorial setting that is evident in the rest of the narrative poems carries over to this unit, as well.

In the remaining five narrative poems in the Song (poems 2(1:5-6), 8(2:4-7), 13(3:1-5), 19(5:2-6:3) and 29(8:8-10)), the presence of a narratee is made explicit by the narrator's direct pleas to his listener, and/or verbal responses on the part of the narratee. In poem 2(1:5-6), the woman recounts a story concerning her relationship with her brothers (5:6b-c). This story entails a sequence of events, neither of which is a speech act: (1)"my mother's sons got angry with me"; and (2)"they set me to guard the vineyards". The narratorial setting is clearly set forth in this poem. The woman, in her role as narrator, not only pleads with her narratee directly, using a second person masculine plural verb form (1:6a), she also identifies this narratee as the Daughters of Jerusalem. The reason for telling the story is also given. The woman is annoyed by what appears to be impolite staring on the part of the Daughters, and assumes that it is the color of her skin

---

15As will become clear in the section on the discourse setting of the Song, the appeal to the Daughters as the appear in the discourse setting of the Song always takes the form of masculine plural imperatives, in spite of their being identified as a feminine group.
which occasions their impolite gestures. She therefore explains to them that her skin is so dark because she was forced to guard the vineyards. The interaction between the narrator and narratee comes to the foreground in this poem, since the story is told for reasons related to the dynamics of their interaction. This dramatization of the discourse setting provides a context in which to interpret the story itself. The woman tells the story to vindicate her appearance to the Daughters of Jerusalem.

The second narrative poem in which the presence of a narratee is explicit is poem 8(2:4-7). In this poem, the woman, who functions both as character and as narrator, alternates between the straightforward telling of the events of the story (2:4,6) and direct pleas to her narratee (2:5,7). In 2:7, this narratee is identified as the Daughters of Jerusalem. The poem begins with the narration of events: "He brought me to the house of the wine and his standard upon me was love" (2:4). Michael D. Gouder (1986:19) has recognized the sexual connotations of the second half of the line, noting:

The ancients did not have flags as we do, but standards, that is poles held upright with a symbol on them....The realization that he is responsive tells her triumphantly that he feels for her genuinely - lit. "his standard upon me is love."

The "standard", then, would appear to be a euphemism, the woman indicating that her lover made a sexual advance. The context of an intimate encounter between the two lovers at
the level of the story is confirmed by 2:6, the second verse which represents a straightforward narration of events: "His left hand was under my head while his right caressed me". The story, then, is that of an intimate encounter between the woman and her love partner.

Intertwined with the account of this story are interjections to the woman's narratee, the Daughters of Jerusalem. The situation is complicated by the fact that these appeals also deal with the subject of sexual intimacy. In 2:5 the woman exhorts her narratee: "Sustain me with raisin cakes, support me with apples, for I am weak/writhing with love." In 2:7 she exhorts the Daughters to take an oath: "You shall not waken or arouse love until it pleases".

The latter appeal may be taken as an exhortation for the Daughters to learn from her own situation, suggesting that the woman has herself wakened or aroused love "before it pleased". But the first appeal is more problematic, at least if one assumes that there is a temporal gap between story-time and discourse-time in this poem. In 2:4, the woman indicates that in the story her lover made a sexual advance; in 2:5, however, she expresses her responsiveness to that advance, declaring that in the realm of discourse she is one "weak/writhing with love". While one might suggest that the speech act in 2:5 is the product of the woman in her role as character, rather than in her role as narrator, this interpretation would necessitate that a masculine plural
entity be present in the story realm at the time of the lovers' intimate exchange, to function as addressee in the speech act.\textsuperscript{16} I would suggest, rather, that the woman has a rather active imagination, and that while she tells the story of her encounter with her lover (a series of events which took place in the indefinite past), she also relives the experience in her imagination. The appeal to the masculine plural narratee in 2:5, then, reveals that the woman, as narrator, has a particular reaction to the events she narrates.\textsuperscript{17} The poem, with its direct appeal to a narratee in 2:5 and 2:7, and identification of this narratee in 2:7, clearly dramatizes the interaction between its narratorial agents.

The reason for the telling of the story appears to be that of teaching the Daughters a lesson, by providing an

\textsuperscript{16}The situation would be most compatible with the cultic mode of interpretation, which suggested that the Song dealt with sexual intimacies as acted out in a cultic setting.

\textsuperscript{17}One further possibility is that the speech act, in Genette's (1980:234–235) terminology, represents a narrative metaelepsis, the woman in her role as character, addressing the Daughters who function as narratees at the level of discourse. This interpretation would suggest that story-time and discourse time concur in the poem, and that the woman's narration of events is either simultaneous with the events themselves, or takes place between the moments of the action. But again, this line of interpretation presupposes that the Daughters are present, watching and listening at the time of the lovers' intimate exchange. While again, not impossible, in my view, the metaelepsis is not the only way, nor necessarily the most natural way, of dealing with the problem.
example of inappropriate behavior on the part of the woman, followed by an exhortation to the Daughters not to follow suit. But the abrupt transitions from the telling of the story to the direct pleas to the Daughters make it difficult to determine just how the woman aroused love before it pleased. It may have been through the events of the story, or it may have been through the actual telling of the story (cf. 2:5). In two other instances in the Song [poems 13(3:1-5) and 25(8:1-4)], this same adjuration follows an account of how the two lovers came to a house or an expressed wish for the woman and her lover to enter a house. Here in poem 8(2:4-7), as well, the woman recounts that she and her lover entered a house together. The adjuration to the Daughters appears to be an exhortation not to follow the woman's example, wakening or arousing love by bringing or accompanying the love partner to a house.

The third poem which is explicit about the presence of a narratee is poem 13(3:1-5). Here, the woman begins with a straightforward narration of events, making it clear that the Daughters are her narratee only in the concluding verse. The woman relates how she awoke one night to find that her lover had left (3:1). She arose, wandered through the city looking for him (3:2), and encountered the city watchmen (3:3). After a brief incident of reported speech (3:3b), the woman continues her narration, indicating that she finally found her lover and brought him to her mother's
house (3:4). The poem concludes with a direct appeal to the Daughters, which is identical to that found in 2:7. Again, I would suggest that this exhortation to the Daughters is an appeal not to follow the woman's example, bringing the love partner to a house.

The fourth narrative in which the presence of a narratee is explicit is poem 19(5:2-6:3). Here, both direct appeals to the Daughters of Jerusalem and the Daughters' verbal response to these appeals bring the narratorial setting of the poem to the foreground. The poem begins with the woman, as narrator, relating another incident concerning herself and her lover. After a brief introduction, in which the woman declares that she was asleep when the incident began, she reports a speech of her lover, indicating its status as reported speech by the phrase, "Voice of my lover, as he knocks" (5:2a). Following this reported speech, the woman, in her narratorial role, makes a direct appeal to her as yet unidentified narratee. The rhetorical force of the interrogative 'ækákâh suggests that she is trying to convince them that her hesitancy to comply with her lover's request of opening the door was a legitimate response to the situation.¹⁰ The woman then continues her account,

¹⁰The interrogative 'ækákâh appears elsewhere only in Est. 8:6, where it introduces rhetorical questions with negative force: "Shall I really be able to bear the evil which shall find my people, and shall I really be able to bear the destruction of my kindred?" The use of 'ækákâh here in Cant. 5:3 would appear to have the same negative force: "Was I really to clothe myself...was I really to dirty
telling how she finally arose to open the door, but was unable to open it before her lover departed. She tells how she went out to look for her lover, but encountered instead the city watchmen. This time the watchmen were cruel to her, striking her and taking her cloak. In 5:8, she concludes her account of the incident with a direct appeal to her narratee, now identified as the Daughters of Jerusalem. She exhorts them not to find her lover or to tell him¹⁰ that she is "weak/writhing with love".²⁰ The Daughters, as narratee, respond to the woman's adjuration, asking her: "How does your lover compare with another, that thus you adjure us?" (5:9b). The woman replies with an extended description of her lover (5:10-16), again indicating that the Daughters are her narratee by a direct appeal to them in the vocative (5:16b). The Daughters interject once more (6:1), asking the [my feet]?"

¹⁰That both 'îm and māh are to be taken as negative oath particles in this context can be seen by comparing 2:7 and 3:5, with 8:4. While otherwise identical (except for the omission of the phrase "by the gazelles or the hinds of the fields" in 8:4), 8:4 displays a substitution of the particle māh for the more common negative oath particle 'îm.

²⁰In 2:5, the participle in the phrase "I am weak/writhing with love" was translated in the present tense, because the preceding imperatives suggested a sense of immediacy. Here, in 5:8, the participle may be rendered in either the present or the past tense. The adjuration, then, may reflect an appeal not to tell the love partner that at the time of the story, the woman, as character, was "weak/writhing with love". On the other hand, with the participle translated in the present tense, it may reflect an appeal not to tell the love partner that at the time of the discourse event, the woman, as narrator, is "weak/writhing with love".
woman where her lover has gone. The woman responds (6:2-3), indicating that her lover has gone down to his garden. What began as the straightforward narration of a story, then, develops into a full conversation between narrator and narratee, in the discourse setting.

The introductory episode of poem 19(5:2-6:3) bears a close resemblance to poem 13(3:1-5), although in poem 19(5:2-6:3) there is no mention of entering a house or desire to enter a house; similarly, there is no adjuration not to wake or rouse love until it pleases. Rather, the events of the story appear to center on the woman's desire for her lover, and the extended description of him in 5:10-16 gives an indication of how he appears in her eyes. The Daughters' participation in the exchange helps to elicit more information from the woman, information which she may not have provided without prodding. The woman's attitude toward the Daughters appears to change during the course of the poem. In 5:8, the woman exhorts the Daughters not to find her lover, not to tell him of her reaction to the incident she narrates. But by the end of the poem, she is willing to tell the Daughters where he can be found, information given so that they might help her find him (6:1-3). One might suggest that the woman is warming up to her audience, perhaps in reaction to their interest in her story.

The final narrative poem which makes the presence of a narratee explicit is poem 29(8:8-10). In this poem, the
narrator is an unidentified group. The narratee, on the other hand, appears to be the female lover, for she alludes to her relationship with an unidentified male: "Thus I am in his eyes as one finding peace" (8:10). While the narrator makes no direct appeal to the narratee, the fact that the woman has heard the story is clear from her use of precisely the same imagery to describe her own situation, as the group had used to describe their little sister. The woman contrasts her own stature with that of the little sister, for while the little sister has no breasts, the woman declares that her own breasts are like towers. Furthermore, while the group proposes one means of protection if the little sister be a "wall", and another if she be a "door", the woman in 8:10 declares that she is a "wall". The poem not only draws attention to its own narratorial setting, but also reveals a process of reflection that takes place at this level of discourse, the woman listening to the narrator's story, then telling how her own situation compares with that of the character whose story is told. By contrasting herself with the group's little sister, the woman indicates the relevance of their story for her own situation. It is precisely through the means of protection that the narrator hopes to provide for their little sister that the woman has become "in his eyes as one finding peace".

The preceding analysis of the narrative poems in the
Song has served to illustrate the distinction between speech acts which take place at the level of story and speech acts which take place at the level of discourse. Speech acts do not normally traverse the boundary between story and discourse; rather, for any given speech act, both speaker and addressee must reside within the same narrative realm. When the speaker who tells the story is also a character in that story, the two roles of the speaker (narrator and character) must be distinguished clearly.

In the two poems in the Song which contain speech acts at the level of story [poems 13(3:1-5) and 19(5:2-6:3)], the woman who narrates the stories also participates in speech acts at the level of the story (in 3:3b, as a speaker; in 5:2b-c, as an addressee). As a character, she addresses and listens to other characters at the level of the story. As a narrator, however, she addresses and listens to other narratorial agents at the level of discourse.

In one poem [poem 21(6:11-12)], the narratee remains entirely in the background. When this poem is considered in isolation, there can be no difference between the stance of the narratee and the stance of the reader, who takes the position of the implied reader. But the narrator's act of telling the story still presupposes that a narratee is present to listen to that story, even though the role of the narratee is not dramatized in the poem. In the remaining
five poems, the presence of a narratee is made explicit, either by way of dialogue between narrator and narratee (poems 19(5:2–6:3) and 29(8:8–10)), or by way of direct appeals to this narratee on the part of the narrator (poems 2(1:5–6), 8(2:4–7), 13(3:1–5) and 19(5:2–6:3)). In these poems, then, the interaction between the narrator and narratee itself becomes dramatized, the reader, from the stance of the implied reader, functioning as the audience for this dramatization. Such dramatization of the discourse setting has important implications for the interpretation of the Song. But before exploring these implications, I would like to turn to speech acts within the lyric poems in the Song, in order to establish the lines of communication evoked by these speech acts, and the position of these lines of communication relative to the fictive world in the poems.

**THE LYRIC POEMS**

In her definition of the lyric, Marcia Falk (1982:73) begins by noting: "The lyric tends to be a subjective form, expressive of personal feeling toward specific subject matter". Subjectivity is, in fact, probably the most characteristic feature of the lyric. In the lyric, the reader is given access to the inner life of the speaker. As Tilottama Rajan (1985:196) states:

Lyric consciousness...comes as close as possible to approximating what Satre calls a "shut imaginary consciousness," a consciousness without the dimension of being
in the world....The lyric poet, [Hegel]
argues, asserts himself "as a self-enclosed
subject," "a subjectively complete world."
Although he does not eschew the external
world, what he portrays is not objective
fact, but "the echoes of the external in the
mind."

That the speaker presents himself as a "subjectively
complete world" suggests that these "echoes" are more than a
random selection of perceptions as filtered through the
speaker's psyche. The world which the speaker presents may
not coincide with the external world, but it does have an
internal coherence of its own. This world is an "ideal
world" or "fictive world" which is the way the speaker would
like it to be. The lyric, therefore, is an expression of
radical egocentricity. As Rajan (1985:201-202) suggests, in
its visionary mode the lyric "assumes that the world is an
extension of the [speaker's] cognito, and therefore, can be
imaginatively modified by the mind."

The fictive world which the lyric presents derives
its coherence from the imagination of its speaker. Yet in
a literary text, in which the speaker is not to be equated
with the poet, the "imagination of the speaker" is itself a
fictive entity. The reader is given the impression of a
speaker's presence, through the phenomenon of "voice".²¹
Continuity of voice, therefore, suggests continuity of
speaker, which in turn aids in the impression of a unified

²¹Jonathan Culler (1985:50) asserts that "the
fundamental aspect of lyric writing...is to produce an
apparently phenomenal world through the figure of voice".
world view. Since one of the essential features of the lyric is this unity of world view, it would seem that the lyrical quality of a poem is best assured when it contains only one speaker, or continuity of voice. Rajan (1985:196) goes as far as to suggest that pure lyric must be a monological form. Rajan's position, however, stands in contrast to that of Falk (1982:72), who states: "The speaker of the lyric is usually an individual I-speaker, although as we shall see shortly, more than one speaker may speak a lyric." The problem with Falk's stance is that she is basing her definition of the lyric on what she finds in the Song, rather than first determining the essential features of the lyric genre. Although, in my view, Falk is correct in asserting that more than one character may speak in a lyric, she does not establish the conditions under which such duality (or multiplicity) of speaker is possible, and as a result, includes more dialogical poems in the category of lyric than the genre can accommodate. In order to determine the conditions under which the lyric may be dialogical, it is necessary to look at the reasons Rajan gives for her assertion that a pure lyric must be monological. As she (1985:196) states:

My argument is that pure lyric is a monological form, where narrative and drama alike are set in the space of difference. The latter presents the self interaction with other characters and events. But lyric, as a purely subjective form, is marked by the
exclusion of the other through which we become aware of the difference of the self from itself.

By setting the self in interaction with other characters and events, narrative creates a fictive world which contains conflicting world views. This juxtaposition of conflicting world views is the cornerstone upon which authors and poets construct a network of actions which give rise to a story. The story [as discoursed, or as "plotted" by the discourse] is geared toward resolution of the conflict. Such resolution, however, requires a time-framework which allows for sequence of action, since it is precisely through such sequence of action that resolution takes place. But conflict, action, temporal sequence and the "story" or fictive world which encapsulates them stand in direct opposition to the fictive world of the lyric. The primary quality of the lyric is its presentation of a subjective, but unified world view. There is, therefore, no conflict in the fictive realm of the lyric, and hence no need to resolve conflict. Apart from the speaker's act of expressing his world view, nothing happens in the lyric, for the fictive realm of the lyric is devoid of action. Since nothing happens in the lyric, its fictive realm need not accommodate sequentiality. As Jonathan Culler (1981:152) suggests, the lyric stands as a "monument to immediacy". The primary difference between the fictive world of a narrative and that of a lyric, then, lies in the presence or absence of change.
The conflict, actions, and sequentiality inherent in the fictive realm of the narrative all involve the element of change. But in the fictive realm of the lyric nothing changes; the speaker presents his view of an ideal world in which there is no need for change.

In asserting that the lyric must be monological, then, Rajan is asserting that the fictive realm presented by the lyric must be devoid of conflict, actions, temporal sequence or any other change which might impart a story to the poem. Since duality of speaker often brings with it divergent world views and thus introduces conflict and the need to resolve conflict, Rajan asserts that the pure lyric must be monological. In my view, however, what is at stake in determining a poem's status as a lyric as opposed to a narrative is not the number of speakers per se, but rather, the unity of world view or vision presented. While a single speaker helps to ensure such unity of vision, and therefore a poem's lyrical quality, this lyrical quality is not dependent upon monological form. Provided that the introduction of a second speaker does not bring with it the introduction of a divergent world view or other source of conflict, the dialogical poem may in fact be lyrical.

A few examples from the Song may serve to illustrate the distinction between the type of fictive realm presented in a lyric poem and the type of fictive realm presented in a narrative poem. Poem 15(4:1-7) is a monologue, spoken by
the man to his female love partner. He begins with a
general statement concerning her appearance, "Ah, you are
fair, my companion, ah, you are fair" (4:1a), then proceeds
through a description of her bodily features, moving from
the head, downward. In this description, the man compares
the various parts of the woman's physique to natural and
cultural phenomena: her eyes to doves; her hair to a flock
of goats, streaming down a mountain; her teeth to a flock of
recently washed ewes, all bearing twins; her lips to a
scarlet cord; her brow behind her veil to a pomegranate
split open; her neck to the Tower of David; and her breasts
to two fawns, browsing amongst lilies. The mode of
description is figural, the speaker employing metaphors and
similes throughout. But at times the images employed,
supposedly to define the body of the woman, seem to take on
a life of their own. As Michael V. Fox (1983:227) states:

Our attention focusses on the images
themselves more than on the parts of the
body. The images become largely independent
of their referents and combine to convey a
unified picture of a self-contained world: a
peaceful fruitful world, resplendent with the
blessings of nature...heaps of wheat are
surrounded by lilies; ewes, white and clean,
bear twins and never miscarry; goats stream
gently down the mountainside; proud and
ornate towers stand tall above the landscape
...not only does this world provide a
pleasant backdrop to the expression of love,
it also reveals the author's idea of a
lover's view of the world...the imagery shows
us a world created by love, for it comes into
being and is unified only through the lovers'
vision of each other.

The primary focus of poem 15(4:1-7), then, is the
presentation of a vision, a vision of how the speaker would like the world to be. There are no events in the fictive world of the poem, no conflict and no sequentiaity. Rather, the poem, which is clearly lyrical in character, presents a description of the man's love partner which at one and the same time conveys the beauty of the woman and the beauty of an ideal world.

The same lyrical mode of description is found in several of the dialogical poems which involve the interaction between the two lovers. Poem 6(1:15-17), for example, is lyrical in character, in spite of its dialogical form. The man begins, addressing the female: "Ah, you are fair, my companion, ah, you are fair; your eyes are doves" (1:15). The female responds, addressing her love partner: "Ah, you are fair, my lover, indeed, handsome; yea, our couch is luxuriant green, the beams of our house cedars, our rafters, cypress." Although the poem contains two speakers, their viewpoints are very similar, both being enthralled with the appearance of the other. This similarity in viewpoint is emphasized by the fact that each uses the same verbal construction to tell the other of his or her beauty (hinneh + pronominal suffix + yapah/yapeh). Although the woman continues, describing their dwelling, this description does not introduce any conflict, actions, or temporal factors into the fictive world of the poem. Rather, it emphasizes the natural or idyllic quality of their abode,
revealing a lover's view of her surroundings. This poem, then, displays both the figural mode of description and the merger between the lovers' view of each other and their view of an ideal world or setting, as was evident in the monological lyric poem above [poem 15(4:1-7)]. The fact that both lovers speak does not interfere with the poem's lyric qualities, but rather enhances them, since it highlights the mutuality of the love affair which is the source of the speaker's idyllic world view.

The idyllic setting evident in each of the two poems discussed above is not confined to the lyric poems in the Song. The one narrative poem which highlights such an idyllic setting [poem 21(6:11-12)], however, introduces the setting for reasons related to the story it recounts. The poem is a monologue in which one of the lovers addresses an unspecified audience. In 6:11, the speaker states that he had gone down to the nutgrove, "To see the freshness of the valley; to see if the vines had budded, (if) the pomegranates had blossomed." The verse describes an action and the motivation for that action. But contrary to the expectations of the speaker, he set himself "amidst chariots of the nobility" (6:12). The poem thus presents a series of actions in a particular time sequence: (1) "I went down to the nutgrove", and (2) "I set myself amidst chariots of the nobility." The fictive realm, although it includes the idyllic vineyard setting, is clearly that of a story,
including action and temporal sequence which run counter to the visionary mode of the lyric poems.  

Thus far, then, I have distinguished between the fictive realm of the narrative, which entails conflict, actions, and temporal sequence, and the fictive realm of the lyric, which is devoid of such conflict, actions, and temporal sequence, but which presents a vision of an ideal world that is in no need of change. I have also argued that more than one persona may speak in a lyric, provided that multiple speakers do not introduce conflicting world views. But when it comes to speech acts in the lyric, the issue of audience or addressees also requires some discussion, for speech acts in the lyric display rather complex speaker-addressee relationships. As noted earlier, while speech acts in the lyric function both within the fictive realm and outside of the fictive realm, one and the same speech act may function at both levels. I shall begin, therefore, with a theoretical discussion of speaker-addressee relationships in the lyric genre, then proceed to an analysis of speech acts within the lyrics in the Song.

---

Unlike the lyric poems in the Song, none of the narrative poems contains dialogue at the level of the fictive realm or story of the poem. One finds speech events at the level of the story (cf 3:3b in poem 13 and 5:2b-c in poem 19), but never an actual dialogue. What one does find in the narrative poems, however, is dialogue between narrator and narratee at the level of discourse (the level of the telling of the story).
In her discussion of the audience of the lyric, Falk (1982:72) states: "The lyric...[is] addressed to a particular listener...the audience of the lyric (by which I mean the listener whom the speaker addresses, not necessarily the readership of the poem) may be almost anyone..." The figure of address is an important element of the lyric, one which distinguishes the genre from simple descriptive poetry. As a distinguishing feature of the genre, this figure contributes to the inner dynamics of the poem, and therefore, should not be passed over as mere convention.²³

Theoreticians of the genre, however, are becoming increasingly aware that this figure of address in the lyric is a rhetorical device, designed to create a particular literary effect. Although within the fictive realm of the lyric itself the speaker may address another character, natural phenomena, the spirit of the Muse, even himself, ultimately, the lyric is directed towards its readership. John Stuart Mill captures the poetic effect this dual

²³As Paul de Man (1985:61) states:

Now, it is certainly beyond question that the figure of address is recurrent in lyric poetry, to the point of constituting the generic definition of, at very least, the ode (which can, in its turn, be seen as paradigmatic for poetry, in general). And that it therefore occurs, like all figures, in the guise or cliche or a convention is equally certain. None of this would allow one to discard or to ignore it as the main generative force that produces the poem in its entirety.
audience creates in his famous aphorism: "the lyric is not heard, but overheard". The effect is one of stumbling across the speaker in what was meant to be an intensely private moment, when he pours out his true feelings, whether it be to himself, to inanimate objects, or within the context of an intimate personal relationship. But while the effect is one of eavesdropping on what was not intended for one's ears, it is the rhetorical features of the poem which create for the reader the impression of overhearing when he was meant to hear all along. The impression of overhearing, as opposed to hearing, then, is a contrived effect, one which is facilitated by the figure of address itself.

The artifice of having the speaker explicitly address one audience while intending another may at times go unnoticed, particularly when the explicit audience is another character. In narrative, characters often address each other, the demands of the plot at times necessitating such interaction. But in a lyric addressed to another character, the interaction is not plot-significant, and is therefore a contrived appeal to the reader. The artifice becomes more apparent when the speaker addresses himself, since the speaker's very act of voicing his thoughts suggests an audience other than himself. But the artifice is most apparent when the speaker addresses inanimate objects. Such apostrophic gestures highlight the contrived nature of the

speech, since, as Jonathan Culler (1985:39) notes: "It is difficult to see these apostrophes as fictional representations of plausible historical speech acts". The artificiality of the address, in evoking an entity incapable of hearing it, although on other levels poetically effective, exposes the need for a second audience. This second audience, although not overt in the poem, constitutes the actual audience for which the speech is intended. As Cynthia Chase (1985:212) suggests:

...what the [apostrophic] address does is to claim the existence of an addressee capable of hearing it: capable of giving ear, of giving voice, to a text;...the trope of address, a prosopopoeia, institutes the intelligibility of language by engendering the figure of a reader.

The figure of apostrophe, therefore, draws attention to the duality of audience which is inherent in all lyrics. In the pure lyric, the double audience consists of the explicit addressee, whether another character, the speaker

---

The appeal to inanimate objects produces what Paul de Man (1985:63) describes as an "hallucinatory effect", which serves to amplify the visionary character of the lyric. As Jonathan Culler (1981:139) states:

...to apostrophize is to will a state of affairs, to attempt to call it into being by asking inanimate objects to bend themselves to your desire. In these terms, the function of apostrophe would be to make the objects of the universe potentially responsive forces: forces which can be asked to act or refrain from acting, or even to continue behaving as they usually behave. The apostrophizing poet identifies his universe as a world of sentient forces.
himself, or inanimate objects, and the reader, as he listens from the stance of the implied reader. But when the lyric is embedded in a larger narrative or dramatic context, the issue of audience becomes even more complex. Often the reception of the lyric by an audience other than that which is explicitly addressed becomes, itself, dramatized. The persona who overhears the lyric, then, becomes another character in the work. When the act of overhearing the lyric is one of the actions in a story, it must constitute a plot-significant event. But the act of hearing the lyric may also be represented in a discourse setting, suggesting a formal performance setting for the delivery of the lyric. In the latter case, the persona who listens to the presentation of the lyric functions in the same way that the narratee functions in the narrative poems. But there is one essential difference. In narrative poems, there is a clear distinction between those speech acts which take place at the level of the fictive realm or story, and those speech acts which take place at the level of the discourse setting. While at the discourse level, the narrator may report speech acts which were uttered by characters at the level of the story, there is generally some clear indication that the speech act

---

26 The reader functions as the second audience of these speech acts, in much the same way as the reader functions as a second audience in speech acts uttered in the discourse setting of a narrative. These speech acts are uttered by the narrator and directed to the narratee. But the reader, from the stance of the implied reader, is meant to overhear the exchange.
belongs to the fictive realm, and is not the product of the narrator, in his role as narratorial agent. But in the lyric, one and the same speech act may function both at the level of the fictive realm and at the level of discourse, with nothing to signal the reader that the boundary between the two realms has been traversed. While within the fictive realm the speaker may address another character, himself, or inanimate objects, at the level of discourse, a second fictive persona overhears the speaker, and is meant to overhear the speaker. In effect, the artifice of the poet, in having the speaker address one audience, but intending another, becomes even more exposed. The reader, from the stance of the implied reader, then, is placed in a position from which to observe the double audience at play in the poem. Twice removed from the fictive realm, the reader functions as a third audience for the speech act. But at the same time, the reader is given the opportunity to watch the reception of the lyric, as dramatized in the discourse setting. As will become clear below, the Song contains both pure lyrics which contain no reference to a listener outside of the fictive realm, and lyrics which dramatize the situation of their delivery to an audience who stands outside of the fictive realm.

In my view, six poems in the Song [poems 3(1:7-8), 4(1:9-11), 6(1:15-17), 23(7:7-10), 27(8:5b), and 28(8:6-7)], can be considered pure lyrics. Poems 4(1:9-11), 23(7:7-10),
27(8:5b), and 28(8:6-7) are monologues, spoken by one of the lovers and addressed to the other. Poems 3(1:7-8) and 6(1:15-17) are dialogues between the two lovers. The primary themes in these poems are the physical charms of the love partner (especially in poems 4(1:9-11), 6(1:15-17), and 23(7:7-10)), the desire to be with the love partner and the locale where they can be together (especially in poems 3(1:7-8) and 27(8:5b)), and the ultimate value of love [poem 28(8:6-7)]. Often in these poems, the lovers are likened to natural and cultural phenomena (especially poems 4(1:9-11), 6(1:15-17) and 23(7:7-10)). But in none of these poems is there any indication of a double audience. The lovers appear to speak only to each other, and whoever does overhear them (whether it be the reader, or a fictive persona in the discourse setting of the Song) remains entirely in the background. The poems give the impression, therefore, of an intimate exchange between lovers.

But there are several poems in the Song which maintain the lyrical mode of description, as well as a general absence of conflict, actions and temporal sequence, but which are self-conscious of their dual audiences. In one of these poems [poem 31(8:13-14)] the presence of an outside audience who listens to the speeches of the lovers is revealed by the man's third person reference to this audience: "O you (fem. sing.) who sit in the gardens,
companions are listening to your voice; let me hear" (8:13). The woman responds to her lover's request, addressing him in the second person: "Flee, my lover, and be like a gazelle, or a young hart of the stags, over the mountains of spices!" (8:14). While the woman exhorts her lover to perform a certain action, there is no record of the action actually taking place. The poem, with its idyllic vineyard and mountain settings and comparison of the love partner to natural phenomenon, remains in the lyrical mode.

In three other lyrical poems [poems 7(2:1-3), 20(6:4-10) and 24(7:11-14)], the presence of an audience outside the love relationship is suggested, in my view, by the third person references to the love partner in all or part of the poem. In the double monologue, poem 7(2:1-3), both lovers speak, but they refer to each other in the third person throughout. The outside audience, although not identified, is thus the explicit audience in this poem. But the lovers, even though they do not directly address each other, would appear to function as the implicit audience in the speeches, since each responds to the content presented by the other. The poem, therefore, can be said to have a double audience, even though only one of these audiences is explicit. The lyric mode of description prevails throughout the poem: the female likening herself to a "rose" or a "lily"; the male appropriating the image and developing it, using it to draw a comparison between her and the other maidens; and the
female responding in kind, using the image of the apple
tree, derived from the natural world, to draw a comparison
between him and the other young men. The poem is thus
lyrical in mode, in spite of the fact it is directed toward
an outside audience.

In poem 24(7:11-14), the woman's third person
reference to her lover at the beginning of the poem (7:11)
suggests she addresses an audience who stands outside the
love relationship. But in 7:12-14, the woman turns and
addresses her lover directly, using a masculine singular
imperative, first person plural cohortative forms, and second
person masculine singular pronominal suffixes. The change in
addressee, although it reflects the poem's self-consciousness
about its dual audience, does not affect the lyric quality of
the poem. The woman begins by proclaiming the mutuality of
their love for each other, then invites her lover to join her
in the fields and vineyards, presumably so that they can
express this mutual love (7:13e). Although in this poem the
female does not describe her lover, she beckons her lover to
join her in the idyllic setting of the vineyard,
proclaiming: "There I will give my love to you." The
interaction of the lovers, therefore, remains closely
aligned with the idyllic setting. While the woman
promises "excellent things" for her lover, nothing happens
in the poem to detract from its lyrical quality, and in
spite of the poem's explicit dual audience, it remains in
the lyrical mode.

In poem 20(6:4-10) a similar shift in audience is apparent. The poem begins with the male addressing his female love partner (6:4-7), proclaiming her beauty and comparing her features to natural phenomena. In 6:8-10, however, the addressee changes, since the male now refers to his female love partner in the third person. The theme of the woman's beauty continues, however, the man comparing her to "queens", "concubines" and "maidens" (6:8). Although this comparison introduces new characters into the poem, the continuity in point of view is emphasized by the instance of reported speech which concludes the poem. The maidens, queens and concubines, previously compared to the woman, now themselves express admiration for her, using precisely the same phrase as the man had used at the beginning of the poem (6:4): "Awesome as bannered hosts" (6:10). The new characters are introduced, therefore, in order to consolidate the vision, and in spite of the explicit double audience and instance of reported speech in the section explicitly addressed to the outside audience, the poem remains in the lyrical mode.

The preceding three poems made the presence of a dual audience clear, either by alternation between second and third person references to the love partner (poems 20(6:4-10) and 24(7:11-14)), or by third person reference to the love partner and contextual indications that the love
partner also functions as implicit audience [poem 7(2:1-3)]. But the outside audience was not identified, nor did the poems dramatize the interaction between the speaker and this outside audience to any great extent. In two other lyric poems in the Song, the interaction between the speaker and the outside audience is given greater emphasis. In one extended lyric, poem Y(4:1-5:1) [Falk's poems 15-18(4:1-7, 8, 9-11, and 12-5:1, respectively], the speaker makes direct appeals to several addressees. 4:1-15 represents the speech of the male lover to his female love partner. His address to her is clear from the love epithets, "companion" (4:1), "bride" (4:8), and "my sister bride" (4:9), the second person feminine singular verb forms and pronominal suffixes, and the metaphorical epithets which liken her to natural phenomena (perhaps already in 4:12; definitely by 4:15). In 4:16a, however, the man addresses natural phenomena, "North Wind" and "South Wind", directly, thus moving to an apostrophic gesture.\(^\text{27}\) This apostrophe, although addressed explicitly to natural phenomena, signals the presence of an outside listener. But at this point in the poem, it is impossible to determine whether this outside audience is simply the reader from the stance of the implied reader or a

\(^{27}\)That the appeals to the "North Wind" and "South Wind" cannot be taken as metaphorical appeals to the woman is clear from the exhortation for these natural phenomena to blow on the speaker's garden, which elsewhere in this poem is used as a metaphor for the woman (4:12). Since the winds are implored to act upon the woman, they cannot also be equated with the woman.
fictive persona within the boundaries of the text. The woman responds in 4:16b, her third person reference to her love partner suggesting an appeal to an unspecified audience which stands outside the love relationship. Here, the third person reference to the love partner would suggest that the outside listener is another fictive persona in the work, rather than simply the reader.\footnote{The other alternative is to view the woman's appeal to this unspecified audience as a continuation of the man's apostrophic gesture in the previous line, so that she, too, addresses natural phenomena.} The poem concludes with the male appealing to a human audience, designated as "friends" or "lovers" (rēʾōm; 5:1c), imploring them: "Eat, rēʾōm, drink and become intoxicated on love". This human audience may represent an audience in the discourse setting who have stayed in the background, but overheard the lyric all along. The man does not identify them, but refers to them with a relational term, "friends" or "lovers" ("lovers of the world" so to speak), suggesting congenial relations between them and the lovers. His appeal to them reveals a discourse setting for the lyric, indicating that even within the boundaries of the text the poem is recited in front of an audience.

The theme of the poem is enchantment with the beloved, this enchantment expressed through comparison with natural and cultural phenomena. While it should be noted that an action is alluded to in this poem, the consummation...
of the characters' love being implied by the gap between 4:16 and 5:1, this event in no way conflicts with the lyric mode of the poem, but rather enhances it.\textsuperscript{29} The man's final appeal to an outside audience, exhorting them to partake of the pleasures which he has just enjoyed, helps to cement this lyric mode, providing a view of the world in which the people who surround the lovers uphold the same values as the lovers themselves.\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{29}Tilottama Rajan (1985:197) cites one example in which an event is recorded in lyric. At the end of Wordsworth's poem, "she dwelt among the untrodden ways",

...the speaker allows that something has happened in the hitherto timeless world of lyric: "But she is in her grave, and oh,/the difference to me!" Yet this intrusion of difference does not seem to disrupt the identity between visionary nature, speaker, and reader, but rather seals it in the permanence of shared loss.

In my view, the consummation which appears to take place between 4:16 and 5:1 functions in the same way. The man likens the experience to enjoying food and drink: "I have plucked my myrrh and spice, eaten my honey and honeycomb, drunk my wine and my milk" (5:1b-c). Previously, he had used many of these images, in conjunction with other images derived from the natural world, to describe the beauty of the woman (see especially 4:10-11). The event does not interfere with the vision of the lovers, then, but rather reflects the realization of this vision.

\textsuperscript{30}Note the contrast in the narrative poems, where other characters do not appear sympathetic to the lovers desire to be together. In poems 13(3:1-5) and 19(5:2-6:3) the watchmen are either indifferent or cruel to the woman as she searches for her lover. In poem 19(5:2-6:3) the woman first appears suspicious of her narratee's intentions, imploring the Daughters: "You shall not find my lover, you shall not tell him that I am weak/writhing with love. Later, however, they appear to gain her confidence and when they ask where her beloved has gone, suggesting that they might seek him with her, she does reveal his location. As will become
In one other lyric poem (poem 22(7:1-6)), a discourse setting is indicated within the boundaries of the text. The poem begins with the interaction between two unidentified speakers (7:1). The first is a group, clear from the first person plural verb forms in 7:1a and the second person masculine plural form of address when the second speaker responds in 7:1b. The group addresses the "Shulammite", exhorting her: "Turn, turn, that we might gaze on you." The second speaker is probably the male lover, although there is no explicit indication of his identity. He interjects, also referring to the Shulammite in the third person, and addressing the group who initiated the discourse: "Why would you (masc. pl.) gaze on the Shulammite...?" (7:1b). What follows is a section addressed to the female, her bodily aspects being compared to natural and societal phenomena (7:2-6). Elsewhere in the Song, it is the male love partner who speaks such extended lyric descriptions of the woman's physique. Here, too, the lyric section (7:2-6) is probably spoken by the man. The introductory verse serves to put the lyric which follows into the context of its discourse setting. This discourse setting consists of the two lovers and an unidentified group. The group initiates the exchange by addressing the female.

clear below, poem 25(8:1-4) also suggests that the lovers live in an environment which is unsympathetic to their plight as lovers. The woman presents her view of an ideal world where "[she] could kiss [her lover] when [she] met him in the street, and no one would despise [her]" (8:1).
Their appeal for her to show herself to them, occasions the man's response, which consists of an extended lyric description of his love partner. Although the female lover does not speak, she is addressed by the group within the discourse setting, and therefore, must be present in the discourse setting. But when the male addresses her, his address is directed toward her as she appears in the fictive realm of the lyric, and not necessarily as she appears in the discourse setting. The man's address to the woman is thus a rhetorical device, designed to create a literary effect for the group who functions as audience in the discourse setting.

Several of the lyric poems in the Song (poems 7(2:1-3), Y(4:1-5:1), 20(6:4-10) 22(7:1-6), 24(7:11-14), and 31(8:13-14)), then, are self-conscious with regard to their double audiences. In addition to addressing the love partner [at least implicitly; cf. poem 7(2:1-3)], who resides within the fictive realm of the lyric, these poems indicate the presence of an audience in the discourse setting of the work. The double audience is indicated by: (1) third person reference to this outside audience, within the context of the lovers' speeches to each other [poem 31(8:13-14)]; (2) alternation between second and third person references to the love partner, indicating that both the love partner and an outside audience function as addressee [poems 20(6:4-10) and 24(7:11-14)]; (3) third person references to the love partner, which indicate the presence of an outside audience,
along with contextual indications that the love partner is also an audience in the poem [poem 7(2:1-3)]; (4) direct appeals to both the love partner and an audience who resides in the discourse setting [poem Y(4:1-5:1)]; and (5) actual speech acts uttered by the personae who functions as listeners for the lyric in the discourse setting, along with appeals to the love partner within the fictive realm [poem 22(7:1-6)]. In these poems, the contrived nature of the address to the love partner becomes exposed as a rhetorical device, designed to create a literary effect for the listener who resides within the discourse setting of the poem. While the remaining lyrics [poems 3(1:7-8), 4(1:9-11), 6(1:15-17), 23(7:7-10), 27(8:5b), and 28(8:6-7)] involve only the love partner(s) as explicit addressee(s), it should be noted that the lyric genre, by definition, involves a double audience. When viewed in isolation, the double audience in these lyrics would appear to consist of the love partner within the fictive realm and the reader who listens from the stance of the implied reader. But as will become clear below, it is possible that the discourse setting, evident in poems 7(2:1-3), Y(4:1-5:1), 20(6:4-10), 22(7:1-6), 24(7:11-14), and 31(8:13-14), carries over to these poems, making the fictive personae who listen in the discourse setting the second audience for these poems, as well. Falk, by leaving the reader out of her discussion of the audience in the lyric, fails to acknowledge that duality of audience is inherent in
the lyric genre. She, therefore, does not consider the possibility that the reception of the lyric by a party other than the addressee in the fictive realm may itself become dramatized in the various units.

In the poems discussed so far, two distinct genres have been evident: the lyric poem and the narrative poem. In the lyric poems I distinguished between those poems in which only one audience is explicit, that audience being the addressee in the fictive realm, and those poems in which two audiences are clear, one in the fictive realm and one in the discourse setting. In the narrative poems, I distinguished between poems which dramatize the discourse setting, making the presence of a narratee explicit, and poems which do not dramatize the discourse setting, making no direct reference to a listener in the discourse setting. But the lyric and narrative categories of poems in the Song are not mutually exclusive; several poems display a combination of lyric and narrative features. These poems also vary in the extent to which the discourse setting is brought to the foreground.

**THE POEMS OF COMPOSITE GENRE**

The composite poems [poems 1(1:2-4), 5(1:12-14), X(2:8-17), and 25(8:1-4)] contain no new features, but rather a combination of the features found in the lyric and narrative poems. Parts of these poems display the figurative mode of description linked with the ideal world in the Song.
In all but poem 5(1:12-14), these lyric sections are addressed to the love partner. But the poems also include narrative features in the form of narration of events and, at times, direct appeals to a narratee. All of these poems give some indication that an audience outside of the love relationship is present within the boundaries of the unit, but the poems differ in the degree to which they dramatize this audience's presence.

Two of the composite poems (poems 1(1:2-4) and 5(1:12-14)) are primarily lyrical in quality, but include one reference to an event which links the poem to a narrative realm. Poem 5(1:12-14) is the more straightforward of the two. In this poem, the woman addresses an unidentified outside audience throughout. The mode of description is lyrical in character, the woman comparing her lover to "a sachet of myrrh" between her breasts (1:13) and a "cluster of henna" (1:14). But the first verse sets the poem in a specific temporal context: "Until the king was on his couch, my nard gave forth its scent" (1:12). The statement suggests that now that the king is on his couch, the situation has changed. The actual event of the king's sitting or lying on his couch, then, introduces an element of difference into the poem. The event places the state of affairs which the woman describes in a particular temporal schema which is narrative rather than lyrical in character.
The addressee in this poem, although outside of the fictive realm throughout, remains unidentified and undramatized.

The second poem (poem 1(1:2-4)) is more complex, because, while including the narration of an event, the poem displays evidence that more than one addressee is involved. The poem begins with the woman addressing an outside audience, indicated by the third person reference to her lover in 1:2a. She then turns and addresses her lover directly (1:2b-4a), comparing his love to wine and his scent and his name to fine oils. But imploring him to run with her, she suddenly changes stance, introducing a narrative element into the poem: "The king has brought me to his chambers" (1:4a). The poem is further complicated by the introduction of the maidens; but their inclusion does not interfere with the lyric mode of the majority of the poem, since they are introduced to confirm the woman's judgment concerning her lover (1:3b and 4c). But the reference to the king and his action of bringing the woman to his chambers does interfere with the lyric mode. Whether the king is to be identified with the woman's lover or represents another character, the reference to him and his action imparts a narrative element to the poem. This narrative element would appear to be addressed to an outside audience, as was the first line of the poem. The outside audience is not identified in the poem, and apart from the transition from second to third person references to the love partner, which
highlight the presence of this audience, their role is not
dramatized in the poem.

In two other poems [poems X(2:8-17) and 25(8:1-4)],
the narrative elements are more extensive. In my view,
Falk's poems 9-12 (2:8-13, 14 15, and 16-17, respectively)
reflect one poem, its boundaries being marked by the
comparison of the male love partner to a "gazelle" and a
"young hart of the stags" in 2:8-9 and 16-17. The poem
begins with the woman addressing an unspecified audience,
who stands outside of the love relationship. She recounts a
series of events in which her lover comes over the
mountains, stands behind the wall (presumably of her house),
and gazes in through the window (2:8-9). In 2:10a she
introduces an element of reported speech, stating: "My lover
answered, saying to me". What follows is the speech of the
male love partner, reported by the woman, but addressed to
her in her role as character in the story. Her lover
beckons her to come away with him, into the pastoral setting
of vines and fig trees (2:11-13), since spring has now
arrived. He implores the woman to show him her appearance
and to let him hear her voice (2:14). The speech, with its
picturesque descriptions of the spring as seen through a
lover's eyes, and exhortations to the woman to come away
with the speaker, is thoroughly in keeping with the lyric
mode in the Song. But in this context, the lyric is
embedded as reported speech into a larger narrative context. In 2:15 a sudden shift occurs, the woman moving from reporting the speech of her lover to addressing her outside audience directly. The transition is indicated by the masculine plural imperatives: "Catch for us foxes, little foxes, those ruining vineyards, for our vineyards are in bloom". Apart from the designation of the addressee as a group, this addressee remains unidentified. In 2:16, the woman continues to address the outside audience, referring to her lover in the third person, proclaiming their mutual love. But in the final verse, she turns and addresses her lover directly, comparing him to a "gazelle" and a "young hart of the stags", and exhorting him to flee back to his mountain habitation (2:17). In 2:10b-14, she had reported the speech of her lover, suggesting that he was not present at the time of the discourse event. At first glance, her direct address to him at the conclusion of the poem would seem to suggest that he is, in fact, present in the discourse setting. But the woman's address to her love partner is an address to him as he appears in the fictive realm of the poem. The male lover, then, need not be present in the discourse setting, for the woman's address to him is a rhetorical device, designed to create a literary effect for a second audience. This second audience may well be the same as the audience in the discourse setting of the narrative portions of the poem. While the group remains unidentified, the
direct appeal to them in 2:15 dramatizes their role as narratee in the poem. The poem, then, contains the narration of events (2:8-10), lyric elements [both in the instance of reported speech (2:10b-14) and in the appeal to the male lover which concludes the poem (2:17)], and one direct appeal to the narratee (2:15).

The final poem which contains both narrative and lyric features is poem 25(8:1-4). This poem begins with the woman addressing her lover (8:1-2). Although the speech alludes to events, these events are expressed as hypothetical events or wishes, the woman's statement of how she would like the situation to be. The optative mood of this section suggests a lyrical mode, an expression of the female lover's vision of an ideal world:

If only you could be like a brother to me,
One nursed at the breasts of my mother
(Then) I would meet you on the outside and
    I would kiss you,
And no one would despise me;
I would lead you, I would bring you
To the house of my mother (who) taught me;
I would let you drink of the spiced wine,
Of the juice of my pomegranate.

The ideal world which the woman presents is one which is sympathetic to the plight of the lovers, for in it they would have no worries about public reaction to their love affair. But the woman also includes in her vision an expressed wish to enter a house. In 8:3 a transition occurs, the woman recounting an event which took place between herself and her lover: "His left hand was under my head while his right hand
caressed me". The addressee would now appear to stand
outside of the love relationship, since the woman refers to
her lover in the third person. In the final verse (8:4), the
woman addresses her outside audience directly, with the
adjuration formula directed to the Daughters of Jerusalem.
The adjuration, as in poems 8(2:4-7) and 13(3:1-5), may be
related to the woman's desire to enter a house; the woman
implores the Daughters to learn from her example, exhorting
them not to waken or arouse love until it pleases. The
Daughters, who function as the narratee in the narrative
section of the poem (8:3-4), may also function as the second
audience in the lyric section (8:1-2). By dramatizing this
discourse setting, consisting of the female lover and the
Daughters, the poem highlights the fact that the address to
the love partner is a rhetorical device aimed at producing a
literary effect for the audience in this discourse setting.

In only one of these poems of composite genre, then,
does the audience remain consistent. Poem 5(1:12-14), in
spite of its combination of narrative and lyric features, is
addressed to an audience that stands outside the love
relationship. The three remaining poems in this category
display a self-consciousness with regard to double audience
similar to that found in some of the lyric poems in the Song.
In poem 1(1:2-4), this self-consciousness is conveyed by the
alternation between second and third person references to the
love partner, in addition to the third person reference to
the king which presupposes an outside audience. In poem X(2:8-17), the woman first addresses an outside audience and, in spite of the incident of reported speech, the outside audience remains the addressee in the discourse setting throughout 2:8-16. In the last verse of the poem, although the explicit addressee is the love partner, this address can be seen as a rhetorical device, designed to create a literary effect for the audience in the discourse setting. A similar situation occurs in poem 25(8:1-4). Again, a double audience is clear from the alternation between second and third person references to the love partner. But in 8:1-2, the lyrical address to the male love partner constitutes an address into the fictive realm of the poem. The Daughters of Jerusalem, who function as the narratee in the discourse setting of the narrative section of the poem, may well constitute the audience in the discourse setting for the lyric section of the poem, as well. By drawing attention to their dual audiences, these poems draw attention to a performance setting inherent in each of the poems. While the address to the love partner gives the impression of an intimate exchange between lovers, the presence of an outside audience highlights the contrived nature of this intimate exchange. In the final analysis, the interaction between the lovers is exposed as a performance, a contrived exchange designed to create a literary effect for an audience who resides within the discourse realm of the poems. I shall return to a
discussion of this discourse realm and its implications for the interpretation of the Song below. But before such a discussion is possible, three units in the Song remain to be discussed. These units do not fit into any of the genre categories established above. Two of the poems [poem 14(3:6-11) and 30(8:11-12)] reflect a variation on the narrative genre. The remaining poem [poem 26(8:5a)], although very brief, takes the form of a rhetorical question.

THE REMAINING POEMS IN THE SONG

The remaining poems in the Song differ in several respects from the twenty-two poems in the three genre categories above. First of all, as noted above, these three units differ from the previous poems in terms of form, poem 26(8:5a) being simply a rhetorical question, poems 14(3:6-11) and 30(8:11-12) reflecting a variation on the narrative genre. Second, while in the previous poems at least one of the lovers was involved in the speech acts of the units, functioning as speaker and/or addressee, in these three poems neither speaker nor addressee need be involved in the love relationship. Finally, although the rhetorical question of poem 26(8:5a) shows affinities with the previous units in terms of subject matter, the poem still concerning the two lovers, poems 14(3:6-11) and 30(8:11-12) display divergent subject matter, each being concerned with the endeavors of Solomon.
Poem 26(8:5a), when viewed in isolation, can hardly be considered a full "poem". Still, if one wishes to maintain any internal coherence to the units as delineated, it is difficult to see any necessary connection between poem 26(8:5a) and the units which immediately precede and follow it; in my view, the colon is best taken as an isolated unit. The form of the unit is a rhetorical question. The speaker queries: "Who is this coming up from the wilderness, leaning on her beloved?" Both lovers are referred to in the third person in this unit, suggesting that neither functions as speaker or addressee in the poem. But both speaker and addressee remain unidentified, and there is little in the way of contextual indications which would suggest their identity.

The two remaining poems [poems 14(3:6-11) and 30(8:11-12)] are more substantial units, each with clearly demarcated boundaries and a considerable degree of internal coherence. The subject matter of these poems differs considerably from the other units in the Song, with no reference being made to the male and female lovers found elsewhere in the Song; rather, these poems deal with the endeavors of Solomon, his procession and the building of the

\[\text{\footnotesize \textsuperscript{\textdegree\degree}}\]

Again, I do not mean to suggest that within the context of the Song as a whole the unit has no role to play. Rather, its role in the Song may be determined by its connection with units other than those which immediately surround it. Note, for example, the use of the element "Who/What (mî) is this coming up from the wilderness" in both 3:6a and 8:5a, and the use of the "Who (mî) is this" in 6:10.
'appiryòn" in poem 14(3:6-11), and his treatment of his vineyard in poem 30(8:11-12). In terms of form, these poems also differ considerably from the other units in the Song. Although basically narrative in character, involving the narration of events which occur in a particular time sequence, these poems display an aberration of the narrative form when it comes to speech acts. In discussing the narrative genre, I suggested that the genre makes a clear distinction between speech acts which take place at the level of story and speech acts which take place at the level of discourse. Under normal circumstances in a narrative, a speech act cannot traverse the boundary between the story and discourse realms. But each of these poems displays a speech act which does traverse this boundary. In each, the narrator begins by recounting the events of the story, referring to the characters in the third person and, presumably, addressing a narratee in the discourse setting in which he himself resides. The speaker does not participate in the story as a character, but rather tells the story from the stance of an outside observer. But in the final verse of each poem, the narrator abandons his stance as objective observer and intrudes into the level of the story, addressing a character or characters of that story directly. Gerard Genette (1980:234-235) refers to this technique as "narrative

\[\text{For a discussion of the etymologies and derived meanings which have been proposed for the term 'appiryòn, see Chapter III.}\]
metalepsis". He notes that through the technique, the narrator gives the impression that he "hismself brings about the effects he celebrates". In so doing, the narrator often reveals his evaluation of the events he narrates. Thus, as in the lyric genre, the address to a character in the fictive realm is a rhetorical device, designed to create a literary effect for a second listener. In both poems, this second listener is the narratee who remains in the background throughout the poem, listening to both the third person account of the story and the direct appeal to the story character.

Poem 14(3:6-11) begins with an account of a procession featuring Solomon's "couch" (mitzāh), then proceeds to a description of his building of the 'appiryôn. In these first five verses (3:6-10), the narrator maintains an objective stance, portraying the scenes as if through the eyes of an outside observer. Solomon, his sixty warriors, and the Daughters of Jerusalem all figure as characters in the story he tells, being referred to in the third person throughout this section. But in the final verse (3:11) of the poem, the narrator abandons his stance as objective observer, intruding into the level of the story and addressing the Daughters directly. Returning to the procession scene of 3:6-8, the narrator beckons the Daughters, in their role as characters in the story, to come out and see Solomon wearing his crown. The narrator thus
tries to give the impression that he is responsible for the Daughters' coming to see the procession. At the same time, through his interjection, he conveys his evaluation of the events he narrates. The Daughters have laboured, laying the pavement for King Solomon's 'appiryôn; but it is Solomon who appears in the procession while the Daughters can participate only as spectators. Furthermore, while the Daughters have carried out their labour with "love", the crown which Solomon wears in the procession is said to have been given to him on the day of his "wedding", one would assume the day when the "love" relationship began. The narrator, through his address to the Daughters, reveals his evaluation of the events, for he appears to chide the Daughters for the position in which they find themselves. The relationship between Solomon and the Daughters, characterized as a "love" relationship and a "marriage", is one in which the Daughters do all the work while Solomon gets the glory. 33

The second poem [poem 30(8:11-12)] displays a similar technique. Again, an unidentified narrator begins by recounting a series of events pertaining to Solomon, this time with regard to his ownership of a vineyard. Through 8:11, this narrator maintains an objective stance, telling the events as if through the eyes of an outside observer. He refers to Solomon and his "keepers", the characters in the 

33A detailed exegesis of this passage will appear in Chapter III.
story, in the third person. But in 8:12, the narrator intrudes into the level of the story, addressing Solomon directly. His statement pertains to Solomon's actions in the story, indicating that he addresses him as a character in that story. While in 8:11 the narrator indicates that a man would offer a thousand pieces of silver for the fruits of the vineyard, in 8:12a he chides Solomon: "My own vineyard is before me; the thousand [pieces of silver] are yours, O Solomon!" The address suggests that Solomon has chosen to sell the fruits of his vineyard, accepting the silver in exchange for the fruits. The narrator, by evoking the image of his own vineyard and contrasting what belongs to himself and what belongs to Solomon, implies that he would not have made such a choice.

In both of these poems, then, the narrator intrudes into the level of the story, addressing a character in that story. Although the only explicit addressee in the poems are these story characters, these appeals to story characters are rhetorical devices, designed to create a literary effect for the true listener who, like the narrator, must reside within the discourse setting of the poems. This discourse setting has important implications for the interpretation of the Song. But before proceeding to a discussion of the possibility of a unified discourse setting in the Song, a summary of the genres evident in the Song is perhaps in order.
SUMMARY OF GENRES

The preceding analysis has attempted to isolate the various genres evident in the Song. The following chart summarizes these genres, as well as the evidence for a discourse setting found in the poems in the Song:

A. The Narrative Poems

(1) Poems Which Do Not Dramatize the Discourse Setting

21(6:11-12)

(2) Poems Which Dramatize the Discourse Setting

(a) by direct appeals to a narratee

2(1:5-6)
8(2:4-7)
13(3:1-5)

(b) by dialogue between narrator and narratee

29(8:8-10)

(c) by both direct appeals to narratee and dialogue between narrator and narratee

19(5:2-6:3)

B. The Lyric Poems

(1) Poems in Which the Only Explicit Audience is the Addressee in the Fictive Realm of the Lyric

3(1:7-8)
4(1:9-11)
6(1:15-17)
23(7:7-10)
27(8:5b)
28(8:13-14)

(2) Poems in Which the Only Explicit Audience is the Addressee in the Discourse Realm of the Lyric

7(2:1-3)
(3) Poems in Which Both an Addressee in the Fictive Realm and an Addressee in the Discourse Realm Are Explicit

(a) by direct appeal to addressee in fictive realm and third person reference to the audience in the discourse realm

31(8:13-14)

(b) by alternation between second and third person reference to the love partner

20(6:4-10)
24(7:11-14)

(c) by direct pleas to both addressees in the fictive realm and addressees in the discourse realm

Y(4:1-5:1)

(d) by dialogue between agents in the discourse realm, introducing the address to the audience in the fictive realm

22(7:1-6)

C. The Composite Poems (Involving Both Narrative and Lyric Features)

(1) Poems in Which Only the Audience in the Discourse Realm is Explicit

5(1:2-4)

(2) Poems in Which Both an Addressee in the Fictive Realm and an Addressee in the Discourse Realm Are Explicit

(a) clear from alternation between second and third person references to the love partner

1(1:2-4)

(b) clear from alternation between second and third person references to the love partner and direct appeals to an audience in the discourse setting

X(2:8-17)
25(8:1-4)
D. Poem in the Form of a Rhetorical Question

(1) Poem in Which the Position of the Both Speaker and Addressee in Relation to the Fictive Realm is Ambiguous, Although the Two Lovers of the Fictive Realm Are Referred To in the Third Person

26(8:5a)

E. The "Metealepsis Narrative" Poems

(1) Poems Which Do Not Dramatize the Narratorial Setting, With the Only Explicit Addressee Being a Character in the Story Realm

14(3:6-11)
30(8:11-12)

Apart from the two extended units [poems X(2:8-17) and Y(4:1-5:1)], these units correspond with the poems Marcia Falk (1962:73) delineates in the Song. But while Falk categorizes all of the poems as lyrics, the analysis above suggests that only about half of the poems belong within the lyric genre per se. Nonetheless, the diversity of genres present is not in itself indicative of disunity. The combination of genre elements is as complex in some individual poems as it is in the majority of poems combined. Although the poems in Category A are entirely narrative in character, and the poems in Category B are entirely lyrical in character, the poems in Category C display a combination of narrative and lyric elements. If the poems in Category C, with their combination of narrative and lyric elements, can be considered unified literary compositions, there is no reason why the twenty-two poems in Categories A, B, and C,
with their combination of narrative and lyric elements, cannot be taken together as a unified literary composition. While the three poems in Categories D and E remain, once the principle of multiple genres in a unified work is established, there is no reason why these three poems cannot be included as well. Again, this is not to say that the poems, as Falk delineates them, are not convenient units with which to work. But the convenience of these units as working units does not militate against their working together in the end, each contributing something to the meaning of the whole. Yet, in order to assert that these units do work together as a whole, one must find their unifying principle, or the particular structure which organizes the units in a meaningful way. In my view, this overarching structure is to be found in the performance setting evident in many of the poems in the Song.

THE POSSIBILITY OF A UNIFIED DISCOURSE SETTING IN THE SONG

In discussing the poems in Categories A, B, and C above, I noted that many of these poems include within their boundaries references to their own performance settings. That is to say that while they include lyrics and stories, they also draw attention to the situation in which these lyrics and stories are recited, dramatizing the act of delivering these compositions to a particular audience. All of the poems in these three categories contain a fictive
realm which pertains to the two lovers. As well, the speech acts in all these poems involve at least one of the lovers as a speaker and/or an addressee. Apart from the six pure lyrics in Category B(1) above, all of the poems in these three genre categories give some indication of an audience who stands outside of the fictive realm pertaining to the two lovers. Furthermore, the six poems which I have designated as pure lyrics, by definition, entail a double audience. When these poems are viewed in isolation, this double audience consists of the addressee within the fictive realm of the poem [the love partner] and the reader, who takes up the stance of the implied reader. But it is possible that the discourse setting evident in the remainder of the poems is meant to carry over to these lyric poems. The discourse setting could then be seen as the unifying principle or structure for at least these twenty-two poems in the Song. But before making such an assertion, one must first establish that the discourse setting is a continuous discourse setting, containing a fixed number of discourse agents who interact in an organized way. I shall begin with those poems in which the discourse setting is set forth most clearly, then examine the remaining manifestations of a discourse setting to see whether they are in accord with the setting already established.

The discourse setting is most clearly set forth in those poems in which both the speaker and the addressee in
this setting are identified. In four of the narrative poems (poems 2(1:5-6), 8(2:4-7), 13(3:1-5), and 19(5:2-6:3)) and one poem of composite genre (poem 25(8:1-4)), the addressee in the discourse setting is identified as the Daughters of Jerusalem. But in spite of their designation as a group of females, the speaker uses second person masculine plural verb forms in addressing them (1:5; 2:7; 3:5; 5:8; and 8:4). In all of these poems, the speaker is a woman, and in all but poem 2(1:5-6), she tells a story that pertains to herself and her lover, indicating that she is to be identified with the female lover in the Song. In poem 2(1:5-6), although her story concerns her relationship with her brothers, there is nothing which militates against her being identified as the female lover, even though she now tells of her relationship with characters other than her love partner. The discourse setting in these five poems, then, would appear to be continuous.

In one other narrative poem (poem 29(8:8-10)), although the identity of the group is not given, the discourse setting is clearly set forth, the female lover

---This practice would suggest that the term "Daughters of Jerusalem" is a symbolic term, referring more generally to the inhabitants of Jerusalem who would be of mixed gender. Jerusalem is then personified and its inhabitants referred to as her daughters. While the phrase occurs only in the Song, a parallel expression, "Daughters of Zion", also found in the Song (3:11), appears in Is. 3:16,17, and 4:4. A similar expression, "Sons of Israel", used in reference to the Israelites, is very common in the Hebrew Bible; for examples see I Kg 6:1,13; 8:9,63; 9:21; 11:2; II Chr 5:10.
interacting with an unidentified group. Many scholars, picking up from the group's reference to their "little sister", have suggested that the group is to be equated with the woman's brothers, as referred to in 1:6 as the "sons of [her] mother". But the woman's brothers do not speak elsewhere in the Song and there is no reason why the group need be men as opposed to women or a group of mixed gender. Elsewhere, the epithet ḥotî, "my sister", is used by the male lover in reference to his love partner. The term "sister" need not be taken literally in the Song, but may simply be an affectionate term for a girl or woman. In my view, there is no reason why the discourse setting in this poem cannot be seen as continuous with that established above, the woman interacting with the Daughters of Jerusalem.

In poem Y(4:1-5:1), the speaker makes a direct appeal to an audience in the discourse setting, referring to this audience as ṭĕm, "friends" or "lovers" (5:1). But since "friends"/"lovers" ("lovers of the world" so to speak) is a relational term, indicating congenial relations between the speaker and his audience, and not the audience's identity per se, there is no reason why the Daughters and these "friends"/"lovers" cannot be the same group. In appealing to the group, the speaker uses the same second person masculine

---

Some examples of recent scholars who maintain this view include Marvin Pope (1977:678), Marcia Falk (1982:132), and Michael V. Fox (1985:171). Michael D. Goulder (1986:66) suggests the more general "relatives of the...girl".
plural form of address as was used in the appeals to the Daughters in the previously mentioned poems. Poem 31(8:13-14) also refers to an audience in the discourse setting using a relational term. The man, addressing his love partner, refers to this audience in the third person, using the term ḫabērīm, "companions". Again, the term indicates a sense of comradeship between the lovers and their audience, but not, strictly speaking, the identity of the group. There is no reason, therefore, why these companions cannot be the Daughters. In both poems, however, both the male and the female lover appear as speakers. Both lovers must then reside within the discourse setting of the Song. They interact with each other, in addition to making direct appeals to the Daughters; but even when the lovers address each other, the Daughters remain in the background, listening to the exchange.

Two other poems [poems X(2:8-17) and 22(7:1-6)] involve interaction between the lovers as well as direct appeals to a group in the discourse settings. But in both cases, the group in the discourse setting remains unidentified. In poem X(2:8-17), this group remains in the background through most of the poem; but in my view, the presence of an outside audience is clear from the woman's third person references to her lover (2:8-10a, 16). In 2:15, however, the woman makes a direct appeal to her audience, using masculine plural imperative forms. Again, this
masculine plural form of address is in accord with the form of address used in appeals to the Daughters of Jerusalem, suggesting that the Daughters may be the addressee here, as well. In poem 22(7:1-6), the man uses second person masculine plural verb forms in addressing his audience in the discourse setting (7:1b); the form of address is again identical with that used in addressing the Daughters.

In five other poems, the presence of an audience who stands outside the love relationship is suggested by the third person references to the love partner in all [poems 5(1:12-14) and 7(2:1-3)] or part [poems 1(1:2-4), 20(6:4-10), and 24(7:1-6)] of the poem. Although in these poems there is no indication of the identity of this outside audience, or even whether the audience is a singular persona or a group, there is no reason why it cannot be the Daughters who function in the discourse setting elsewhere in the Song. As well, poem 21(6:11-12) is probably addressed to an audience who stands outside the love relationship, although in this poem, because there is no reference to the love partner, it is impossible to determine with any certitude the position of the addressee vis à vis the love relationship. But elsewhere in the Song the narrative poems are addressed to the Daughters, and an audience outside of the love relationship is, in my view, the more likely solution. It is possible, therefore, that the Daughters
function as the addressee in the discourse setting of this poem as well.

There is no reason, then, why the discourse setting in the seventeen poems discussed above cannot be seen as continuous, with the lovers either addressing the Daughters directly, or addressing each other but intending that the Daughters hear the exchange. Given the fact that continuity of discourse setting is a viable possibility in these seventeen poems, it may well be the case that this discourse setting is continuous throughout the twenty-two poems in genre Categories A, B, and C, above, even though the pure lyrics [poems 3(1:7-8), 4(1:9-11), 6(1:15-17), 23(7:7-10), and 27(8:5b)] make no reference to a discourse setting. But the fact that a poem such as poem 25(8:1-4) combines both lyric elements (which give the impression of an intimate exchange between lovers) and narrative elements (which highlight the interaction between the individual lovers and the outside audience) and, at the same time, identifies the audience in the discourse setting as the Daughters of Jerusalem, suggests that the discourse setting which features the Daughters as audience is not incongruous with the lyric elements in the Song. If one considers the units as delineated above as units created for the sake of interpretive convenience, with no autonomous existence apart from their context in the Song, there is no reason why the discourse setting as established elsewhere in the Song cannot
remain in the background of the lyric units. In my view, the
dynamics of this discourse setting are seen most clearly if
one uses the analogy of a dramatic stage production.\textsuperscript{36}

The drama features two lovers who stand on stage,
performing before the Daughters of Jerusalem. The
Daughters, as audience, sit on the ground floor of a large
auditorium. At times, the two lovers address each other,
expressing their love for each other as if they were alone.
But the impression of being alone is a contrived effect, for
the dramatic genre demands that an audience be present, even
if the actors take no cognizance of them. At other times,
the lovers do take cognizance of their audience, turning and
addressing the Daughters directly. In these cases, the
actors tell the audience of particular encounters with the
love partner rather than acting them out on stage.
Occasionally, the actors make direct appeals to their
audience, suggesting that the drama which they present has
particular relevance for the Daughters. The woman exhorts
them not to make the same mistakes she has made (2:7; 3:5;
\textsuperscript{36}By suggesting that the discourse setting of the
Song is best understood by way of an analogy with a stage
production, I do not mean to suggest that the Song was ever
intended to be produced as a play. Rather, the interaction
between the different voices, with the distinction between
those which operate within the fictive realm and those
which operate outside of the fictive realm, can be
visualized more easily with the help of the analogy. Like
Roland E. Murphy (1979:102), I would argue: "The work is not
a drama, but it is dramatic...the literary articulation of
[the relationship between the lovers] is worked out in a
dramatic way".
8:4); she also implores them to catch the little creatures which spoil the idyllic vineyard setting (2:15). The man, on one occasion, encourages the audience to partake of the pleasures of love (5:1c). Sometimes the Daughters respond to the drama as it is presented, prodding for more information (5:8; 6:1), or imploring the actors to behave in a particular fashion (7:1). Once, they even interject, telling the female actor a story of their own (8:8-9). The performance setting is thus relatively informal and seems to encourage audience participation. The fact that the Song dramatizes the audience's role in the stage production indicates that their role is crucial for the understanding of the stage production itself; the meaning of the stage production cannot be ascertained apart from its relevance for the Daughters of Jerusalem.37

Up in the third balcony sits the reader, viewing the production from the stance of the implied reader. Though too far away to take part in the exchange between the actors and

37Linda Hutcheon (1984:xii) uses the term "metafiction" to denote fiction which "provides, within itself, a commentary on its own status as fiction and as language, and also on its own processes of production and reception". The Song, by dramatizing the recitation of poetry by the lovers, and the reception of this poetry by the Daughters, indicates that the poetry is just that, "poetry", literary compositions designed to create particular literary effects on its audience. Hutcheon (1984:6) argues that "the point of metafiction is that it constitutes its own first critical commentary, and in so doing...sets up the theoretical frame of reference in which it must be considered". As far as the Song is concerned, the Daughters constitute the frame of reference in which the poetry of the lovers must first be considered.
their audience, he has the advantage of being able to sit back and watch the exchange from a distance, without becoming involved in the exchange himself. From his vantage point, he can see not only the drama of the lovers as it unfolds, but also the techniques which the actors use to convey their message, and the effect of these techniques upon the audience. For the reader, then, the dynamics of the interaction between actors and audience becomes the focal point. The drama itself is reduced to a means to an end, a form of rhetoric designed to convey a message to the Daughters.

But in my discussion of the discourse setting, thus far, I have confined myself to those units in which it is clear that at least one of the lovers participates in the speech acts of the poem. The three poems in genre Categories D and E remain. These poems give little indication of the identity of their speakers and addressees, although in poem 26(8:5a) it is clear that the lovers do not participate as either speaker or addressee in the speech act, since both are referred to in the third person in the unit. In this poem it is impossible to determine with absolute certainty whether the speech act takes place within the fictive realm or in the discourse setting. But in my view, the poem is probably uttered in the discourse setting of the Song. It is not difficult to reconcile such a speech act with the discourse setting as suggested above. The poem takes the form of a
rhetorical question, and given the Daughters' propensity for asking questions (cf. 5:9 and 6:1) they appear a likely candidate as speaker in the speech act. The addressee is slightly more problematic, since the only other fictive personae who participate in the discourse setting are the two lovers, and the Daughters refer to both in the third person in this unit. In my view, the most natural solution is to posit either that the Daughters turn and address each other, or that the verse represents a vocalization of their thoughts, addressed to no one in particular (tantamount to the Daughters addressing themselves).

At first glance, the two remaining poems, the "metalepsis narratives" of Category E [poems 14(3:6-11) and 30(8:11-12)], appear more difficult to reconcile with the discourse setting as described above. One reason is that the subject matter changes considerably, both poems dealing with the endeavors of Solomon. But the issue of subject matter pertains to the fictive realm of the poems and not the discourse setting. While the subject matter clearly changes, the discourse setting may remain consistent. In both of the poems in question [poems 14(3:6-11) and 30(8:11-12)], a narrator in the discourse realm of the poem tells a story. His stance at the beginning of each poem is that of an outside observer; he refers to the characters in the story in the third person. In the final verse of each poem, however, the narrator intrudes into the level of the story, addressing
a character or characters in that story directly. But the
appeal to story characters is a rhetorical device, designed
to create a literary effect for the true listener who, like
the narrator, must reside within the discourse setting of the
poems. In my view it is possible to reconcile the discourse
setting of these two poems with that established for the love
poems above.

The narrator is an actor who appears on stage,
addressing the Daughters of Jerusalem. The actual actor who
plays the role of this narrator may be the same actor who
played the role of one of the lovers. But now, instead of
telling stories and reciting lyrics which relate to his own
role as lover, he recounts two stories pertaining to Solomon,
telling them from the stance of an outside observer.

\[\text{That the narrator in poem 30(8:11-12) is one of the}
\text{lovers is suggested by the fact that the same expression, "My}
\text{very own vineyard" (karm\textsuperscript{t} šelli\textsuperscript{t}) is used both by the female}
\text{lover in 1:6 and by the narrator of 8:12. But it is}
\text{difficult to determine which of the lovers speaks in 8:12,}
\text{since it may be the woman speaking either of an actual}
\text{agricultural vineyard or herself, or the man speaking either}
\text{of an agricultural vineyard or his lover.}

\[\text{In Gerard Genette's (1980:189) terminology, the}
\text{speaker's change in stance amounts to a change in}
\text{"focalization". The poems dealing with the love relationship}
\text{were focalized internally, the lovers relating stories and}
\text{lyrics in which they themselves functioned as characters.}
\text{These stories and lyrics were thus told from the point of}
\text{view of the main characters, although in the narrative poems,}
\text{focalization was through the lover as narrator, as opposed to}
\text{through the lover as character. But in the poems pertaining}
\text{to Solomon, the persona who narrates the stories does not}
\text{figure as a character in the story which he tells. The}
\text{stories are thus focalized externally, from the point of view}
\text{of an outside observer.}
Although the two groups of poems entail different narrative stances, there is no reason why one speaker/actor cannot tell both types of stories, one pertaining to events which involve himself, the other pertaining to events which involve others.

As far as the audience is concerned, poem 30(8:11-12) poses no particular problem when viewed within the context of the discourse setting outlined above. Since the Daughters do not function as characters in the story, there is no reason why they cannot be the audience to whom the narrator tells the story. Poem 14(3:6-11) poses more of a problem, since the Daughters do function as characters. The narrator, in speaking of them in their character role, first refers to them in the third person (3:10), but then addresses them directly, beckoning them to come out and watch the procession.

The third person reference to the Daughters in the story realm is problematic if one wishes to maintain that

[Note: It is worth noting that the narrator seems to make a distinction between appeals to the Daughters in the fictive realm of the story (3:11) and appeals to the Daughters in the discourse setting, as evident elsewhere in the Song. In 3:11, when the narrator intrudes into the level of the story he refers to the Daughters as the "Daughters of Zion" and uses second person feminine plural verb forms in addressing them. Elsewhere in the Song, when the narrator appeals to the Daughters in the discourse setting, he refers to them as the "Daughters of Jerusalem" (as when he refers to them in the third person in 3:10), using second person masculine plural verb forms in addressing them. The reason for the discrepancy may be that in the fictive realm of the story, the Daughters are actually meant to represent female characters, while in the discourse setting they refer more generally to the inhabitants of the city who would be of mixed gender. For a more extensive discussion of the issue, see Chapter III.]
in the discourse setting the Daughters function as the audience or narratee for this poem. But the problem is not insurmountable, since the narrative metalepsy of 3:11 already places this poem within the realm of special effects; the third person reference to the Daughters may be another such special effect. The narrator, by referring to the Daughters in the third person, may wish to create for his audience the impression of looking at the situation as it would appear to an outside observer. But as will become clear when the poem is examined in detail in Chapter III, even the section narrated in the third person is filled with indications of the narrator's evaluation of the events he narrates. By using the third person form of narrating, then, the narrator gives a false sense of objectivity to his story. He creates for the Daughters an impression of objectivity, in hopes that they will not notice that their own evaluation of the situation is being molded by the presentation. When in 3:11 he addresses the Daughters in their character role, his evaluation of the events becomes more overt. But by this time, the Daughters cannot help but agree with his stance, thinking that they have come to the same conclusions on the basis of the narrator's previous "objective" presentation of the situation. As noted earlier, the dynamics of this poem will be explored in detail in the following chapter.

The preceding analysis demonstrates that it is possible to see a continuous discourse setting running
through the entire Song. This discourse setting consists of a man and a woman who tell stories and recite lyrics to an audience identified as the Daughters of Jerusalem. Through most of the Song, this man and woman recount stories and recite lyrics which pertain to their own love relationship. But at times, they make direct appeals to their audience, suggesting that the stories and lyrics have particular relevance for the Daughters of Jerusalem. On two occasions, either the man or the woman takes an entirely different stance, abandoning his or her role as lover temporarily and telling a story which pertains to King Solomon. The narrator tells these two stories from the point of view of an outside observer. But while the stance of the narrator changes, his audience remains the Daughters of Jerusalem. At least one of these poems also has direct relevance for the Daughters, since they figure as characters in the situation depicted. The discourse setting, with the Daughters functioning as audience, thus constitutes a unifying factor for the stories and lyrics presented. The dramatization of the audience's role in the Song indicates that the meaning of the individual units cannot be ascertained apart from their relevance for the Daughters of Jerusalem. But the material presented to the Daughters appears to fall into two distinct blocks, one pertaining to the relationship between the two lovers, the other to Solomon, his endeavors, and his relationship with the Daughters. In order to assert that the text can be read
as a unity, one must demonstrate that the two blocks of material are related in some way, and that through the presentation of them both, a single message is conveyed, first to the Daughters, and then by way of the Daughters to the readership of the Song. While it is beyond the scope of this study to give a detailed exegesis of the entire Song, the following chapter will give some indication of how such a demonstration would proceed.

CONCLUSION

I began this chapter by examining Marcia Falk's analysis of speaker-addressee relationships in the Song. In conclusion, I shall note that by drawing attention to the importance of speaker-addressee relationships for understanding the dynamics of the individual units, Falk has made an important contribution to the study of the Song. As Falk rightly notes, several different speakers appear in the Song and they address different audiences. But the major problem inherent in Falk's analysis is that she does not allow for the possibility that there is a principle of organization regulating the interaction between speakers and addressees in the text. In my view, speakers and addressees do interact in a complex, but organized fashion in the Song. The principles which regulate this interaction are different in the various genres evident in the Song, but in each, the lines of communication evoked entail a necessary distinction
between the fictive realm and the discourse setting of the poems. Although the Song contains two distinct fictive realms, the discourse realm may be consistent through the two blocks of material. In my view, this discourse setting provides an overarching structure to the text, constituting one of the Song's major unifying features. As will become clear in the following chapter, this structure provides the reader with a valuable starting point for exploring the inner dynamics of the text.
III. THE IMPLICATIONS OF A UNIFIED DISCOURSE SETTING FOR THE INTERPRETATION OF THE SONG

In the preceding chapter, I examined the evidence for a unified discourse setting in the Song, and concluded that while there appears to be two separate blocks of material, each with different subject matter and literary form(s), there is no reason why the discourse setting of these two blocks of material cannot be continuous. This discourse setting consists of two speakers, one male and one female, who tell stories and recite lyrics to an audience identified as the Daughters of Jerusalem. In this chapter, I would like to explore the implications of this unified discourse setting for the interpretation of the Song. While it is beyond the scope of this study to provide a detailed exegesis of every unit in the Song, I shall begin by putting the issue of interpretation into a theoretical context, then illustrate the possibility of a unified interpretation by applying the principles established in this theoretical discussion to a few examples in the Song.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The dramatization of its discourse setting places the Song in a category of literature which Linda Hutcheon (1984:xii) labels "metafiction". Hutcheon uses the term to
denote a literary composition which "provides within itself a commentary on its own status as fiction and language and also on its own processes of production and reception". Hutcheon (1984:6) argues further that "the point of metafiction is that it constitutes its own first critical commentary and in so doing...sets up a theoretical frame of reference in which it must be considered". By dramatizing the situation in which the various poetic segments are presented to their audience, the Song provides a specific frame of reference in which to interpret the segments; the meaning of the individual narratives and lyrics cannot be determined apart from their relevance for the Daughters of Jerusalem. But at the same time, the dramatization of the discourse setting draws attention to the fact that the recitation of the poetry is a performance and that the individual narratives and lyrics are "narratives" and "lyrics", literary compositions designed to create a literary effect for the audience to whom they are directed.

By highlighting the nature of the individual segments as literary compositions, as well as the specific setting in which they are delivered, the Song leads the reader to consider the way audiences [and readers] derive meaning from literary texts. The interaction between those who recite the poetry and the Daughters who listen to the poetry becomes a story in itself, with the recitation of the narratives and lyrics constituting the actions propelling this story.
forward. The aim of the speakers is to convey a particular message to the Daughters through their poetry. The story's plot consists of the literary devices or means of rhetoric which the speakers employ in communicating with their audience; the effectiveness of these rhetorical devices determines whether they will be successful in getting their message across to this audience. The reader's task, then, is to identify the rhetorical devices, determine their effect, and discover the message which the speakers attempt to convey. The reader must also determine how the presentation can be relevant to the Daughters of Jerusalem.

Gerard Genette (1980:227ff), in his treatment of the narrative, discusses the phenomenon of stories within a story. Genette (1980:228) distinguishes between "metadiegetic" narratives and the "diegetic" or "first level" narrative in such texts: the former is a story told within a story; the latter is the primary story within the text. Although Genette discusses only the phenomenon of narratives embedded in the context of larger narratives, there is no reason why the diegetic/metadiegetic distinction cannot apply when a lyric is embedded within a larger narrative context. In the case of the Song, the interaction between the two speakers/actors and the Daughters of Jerusalem constitutes the diegetic narrative, while the individual narratives and lyrics constitute metadiegetic compositions. Genette (1980:232-234) suggests three relationships which may exist
between the diegetic and metadiegetic levels in a text:

(1) a relationship of direct causality between the events of the metadiegesis and those of the diegesis, conferring on the former an explanatory function;

(2) a thematic relationship between the metadiegesis and the diegesis, with no spacio-temporal continuity between the two levels, but rather a relationship of contrast or analogy;

(3) no explicit relationship between the two levels, the act of narrating the metadiegetic composition(s) itself fulfilling a function in the diegesis, regardless of the metadiegetic content.

In my view, the relationships which Genette delineates prove useful in interpreting the Song.

But the situation is complicated by two factors. First of all, apart from the audience's identity as the Daughters of Jerusalem, very little information about the Daughters is provided in the text, at least as they appear in the discourse setting. The two speakers/actors make several appeals to the Daughters. The woman implores them not to stare at her (1:6); not to waken or arouse love until it pleases (2:7; 3:5; 8:4); not to find her lover or to tell him of her state of arousal (5:8); on one occasion to aid her because of her state of arousal (2:5); and on one occasion to catch the little foxes that spoil the idyllic vineyard setting (2:15). The man, on one occasion, invites his audience to partake of the pleasures of love (5:1); at another point he indicates their presence in the garden (8:13). On one occasion, the Daughters interject and tell a
story of their own (8:8-9); but the story pertains to their relationship with their little sister and says very little about their own station in life. With so little information provided concerning the Daughters in the text, it is difficult to determine how the narratives and lyrics can have particular relevance for them.

The second factor which complicates the issue of the relationship between the diegetic and metadiegetic levels in the text is the diversity of material presented at the metadiegetic level. As noted in the previous chapter, both in terms of form and in terms of subject matter, the units in the Song appear to fall into two distinct blocks. The first block of material contains both narrative and lyric poems, as well as some units which combine narrative and lyric features. This block of material deals with the relationship between two lovers and comprises the majority of units in the Song. The second block of material contains only two units (3:6-11 and 8:11-12), both taking the form of a metaleptic narrative. This second block of material deals with the endeavors of Solomon.¹ Before proceeding to the relationship

¹Technically, one could argue for three blocks of material, one pertaining to Solomon, one pertaining to the two lovers, and one which combines the lyric realm of the lovers with a narration of events pertaining to "the king" [poems 1(1:2-4) and 5(1:12-14)]. But for the sake of convenience, I have included the two poems in question in the block of material pertaining to the two lovers, and will comment on the role of the references to the "king" in these passages when I discuss the use of key images in these passages.
between the metadiegetic compositions and the diegetic discourse setting for these poems, then, the reader must first establish the relationship between the two blocks of material at the metadiegetic level.

In my view, the relationship between the two blocks of material is thematic in character [Genette's category (2), above]. The key to understanding this relationship is the large number of images and expressions which the two blocks of material have in common [a table of these images and expressions can be found in Appendix IV]. These images appear in very different contexts in the two blocks of material. Yet in my view, the evaluation which the characters give to these images in their respective contexts contribute significantly to the dynamics of the text as a whole. But it is beyond the scope of this study to examine how each of the twenty-one images and expressions in question functions in its contexts in the two blocks of material, or how the juxtaposition of their usages function in the text as a whole. Rather, to give some indication of how such a study

---

Wayne Booth (1983:272) notes the impact patterns of imagery can have in a literary text when, in connection with his discussion of impersonal narration, he states:

With commentary ruled out, hundreds of devices remain for revealing judgment and molding responses. Patterns of imagery and symbol are as effective in modern fiction as they have always been in poetry in controlling our evaluation of details.
would proceed, I shall begin by examining in detail the two units pertaining to Solomon.

The block of material pertaining to Solomon serves as a convenient starting point for two reasons. First of all, its brevity will permit a detailed discussion of the entire block of material and thus will allow me to establish the complete frame of reference which it draws into the text. Second, since the Daughters of Jerusalem function as characters in one of these units (3:6-11), a discussion of their role in the story may provide some insight into the relevance of this block of material for the Daughters as they reside in the discourse setting of the work. In my view, there is an explanatory relationship [Genette's category (1), above] between the metadiegetic stories pertaining to Solomon and the diegetic story of the speakers'/actors' interaction with the Daughters in the discourse setting of the work. That is to say, the stories pertaining to Solomon provide background information about the Daughters which is useful for understanding their concerns within the discourse setting. Since the discourse setting itself provides so little information about the Daughters, the Solomon stories fill the gap left by the lack of concrete information pertaining to the Daughters in the discourse setting.

But while the stories pertaining to Solomon have an explanatory relationship with the discourse setting, the love poetry has a thematic relationship with both the Solomon
passages and the discourse setting of the work. As indicated previously, this thematic relationship is suggested by the large number of images which the love poetry and the passages pertaining to Solomon hold in common. As will become clear below, this thematic relationship works on the principle of contrast. In the passages pertaining to Solomon, the narrator presents a conception of love which has played an important role in the Daughters' past. The love poetry portrays a more intimate conception of love, with values entirely different from those presented in the Solomonic passages. By juxtaposing the two types of love, the narrator attempts to mold the Daughters' response to their situation as depicted in the passages pertaining to Solomon. In discussing the material, therefore, I shall begin with a detailed examination of the two units which pertain to Solomon, then demonstrate how their key images are manipulated in the love poetry so as to mold the Daughters' [and the reader's] evaluation of the images. I shall conclude with some directives for further research on the topic.

THE TWO POEMS PERTAINING TO SOLOMON

The presence of these two passages which relate to Solomon has always been a mystery for interpreters of the Song. As Samuel Krauss (1942-1943:17) suggests:

The clue to the unravelling of the difficulties of the Song of Songs is to be
found in the passage 3:6-11; he who succeeds in interpreting it successfully possesses the key for the solution of the riddle which is proffered by the Song.

The most common approach among contemporary scholars is to look upon the Solomon passages as literary fictions, contributing to the dynamics of the love poetry elsewhere in the Song. As far as 3:6-11 is concerned, Gillis Gerleman (1965:140), John B. White (1978:146) and Michael V. Fox (1985:125) suggest that the poem reflects the two lovers in a fictive wish situation, dreaming about their wedding as if it were to take place in royal fashion. With regard to 8:11-12, both Marcia Falk (1982:133) and Michael V. Fox (1985:174-175) suggest that Solomon's treatment of his harem (under the metaphor of his vineyard) serves as a foil for the youth's

Earlier modes of interpretation dealt with the problem in various ways: the allegorists treated the references to Solomon as references to either God or the Messiah; advocates of the dramatic mode of interpretation identified Solomon as either the male lover or as a rival to the male lover who appears elsewhere in the Song; the cultic mode of interpretation maintained that in its original form, the name Solomon was really "Shelem", a Canaanite name for the sun-god Tammuz, and that only later, when the poetry was adapted for Jerusalemite worship, was it changed to "Solomon"; the wedding week theory saw the references to Solomon as indications of play-acting on the part of the bride and groom, both being hailed as royal figures during the nuptial ceremonies; Robert Gordis (1949:168 and 1974:20) champions the approach whereby 3:6-11 is seen as a poem celebrating an actual wedding of Solomon, the poem finding its way into the collection by way of the general theme of love.

Michael V. Fox (1985:125) notes that Ibn Ezra viewed Solomon's wedding as a foil for that of the lovers; the lovers are in no need of the extravagant ceremony Solomon required, because they have something more valuable in each other.
treatment of his beloved. These scholars all presuppose that the two Solomonic passages stand apart from the other poems in the Song and that Solomon is not to be equated with the male lover in the remainder of the poetry. It is worth noting that each suggests a type of thematic relationship between the poems pertaining to Solomon and the other poems in the Song, the two poems in question being related to the love poetry either by way of contrast or analogy.

Another approach worth noting is that advocated by Francis Landy. Equating Solomon with the male lover in the work, Landy suggests that these poems (Cant 3:6-11 and 8:11-12) draw attention to a development in Solomon's attitude toward the beloved. For Landy (1983:118ff), 3:6-11 represents Solomon's marriage to the beloved, with the beloved's presence suggested by the implied equivalence between her and Solomon's 'appiryôn (3:9-10). The point of the poem is to show how the wedding becomes a display of Solomon's grandeur, while the bride's role is reduced to a contributing factor in establishing this grandeur. Landy (1983:120) notes:

[The wedding] is a public affair, a dynastic triumph; one may even recall Solomon's troubled succession, and Bathsheba's anxious part in it. The spouse is reduced to a political insurance. Hence her total neglect in the description of the palanquin, which is

---

=Part of Landy's basis for suggesting such an equivalence is the use of the phrase "Who is this coming up from the wilderness?" in reference to the woman in 8:5 and in reference to Solomon's mittâh or 'appiryôn in 3:6ff.
just an expression, subverted by "paved with love", of Solomon's magnificence; her only value is as a metonymy, as part of his display, and for this reason, too, the eye is caught by the attributes of his power: the diadem, the royal sovereignty.

In the second poem (8:11-12), Landy (1983:154-156) suggests that Solomon's vineyard represents Israel and that the point of the poem is to indicate Solomon's need to come to terms with his attitude toward his beloved; the woman narrates the story of Solomon and his vineyard, then concludes, advocating that her own "vineyard" is worth more than all of Solomon's kingdom. In my view, Landy's approach is hampered by his failure to distinguish between Solomon and the male lover elsewhere in the poem. But his suggestion of a second frame of reference pertaining to Solomon's royal status and his political affairs is an interesting one which, in my view, is worth exploring. If 3:6-11 and 8:11-12 are viewed apart from their connection with the love poetry (at least in the initial stages of exegesis), and rather in relation to the traditional accounts of Solomon's reign (as reported in I Kings 1-11 and II Chronicles 1-9), some interesting parallels emerge. But before I embark on an exegesis of the two passages in light of these parallels, a brief methodological note is perhaps in order.

In asserting that the 3:6-11 and 8:11-12 should be read in light of the traditional accounts of Solomon's reign, I am in fact asserting that the poems have two separate
frames of reference. On the one hand, the poems are closely connected to the love poetry found in the remainder of the Song. This connection is conveyed primarily through the similarity in imagery employed in the two blocks of material [see Appendix IV]. As noted above, it is precisely this similarity in imagery which suggests that there may be a literary relationship between the two blocks, thus allowing for a unified interpretation of the Song. On the other hand, the poems also use series of images and motifs which have particular significance within the context of the traditional

---

Benjamin Hrushovski (1984:11-12), in defining a frame of reference in a literary text, distinguishes between the sentence and the frame of reference:

Both the sentence and the \( fr \) [frame of reference] combine words in a text; but the \( fr \) goes off, as it were on a tangent; it selects some parts of a sentence and adds to them (parts of) other sentences, using "reality-like" models. A sentence is a linear unit occupying a stretch of the text; whereas a \( fr \) is a construct based on discontinuous elements in a text which are linked to each other by some kind of flexible but necessary "semantic syntax"... The basic unit of semantic integration is not the sentence but a frame of reference (\( fr \)). An \( fr \) is any continuum of two or more referents to which parts of a text or its interpretation may relate: either referring directly or simply mentioning, implying or evoking. It may indicate an object, a scene, a situation, a person, a state of affairs, a mental state, a history, or a theory; it may be real, hypothetical, or fictional. It may be given in reality or in a reader's network of knowledge or projected uniquely in a given text. Its ontological status is immaterial to semantics: it is anything we can talk about, no matter whether and how it exists.
accounts of Solomon's reign in I Kings 1-11 and II Chronicles 1-9. Strictly speaking, however, the context of Solomon's reign is denied existence in the fictional situation depicted in the poems. It can be integrated with this fictional situation only through metaphorical transfer.\(^7\) Such metaphorical transfers take place at the level of individual metaphors and similes within the poems. Through these metaphorical transfers, the context of the events and states of affairs associated with Solomon's reign enter the poems. While a limited number of situations pertaining to his reign are alluded to in these two poems, the allusions themselves are, in my view, specific enough to signal the reader that the poems should be read in that context. Because the most specific of these allusions appear in the description of the 'appiryôn, in 3:9-10, I shall begin my discussion with this section of the unit 3:6-11, then return to the procession scene portrayed in 3:6-8,11. I shall conclude my discussion of the material pertaining to Solomon by examining Solomon's treatment of his vineyard, as portrayed in 8:11-12.

**Solomon's Building Project and Procession (3:6-11)**

The account of Solomon's building project begins with the hapax legomenon 'appiryôn, the precise connotations of which remain a matter of debate. Although it is clear from context (3:9-10) that the word denotes an ornate wooden

structure of some sort, the size, shape, mobility and function of this structure remain unspecified. Yet there may be a reason for this lack of clarity. In my view, within the context of the poem as a whole, the word functions as a vehicle for a metaphor. That is to say that while the word itself denotes one such wooden structure, the description which follows evokes another structure, which functions as the referent of the metaphor. For the purposes of this chapter, it is the referent evoked by the description which serves to establish the frame of reference pertaining to Solomon's reign. But in order to determine the extent of metaphorical transfer required, it will be useful to survey the various etymologies which have been proposed for Hebrew 'appiryôn.

Semantically, the majority of etymologies proposed for 'appiryôn fall into two main categories. The first group designates a seat, couch, or bed, designed either to be carried in a procession, or as a stationary piece of furniture. Advocates of these etymologies equate the 'appiryôn with Solomon's mittâh, "couch", in 3:7. The earliest and still the most widely accepted etymology traces the origins of Hebrew 'appiryôn to Greek phoreion. The Septuagint, in translating Cant. 3:9, uses phoreion, denoting a "sedan chair" or "litter". Jerome, in his commentary to Is. 7:14, already explained the Hebrew 'appiryôn as derived
from the Greek word. Although Frithiof Rundgren (1962:71-72) does provide an acceptable philological argument for the phonetic changes which would have taken place in the transition from Greek to Hebrew usage, the etymology is not


Although several forms without prosthetic aleph do appear in Aramaic and late Hebrew (i.e. poryôn, puryôn, poryânâ, pîrîyanâ, pîryôm, and poryêmâ), Rundgren (1962:71) notes that the addition of a prosthetic aleph is not unusual when a word passes from Greek to Aramaic or Hebrew usage. In Aramaic,

Die Verbindung ph oder p + Konsonant musste entweder durch ein prosthetisches Alef mit Vokal + p = f wiedergegeben oder mittels eines Hilfsvokals aufgelöst werden.

[The combination ph or p + consonant had to be represented either with a prosthetic aleph with a vowel and p = f or by means of a helping vowel.]

In late Hebrew,

Ein frikatvisches p = f konnte im Anlaut durch Alef mit Vokal + p wiedergegeben werden.

[A fricative p = f could be represented by an aleph with a vowel + p.]

Rundgren (1962:72) suggests that the form 'appiryôn, found in Cant. 3:9, represents a hybrid form from late Hebrew 'afîryôn and Aramaic pîryôn.

Michael V. Fox (1985:125), picking up from Rundgren's linguistic argument, suggests the borrowing from the Greek may not have been direct. He suggests that in order to ascertain the semantic range of Hebrew 'appiryôn, one should consider the Aramaic cognate terms. Fox examines various Aramaic forms from Targumic and Talmudic sources which are phonetically similar to the Greek phoreion and Hebrew 'appiryôn. These include: pwrywym, prwy, pwryyn, pwry' and pwryh, all of which appear to denote some form of bed. In one case (Cant. Rab. iv 22), pwry' may designate a litter for a bride, although it need not suggest a palanquin
without problems. While B.S.J. Isserlin (1958:60) maintains that the litter or sedan chair appears to have been in use as early as 500 B.C.E., Gillis Gerleman (1965:141) notes that such litters are never depicted in the vase art of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.E., and that the earliest literary attestation of the word *phoreion* appears in Deinarchos around 300 B.C.E. The word is used sparingly in late koine writings, although it is attested in Plutarch, Polybius, and Herodian.\(^{10}\) Furthermore, although Greek *phoreion* does sound similar to Hebrew *'appiryôn*, it is difficult to determine whether it is the root from which the Hebrew word derives, or whether the Septuagint translator, himself uncertain of the meaning of the Hebrew word, chose a word which, in his view, suited the context of the description provided, and at the same time, was as similar as possible in sound to the difficult Hebrew *Vorlage*. Although *'appiryôn* is used in the Mishnah (Sotah ix 14) in the sense of the Greek *phoreion*,\(^{11}\) the rabbinic usage of *'appiryôn* with the sense of a "litter" may derive from the Septuagintal tradition.\(^{12}\) Gillis


\(^{12}\) Manfred Görg (1982:17) cites the arguments given by H. Schult (1972), who suggests that the superficial resemblance of the Greek and Hebrew words led to two results:
Gerleman (1965:141) provides one further argument against the Greek etymology, suggesting that the description which follows evokes a permanent building rather than a movable structure. This criticism holds true for the other etymologies which have been put forth in favour of the interpretation of a "litter" or a "palanquin". ¹³

(a) die Bedeutung von phoreion "wurde in die Auslegung der Hl-Stelle eingetragen (zuerst von LXX)", (b) das so "aktualisierte" Wort 'appiryôn "wurde in den gelehrt en rabbinischen Sprachgebrauch übernommen und stand fortan in seiner biblischen Dignität neben phoreion".

[(a) the meaning of phoreion was entered in the interpretation of the Song of Songs passage (first in LXX), (b) the actual word 'appiryôn was assumed in the scholarly rabbinic usage and stood from this time onward in its biblical dignity near phoreion.]

¹³S. R. Driver (1956:449), Robert Gordis (1974:85), and Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs (1951:68) argue for a Sanskrit etymology, derived from the word pary-änka, which again means "sedan chair" or "litter". But as Michael V. Fox (1985:125) notes, although Hebrew did adopt words of Indian origin for some objects acquired from India by trade, it is unlikely that a litter would have been imported when it could be built from local materials. Furthermore, the -k- in the Sanskrit word is not represented in Hebrew 'appiryôn. Manfred Görg (1982:20) suggests a similar meaning:

das Instrument...das der König für seinen feierlichen Aus- und Aufzug benötigt und fertigen lässt, nämlich eine Art sedia gestatoria!

[the apparatus...which the king required and had built for his solemn procession, namely a type of sedia gestatoria.]

Görg relates 'appiryôn to the Hebrew root pry, which is
The second group of etymologies involves an entirely different semantic range pertaining to a "house" or more elaborate "palace" building. Several scholars have proposed a Persian etymology, based on the similarity between 'appiryôn here in Cant. 3:9 and a word of Persian origin, 'appeden, found in Dan. 11:45. In Daniel, the word designates the palace of a king. Gillis Gerleman (1965:140-141) argues for an Egyptian etymology, suggesting the Hebrew 'appiryôn reflects a borrowing from Egyptian pr, a common expression for "house". In the Hebrew it appears with preformative aleph and ending ywn. The Hebrew word for pharaoh, with the root meaning "big house", derives from the same root. On the basis of the Egyptian etymology, Gerleman (1965:140) cognate with Egyptian prj. In Hebrew, the root has the basic meaning "to come up", "to be fertile", or "to be productive". In Egyptian, the root has the basic meaning "to come out", and is related to the "coming out" or official appearance of gods and kings in the procession from the Temple. Görg suggests that 'appiryôn represents the second infinitive of Egyptian prj with Hebrew preformative aleph and afformative waw-nun. He concludes that the cognate with the Hebrew root prv, with its intimations of procreation, may indicate a connection between the king's "coming out" and the beginning of creation.

Jacques Winandy (1965:104) cites Halevy, Winckler, Jeremias and Ricciotti as maintaining this view.

In opposition to this etymology, Manfred Görg (1982:18) argues that in Egyptian and Coptic, an -r- seldom appears in the final syllable and in absolute position in a word. He suggests that it is, therefore, unlikely that a form such as pr could find its way into the Israelite collection of loan words. Michael V. Fox (1985:125) maintains, however, that the Egyptian word probably ended in a -y- or a vowel so that the afformative element could be the familiar -ôn diminutive.
suggests that the 'appiryôn designates Solomon's Thronehall. But in my view, Manfred Gorg (1982:18-19) is correct when he asserts that such an extension of meaning from the "house" to "Thronehall" is unwarranted, especially if one takes into consideration Fox's proposal that the concluding -ôn is a diminutive. While it is possible that as a vehicle for a metaphor the word refers to one of Solomon's grandiose building projects (see the discussion below), a literal rendering of the word, according to the Egyptian etymology, would appear to be more along the lines of a "little house", or perhaps simply "house".

The interpretation of 'appiryôn as a building does find support in some of the ancient versions and interpretations. The Peshitta translates mgdl', "tower". The Targum and Ibn Ezra equate the 'appiryôn with Solomon's Temple. The Zohar (i 15a) speaks of a palace. While it is unlikely that the word 'appiryôn actually designates a "tower", "palace" or "temple", the description which follows in 3:9-10 does evoke the image of a rather elaborate building. In my view, the actual meaning of the word 'appiryôn is probably "house". But within the context of the poem as a whole, the word functions as the vehicle for a metaphor; the referent of this metaphor is a more grandiose construction, namely, Solomon's Temple.

The frame of reference pertaining to Solomon's

16 Cf. footnote 15.
Temple is most apparent in the description of the 'appiryon and its construction as reflected in 3:9-10. These two verses contain several images which are directly associated with the accounts of Solomon's building and dedication of the Temple in I Kings 6-8 and II Chronicles 2-7. Included in these parallels is the frequent use in the traditional accounts of the term "house" to designate the Temple. But, in addition to imagery derived directly from the traditional accounts of Solomon's reign, the verses contain images derived from the description of the Tabernacle in the wilderness in Exodus 25-31 and 35-40, and from Ezekiel's description of the Temple in Ezekiel 40-48. Given the close literary relationship among these four passages, it is not

\[1^{7}\]See, for example, I Kg 6:2-10, 14-19; II Chr 3:4-7, 11-13. Other titles which incorporate the "house" element include: "the House of the Lord" (I Kg 6:1; 7:40, 45, 48, 51; 8:10, 11, 63, 64; 9:1; II Chr 3:1; 5:1, 7, 13; 7:2, 11; 8:1); "the House of God" (II Chr 3:3; 4:11, 19; 5:14); and "the House for the Name of the Lord" (I Kg 8:20; II Chr 1:18; 2:3; 5:13; 6:7).

\[1^{8}\]The interdependence of the descriptions of the Temple in I Kg 6-8 and II Chr 2-4, the ideal account of the Temple in Ez 40-48, and the Tabernacle in the wilderness in Ex 25-31 and 35-40, has been noted by many scholars. According to the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis, both the Ezekiel account of the Temple and the Exodus account of the Tabernacle present ideal structures, based on Solomon's Temple as described in I Kg 6-8. While Ezekiel projected his ideal Temple into the future, the Priestly Writer responsible for the Exodus account set his ideal structure back in the desert period of Israel (G. Henton Davis (1962:503)). In its bare outline, with its cubical for the Ark of the Covenant, separated from the remainder of the Tabernacle, and its surrounding courtyard, the description of the Tabernacle does resemble that of Solomon's Temple as presented in I Kg 6-8. Some similarity in furnishings are also apparent, such as the cherubim, which in the Exodus account were attached to
surprising that a poet, familiar with all four accounts, might either confuse the distinctive features of each, or deliberately amalgamate them, in his metaphorical description of Solomon's Temple.

The description begins with a reference to the builder of the 'appiryôn: "An 'appiryôn King Solomon made for himself" (3:9). The phrase hammalek Shelômôh is quite common in the sections of I Kings and II Chronicles which deal with Solomon's reign. It is used liberally throughout the mercy seat of the Ark (Ex 37:7-9), but which in I Kings take on much larger proportions and were actually part of the Holy of Holies in which the Ark was housed (I Kg 6:23-28). But as G. Henton Davis (1962:504) suggests, the relative dating of the I Kings Temple account and the Exodus Tabernacle account is difficult to determine, since the Tabernacle might be a prototype for Solomon's Temple, rather than an account modelled after the Temple [cf. more recently, the theory of R. E. Friedman, in The Exile and Biblical Narrative]. The Chronicler's description of the Temple (II Chr 2-4) would appear to post-date both the I Kings and Exodus passages. While the Chronicler is clearly using I Kings as the main source for his own account, he does incorporate some features found in the description of the Tabernacle which are not reflected in the description in I Kg 6-8. Consider, for example: the reference to a detailed plan for each structure (Ex 25:9; I Chr 28:19); the indication that the Israelites made contributions for the project (Ex 35:20-29; 36:2-7; I Chr 29:6-9); the inclusion of the veil in front of the Holy of Holies (Ex 26:31-33; II Chr 3:14); and the descent of fire to consume the offering at the dedication (Lev 9:22-24; II Chr 7:1-3) [I am indebted to Dr. Stephen Westerholm for drawing my attention to these parallels]. The Chronicler also appears to have derived some of his imagery from Ezekiel. One feature of particular note is the equation of the cherubîm in the Holy of Holies with a chariot (I Chr 28:18), an equation which may well be dependent on Ezekiel's description of his chariot vision (Ez 1). [For further discussion of this detail, see below.] Thus while the Chronicler appears to have I Kings as his basic source, he probably also drew upon the account of the Tabernacle in Exodus and the account of the Temple in Ezekiel for some of his details.
the accounts of Solomon's building projects\(^1\) and in the accounts of the dedication of the Temple,\(^2\) but also in other passages which highlight Solomon acting in his official capacity as king.\(^3\) Outside of these two books, however, the phrase appears only here in Cant 3:9 and 3:11, and in Jer 52:20, where it is used in connection with his role as builder of the Temple. The verb 'āh is also employed liberally within the context of Solomon's building projects. While generally speaking, both I Kings and II Chronicles tend to use

\[ bnh \]

when speaking of Solomon's building of the Temple

\[ \text{per se,} \]

the verb 'āh is often used in conjunction with his building of individual parts of the Temple.\(^4\) In one

\[ ^{1}\text{See, for example, I Kg 6:2; 7:13,14,40,45,51; 9:11,15,26; 10:16,21; II Chr 4:11,16; 9:15,20,22.} \]

\[ ^{2}\text{See I Kg 8:1,2,5; II Chr 5:6,7.} \]

\[ ^{3}\text{Note, in particular, the occasion of his coronation (I Kg 1:34,39; I Chr 29:34), his interaction with foreign dignitaries (I Kg 9:11; 10:10,13; II Chr 9:9,11), and statements concerning his status as king (I Kg 1:45; 4:1; 10:23; II Chr 9:22).} \]

\[ ^{4}\text{For some examples, see I Kg 6:2; 7:1; 8:13,27,43,44; 9:1,3; II Chr 1:18; 2:3; 3:1,2,3; 6:2,5,10,18,33,34,38.} \]

\[ ^{5}\text{Note the use of the verb 'āh in connection with the building of the following items: the cherubim (I Kg 6:23; II Chr 3:10); the windows (I Kg 6:4); the tank/sea of cast metal (I Kg 7:23; II Chr 4:2); the laver stands (I Kg 7:27; II Chr 4:14); the lavers, scrapers and sprinkling bowls (I Kg 7:40; II Chr 4:7); the vessels of the House (I Kg 7:45; II Chr 4:16,18); all the furnishings of the House (I Kg 7:48; II Chr 4:19); all the work that King Solomon had done in the House of the Lord (I Kg 7:51; II Chr 5:1); the Holy of Holies (II Chr 3:8); the curtains (II Chr 3:14); the columns (II Chr 3:15); the chainwork in the inner sanctuary (II Chr 3:16); the altar of bronze (II Chr 4:1; 7:7); the} \]
instance, I Kg 9:11, the two verbs appear together in conjunction with Solomon's building projects: "When Solomon had finished building (bnh) the House of the Lord and the royal palace and everything that Solomon had delighted to make (ʾāsh)...". Both the title, "King Solomon", and the verb ʾāsh used to characterize his activity, then, have affinities with the accounts of Solomon's building of the Temple in I Kings and II Chronicles.

The poem reports that the ʾappiryon was made "from the wood of the Lebanon" (3:9). Both I Kg 5:20ff and II Chr 2:7ff recount how Solomon enlisted the help of King Hiram of Tyre to procure cedar and cypress wood from the Lebanon for the building of the Temple. The phrase "the wood of the Lebanon", apart from its appearance in Cant 3:9, occurs elsewhere only in connection with this enlisting of Hiram's men in II Chr 2:7. But references to the cedar wood acquired from the Lebanon for use in the Temple are frequent in the I Kings account. One of the buildings in the complex, the "House of the Forest of Lebanon", derives its name from this Lebanon timber.

Cant 3:10 begins with the statement: "Its pillars (ʾammûdây) he made of silver". Both I Kg 7:15ff and II Chr lampstands of gold (II Chr 4:7); the tables and gold basins (II Chr 4:8); the Court of the Priests and the Great Court (II Chr 4:11); the bronze platform (II Chr 6:13); and the ramps for the House of the Lord (II Chr 9:11).

See especially I Kg 6:9,10,15,16,18,20,36.
3:15 refer to two massive pillars (ʿammūdīm) which were erected in front of the Great Hall of the Temple. The Chronicler does not specify the material from which they were constructed; the Kings passage indicates they were made of bronze. But the description of the Tabernacle in Ex 25-31 and 35-40 includes several posts or pillars (ʿammūdīm) which had rods strung across, and from which the veil and hangings for the entrance to the Tabernacle and the courtyards were hung. While the veil was suspended on pillars of acacia wood, with golden hooks and silver sockets (Ex 27:32; 36:36), the pillars for the hangings of the courtyard were to have sockets of bronze, but hooks and rods in silver (Ex 27:10-11,17; 38:10,11,12). The capitals of the pillars in the courtyard were also plated in silver (Ex 38:17,19). The silver pillars, in Cant 3:10, may allude to the pillars plated and trimmed with silver, as described in Exodus 27 and 38. The image represents an amalgamation of the Temple and Tabernacle accounts.

The second half of 3:10a states: "Its ṭefīdāh (was made) of gold". The word ṭefīdāh is another hapax legomenon, not found elsewhere in the Bible. A nominal form of the verbal root ṭappd appears as a place name in Ex 17:1,8; 19:2; and Num 33:14f. Verbal forms of the root appear in Job 17:13; 41:22; and Cant 2:5. According to Marvin Pope (1977:380), the basic meaning of the root is "to spread", "to underlay" or "to support". He notes that Arabic and Old
South Arabic cognates have this sense. Several proposals for the interpretation of the rēfīdāh, based on the interpretation of the 'appiryōn as a "litter" have been set forth. Gillis Gerleman (1965:139), who maintains that the 'appiryōn is a building, suggests that the rēfīdāh denotes "that which is spread out", and thus may represent a floor or a ceiling. Michael V. Fox (1985:126), who notes that elsewhere the root rpd seems to be used in connection with floors, suggests a carpet or upholstery with gold threads worked into it. Fox's interpretation of this word as a "floor" is a possibility; it is of note that I Kings 6:30 suggests that the floor of the Temple was overlaid in gold. But in my view, the word rēfīdāh, with the basic meaning of its root being "to spread out", may refer to a "veneer finish" or "overlay" as opposed to a "floor". Ibn Ezra's gloss of vaṣî for rēfīdāh would suggest such an interpretation. I Kings 6:20-35 recounts that the interior

---

At one point, Marvin Pope (1977:380) suggests that the rēfīdāh may have a meaning similar to that of Arabic rifīdah, "saddle blanket". Elsewhere (1977:443), on the basis of LXX anakliton and Vulgate reclinatorium, he suggests bolsters as a translation, since it may designate either a long pillow for a bed, or a supporting piece in a structure or apparatus. Manfred Gorg (1982:21) proposes an Egyptian etymology, suggesting that Hebrew rēfīdāh is related to a nisbe form of Egyptian rpyt; in itself, this nisbe form would denote "that which belongs to the female figure/ goddess of the litter", but here the images becomes de-divinized. He advocates that the figure of the litter is thus no longer a woman or goddess, but the trimmings of the litter; Gorg suggests the cabinet or casing of the litter. Jacques Winandy (1965:106) suggests the horizontal part of the litter, as bed or bedboard.
of the Holy of Holies, its cedar altar and its cherubim, as well as the walls of the Temple, the doors to the entrance of the Great Hall, the floor to the Temple, and in fact, the entire interior of the House was overlaid with gold. II Chronicles 3:5-10 recounts a similar extravagant use of gold, noting that the porch in the front of the Temple, the beams, thresholds, walls, and doors of the Temple, its Holy of Holies, its cherubim, and again, the entire interior of the House was overlaid with gold. Whether one takes the meaning the word רֶפֶדָה to be a "floor" or a "veneer finish", the poem's statement that this רֶפֶדָה was made of gold is in keeping with the descriptions of Solomon's Temple. And while the word רֶפֶדָה does not have a direct linguistic counterpart in the descriptions of Solomon's Temple in I Kings and II Chronicles, there is a possible etymological affinity between יָסִא [cf. I Kg 6:5-10] and רֶפֶד.

The next element in the description of the 'appiryôn is that "its merkab [was made] of purple material ('arqāmān)". The noun merkāb is found in only two other instances in the Bible. In Lev 15:9, it would appear to denote a type of seat, perhaps a "saddle seat" or "chariot seat".26 In I Kg 5:6, the noun designates a "fleet of

26Jacques Winandy (1965:106) suggests that the use of merkāb in Lev 15:9 may denote the vehicle rather than a seat. The verse reads: "Any merkāb on which the sick man travels will be unclean".
chariots". Although within the frame of reference pertaining to a "house" the interpretation of merkāb as a seat of some kind is appropriate, within the frame of reference pertaining to Solomon's Temple, the term is best understood in its sense of a "fleet of chariots". The connection of this imagery with the traditional description of the Temple will be explained below.

The color 'argāmān, "purple" was used extensively in the Tabernacle in Exodus. The hangings used for the Tabernacle and the veil were made of 'argāmān, as well as violet, red and crimson material. On these hangings, the figures of cherubim were embroidered. While the description of the Temple in I Kings makes no mention of such hangings, the Chronicler includes the veil in his description of the Temple (II Chr 3:14). Here, the veil is made of blue, 'argaman and crimson yarn, embroidered with the figures of cherubim. The cherubim also appear elsewhere in the accounts of the Tabernacle and Solomon's Temple. Ex 25:18-22 reports how such cherubim were molded of solid gold and attached to the Mercy Seat of the Ark of the Covenant. In Solomon's Temple, the cherubim were plated in gold and represented in much larger form, in the Holy of Holies. But in I Chr 28:18, a development in the understanding of these cherubim is

---The verse reads: "Solomon had 40,000 stalls of horses for his fleet of chariots (lēmerkābō) and 12,000 horsemen".

presented. The plan of the Temple, which David gave to Solomon, included the weight of gold required "for the figure of the chariot, the cherubim which spread out [their wings] and screened the Ark of the Covenant of Yahweh". The Chronicler has equated the cherubim with the "figure of a chariot". While in 1 Chr 28:18 it is the cherubim in the Holy of Holies which are described as a chariot, one can easily see how the image might be extended to the cherubim embroidered on the veil before the Holy of Holies (cf. 2 Chr 3:14). This veil, like the hangings of the Tabernacle, was made of 'argāmān. In the context of Cant 3:10, then, the merkāb made of 'argāmān may allude to the fleet of chariots or cherubim embroidered on purple cloth, used as a veil in front of the Holy of Holies in the Chronicler's description of Solomon's Temple.

The final element in the description of the 'appiryôn, "its interior (tūk) was paved (rāṣūf) lovingly by the Daughters of Jerusalem", has occasioned much debate.

As B. D. B. (1951:500) suggest, this conception of the cherubim in Chronicles may derive from the description of Ezekiel's chariot vision in Ez 1:5-28. Here, the cherubim are depicted as having wheels beside them: "As I gazed on the creatures, I saw one wheel on the ground next to each of the four-faced creatures" (Ez 1:15). That these wheels were part of the cherubim, and not part of a structure which they pulled, can be seen from the fact that the wheels moved in synchronization with the cherubim, moving when they moved, remaining still when they remained still, being airborne when they were airborne, "for the spirit of the creatures was in the wheels" (Ez 1:20,21). The conception of the cherubim as live chariots for Yahweh can also be seen in Ps 18:11 and II Sam 22:11; in these verses, Yahweh is said to have "mounted a cherub and flown".
Within the frame of reference pertaining to a "house", the designation of an "interior" or "central portion" is natural enough. The construct form (țôk) appears in what would seem to be a more technical sense in I Kg 8:64 and II Chr 7:7. In both cases, the narrator reports that "Solomon [in I Kg 8:64, "the king"] consecrated the țôk of the court which was before the House of the Lord". In I Kg 8:64, a further qualification is made: "For he made there the burnt offerings and the meal offerings and the fat parts of the offerings of well-being, because the bronze altar was too small to hold the burnt offerings, the meal offerings and the fat parts of the offerings of well-being". This bronze altar was situated in front of the Temple, within the inner courtyard. The "țôk of the court", then, may be either a specific portion of the inner courtyard or the entire space enclosed by the wall of the inner courtyard.

The element țôk is generally used in a compound with the preposition bê, "in the midst of", the preposition min, "from the midst of", or the preposition 'el, "to the midst of". The absolute form tawek is used as an adjective, designating "the middle one" (some examples include the "middle city" in Num 35:5, the "two middle pillars" in Ju 16:29, and the "middle gate" in Jer 39:3). In Deut 3:16 and Josh 12:12, the construct form țôk is used to designate "the space in the middle". With pronominal suffix, the form appears in Ez 15:4, designating the middle section (as opposed to the ends) of a piece of vinewood.

Although the building of the bronze altar, which was situated in the inner courtyard, is not reported in the I Kings account (cf. II Chr 4:1), it is clearly presupposed, since the only other altar described, the one in front of the Holy of Holies within the Temple (I Kg 6:22), was overlaid with gold, not bronze.
The Qal passive participle ṭašūf from the verbal root ṭsp is the only verbal form from this root in the Bible. Two nominal forms, ṭisfāḥ and marsefet, do appear, each designating the pavement of a courtyard. In Est 1:6, the court of the king's palace garden is said to have a ṭisfāḥ of marble, alabaster, mother of pearl and mosaics. In Ez 40:17-18 and 42:3, the ṭisfāḥ is that of the Temple's "outer court". The nominal form marsefet appears in II Kg 16:17, which features King Ahaz rearranging the furniture of the Temple complex. The narrator reports that Ahaz moved the tank from the bronze oxen and placed it on a marsefet of stones. Again, the sense of "pavement" fits well in context. The bronze tank, like the bronze altar, was situated in the inner court of the Temple precinct. Both the inner and the outer courts of the Temple complex, then, appear to have been paved. While within the context of the fictive realm pertaining to a "house", the expression "its tōk was ṭašūf" may suggest that the inside of the structure had a tiled floor, the connection of both the construct form tōk and the root ṭsp with the courtyards of the Temple precinct suggests that at a metaphorical level the phrase may allude to the pavement of the Temple's courtyards.

The presence of the word 'aḥāḇāh, "love", in this line has been dismissed by many scholars as unintelligible. Three main proposals for emendation have been offered:

(1) Marvin Pope (1977:445) cites Graetz, Budde, Haupt, Dussard, Ricciotti, Widdekindt,
Miller and Haller as emending 'ahābāh, "love" to ḥobnām, "ebony", mentioned in Ez 27:15; the final mem is derived from the initial consonant of the following word;

(2) G. R. Driver (1936:111), followed by Robert Gordis (1974:85) and John B. White (1978:45), suggest "leather" on the basis of an Arabic cognate, 'ḥb; the root is used in the Arabic nouns 'ihā'b, "hide, raw skin", and 'iha'b, "soldiers equipment";

(3) Gillis Gerleman (1965:142), followed by Michael V. Fox (1985:126), emends 'ahābāh to ṣābānām, "stones"; again, the final mem is derived from the initial consonant of the following word.

Some scholars maintain the 'ahābāh:

(1) Marvin Pope (1977:445), arguing that rāṣūf carries the sense of "inlaid" rather than "paved", defends MT's 'ahābāh, suggesting that Solomon's bed was decorated with inlaid carvings of love scenes;

(2) Jacques Winandy (1965:109), advocating that the root ṣāp means "to order" or "to arrange", takes 'ahābāh as an adverbial accusative, (cf. Jouon 102d), yielding "the tāk was arranged lovingly"; as Winandy suggests, this proposal is tantamount to saying that the Daughters, who are the agents of the action (cf. Jouon 132d), have put their whole heart into their work: "elle y ont mis tout leur coeur".

Even within the frame of reference pertaining to the "house", Winandy's proposal yields an acceptable solution to the problem posed by MT's 'ahābāh. But within the frame of reference pertaining to Solomon's reign, drawn into the poem by metaphorical transfer, the use of 'ahābāh in the phrase "the tāk was paved lovingly by the Daughters of Jerusalem" takes on political connotations. The use of the word "love" in the context of treaty or covenantal relationships has been
well documented in the literature of the ancient Near East. William L. Moran (1963:78) notes that in ancient Near Eastern documents dating from the eighteenth to the seventh centuries B.C.E., the term "love" is used to describe the loyalty and friendship joining independent kings, sovereigns and vassals, kings and subjects. When the political agreement is between two parties of unequal status, the term carries the connotation of "obedience" or "service". The use of 'ahēbāh can be seen in many different types of covenantal agreements in the Hebrew Bible.\textsuperscript{22} One such covenant agreement is that

\textsuperscript{22}In Deuteronomy, the covenantal relationship between Yahweh and Israel is described in terms of 'ahēbāh [consider, for example, the exhortations to love Yahweh in Deut 5:10; 6:5; 10:12; and 11:1; a reference to Yahweh's love for Israel appears in Deut 7:8]. In I Kg 5:15, the term 'ōhēb, "friend" or "one who loves" is used in connection with a covenantal agreement between the king of Israel and the king of Tyre. The narrator reports that King Hiram of Tyre sent officials to Solomon when he heard that he had been anointed king in place of his father, for Hiram had been an 'ōhēb of David. The encounter concludes with a statement that "there was peace between Hiram and Solomon" ["peace" being another common covenantal term; cf. Weinfeld (1974:258)], and that "the two of them made a covenant" (5:26). The use of 'ōhēb to define the relationship between David and Hiram in 5:15 would suggest that David and Hiram had already had a treaty, and that Hiram's sending of officials to Solomon was for the purpose of confirming a similar treaty with David's successor. The use of 'ahēbāh in connection with a covenant between individuals can be seen in I Sam 18:3. The verse reads: "Jonathan made a covenant [with] David, to love him as himself".
governing the relationship between king and subjects. All Sam 5:1-3 reports:

All the tribes of Israel came to David at Hebron, and said, "We are your own flesh and blood. Long before now, when Saul was king over us, it was you who led Israel out and in [in war] and the Lord said to you: You shall shepherd my people Israel; you shall be ruler of Israel." All the elders of Israel came to the king at Hebron and King David made a

There are several parallels in the documents from the ancient Near East. Ian Bergman (1974:100) states that in Egyptian documents:

Love describes the ideal relationship between a king and his subjects. Some kings state proudly, "Men love me". Sinuhe praises the new king with these words: "He is a lord of favor, great in sweetness; he is the one who conquers by love (mrwt). The inhabitants of the city love him more than they love themselves..." (Sinuhe B, 66).

A. O. Haldar (1974:100-101) notes that in Mesopotamia:

The usual Sumerian word for "love" is ki-ag...The use of this idea in political life is especially interesting. The Amarna letters state that princes "love" each other, that vassals "love" the pharaoh and that the pharaoh "loves" them, and that subjects should "love" their king. This "love" includes primarily loyalty, fidelity, and obedience.

William L. Moran (1963:78, 80) gives examples from the Letters of Mari and the Amarna letters:

In a letter to Yasma'-Addu, the king of Mari, one writer declares himself the king's servant and "friend" (ra'imka, literally, "the one who loves you")...[In the Amarna letters] Rib-Adda's loyal subjects are "those who love me" and they are opposed to the treacherous and rebellious.
covenant with them in Hebron before the Lord.
and they anointed David king over Israel.\textsuperscript{34}

Although the records of Solomon's own coronation [I Kg 1:38-40 and II Chr 29:20-25] contain no reference to a covenant between king and subjects, such a covenantal agreement is probably presupposed in the biblical accounts.

Within the frame of reference pertaining to Solomon's reign, then, the statement "The tôt was paved lovingly by the Daughters of Jerusalem", may allude to the fact that the Israelites, designated figuratively as the "Daughters of Jerusalem",\textsuperscript{35} acted obediently, according to their covenantal

\textsuperscript{34}Further evidence of a covenantal agreement between king and people appears in II Kg 11:17: "And Jeholada solemnized the covenant between the Lord, on the one hand, and the king and the people on the other - as well as between the king and the people - that they should be the people of the Lord". Five verses earlier (II Kg 11:12), the people had anointed the king, shouting: "Long live the king!" Note also that at Saul's coronation, after all the people had acclaimed him, shouting "Long live the king!" (I Sam 10:24), the narrator reports: "Samuel explained the royal constitution (mīšāt hammelukāh) to the people and inscribed it in a book, which he placed before Yahweh" (I Sam 10:25). Although the word berit "covenant" is not used in this context, a formal agreement between king and subjects is clear. In addition to covenants made between king and subjects at the time of the king's official coronation, there is one instance of a covenant between king and subjects for the purpose of instituting a change in laws. Jer 34:8-9 reports: "The word which came to Jeremiah from the Lord, after King Zedekiah had made a covenant with all the people in Jerusalem, to proclaim a release among them - that everybody should set free his Hebrew slaves, both male and female, and that no one should keep his fellow Judean enslaved."

\textsuperscript{35}The phrase "Daughters of Jerusalem" is probably best taken as referring to the inhabitants of Jerusalem; the city is thus personified and its inhabitants referred to as her daughters. While the phrase occurs only in the Song, a parallel phrase, "Daughters of Zion", found in Cant 3:11, is also found in Is 3:16,17 and 4:4. That these expressions
agreement with Solomon, paving the courtyards of the Temple. Although the passage opened with the statement, "King Solomon made an 'appiryôn...its pillars he made of silver..."", the verb 'ašah suggesting that he did the work himself, in 3:10b-c the identity of the labourers is revealed. Although Solomon receives the credit for having made the structure, it is the Israelites who have been the actual labourers in the construction. But while the verse states that the Daughters did their work "lovingly", Solomon had, in fact, imposed forced labour on the Israelites for the project.\footnote{I Kg 5:27-30 reports on Solomon's forced labour, indicating that Solomon imposed such labour on all of Israel. But elsewhere, II Chronicles records that it was only the aliens in the land who were put to forced labour (II Chr 2:16; 8:7-10). I Kg 9:20-22 makes a similar claim, in spite of the previous assertion (I Kg 6:27-30) that "King Solomon imposed forced labour on all Israel". J. Albert Soggin (1982:262-263) suggests that for the Israelites, the type of labour demanded was statutory labour, manual labour for public service, possibly instead of additional taxes. Such labour appears to have been demanded on a periodic basis (I Kg 6:27-28). The Canaanites living in the land may well have received harsher treatment. The biblical tradition suggests that forced labour was a major issue leading to the North's rejection of Rehoboam, Solomon's son, as their king (cf. I Kg 12:4; II Chr 10:4).} The political metaphor introduced through the image of "love" in 3:10 is developed further in 3:11. Although 3:11 represents a return to the time-framework of the procession scene begun in 3:6-8, in order to explore this development of the should be taken as referring to the inhabitants of the city is clear from a similar phrase, "Sons of Israel", used in reference to the Israelites [see, for example, I Kg 6:1,13; 8:9,63; 9:21; 11:2]. Rashi, in his commentary on Cant 3:10, suggests that the Daughters are the "completely God-fearing Israelites."
political metaphor I shall begin with a discussion of 3:11, then proceed with the remainder of the procession scene in 3:6-8.

In 3:11, the narrator abandons his stance as objective observer and addresses the Daughters in their role as characters. He beckons them: "O Daughters of Zion come forth and see King Solomon in the crown which his mother crowned him, on the day of his wedding, on the day of his gladness of heart" (3:11). The exhortation to "come forth and see" refers back to the procession scene; the Daughters are invited to view the procession as it passes. But the ——

That the "Daughters of Zion" in 3:11 are to be equated with the "Daughters of Jerusalem" in 3:10 is clear, not only from context, but also from the fact that elsewhere, when used in the singular, the phrases "Daughter/Maiden Jerusalem" and "Daughter/Maiden Zion" appear in parallelism [see, for example, II Kg 19:21; Zech 9:9; Zeph 3:14]. The use of the two different phrases may be for the sake of avoiding verbatim repetition in such close proximity. But the introduction of the phrase "Daughters of Zion" in conjunction with the feminine plural form of address may also serve to distinguish this address to the Daughters in their role as characters from the appeals to the Daughters in their role as narratee. Elsewhere, when the Daughters are addressed in their role as narratee, they are referred to as the "Daughters of Jerusalem" (as when they are referred to in the third person in the story in 3:10), but addressed with second person masculine plural forms of address. As noted in footnote 35, the Daughters in the discourse setting may represent the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Although in the discourse setting they would be of mixed gender (hence the masculine plural form of address), in the context of this story they are portrayed as feminine characters; the reason for this change in gender may be for the sake of maintaining consistency in the frame of reference pertaining to Solomon's wedding. Outside of the frame of reference pertaining to Solomon's treatment of the Israelites, it would not be appropriate to have Solomon married to anyone but female characters.
procession need not be that of Solomon's wedding, since the verse states merely that the crown he wears in the procession was given to him on his wedding day, and not that the procession itself takes place on his wedding day. While the procession scene is portrayed as an event contemporaneous with the act of narrating, the wedding is portrayed as an event in the indefinite past.

The word hātunnāh, "wedding" or "marriage", appears only here in Cant 3:11. The root from which it derives, htn, appears in the Hithpa'el conjugation with the meaning "to become son-in-law to" or "to make a marriage alliance with". As such, the root seems to pertain more to the formal arrangement between the groom and the father of the bride or, at times, the fathers of both bride and groom, than it does to a commitment between bride and groom. Often, the verb denotes more a political alliance than a familial bond.\(^{38}\) In the context of the fictive realm pertaining to Solomon's

\(^{38}\) The sense of a formal alliance is particularly evident in I Kg 3:1, where Solomon allies himself by marriage with Pharaoh, King of Egypt; in II Kg 8:18 and II Chr 2:6, where Jehoshaphat allies himself by marriage with Ahab; and in I Sam 18:21-23, where David makes a marriage alliance with Saul, marrying his daughter Michal. In this last example, the king sends his servants to David with the message: "Indeed, the king delights in you and all his servants love you, and now, ally yourself in marriage to the king" (I Sam 18:22). Note the covenantal use of the term "love" in this context, defining, not the relationship between David and Michal, but rather, the relationship between David and Saul. In one final example, Gen 34:9, the mutual exchange of daughters for marriage emphasizes that what is at stake is a political alliance between families and not just a matter of acquiring in-laws.
reign, "the day of his marriage" may allude to the day of his covenantal arrangement with the Israelites when his "love" relationship with them began, the day of his formal coronation. This interpretation is confirmed by the role that Solomon's mother performs on that day, for she is said to have crowned him on his wedding/coronation day. As reported in I Kg 1, Solomon's mother, Bathsheba, played an important role in her son's ascension to the throne. The poet of Cant 3:6-11 alludes to this fact metaphorically, having Bathsheba actually conferring the crown on her son on the day of his wedding/coronation.

The mention of Solomon's "wedding" in 3:11, then, serves to develop the motif of the Daughters' "labour of love" as presented in 3:10. These two images, when viewed within the frame of reference pertaining to Solomon's reign, allude to the formal agreement between King Solomon and his subjects, and the working out of that agreement through the Daughters' obedient service. But there is a stark contrast between the way the Daughters have fared in the "love" relationship and the way Solomon has fared in the "love" relationship. The Daughters/Israelites have been forced to work diligently, paving the courtyard of the Temple precinct, not to mention constructing the Temple itself, the building

---

The use of the marriage relationship as a metaphor for a covenant relationship is well attested in the literature of the Hebrew Bible, especially for the covenantal relationship between Yahweh and Israel (See Hos 2; Is 54:4ff; 62:4ff; Jer 2:2; 3:20; Ez 16 and 23).
which "King Solomon made". But in spite of their hard labour, Solomon takes the credit for the work that they have done. Furthermore, Solomon is the one who appears in the procession decked in the splendour of his royal attire, wearing the crown he received on the day when the "love" relationship began. The Daughters, on the other hand, can take part in the procession only as spectators, gazing on Solomon as he appears in his glory. The "love" relationship, as presented in 3:10-11, then, works to the benefit of King Solomon; the Daughters have done the labour while Solomon takes the credit and receives the glory. The contrast in status becomes even more apparent once the significance of Solomon's appearance in the procession is taken into consideration.

In terms of its time-framework, the account of the procession in 3:6-8,11 gives the impression of being told at the same time as the actual events. The narrator begins with a question, "What/Who is this coming up from the wilderness" (3:6), then, with the particle hinnēh which conveys a sense of immediacy, introduces the answer to this question (3:7-8). This sense of immediacy is resumed with the imperative forms of 3:11. The account of Solomon's construction of the

---

*This interpretation demands that the introductory mā zō't refer to an object rather than a person. No female character appears in the poem who could correspond with the feminine singular demonstrative pronoun zō't, suggesting that the feminine noun mittah serves as an answer to the question. Marvin Pope (1977:423) notes that mā appears in Akkadian with the sense of "what" rather than "who".*
'appiryon in 3:9-10 seems to digress from this contemporaneous form of narrating, the two verses recording events which took place before the procession began. In my view, however, 3:9-10 is an integral part of the poem, since it provides background information necessary for understanding the procession.

On the basis of 3:11c, many scholars have interpreted the procession as a wedding procession: Robert Gordis (1974:19-20), Francis Landy (1983:120) and Michael Goulder (1986:29) suggest a procession in connection with one of Solomon's weddings; John B. White (1978:146) and Michael V. Fox (1985:121) suggest a wedding procession of the lovers in a fictive wish-situation. But as noted earlier, Solomon's wedding appears to be an event of the past in this poem. With Solomon's wedding ruled out, no occasion for the grand procession, featuring Solomon and his sixty warriors, is explicitly stated within the fictive realm of the poem. But,

---

"In Gerard Genette's (1980:40,48) terminology, 3:9-10 represents an "analepsis" to the "first narrative" begun in 3:6-8 and resumed in 3:11. An "analepsis" is "any evocation after the fact of an event that took place earlier in the story than where we are at any given moment". The "first narrative" is "the temporal level of narrative with respect to which anachrony [including analepsis] is defined as such". Although the narration of the building of the 'appiryon takes place after the narration of the procession begins, the construction program is portrayed as a past event, while the procession is portrayed as an event of the present [contemporaneous with the act of narrating; cf. Chapter II, footnote 8]. As Genette (1980:50) suggests, the function of this analepsis is "to fill out the first narrative by enlightening the reader on one or another 'antecedent'"."
if the governing metaphor os Solomon's reign, and the 'appiryon represents Solomon's Temple, the procession could be that which accompanies the dedication of the Temple. The procession in Cant 3:6-8,11 does resemble the procession described in I Kings 8 and II Chronicles 5-7 in some respects [for details, see below]. But the poet's account of this procession also contains significant deviations from the accounts in the historical books. In my view, both the similarities and the differences are deliberate, the poet of Cant 3:6-11 reworking the material presented in the historical accounts into a parody. In doing so, he conveys an evaluation of Solomon's building of the Temple which differs radically from that presented in the historical books.

The primary foci of the procession scene are Solomon's mittāh, his person, his crown and his status as king. The noun mittāh generally denotes a stationary bed or couch, but on two occasions it denotes a movable structure. In the context of a procession, one would expect a rather elaborate piece of furniture, perhaps a litter or palanquin. But the use of the term mittāh may serve a rhetorical purpose, the object having particular

---

^2 For examples, see I Kg 17:19; 21:4; II Kg 1:4,6,16; 4:10,21,32; Am 6:4.

^3 In I Sam 19:5, Saul gives orders for David, who was reported ill, to be brought to him on his mittāh. In II Sam 3:31, mittāh designates a coffin or bier for transporting a dead body.
significance within the frame of reference pertaining to "love" (3:10) and "marriage" (3:11) in the poem. As far as the frame of reference pertaining to Solomon's reign is concerned, the piece of furniture most appropriate to the "love" relationship between Solomon and his subjects would be Solomon's throne. Within this frame of reference, then, Solomon's mittāh may represent a type of portable throne, suitable to be carried in a procession. In my view, the nature of this procession, with its emphasis on Solomon's mittāh/throne, crown, and royal status, can best be understood if viewed within the context of the relationship between temple construction and royal status, as reflected in other ancient Near Eastern documents.

In a study which examines the Mesopotamian kalu-ritual and its implications for the interpretation of Zech 1-8, Baruch Halpern (1978:176) notes that a king's participation in this ritual, associated with the laying of temple foundations, serves not only to initiate the process of the temple's construction, but also to establish that king's royal status. Halpern traces this connection between temple construction and the conferring of royal authority back to mythic roots. He (1978:182) notes:

Both the E[Numal] e[lish] and the Ba'el cycle at Ugarit culminate, after the defeat of the foe, in the enthronement of the god and the construction of a Temple (or royal palace) for him. Thus it seems logical that the ritual for Temple foundation and construction should draw for its mythic correlative on the combat-creation cycle.
Halpern (1978:183-184) argues that in the course of the kalu-ritual, the king, playing the role of combatant god, symbolically re-enacts the cosmic battle; through his victory, he establishes his royal authority. The completion of the temple, with its mythic correlative in the establishment of cosmic order, serves as a verification of this authority. Halpern's study, demonstrating the implications of this ritual for the interpretation of Zechariah 1-8, indicates that the ritual was known in Israel, and that its conceptual framework played a role in the literary representation [at least] of temple construction in Israel."

In my view, the conceptual framework which is found in this ritual, with its conjoining of temple construction, the conferring of royal status, and the combat motif, has important implications for the interpretation of Cant 3:6-11. The poem includes an account of the building of a structure which metaphorically represents the Temple (3:9-10), several direct indications of Solomon's royal status [Solomon's mittāh/throne (3:7), his crown (3:11), and his title as "King Solomon" (3:9,11)], as well as reference to

"Also of note is the more general study of Arvid S. Kapelrud (1963:56-62). Kapelrud (1963:58,62) discusses the connection between temple building and the conferring of special status on the builder-king. Although he places less emphasis on the combat motif, he does draw some interesting parallels between the ancient Near Eastern mythic accounts of temple building and the biblical account of Solomon's building of the Temple in I Kings."
sixty warriors, trained in battle, suggesting the combat motif.

In spite of striking similarities, one need not claim that the procession in 3:6-11 is actually part of the Mesopotamian kalu-ritual, or even an Israelite counterpart to this ritual. In my view, since the actual building of the 'appiryon is portrayed as a past event, the procession is more likely related to a celebration of the Temple's completion than to a ritual which initiated the building process. Since the completion of the Temple served to verify Solomon's royal status, a celebration of his kingship would naturally be appropriate. Such a celebration, however, is not reported in the biblical accounts of the dedication of the Temple. In those historical accounts, the focus of the dedication service is Yahweh and the process by which He takes possession of His abode in the newly constructed Temple. Yet while the focus of the dedication service is different, there are important similarities between the accounts in the Song and the historical books.

In I Kings 8 and II Chronicles 5, the Ark of the Covenant was the main focus of the procession. It was carried to its new resting place in the Holy of Holies in the new Temple, and symbolized Yahweh's presence among His people. It was viewed as Yahweh's footstool, with His throne situated above the cherubim which were attached to the Ark's Mercy Seat. In contrast, the Song highlights Solomon's
throne, symbolized by his mittāh. The Song's substitution of Solomon's throne for Yahweh's throne is a primary indication that a parody is at work in the Song's account. But there are other similarities which would suggest that the two accounts should be read in light of each other.

In both cases, the object symbolizing the throne is accompanied by an entourage of men: in the historical accounts the priests and/or Levites; in the Song, the sixty warriors trained in battle (3:7-8). In the historical accounts, it is fitting that religious officials should play an important role in the ceremony which begins a new era in Yahwistic religion. In the Song, the warriors, trained in battle, highlight the combat motif. These warriors highlight Solomon's victory over the forces of chaos, as symbolized by the completion of the Temple, and thus legitimate his royal authority.

Two other details in the Song's account of the procession scene also suggest that it should be read in connection with the historical accounts. In the historical accounts, the Ark was brought up (ha'alot; Hiphil ‘īḥ) in the procession (1 Kgs 8:4; II Chr 5:5); in the Song, the mittāh is said to come up (‘ōlāh; Qal ‘ūḥ) in the procession. In the historical accounts, the Ark is brought up from the City of David or Zion (1 Kgs 8:1; II Chr 5:2), where it had been

---

*I Kings 8:3 suggests the priests; II Chr 5:4-5 suggests the Levites.*
housed prior to its installation in the Temple (cf. II Chr 1:4); in the Song, Solomon's mittâh comes up from the wilderness. While in this case the details do differ, the traditional home of the Ark is the Tent of Meeting in the wilderness;†† this tradition may be the source of the poet's allusion in Cant 3:6.

One final feature warrants detailed attention. In the Song, the appearance of the procession is said to be "like a column of smoke". The phrase is found elsewhere only in Joel 3:4, where it designates one of the portents that will come before the great and fear-filled Day of Yahweh. It may be that by the inclusion of this detail, the poet of Cant 3:6-11 wanted to suggest that the celebration of Solomon's kingship was such an ominous portent. But at the same time, the image evokes that of the cloud which filled the Temple upon the installation of the Ark (I Kgs 8:10-12; II Chr 5:13-14). The word 'āšān, "smoke", is generally used in connection with unpleasant or illusory experiences,†† Yahweh's anger and destructive actions,†† or theophanic appearances of Yahweh.††110> Is 4:4-5 is of particular note. The verse states that once Jerusalem is purified,

††See, for example, Num 1:1.
††Cf. Prov 10:26; Ps 102:4.
††Cf. Gen 15:19; II Sam 22:9; Ps 18:9; Is 6:4.
Yahweh will create over the whole shrine and meeting place of Mount Zion cloud by day and smoke ('āsān) with the glow of flame by night.

As an indication of Yahweh's presence in His sanctuary, smoke functions at night as cloud functions during the day.\textsuperscript{50}

Since the procession in Canticles appears to take place at night (3:8), the "columns of smoke" give the impression of a theophanic phenomenon, a counterpart to the cloud in the historical accounts. But in the Song, the procession coming up from the wilderness is said to be "like a pillar of smoke", not a pillar of smoke in itself. The reader's expectations of a divine phenomenon are thwarted in the line which follows: "Reeking with myrrh and frankincense from all the powders of merchants". The divine character of the phenomenon, then, is an optical illusion, for Solomon has contrived the effect with the help of expensive imports from South Arabia.\textsuperscript{51}

The effect of this display of "special effects" is that Solomon is portrayed as a glory-seeker, one who would

\textsuperscript{50}For other references to the presence of Yahweh as represented by atmospheric phenomena, see Ex 33:9; 40:34-38; and Num 9:15-25.

\textsuperscript{51}As Athalya Brenner (1983:75, 78) notes, myrrh and frankincense were both of South Arabian origin. Solomon's trade with Southern Arabia, and through it, with South India, is documented by the story concerning the Queen of Sheba's visit and other remarks concerning Solomon's wealth and trade in I Kings 10 and II Chronicles 9.
like to exalt his own kingship to divine proportions. The reader is led to inquire concerning Solomon's motivation for building the Temple: was it the earnest desire "to build a House for the name of the Lord" as the historical accounts would suggest (cf. II Chr 1:18), or was the Temple an exorbitant extravagance, designed to enhance Solomon's own status? The Song conveys its evaluation of the situation when it states: "An 'appiryôn King Solomon made for himself!"

The act of building of the Temple is portrayed as an act of self-indulgence on Solomon's part, so much so that Yahweh's name is not even mentioned in the poem. Furthermore, it is toward this end, Solomon's own aggrandizement, that the Daughters' labour of "love" has been directed. The poignancy of the stark contrast between the way the Daughters have fared in the "love" relationship and the way Solomon has fared becomes even more apparent when one considers not only Solomon's motivation for the 'appiryôn endeavor, but also the

---

Arvid S. Kapelrud (1963:56-62) discusses the relationship between the mythical accounts of temple building in the ancient Near East and the biblical accounts of Solomon's construction of the Temple. He (1963:58) notes that in the Mesopotamian account of Gudea's building of a temple (as presented on the Gudea cylinders A and B), Gudea, the temple builder, was elevated to the status of the gods for his endeavor. Kapelrud (1963:61) indicates that in the biblical accounts of Solomon's construction of the Temple, although Solomon was not taken up into the ranks of the gods, a special status was conferred on him; Yahweh promised "to establish his royal throne over Israel for ever" (I Kg 9:5). In the Song, however, Solomon tries to give the impression of a divine character to his kingship, by making the procession which accompanies the celebration of his kingship appear as a divine phenomenon.
presence of the Daughters in the discourse setting of the work.

As noted in the previous chapter, the third person reference to the Daughters in the story serves a rhetorical purpose, providing for the Daughters in the discourse setting the effect of looking at the situation objectively. Yet all the while, the narrator has employed techniques to mold the Daughters' evaluation. By the time the narrator intrudes into the level of the story, addressing the Daughters in their character role, the Daughters in the discourse setting cannot help but agree with his presentation of the situation. The Daughters have allowed Solomon to exploit them for his own advantage. As will become clear below, Cant 8:11-12 presents a similar evaluation of Solomon's treatment of Israel.

Solomon's Treatment of His Vineyard (8:11-12)

Cant 8:11-12 records a story concerning Solomon and his treatment of his vineyard. In my view, the narrator's use of the phrase "my very own vineyard" in 8:12, identical to that used by the female lover in 1:6, indicates that the

It is noteworthy that Solomon's exploitation of his subjects is entirely in keeping with Samuel's evaluation of what kingship would bring for the people of Israel, as presented in I Sam 8:11-17:

This will be the practice of the king who will rule over you...you shall become his slaves.
speaker is to be identified with one of the lovers elsewhere in the Song. But determining which of the two lovers speaks depends on one's interpretation of the vineyard metaphor. It may be the woman, speaking of either her agricultural vineyard (cf. 1:6) or her sexuality (cf. 1:6 and the use of the "garden" as a metaphor for the woman's sexuality); it may also be the man, speaking of the woman under the metaphor of the vineyard (cf. the man's use of the "garden" image in 4:12-5:1). In any case, at least the initial segment of the poem is focalized, not from the speaker's role as a lover, but rather from the stance of a neutral observer who stands outside of the situation depicted in the story.

Several scholars, noting the similarity between the opening line of this poem and the opening line of the Song of the Vineyard in Is 5:1ff (see below), have suggested that Cant 8:11-12 is a parable. Picking up from the use of vineyard and garden imagery as metaphors for female sexuality elsewhere in the Song (1:6, 4:12-5:1), Gillis Gerleman (1965:222), Marcia Falk (1982:133), and Michael V. Fox (1985:174-175) all suggest that Solomon's vineyard represents his harem. But while in the end, the use of the vineyard imagery elsewhere in the Song has important implications for the interpretation of the passage, in my view the passage should first be examined apart from its context in the love poetry, and again, within the context of the traditional accounts of Solomon's reign. These accounts
provide the frame of reference necessary for grasping the
nature of the criticism presented in the poem. Yet as far as
the actual dynamics of the poem are concerned, the
poem is best read in relation to Isaiah 5:1ff. As will
become clear below, Cant 8:11-12 constitutes a parody of the
Isaian text, Solomon's treatment of the vineyard being
contrasted with Yahweh's treatment of his beloved vineyard
Israel.

The poem begins, in 8:11a, with the statement:
"Solomon had a vineyard in Ba'al Hāmōn." The place name
Ba'al Hāmōn is not attested elsewhere in the Bible. Robert
Gordis (1974:101), noting a similar place name Balamon in the
apocryphal Book of Judith, suggests a location not far from
Dothan. But in my view, the name is chosen for its symbolic
value, and may represent a fictional location. The first
element of the name, Ba'al, while at times used to designate
foreign deities, has the more general meaning "lord",
"husband" or "owner". The second element, Hāmōn, is used in
a variety of contexts, designating a rumbling sound made by
people (Is 17:12), rain (I Kg 18:41), or chariot wheels (Jer
47:3), a great tumult or confusion (I Sam 14:19; II Sam
18:29), a multitude or crowd (II Sam 6:19; Is 5:13), or an
abundance or wealth (Ps 37:16; Ecc 56:9). The name can thus
be construed either as "Lord of the Multitude" or "Owner of
Wealth". Given the statement that the fruits of the vineyard
were worth a thousand pieces of silver (8:11c) and the
emphasis given to money elsewhere in the poem (8:12), the latter seems the most likely.

The opening line of the poem is identical in form to the opening line in the Song of the Vineyard in Is 5:1ff: "My beloved had a vineyard in Qeren-ben-Šāmen". Again, the place name is not attested elsewhere in the Bible, and seems, rather, to have been chosen for its symbolic value; the literal meaning of the name is "Horn of the Son of Oil". The phrase ben-šāmen, "son of oil", is similar to the phrase bēnē-hayvissār, "sons of fresh oil, used with the sense of "anointed dignitaries" in Zec 4:14. The same sense probably applies in Is 5:1, yielding "Horn of the Anointed One". The exact syntactical sequence, kerem hāyāh lē + name or epithet of person (Solomon/my beloved) + symbolic place name ("Owner of Wealth"/"Horn of the Anointed One") would suggest that the author of the poem in Canticles is patterning his poem after the well-known Isaian passage. The use of the term yēdīdā, "my beloved", similar to the term dōdā used in the Song, the speaker's appeal to the "Dweller of Jerusalem" and the "Man of Judah", similar to the appeals to the "Daughters of Jerusalem" in the Song, and the designation of the poem as a "song", like the "Song of Songs", would also suggest that the

---

The only other passage which bears any resemblance occurs in the introduction to the story about Naboth's vineyard in I Kg 21:1. But here, although the first three elements are identical, kerem hāyāh lē + name of person, the location of the vineyard is introduced with the relative pronoun, ʿāšer, and the location itself is the well attested Jezreel.
author of Canticles intended that the two passages be read in conjunction with each other.

The Isaiah passage continues with an account of how the speaker's beloved cared for his vineyard, hoping that it would yield grapes: he dug the soil; he cleared the stones; he built a tower in the middle; and he dug a winepress (Is 5:2a-b). But in spite of all the care he lavished upon the vineyard, all it produced was sour grapes. The owner appeals to the "Dweller of Jerusalem" and the "Man of Judah", asking them to judge between himself and his vineyard, and pronouncing judgment on the vineyard. The narrator then expounds the significance of the parable for his narratee, identifying the owner of the vineyard as "Yahweh Sebaoth", the vineyard as the "House of Israel", and the seedlings which the owner planted and tended as the "Men of Judah". He identifies the grapes for which the owner had hoped as "justice" and "righteousness", and the sour grapes which he received instead as "injustice" and "unrighteousness" (lit. "outcry"). The fruit that the Lord had expected from Israel, then, was a particular mode of behavior on the part of His people. But in spite of his provision and nurturing of Israel, His "vineyard" failed to bring forth the fruits or behaviors appropriate to its relationship with Him.

In Cant 8:11-12, on the other hand, it is the owner of the vineyard who behaves inappropriately, at least according to the standards set forth by the Isaiah parable.
Solomon appears too busy to tend the vineyard himself, for "He gave the vineyard to keepers". Yet in spite of his own lack of participation in the maintenance of the vineyard, the vineyard produced fruit so abundantly that "a man would bring a thousand pieces of silver for its fruits". In this poem, then, the vineyard acted in a fitting manner, producing for its owner a yield of tremendous value. But the narrator's intrusion into the level of the story in 8:12 indicates that Solomon was not interested in the fruits of his vineyard, but only in the wealth which they could bring him. The narrator's chiding appeal, "The thousand to you, O Solomon", suggests that Solomon accepted the offer of money for the fruits of the vineyard. The keepers of the vineyard apparently share in Solomon's mercenary attitude, since they, too, bear the brunt of the narrator's chiding remarks: "And two hundred to the keepers of its fruits".

When read with the key provided by the Isaiah parable, the poem in Cant 8:11-12 becomes a biting criticism of Solomon's treatment of Israel. The vineyard, as in Isaiah, serves as a metaphor for Israel, and the keepers to whom he gave the vineyard, the officials whom he set over

“For other uses of the vineyard image as representing Israel, see Is 3:14; 27:2,6; Jer 12:10; for the use of the image of the vine as representing Israel, see Jer 2:21; 6:9; Ez 15:2,6; 17:6-7(King of Judah); 19:10; Hos 10:1.”
Yet in spite of the fact that Solomon handed the duties of governing Israel over to "keepers", the vineyard yielded fruit in abundance, the Israelites behaving in a manner that was in keeping with Solomon's wishes and expectations. As noted in the discussion of 3:6-11, these expectations included forced participation in Solomon's building projects. Yet what Solomon valued was not the loyalty and obedience of the people, but rather the riches that this loyalty and obedience procured for him. Solomon is thus portrayed as having traded the fruits, the Israelites' loyal service and allegiance to their monarch, for a thousand pieces of silver. Once again, the Daughters who reside in the discourse setting of the work are provided with an evaluation of Solomon's treatment of them; this evaluation is anything but positive, indicating Solomon's exploitation of his subjects.

When taken together, then, the two poems [3:6-11 and 8:11-12] present a polemical account of Solomon's exploitation of his subjects. In 3:6-11, the polemic is conveyed through a parody of the historical accounts of the Temple's construction and dedication. In the historical accounts, Solomon's building of the Temple was presented as a

**For an extended list of these officials, including the names of priests, scribes, a recorder, a commander of the army, administrator of the palace, companion to the king, officer of the prefects, the twelve prefects, themselves, and Adoniram, who was in charge of the forced labour, see I Kg 4:2-19.**
response to the king's earnest desire to provide a dwelling place for Yahweh. In the Song, the construction of the Temple is directed to Solomon's self-aggrandizement; the Daughters of Jerusalem have been forced to labour in the construction of this monument to Solomon's royal status. In 8:11-12, the poem conveys its critique of Solomon's treatment of Israel by presenting a parody Is 5:1ff, which deals with Yahweh's treatment of Israel. In contrast to Yahweh, who tended the vineyard personally and was disappointed when the vineyard did not bear the appropriate fruits, Solomon hands the vineyard over to keepers, yet takes the first opportunity to exploit it, trading its fruits for a handsome profit. But while at a literary level, the dynamics of the poem are best understood when viewed in relation to the Isalian parable, the frame of reference pertaining to Solomon's reign still provides the backdrop against which to interpret the critique which is presented. Solomon's exploitation of his subjects' services, as reflected in the historical books, provides the key for understanding the image of his selling of the vineyard's fruits.

When these two units are viewed in isolation, then, parody seems to be the primary technique used by the narrator to convey his evaluation of Solomon's endeavors to the Daughters. But when the two units are viewed in their context amidst the love poetry, other techniques come to the fore. In my view, the poet has placed these two units
involving Solomon beside those involving the lovers in order to amplify his evaluation of Solomon's endeavors. The poet's technique is to juxtapose his account of the Daughters' love relationship with Solomon with an account of a more intimate type of love relationship, and to show how the values which govern this more intimate type of love contrast with Israel's state of affairs. The poet conveys his message by presenting some of the key elements in the Solomon stories again in the love poetry, showing how they would fare within the context of a more intimate conception of love. Although it is beyond the scope of this study to provide a detailed examination of all the images which appear both in the Solomon stories and the love poetry, I shall isolate what I consider to be key images in the Solomonic material and examine the contexts in which they recur in the love poetry.

**KEY IMAGES FROM THE UNITS PERTAINING TO SOLOMON AND THEIR USE IN THE LOVE POETRY**

As Appendix IV demonstrates, the passages pertaining to Solomon and those pertaining to the two lovers hold many images in common. In my view, the most significant of these include: the "house", the "bed" or "couch", the "vineyard", the "keeper(s)" or "guard(s)", the "fruits", "wealth", and "love". These images play a significant role in both blocks of material. I shall examine the contexts in which each image is found in the love poetry, then demonstrate how the
value of the image is different for the lovers than it is for Solomon in the passages which pertain to him. But before I proceed to these images, a few comments on the dynamics of the love poetry itself are perhaps in order.

As I noted in the previous chapter, the love poetry contains both narrative and lyric poems, as well as some poems which combine lyric and narrative features. The lyric segments in the Song generally feature the lovers together, expressing their love and admiration for each other. At one point in the lyric segments (5:1), the text suggests that the lovers have actually consummated their love; elsewhere, such consummation is promised (7:13-14) or expressly desired (7:7ff; 8:1-2). The narrative poems, on the other hand, tend to present either the separation of the lovers (1:5-6; 6:11-12; parts of 3:1-5 and 5:1ff) or an account of an encounter between the lovers gone awry (2:4ff; 3:1ff; 5:1ff; 8:1ff). Yet it is the desire of the lovers to be together which impels these narrative segments forward. The narrative poems thus display a yearning for the condition which the lyric poems provide.

Such compatibility of the narrative and lyric segments is not unique to the Song. As Herbert F. Tucker (1985:229-230) writes concerning Browning:

Character in the Browningesque dramatic monologue emerges as an interference effect between opposed yet mutually informative discourses: between a historical, narrative, metonymic text and a symbolic, lyrical, metaphoric text that adjoins it and jockeys with in for authority....the alien voices of
But there is a second level at which the love poetry should be considered. In the love lyrics, the physical charms of the love partner are often compared to natural and cultural phenomena. As I suggested in the previous chapter, these lyric segments present at once and the same time the lovers' view of each other and their view of an ideal world which, as Michael V. Fox (1983:227) suggests, is "a world created by love". This idea has important implications for the interpretation of the love poetry. Fox's formulation of the idea is, in my view, worth repeating at this point. Fox (1983:227) states:

The poet's rhetorical strategy is to point us to each part of the lovers' bodies as if describing them, then to set before our eyes images that cannot comfortably be assimilated to their referents. Our attention focuses on the images themselves more than on the parts of the body. The images thus become largely independent of their referents and combine to convey a unified picture of a self-contained world: a peaceful, fruitful world, resplendent with the blessings of nature and the beauties of human art. That world blossoms in a perpetual spring. Birds sing and bathe in milk; spices give forth their fragrance; springs flow with clear water: fruits and wines offer their sweetness; heaps of wheat are surrounded by lilies; ewes, white and clean, bear twins and never miscarry; goats stream gently down the mountainside; proud and ornate towers stand tall above the landscape. Nor are there

history and of feeling come to constitute and direct one another. Typically Browning's monologists tell the story of a yearning after the condition of lyric, a condition that is itself in turn unimaginable except as the object of, or pretext for, the yearning that impels the story plotted against it.
lacking silver and gold, precious stones, and objects of art: a rich and blessed world. Not only does this world provide a pleasant backdrop to the expression of love, it also reveals the author's idea of a lover's view of the world....The imagery of the praise thus shows us not how the lovers look but how they see. A lover looks at his beloved and through the prism of her beauty sees an ever-present Arcady. In fact, the imagery shows us a world created by love, for it comes into being and is unified only through the lovers' vision of each other.

This view of a world "created by love" thus incorporates natural and cultural phenomena, simple pleasures, as well as luxuries such as frankincense, myrrh, gold, silver, and precious stones. It also contains both Northern localities such as the Lebanon (4:8,11; 5:15), Tirzah (6:4), Mount Hermon (4:8), Mount Senir (4:8), Mount Gilead (4:1), and Heshbon (7:5), and such Southern localities as Jerusalem (6:4) and En-gedi (1:4). In my view, this vision is more than that of an ideal world; it is a vision of an ideal Israel, prosperous and free from political division. While the descriptions of both the male and female lovers contribute to this ideal world view, the extended descriptions of the woman's physique in 4:1-15, 6:4-7, and 7:2-10 are particularly noteworthy.

In the lyric poems, the union of the lovers and their vision of an ideal world are conjoined; the narrative poems, on the other hand, highlight those things that impede the lovers' realization of their vision. The reader may thus evaluate individual images within the love poetry according
to whether or not they are conducive to the well-being and union of the lovers; in so doing, the reader evaluates the conduciveness of the images to the idyllic world view. In the following discussion, I will assign a positive value to any image that is associated with the lovers' well-being and/or union, and a negative value to those images associated with their separation and/or other negative experience. Once I determine an image's value in the love poetry, I will assess its value for Solomon in the passages which pertain to him. I shall argue that those images which have a positive value for Solomon have a negative value for the lovers; those images which have a positive value for the lovers are valued less highly by Solomon. The Daughters in the discourse setting are placed in a position in which they may choose between the values of "Solomon" and those of "love".

The Images of the "Vineyard" and "Garden"

The images of the "vineyard" and "garden" appear to be closely related in the love poetry, at times designating the idyllic setting provided by an actual vineyard or garden, and at other times functioning as a metaphor for the female lover. The word kerem, "vineyard", appears five times in the love poetry [1:6(twice), 1:14; 2:15; 7:13]. In one instance (7:13), it is used as the location in which the lovers plan a rendezvous. The woman invites her lover: "Come my lover, ...let us go early to the vineyard....There I will give my
love to you" (7:12-13). In another passage (1:14), the vineyard is the source of an object which functions as a metaphor for the male lover. The woman declares: "My lover is to me a spray of henna blossoms from the vineyards of En-gedi". In both cases, the vineyard has a positive value for the lovers.

The word kerem also appears twice in 1:6. Once it appears in conjunction with the woman's story concerning herself and her brothers: "My mother's sons were angry with me; they set me to guard the vineyards". Since this declaration serves to explain how her complexion became so dark, it is clear that the woman refers to an actual locale in this portion of the verse (1:6b). But the woman continues: "My own vineyard I did not guard". Here, the vineyard seems to be a metaphor for the woman herself. It may refer to her sexuality, suggesting that she has not been chaste; but it may also refer to her body more generally, indicating that because she had to guard the vineyards, she was not able to keep her skin from becoming dark. In any case, the "vineyard" in this latter portion of the verse has a positive value for the lovers, being associated with the female lover herself. In the first part of the verse, the "vineyard" seems to be neutral in value, since it is not the vineyard which affects the woman's appearance, but the act of guarding the vineyard. As will become clear in the discussion of the images of "guarding" or "keeping", this act
of "guarding" or "keeping" has a negative value in the Song.

An image similar to that of the "vineyard", which appears seven times in the love poetry, but not in the passages involving Solomon, is that of the "garden" (םגד). Like the "vineyard" image, the "garden" sometimes designates an item of setting and sometimes is used as a metaphor for the woman and her sexuality. In 6:2 the woman declares: "My lover has gone down to his garden...". That the "garden" designates an actual locale is clear from the fact that the statement comes as a response to the Daughters' question concerning his whereabouts. In 8:13 the "garden" again designates the setting, for the woman is portrayed as "one sitting/dwelling (םחנ) in gardens". The image also appears five times in the passage 4:12-5:1. In all of these instances, the "garden" appears to be a metaphor for the woman's sexuality. The man refers to her as a "locked garden" (4:12) and a "garden spring" (4:15), then implores "North Wind" and "South Wind" to "blow on [his] garden that its perfume may spread" (4:16a). The woman responds: "Let my lover come to his garden and enjoy its excellent fruits" (4:16b). In all these instances the image probably refers to the woman's pudenda. When the man responds in 5:1, "I have come to my garden, my sister, bride", he suggests that he and his lover have consummated their love. The "garden" image, because of its association with the place where the love
partner can be found, as well as with the woman's sexuality, has a positive value for the lovers in the Song.

The image of the "vineyard" (kerem) also appears in one of the woman's appeals to an audience outside the love relationship in 2:15. As I argued in the previous chapter, although the outside audience is not identified in this verse, the use of masculine plural imperatives suggests that it may be the Daughters of Jerusalem. The woman begins by telling the story of how her lover came to her home, peeped in through the window, then beckoned her to come away with him into the vineyard. Upon completion of the report of her lover's speech, the woman addresses her narratee directly: "Catch for us the foxes, the little foxes that ruin the vineyards, for our vineyard is in bloom". Within the context of the love poem, the exhortation may refer to predators that damage the lovers' idyllic vineyard. But if one takes into consideration the context of the vineyard image in the passages pertaining to Solomon, the appeal to the Daughters in the discourse setting may also function at another level.

In the passages pertaining to Solomon, the "vineyard" is a metaphor for Israel (8:11-12). The poem deals with Solomon's treatment of the vineyard/Israel, his setting "keepers" over it rather than tending it personally, and his

Although the word kerem does not appear in the report of the man's speech, a vineyard setting is clear from context.
trading the vineyard's fruits for a thousand pieces of silver. The poem thus indicates that Solomon valued the vineyard only because of the profit it would bring for him; he valued the wealth more than the vineyard itself. But for the Daughters in the discourse setting, the vineyard is a metaphor for themselves. The value they assign to the vineyard image would thus be far greater than the value Solomon ascribes to the image in this poem. At the level of the discourse setting, then, the woman's exhortation to the Daughters to catch the foxes that ruin the vineyard (2:15) may be understood as an exhortation to put an end to those exploiting the vineyard for their own gain. When read in connection with the poem pertaining to Solomon (8:11-12), the foxes may represent Solomon and his officials. While the images of the "vineyard" and "garden" have a positive value for the lovers, the value Solomon ascribes to the vineyard is much lower, for he values profit more than the vineyard itself.

The Image of the "Fruits" and Related Images

The image of "fruits" appears often in the love poetry, not only under the generic term pĕrî, "fruits" (four instances), but also in more specific examples such as tappû-h, "apple" (four instances), rimmôn, "pomegranate" (six instances), ḫêlôt haggefen, "grapes" or more literally, "clusters of the vine" (one instance), and yayîn, "wine" (six
instances). These images have a positive value for the lovers.

The term πέρι, "fruits", appears four times in the love poetry. Each time it serves as a metaphor for the lovers' bodily features and for sexual pleasures the lovers share. In 2:3, the woman metaphorically equates her lover with an apple tree, then declares: "His fruit is sweet to my mouth". The image of "fruits" probably refers to part of his anatomy, and the statement that it is "sweet to [the woman's] mouth" indicates the sexual pleasure she derives. Similarly in 4:13, the man metaphorically equates the woman's limbs with "an orchard of pomegranates and of all excellent fruits". Later in the poem, the woman declares: "Let my lover come to his garden and enjoy its excellent fruits". The image of the "fruits" is a metaphor for the sexual pleasures to which the man has access. In 7:12-13, the woman invites her lover to join her in the idyllic vineyard setting, promising that there she will give him her love. She concludes: "At our doors are all excellent fruits, both freshly picked and long stored; my lover, I have kept [them] for you". Again the "fruits" function as a metaphor for the sexual pleasures the lovers will share, underscoring the positive value of the image for the lovers.

The term ταπηθή, "apple/apple tree", appears four times in the love poetry. Each time it is associated with either the person or bodily features of the love partner, or
a place that is conducive to the lovers' union. In 2:3, the woman declares: "Like an apple tree among the trees of the forest, thus is my lover among the youths". The "apple tree" serves as a metaphor for the youth and his outstanding qualities. In 7:9, the man declares: "Your breath is like the fragrance of apples". Again, the "apple" image is associated with positive qualities of the love partner. In 8:5, the woman declares:

Under the apple tree I aroused you;  
There, your mother conceived you;  
There, she who bore you conceived you.

The "apple tree" image is thus associated with the union and sexual pleasures of the lovers.

In the final instance, 2:5, the image of the "apple" appears in connection with the woman's appeal to the Daughters of Jerusalem. The context is the woman's sexual arousal in the absence of her lover. The woman begins by telling the Daughters of a sexual encounter with her lover, but interrupts to plead with her narratee:

Sustain me with raisin cakes,  
Refresh me with apples,  
For I am weak/writhing with love.

The verse suggests that within the context of the discourse setting, the woman is "weak/writhing with love". She suggests that "apples" may aid her in her situation. The use of the "apple tree" as a metaphor for her lover and the enjoyment of his "fruits" as a metaphor for sexual pleasures in the preceding unit suggests that the woman desires the
presence and sexual attentions of her lover. In all four instances in which the "apple" image appears, therefore, it has a positive value for the lovers.

The term *rimmôn*, "pomegranates", appears six times in the love poetry. In two instances it is associated with the idyllic garden or vineyard setting. In 6:11, one of the lovers declares: "I went down to the nutgrove, to see...if the pomegranates were in bloom". In 7:13, the woman invites her lover to join her in the vineyards, suggesting, "Let us see...if the pomegranates are in bloom". The "pomegranate" image is thus associated with a setting conducive to the lovers' union, for the woman promises, "There I will give my love to you". In the four remaining instances, the "pomegranate" image is associated with the physical features of the love partner or the sexual pleasures which the lovers share. In 4:3 and 6:7, the man compares the woman's brow behind her veil to "a pomegranate split open". In 4:13, he compares the woman's limbs to "an orchard of pomegranates". In 8:2, the woman presents her view of an ideal situation in which she could let her lover "drink of the spiced wine of [her] pomegranate juice". The image thus serves as a metaphor for sexual pleasures. In all the instances in which the "pomegranate" image appears, then, it has a positive value for the lovers.

The term *'eškēlôt haggefen*, "grapes" or "clusters of the vine", appears once in the love poetry. In 7:9, the man
man compares the woman's breasts to such "clusters of the vine". Closely related to the "grape" image is that of yavin, "wine". The image is used six times in the love poetry. In 7:10, the man compares the mouth of his lover with "fine wine". In two other instances (5:1; 8:2), the image of "drinking wine" appears as a metaphor for sexual intercourse. In 5:1, where the man suggests that the lovers have consummated their love, he declares: "I have eaten my honey and honeycomb, drunk my wine and my milk". In 8:2, the woman expresses her wish: "I would let you drink the spiced wine of my pomegranate juice". In three other instances, the love partner's "love" is praised as "better than wine" (yavin). In 1:2 and 1:4, the woman speaks of the man's "love"; in 4:10, the man speaks of the woman's "love". In all six of these instances, the image yavin is positively associated with the bodily features and "love" of the love partner.

In the passages pertaining to Solomon, the image of "fruits" appears twice (8:11,12). As I suggested in my detailed discussion of 8:11-12, these "fruits" are a metaphor for behavior in keeping with Solomon's expectations of the vineyard/Israel. In the poem, the vineyard produced fruit in abundance, the Israelites acting in accordance with Solomon's wishes. But Solomon was not interested in the Israelites' obedient service, only in the profits that it would bring him. The poet portrays this fact metaphorically, having
Solomon trade the "fruits" for a thousand pieces of silver. Thus while the image of the "fruits" has a positive value for the lovers in the love poetry, Solomon values the "fruits" of the vineyard only for material profit. For the Daughters who reside in the discourse setting of the work, and whose obedient service is synonymous with the "fruits", Solomon's preference for silver over their loyalty and obedience would be seen as an exploitation of their services.

The Image of "Guard(s)" or "Keeper(s)"

The image of "guards" or "keepers" appears three times in the love poetry. In Cant 1:6, the term nōtērāh appears in conjunction with the woman's story concerning her relationship with her brothers. While the term is used in reference to the woman, the act of "guarding" or "keeping" the vineyards of others has a negative value, since her resultant blackened complexion occasions the Daughters' impolite staring.

In the two remaining instances (3:3; 5:7), the term Šōmrîm, "guards" or "watchmen" is used. These Šōmrîm appear during the woman's journey through the city streets in search of her lover. In 3:1ff, the Šōmrîm appear indifferent to her quest. While the woman asks them, "Have you seen the one I love?" (3:3b), the Šōmrîm do not respond to her question, and it is not until after she passes them that she finds her lover. In 5:1ff, the Šōmrîm move beyond
indifference and actually harm the woman when they find her. The woman declares: "They struck me, they bruised me, they stripped my cloak from upon me". In these two passages as well, then, the image of the "guard" has a negative value for the lovers.

In the passages pertaining to Solomon, the term nōtērīm is used to designate the "guards" or "keepers" of the vineyard (8:11-12). Within the frame of reference pertaining to Solomon's reign, these nōtērīm represent the officials to whom Solomon delegated the responsibility of governing Israel. In the poem, they share Solomon's mercenary attitude toward the vineyard, taking their share of the profit when its fruits are traded for silver. Thus for Solomon the nōtērīm have a positive value, since they relieve him of the actual labour of tending his vineyard. For the lovers in the love poetry, however, the images of "guarding" or "keeping" have a negative value; it is an activity which mars the woman's appearance, and it is the work of persons who stand in the way of the lovers' union.

The Image of the "House"

The image of the "house" is one which appears to pose an obstacle to the lovers. The word bayit, "house", appears five times in the Song. In two instances, it appears in the narrative poems (2:4; 3:4); once it appears in a poem of composite genre (8:2). In one of these instances it is
identified as the "house of wine" (2:4); in the other two it is identified as the house of the woman's mother (3:4; 8:2). In all three of these instances, the purpose of the lovers' entry into a house or expressed desire to enter a house would appear to be sexual intimacy. But in all three cases, the entry into a house brings less than the desired result. The woman implores the Daughters of Jerusalem not to make the same mistakes she has made, not to "waken or arouse love until it pleases" (2:7; 3:5; 8:4). The bayit is thus associated with a lovers' escapade gone awry in these three poems.

The word bayit also appears in two of the lyric poems (1:17; 8:6). In 8:6, the woman declares: "If a man would offer all the wealth of his house for love, they would surely laugh at him". Love is more valuable than anything money can buy. While the dynamics of the statement result from its juxtaposition of "wealth" and "love", and the "house" is an image of secondary importance, it is associated with the image of "wealth" in this context. As such, it can be said to have a negative value to the lovers, standing in opposition to what they consider to be of ultimate value.

---

In two of the three cases, the woman provides some details as to what took place: "His left hand was under my head while his right hand caressed me (2:6; 8:3). In the third poem, the suitability of the location for such a sexual encounter is intimated by the allusion to the mother's act of conception in that setting.

For a discussion of each of these terms in the Song, see below.
The final unit in which the term bayit appears is the lyric unit 1:15-17. The poem concludes with the woman's statement: "Our couch is luxuriant green; cedars are the beams of our house, cypresses the rafters". At first glance, the image of a "house" would appear to have a positive value in this instance, being associated with the lovers' idyllic world view. Yet on closer examination, it becomes clear that the woman is in fact saying that the ideal house is no house at all, but rather the shelter provided naturally by the great outdoors.

In two other passages, although the word bayit does not appear, the image of a "house" is clear from context. In Cant 2:9, the woman's lover appears outside of the house, while the woman herself within: "There he stands behind our wall, gazing through the window, peering through the lattice". The man beckons the woman to come away into the idyllic vineyard setting where they can be together. The woman's position within the house thus stands as a barrier to the lovers' union. In Cant 5:2ff, the image of a house is again implicit, evoked by the context of the man's knocking on the woman's door and his appeal to her for entry into her abode. In this case, the woman's hesitancy, as well as the difficulty she has opening the door, results in the lover's
departure. Again, the house stands as a barrier to the lovers' union."^4

^4One other image may be related to that of a "house" in the Song, although, technically, it refers to a room within such a structure. The word heder, "chamber" appears in two instances in the Song (1:4; 3:4). In Cant 3:4 it is used in parallelism with the word bayit:

I held fast to him, I would not let him go
Until I brought him to the house of my mother
And to the chamber of her that conceived me.

Like the "house" in this passage, the "chamber" is associated with a negative experience for the lovers, for the woman concludes with an exhortation to the Daughters, not to follow her example, not to "waken or arouse love before it pleases".

The word heder also appears in connection with one of the poems which appears to straddle the barrier between the two blocks of material in the Song. The unit 1:2-4 is for the most part a lyric poem, but contains one narrative element which not only makes it a poem of composite genre, but also links the fictive realm of the lovers with that of King Solomon's endeavors. The poem begins with the woman extolling the love and kisses of her lover. But in 1:4 she declares: "The king has brought me to his chambers". The use of the Hiphil conjugation of the verb ba'aw, "[the king] brought me", suggests an affinity with the phrase "he brought me to the house of wine" in 2:4; as noted previously, the image of the house has a negative value for the lovers in the unit 2:4-7. It may be that by the similar phraseology the poet suggests a similar negative evaluation to the heder image here in 1:4. But in my view, heder remains a neutral image in this unit, with the passage 1:2-4 serving as an introduction to the Song as a whole. Through its linking of the two fictive realms (that of the lovers and that of the endeavors of Solomon), the passage signals the reader that the text which follows must be read on two levels. Since elsewhere, the description of the woman's body evokes the context of an ideal Israel, it is possible that the king's act of bringing the woman to his chambers at a metaphorical level suggests the beginning of his "love" relationship with Israel. No evaluation of the king's action is given in this introduction, and it is only after the reader has worked through the entire text that he can draw his own conclusions about the implications of the action and the heder image in this context.
The image of the "house", then, appears to have a negative value within the love poetry, being associated with a barrier to the lovers' union (2:9; 5:1ff), values inimical to "love" (1:17; 8:6), or a negative encounter between the two lovers (2:4-7; 3:1-5; 8:1-4). In the passages pertaining to Solomon's endeavors, the corresponding image is the 'appiryôn (3:9-10), the "house" which King Solomon made. For Solomon, the 'appiryôn/ Temple has tremendous value, as a monument to his royal status. But for the Daughters, the 'appiryôn/ Temple stands as a monument to Solomon's exploitation of their "love" relationship. The association of the "house" image with such a negative context for the Daughters may be at the root of the woman's exhortation to the Daughters in 2:7, 3:5 and 8:4. By showing how badly her own love fared in a house, the woman provides a negative example for the Daughters: they should not allow their love relationship to become associated with a house.

The Image of a "Couch" or "Bed"

The image of a "couch" or "bed" appears three times in the love poetry (1:12,17; 3:1); each time a different Hebrew word is used to designate the object. In 3:1, the term miškāh is used in one of the narrative units in the love poetry. The woman declares: "On my bed (miškāh) at night I sought the one I love; I sought him but did not find him". The image of the "bed" is associated with the separation of
the lovers in this context, and thus has a negative value for them. In 1:16, the term 'ereš, "couch," occurs in one of the lyric units in the love poetry. The woman declares: "Our couch is luxuriant green; cedars are the beams of our house, cypresses the rafters". As was the case with the image of the "house" in this passage, at first glance the image of a "couch" would appear to have a positive value. But again, the woman is suggesting that there is no need of couches in this ideal world, for the natural world provides the lovers with a luxuriant resting-place of its own.62

The image of the "couch" or "bed" appears in the passages pertaining to Solomon in the term mittāh. In 3:7-8, the term mittāh serves as a metaphor for Solomon's throne, the piece of furniture most closely associated with the "love" relationship between Solomon and the Daughters. In the two other instances in the love poetry where the image of a "bed" or "couch" occurs (1:17; 3:1), it has a negative value for the lovers. Through the appearance of the image in such negative contexts for the lovers, the narrator molds his narratee's response to the image, presenting it as non-conducive to a more intimate conception of love.

The Image "Love"

The root ’ accordance with

62The outdoor woodland or garden setting with trees as an appropriate place for the lovers' sexual activity is also the theme of the brief poem in 8:5b.
the material pertaining to the lovers. In seven of these cases, it is used in the lovers' speeches to each other. In 1:7, the woman refers to the man with the epithet, "the one whom I love" (še'ahābāh nafṣî). In 7:7, the man praises the woman as "fair", "beautiful" and "love" itself. The noun 'ahābāh is used three times in 8:6-7, where the power and value of "love" are extolled:

   For love is as strong as death,
   Jealousy/Passion as harsh as Sheol;
   Its flames are flames of fire,
   A mighty flame.
   Great waters cannot quench love,
   And rivers cannot engulf it.
   If a man were to offer all the wealth of his house for love,
   They would surely laugh at him.

In two other instances (1:3,4), the woman reports that other maidens love her partner; their love for him may indicate of his general appeal to women.\(^{63}\) In the lovers' speeches to

\(^{63}\)But the maidens' love for the woman's partner may also serve to introduce the reader to a second level at which the poet intended the text to be read. As I noted earlier (cf. footnote 61), the unit 1:2-4, with its combination of elements from the fictive realm pertaining to Solomon and from the fictive realm of the two lovers, may function as an introduction to the Song as a whole. The statement, "The king has brought me to his chambers", evokes a love relationship between the woman and the king. The woman's declaration that "maidens love you" (1:3), and that "rightly (mēšārîm) they love you" (1:4) may allude to the "love" relationship between the Daughters of Jerusalem and King Solomon (cf. 3:10-11). Weinfeld (1974:258) notes the use of the term mēšārîm in covenantal contexts, citing its usage in Dan 11:6: "After some years, an alliance will be made, and the daughter of the king to the south will come to the king of the north to make peace/to effect the agreement (la'as̱āt mēšārîm)". The use of the image of "love" in a covenantal context has already been discussed. In Cant 1:4, then, the phrase "mēšārîm they love you" may allude to the covenantal agreement between the Daughters and the king. As in 3:10-11,
each other, then, the root 'hb clearly has a positive value.

The root 'hb also appears ten times in speeches directed to the Daughters. In five of these instances, it occurs in statements pertaining to the fictive realm of the lovers, and reflects the lovers' feelings for each other. In four of these cases (3:1, 2, 3, 4), the woman refers to her lover with the epithet "the one whom I love" (šē'ahābāh nafṣī). In the final instance, she proclaims, "His banner upon me was love", equating her lover's sexual advance with "love". In all five occurrences, the "love" image again has a positive value for the lovers.

In the remaining five instances, the nominal form 'ahābāh appears in the woman's direct appeals to the Daughters. In two passages, the noun is used in connection with the woman's sexual desire in the absence of her lover. In 2:5, the woman implores her narratee: "Sustain me with raisin cakes, refresh me with apples, for I am weak/writhing with love". In 5:8 she implores the Daughters: "You shall not find my lover, you shall not tell him that I am weak/writhing with love". "Love" in the absence of the love partner is portrayed as a negative experience, one which must, with the Daughters' aid, either be overcome (2:5) or be kept secret from her lover (5:8). In the three remaining

when the Daughters/Israelites appear in the fictive realm of the poetry, they are portrayed as female characters so as to facilitate the metaphor of a "love" relationship between themselves and the king.
cases (2:7; 3:5; 8:4), the noun 'aḥābāh appears in the woman's adjuration to the Daughters. In each case, the adjuration follows the account of the lovers' entry or desired entry into a house. It is a response to an encounter between the lovers gone awry, the woman imploring the Daughters not to make a similar mistake, not to "waken or arouse love until it pleases". But these adjurations to the Daughters in the discourse setting may also function at another level, once the use of the "love" image in the passages pertaining to Solomon is taken into consideration.

The image "love" appears once in the passages involving Solomon (3:10-11), functioning as a metaphor for the relationship between King Solomon and his subjects. In this "love" relationship, the Daughters/Israelites do the work of building the 'appiryôn "house"/Temple, while Solomon receives the credit for the endeavor. The "love" relationship between Solomon and the Daughters thus works to the benefit of the king, but to the detriment of the Daughters. The woman's adjuration to the Daughters is reminiscent of the negative example of the "house" image discussed above: the woman implores the Daughters to avoid another "love" relationship with a king, especially one that entails a "house"/Temple.

A second root which is associated with the "love" image is dōd. The root is used most frequently by the woman, the term dōdî, "my lover", serving as an epithet for her love
partner in twenty-four instances. In seven instances the term is used by the Daughters, five times in reference to the woman's love partner (dödák in 5:9 (twice) and 6:1 (twice); dödah in 8:5), and twice in a comparison of the woman's love partner with another lover (död referring to another lover partner twice in 5:9). In six other instances, the plural dödîm is used as an abstract noun, generally as an attribute of one of the lovers. In 1:2 and 1:4, the woman praises her partner's "love" as better than wine; in 4:10, the man proclaims the sweetness of his partner's "love", then makes a similar comparison, praising her "love" as better than wine. In 7:13, after inviting her lover to join her in the vineyard, the woman promises that there she will give her "love" to him.

The final occurrence of the plural form dödîm is in the man's appeal to his outside audience in the last verse of the extended lyric in 4:1-5:1. He urges the Daughters, addressed as "friends" or "lovers" (rê'tîm), to "drink and become intoxicated on love (dödîm)". The exhortation concludes the only account in the love poetry of an actual consummation of love. This consummation is associated with the image of the "garden" and its "fruits" (discussed above). But the lovers' invitation to the Daughters in 5:1 bears none of the negative connotations of Solomon's "love". True love

See Cant 1:13,14,16; 2:3,8,9,10,16,17; 4:16; 5:2,4,5,6,8,10,16; 6:2,3; 7:10,11,12,14; 8:14.
is thus contrasted implicitly with political "love" for profit.

The Image of "Wealth"

The term hāmôn, "wealth" appears once in the love poetry, in the context of the woman's exaltation of "love" in 8:7:

If a man were to offer all the wealth of his house for love, They would surely laugh at him.

The woman thus proclaims the value of "love" to be greater than anything money can buy. In the passages pertaining to Solomon, the term hāmôn is used to designate the image of "wealth". It occurs in the symbolic place name of the vineyard, Ba'al Hāmôn, meaning "Owner of Wealth"; this symbolic name sets the tone for the values which are presented in the poem as a whole. In the poem, the vineyard produces so abundantly that "a man would bring for its fruits a thousand pieces of silver". The use of the impersonal "a man would bring" is parallel to the impersonal "if a man were to offer" in the passage using the image of "wealth" in the love poetry (8:7). The use of the impersonal construction and the implied equivalence between "fruits" and "love", as well as the proximity of these passages in the text itself, suggests that 8:7 and 8:11-12 should be read in connection with each other. In the love poetry, the woman proclaims that "if a man were to offer all the wealth of his house for
love" he would only be laughed at, implying that no one would be so foolish as to take her up on the offer. In 8:11-12, Solomon accepts the offer of a thousand pieces of silver for the fruits of the vineyard. For the Daughters in the discourse setting, the contrast in values set forth by the love poetry and the metaphorical account of their own "love" relationship with Solomon (3:6-11 and 8:11-12) serves to reinforce a negative evaluation of that relationship and to highlight Solomon's exploitation of them.

In my discussion of the seven key images above, their use in the passages pertaining to Solomon and in the love poetry, I argued for a discrepancy between the value Solomon ascribes to these images and the value that the images have for the lovers. The images of the "house", the "bed" or "couch", the "guards" or "keepers", and "wealth" have a positive value for Solomon, associated with his kingship and his personal gain. But these same four images have a negative value for the lovers, associated with their separation, an encounter gone awry, the marring of the woman's personal appearance, or an explicit statement indicating negative value (at least in relation to other images in the Song). The images of the "vineyard" or "garden", its "fruits", and "love" have a positive value for the lovers, associated with the setting of their love their persons, their physical attributes, their feelings for each other, and their enjoyment of sexual pleasures. But Solomon
places scant value on these images and the things that they represent, being concerned more with his own kingly status and personal gain. The contrasting treatment of these images in the two groups of poems in the Song suggests that there may be a thematic relationship between them. In my view, the love poetry molds the audience's [and reader's] responses to these key images from the Solomon stories, and in so doing reinforces the text's critique of the king. The audience sympathizes with the lovers in their desire to be together and to express their love, and thus distinguishes between images which are conducive to those goals of the lovers and those which are not. The audience's evaluation of these images would then carry over to the Solomon stories, reinforcing negative evaluation.

CONCLUSIONS AND DIRECTIVES FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

My goal in this thesis has been to set forth the possibility of a unified interpretation of the Song, based on the observation of a unified discourse setting within the work. The Song's dramatization of such a discourse setting, with the individual lyric and narrative poems being recited before the Daughters of Jerusalem, led me to explore the consequences of looking at these individual units as literary compositions, and at the way audiences [and readers] derive meaning from such literary compositions. I have argued that both in terms of form and subject matter, the units in the Song fall into two separate blocks of material. One block of
material consists of lyric and narrative poems, as well as some units which combine both lyric and narrative features. The theme of this first block of material is the relationship between two lovers. The second block of material consists of two units, both metaleptic narratives, which deal with the endeavors of Solomon. The detection of these two distinct blocks of material led me to inquire first into the relationship between the two blocks, and then into the relationship between the presentation as a whole and the discourse setting of the work. Gerard Genette's (1980:232-234) discussion of the possible relationships between metadiegetic and diegetic narratives within a text have proven useful in this regard.

I have argued for an explanatory relationship between the passages which pertain to Solomon and the discourse setting of the work. Because the Daughters function as characters in one of these units, this block of material provides valuable background information for understanding the role of the Daughters within the discourse setting. I have argued that these two Solomonic poems should be read within the context of the traditional accounts of Solomon's reign, as presented in I Kings 1-11 and II Chronicles 1-10. Together, these two units present a negative evaluation of Solomon's treatment of the Israelites, who are represented in the poem by the Daughters of Jerusalem.
This negative evaluation of Solomon's endeavors is then reinforced by the block of material about the two lovers. I have argued that the love poetry has a thematic relationship with the two poems pertaining to Solomon, and thus with the discourse setting of the work. This thematic relationship is suggested by the large number of images and phrases appearing in the Solomonic poems that recur in the love poetry [see Appendix IV]. But the key images from the Solomonic poems are used differently in the love poetry. Of the seven images discussed in detail, those that have a positive value for Solomon have a negative value for the lovers, while those that have a positive value for the lovers have a negative value for Solomon. In juxtaposing the love poetry with the passages that pertain to Solomon, the speakers/actors aim at molding the Daughters' [and the reader's] evaluation of these images. Because of the popular appeal of the love poetry, the audience could be expected to sympathize with the lovers in their desire to be together and to express their love. The audience could thus be expected to hold in high regard those images associated with the union and well-being of the lovers, while evaluating those images associated with their separation or other negative experiences less positively. But while molding the Daughters' response to key images, the love poetry also sets before its audience a vision for the future. This vision entails a conception of "love" far different from that
portrayed in the Solomon stories, one in which the "vineyard" and its "fruits" (functioning as metaphors for Israel and the loyal service of the Israelites) are appreciated to the full. This vision integrates the beauty and fertility of the natural world with man-made structures such as the "Tower of David" (4:4) and the "Tower of Lebanon" (7:5), as well as the luxuries of gold, silver, frankincense and myrrh. As Michael V. Fox (1983:227) suggests, this vision is one of "a world created by love, for it comes into being and is unified only through the lovers' vision of each other".

This thesis has attempted to lay a groundwork for a unified interpretation of the Song. But the dynamics of the individual units within the Song must be examined in far greater detail before the interpretation which has been advanced can be verified. The other images which are common to both blocks of material must be examined within the context of the love poetry and the Solomon stories, and their contribution to the workings of the Song as a whole evaluated. The nature of the thematic relationship between the two blocks of material must also be determined with greater precision. As I have suggested on several occasions in the study, in some instances the description of the woman's physique suggests a metaphorical description of Israel. It is possible that the love poetry is intended as an allegory, featuring the relationship between Israel and its king. But it is also possible that by juxtaposing the
two blocks of material the author intended a more fluid type of thematic relationship, the love poetry molding the reader's evaluation of key images and presenting a vision for the future, but with no rigid allegory being intended. These issues, however, are beyond the scope of the present study, and must remain topics for further research.
# APPENDIX I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>EXUM</th>
<th>SHEA</th>
<th>WEBSTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:1-17</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:2-2:6</td>
<td>1:2-2:2</td>
<td>1:2-2:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:1-17</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:7-3:5</td>
<td>2:3-2:17</td>
<td>2:7-3:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:1-11</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:6-5:1</td>
<td>3:1-4:16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:1-16</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>C'</td>
<td>B(Interlude)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:2-6:3</td>
<td>5:1-7:10</td>
<td>3:6-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:1-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:1-12</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>B'</td>
<td>4:1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:4-8:3</td>
<td>5:1-7:10</td>
<td>4:16-6:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:1-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B'.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:1-14</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>B'</td>
<td>6:4-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:4-14</td>
<td>7:11-8:5</td>
<td>6:11-7:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A'</td>
<td>A'.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:11-8:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A'.2</td>
<td>8:4-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:6-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Cheryl J. Exum (1973:77)

I. 1-2, containing (a) 11-1, and (b) 11-2, 21- being a transitional element

II. 2-3

III. 3-51, containing (a') 410-51, which also serves as a transitional element

IV. 5-6

V. 6-8, containing (b') 7-8

VI. 8-14

Edwin C. Webster (1982:74)

A. 1. 1:2-2:6
   2. 2:7-3:5  Banter and Praise

B. Interlude 3:6-11
   1. 4:1-7  The youth
   2. 4:8-15  The youth

C. 4:16-6:3  The maiden

B'. 1. 6:4-10  The youth
   2. 6:11-7:10  The youth

A'. 1. 7:11-8:3  The maiden
   2. 8:4-14  Praise and Banter
William H. Shea (1980:396)

A : B : C :: C' : B' : A'

a  a  a'  a' a' a'  f  (f?)
b  b  b'  b'  a'  e  e
c  c  c'  c'  b'  d  d
d  d  c'  c'  c  c
e  e  b'  b'  b  b
f  f  c'  c'  a  a

12-22  23-17  34-46  53-710  711-820  821-14
**APPENDIX III**

NOTE: "S" designates a strong correspondence, one which accounts for all instances of repetition.

"W" designates a weak correspondence, one which accounts for only one instance of a phrase, when the phrase appears more than once.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kessler</th>
<th>Exum</th>
<th>Shea</th>
<th>Webster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) thy caresses are better than wine (i.2 and iv.10).</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) behold thou art fair, my love, behold thou art fair, thine eyes are doves (i.15 and iv.1).</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) I am sick with love (ii.5 and v.8).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) his left hand under my head and his right hand embraces me (ii.6 and vii.3, both being part of the day-reveries).</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) I adjure you, Daughters of Jerusalem, by the gazelles or by the hinds of the field (not to rouse and not to stir up the beloved until she pleases) (ii.7, iii.5, viii.4, all four being conclusions of love-dreams).</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) voice of my beloved (ii.8 and v.2).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) my beloved is mine and I am his who feeds (his flock) among the lilies (or roses) (ii.16 and vi.3) and similarly &quot;I am my beloved's&quot; (vii.11).</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) until the day breathes forth and the shadows flee away (ii.17 and iv.6).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) be like a gazelle or a young hart upon mountains of spice (Bethel) (ii.17 and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(10) I sought him but I found him not. The watchmen that go about the city found me (iii.2 ff. and v.6 ff., both being part of the night-dreams).

(11) to my mother's house (iii.4 and viii.2).

(12) Who is she, coming up from the country....? (iii.6 and viii.5) and similarly "Who is she who looks forth as the dawn....?" (v1.10).

13) Thy hair is like a flock of goats that come down from Gilead. Thy teeth are like a flock of shorn (mother) sheep which have come up from the washing; whereof every one has twins and none is barren among them...Thy temples are like a piece of pomegranate behind thy veil (iv.1b-2 and 3b and v1.5b-7).

(14) Thy two breasts are like twin fawns of the gazelle (iv.5 and vii.4).

(15) ...see whether the vine has budded...and the pomegranates are in flower (v1.11 and vii.13).
### APPENDIX IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image or Expression</th>
<th>Units Pertaining to Solomon</th>
<th>Units Pertaining to the lovers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who/What is this coming up from the wilderness</td>
<td>3:6</td>
<td>8:5 [a variation in 6:10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myrrh</td>
<td>3:6</td>
<td>1:13 4:6,14 5:5,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frankincense</td>
<td>3:6</td>
<td>4:6,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warriors</td>
<td>3:7(twice)</td>
<td>4:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>3:7,9,11</td>
<td>1:5 [note also the Shulammite in 7:1 and shalom in 8:10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;to learn&quot; (lmd)</td>
<td>3:8</td>
<td>8:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>night</td>
<td>3:8</td>
<td>3:1 5:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>king</td>
<td>3:9,11</td>
<td>1:4,12 7:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>3:9</td>
<td>4:8,11,15 5:15 7:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silver</td>
<td>3:10 8:11</td>
<td>8:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gold</td>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>1:11 5:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purple</td>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>7:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chariot(s)</td>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>1:9 6:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image or Expression</td>
<td>Units Pertaining to Solomon</td>
<td>Units Pertaining to the Lovers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>love</td>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>1:3, 4, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:4, 5, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:2, 4, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughters of Jerusalem</td>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>1:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:8, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother</td>
<td>3:11</td>
<td>1:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:1, 2, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the day</td>
<td>3:11</td>
<td>8:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heart</td>
<td>3:11</td>
<td>5:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:6 [note also the verbal form from lbb in 4:9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vineyard</td>
<td>8:11, 12</td>
<td>1:6, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guard(s)</td>
<td>8:11, 12</td>
<td>1:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fruits</td>
<td>8:11, 12</td>
<td>2:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:13, 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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