

THE CONCEPTUALISATION OF ANGER IN THE HEBREW BIBLE

by

Zacharias Kotzé

Dissertation submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in the subject

ANCIENT NEAR EASTERN STUDIES

at the

Petura roborant cultus recti

DEPARTMENT OF ANCIENT STUDIES

UNIVERSITY OF STELLENBOSCH

PROMOTER: PROFESSOR PA KRUGER

April 2004

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this dissertation is my own original work and has not previously in its entirety or in part been submitted at any university for a degree.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Z. Je', written over a horizontal dotted line.

Signature

.....28.1.2004.....

Date

ABSTRACT

There is no scarcity of publications on the subject of anger in the Hebrew Bible. Most of these concern themselves with the theological significance of the wrath of God. In particular, its function as chastisement for sin is repeatedly accentuated while other conceptual elements as conveyed by Classical Hebrew words and expressions for anger are usually overlooked. In the majority of cases, lexicographical studies of anger terminology contend themselves with the accepted 'literal' meaning of words. The result is an impoverished appreciation of the concepts that governed the mind of the ancient Israelites and determined their use of language with respect to the conceptualisation of anger. This situation provided a good incentive for a study on anger concepts in the Hebrew Bible.

The cognitive theory of language proved to be an ideal tool for analyzing Classical Hebrew lexemes and expressions relating to the concept of anger. Several figurative sayings were identified that relate directly to culturally defined concomitants of this emotion. They can be summarised in an idealised cognitive model that include the following conceptual metonymies for anger: body heat, quickened breathing, frowning, glaring, gnashing of teeth, internal pressure, redness in the face/neck, agitation, internal agitation, slaver at the mouth, lifting the hand, clapping the hands, stamping the feet and violent, frustrated behaviour.

Over and above these metonymies, a number of conceptual metaphors have been identified that added a great deal of conceptual content to the idealised cognitive model of anger in the Hebrew Bible. The ANGER IS HEAT metaphor seems to have its basis in the experience of bodily heat. Environmental phenomena, such as the hot desert wind, earthquake, clouds, storms and floods also proved to be prolific source domains for metaphoric transfer. Other conceptual domains employed by the ancient Israelites to image anger are: burdens, winepresses, poison, opponents, dangerous animals, transgression, presence and bounded spaces.

The data analysed in this study pointed to a clearly defined conceptual model for anger that can best be viewed as a prototype scenario with several stages. The phases follow on each other in temporal order. Anger typically follows on the occurrence of an intended offending event. Although the ideal is to control anger, this rarely happens. In the majority of cases, anger results in some violent act of retribution.

In conclusion, several suggestions have been made with regard to the study of concepts, such as anger, in the Hebrew Bible. Firstly, the fact that most theological dictionaries and Hebrew lexicons to date have been dominated by the Autonomic View of language and its interest to identify the detachable 'meaning' of Classical Hebrew terms needs to be acknowledged. In order to fully appreciate the idealised cognitive model of the ancient Israelites with regard to a specific concept, a thorough diachronic study of related words and expressions needs to be undertaken in view of their humoral theories and beliefs regarding magic and spirits. Finally, some recommendations relating to the etymology of certain Classical Hebrew terms for anger were made.

OPSOMMING

Die oorgrote meerderheid ondersoekers oor die emosie van woede in die Hebreeuse Bybel het as sentrale idee die teologiese implikasies van die toorn van God. Die funksie daarvan as straf vir menslike sonde word dikwels beklemtoon, terwyl nagelaat word om ook aandag te gee aan konseptuele elemente soos dit neerslag vind in die taal wat gebruik word om dié emosie te beskryf. Leksikografiese studies fokus meesal op die 'letterlike' betekenis van woorde en verwaarloos so die konseptuele inhoud van uitdrukkings wat aangewend word om woede te beskryf. Dit is die agtergrond vir die besluit om 'n deeglike ondersoek te doen na konseptualisasie van woede soos dit bestaan het in die gedagte-wêreld van die ou Israeliete.

Die kognitiewe teorie van taal bied die mees gepaste metodologie vir 'n bestudering van sodanige konsepte in die Hebreeuse Bybel. Met behulp van hierdie metodologiese raamwerk is verskeie konseptuele metonimieë geïdentifiseer wat neerslag vind in 'n ideale kognitiewe model van toorn soos dit beskryf word in die Hebreeuse Bybel. Die konseptuele metonimieë vir woede sluit direk aan by verskeie liggaamlike ervarings en wyses van uitdrukking wat geassosieer word met hierdie emosie. Die volgende elemente, wat gebruik is as basis vir die metaforiese taalgebruik in dié verband, is geïdentifiseer: liggaamlike hitte, vinnige asemhaling, 'n frons, glurende oë, tandekners, interne druk, rooiheid in die gesig/nek, agitatie, skuim by die mond, oplig van die hand, handeklap, voete stamp en gefrustreerde gedrag.

Bo en behalwe hierdie metonimieë, is daar ook verskeie konseptuele metafore onderskei wat baie help om 'n meer volledige kognitiewe model van toorn daar te stel. Die TOORN IS HITTE metafoor het waarskynlik sy oorsprong in die ervaring van liggaamshitte deur die persoon wat dié emosie ervaar. 'n Hele aantal metafore blyk gemotiveer te wees deur meteorologiese en omgewingsfaktore, soos die warm woestynwind, aardbewings, wolke, storms en winde. Ander bronne vir metaforiese oordrag met betrekking tot woede is: swaar laste, wynperse, gif, opponente, gevaarlike diere, oortreding, teenwoordigheid en begrensde ruimtes.

Die data wat so versamel is, dui op 'n goed-gedefinieerde konseptuele voorstelling vir woede in die Hebreeuse Bybel. Hierdie model kan gesien word as 'n prototipiese gebeurtenis waarvan die elemente kronologies op mekaar volg. In 'n tipiese geval word die emosie ontlok deur 'n doelbewuste benadeling van die subjek wat die emosie beleef. Die ideaal is dat die persoon sy woede in toom hou. Meesal is dit egter nie die geval nie en loop dit uit op gewelddadige, vergeldende optrede.

Ten slotte is sekere suggesties gemaak rakende die etimologie van sekere terme vir woede in die Hebreeuse Bybel. Daar is ook aanbeveel dat in toekomstige studies van sodanige konsepte in die Hebreeuse Bybel in ag moet neem dat die oorgrote meerderheid van beskikbare teologiese woordeboeke en Hebreeuse leksika ten onregte hulself ten doel stel om die 'letterlike' betekenis van sodanige emosie-woorde na te gaan, met verwaarlosing van die konseptuele wêreld wat die uitdrukkings onderlê. Derhalwe is ook 'n deeglike diakroniese studie van die konseptuele aard van dergelike woorde en uitdrukkings, met inagneming van ou Israelitiese humorale opvattinge betreffende die bonatuurlike, van wesenlike belang.

The financial assistance of the National Research Foundation towards this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed and conclusions arrived at, are those of the author and are not necessarily to be attributed to the National Research Foundation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would hereby like to express my appreciation for the quality of the feedback from my promoter, Professor Paul Kruger. I always knew that I could rely on his expert supervision and masterly criticism throughout the study. The assistance of Professor Klaus Scherer and his associates at the Centre for Emotion Research at the University of Geneva during my stay in Switzerland is also recognised.

Without the generous financial assistance of the University of Stellenbosch and the National Research Foundation, this study would not have been achievable. I am also extremely grateful for the scholarship awarded by the Swiss Confederation that allowed me to study French and to do valuable research in Geneva for a total of one academic year. This proved to be of great value and certainly added to the quality of the present work.

Ms Cherry Grobler kindly proofread the manuscript. Mr At Lambrecht of the School of Biblical Languages and Sciences at the Christian University for Higher Education at Potchefstroom benevolently found time to amend the Hebrew text where necessary, despite a very busy schedule. The wise counsel of Ms Britta Zawada at the Department of Linguistics with regard to practical aspects in the application of the theory of cognitive linguistics is also acknowledged.

I am further indebted to the support of my family. In particular, the continuous encouragement of my wife served as a stable source of inspiration. During the latter part of my research my parents also provided me with a domicile where I could further my learning in tranquillity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

ABBREVIATIONS	x
CHAPTER 1	1
THE NATURE OF ANGER AND ANGER LANGUAGE	1
1.1 THE SOURCES OF ANGER CONCEPTS	3
1.1.1 Symbolic Prototypes	3
1.1.2 The Experience of Physiological Changes	4
1.1.3 The Physical Expression of Anger	4
1.1.4 The Humoral Interpretation of Anger Phenomena	5
1.1.5 Environmental Phenomena	6
1.1.6 Ancient Israelite Beliefs Regarding Magic and Spirits	6
CHAPTER 2	7
CONCEPTUAL MODELS OF ANGER IN PAST RESEARCH: A CRITICAL OVERVIEW	7
2.1 CONCEPTUAL MODELS OF ANGER IN GREEK PHILOSOPHY	8
2.2 CONCEPTUAL MODELS OF ANGER IN THE EARLY CHURCH	10
2.3 CONCEPTUAL MODELS OF ANGER IN MODERN THEOLOGY	14
2.3.1 The Stoic Wise man in Pre-War Theology	14
2.3.2 The Demonic in YHWH	16
2.3.3 Rationality and Love in the “Wrath of God” and the “Fear of God”	19
2.3.4 Anger and Fear in Historical Criticism	31
2.3.4.1 Divine Wrath as a Structural Device	31
2.3.4.2 The Fear of God and the Sanctioning of Wisdom Literature	32
2.3.4.3 The Day of Wrath	33
2.3.4.4 Vengeance	33
2.4 ANGER IN SOCIOLOGICAL AND ANTHROPOLOGICAL STUDIES OF THE ANCIENT ISRAELITE CULTURE	35
2.5 CONCEPTUAL MODELS OF ANGER IN NON-VERBAL COMMUNICATION	44
2.6 CONCLUSION	47
CHAPTER 3	48
CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR: THEORY AND METHODOLOGY	48
3.1 APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF EMOTION	48
3.2 NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION	51
3.3 A COGNITIVE APPROACH	54
3.3.1 Linguistic Relativity	55
3.3.2 Cognitive Linguistics	58
3.4 CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR AND METONYMY	59

3.5	THE DEFINITION OF CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR	59
3.6	LINGUISTIC METAPHOR	60
3.6.1	The Structure of Metaphor	61
3.6.2	The Context of Metaphor	62
3.7	TYPES OF METAPHOR	63
3.7.1	The Classification of Metaphor According to Lingual Levels	63
3.7.2	The Classification of Metaphor According to Conventionality	64
3.7.3	The Classification of Metaphor According to the Proximity of the Domains	65
3.8	THE BASIS OF METAPHOR	66
3.8.1	Primitive and Compound Metaphors	68
3.8.2	Humoral Theories	68
3.8.3	Magic and Spirits	69
3.8.4	Conclusion	70
3.9	THE SCOPE AND THE FOCUS OF METAPHOR	70
3.10	THE RELATION BETWEEN METAPHOR AND CONCEPTUAL MODELS	74
3.11	CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS	75
	CHAPTER 4	76
	CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS AND METONYMIES FOR ANGER IN THE HEBREW BIBLE	76
4.1	CONCEPTUAL METONYMIES FOR ANGER	76
4.1.1	Body Heat	77
4.1.2	Quickened Breathing	81
4.1.3	Frowning	88
4.1.4	Glaring Eyes	91
4.1.5	Gnashing of Teeth	95
4.1.6	Internal Pressure	96
4.1.7	Redness in the Face/Neck	97
4.1.8	Agitation	100
4.1.9	Internal Agitation	101
4.1.10	Slaver at the Mouth	103
4.1.11	Lifting the Hand	114
4.1.12	Clapping the Hands	119
4.1.13	Stamping the Feet	121
4.1.14	Violent, Frustrated Behaviour	122
4.2	CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS FOR ANGER	126
4.2.1	Anger is the Heat of a Fluid in a Container	126
4.2.1.1	Increase in the Intensity of Anger is the Rising of the Fluid	131
4.2.1.2	Intense Anger Produces Steam	134
4.2.1.3	Too Intense Anger is the Fluid Boiling Over	136
4.2.2	Anger is Fire	140
4.2.2.1	The Damage Caused by Fire is Injury to the Offender	142

4.2.2.2	The Fuel for the Fire is the Wrongdoer	143
4.2.2.3	The Intensity of the Fire is the Intensity of Anger	146
4.2.2.4	Igniting the Fire is Causing Anger	147
4.2.2.5	Feeding the Fire is Maintaining the Intensity of Anger	148
4.2.2.6	Other Related Metaphors	152
4.2.3	Anger is a Hot Wind	163
4.2.4	Anger is an Earthquake	170
4.2.5	Anger is Clouds	171
4.2.6	Anger is a Storm	172
4.2.7	Anger is a Burden	173
4.2.8	Anger is a Flood	176
4.2.8.1	Other Related Metaphors	186
4.2.9	Anger is Poison	193
4.2.9.1	Other Related Metaphors	199
4.2.10	Anger is an Opponent (in a Struggle)	220
4.2.11	Anger is a Dangerous Animal	221
4.2.12	The Cause of Anger is Trespassing	233
4.3	MINOR UNRELATED METAPHORS FOR ANGER	234
4.3.1	Anger is Presence	234
4.3.2	Anger is Bounded Space	235
4.4	THE SYSTEMATICITY OF METAPHOR	236
	CHAPTER 5	238
	A CONCEPTUAL MODEL FOR ANGER IN THE HEBREW BIBLE	238
	CHAPTER 6	240
	CONCLUSION	240
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	243

ABBREVIATIONS

BIBLICAL BOOKS

Gen	2 Kgs	Nah	Cant
Ex	Isa	Hab	Eccl
Lev	Jer	Zeph	Lam
Num	Ezek	Hag	Esth
Deut	Hos	Zech	Dan
Josh	Joel	Mal	Ezr
Judg	Am	Ps	Neh
1 Sam	Obad	Job	1 Chr
2 Sam	Jon	Prov	2 Chr
1 Kgs	Mic	Ruth	

OTHER ABBREVIATIONS

A	adjective	m	masculine
Adv	adverb	MT	Masoretic Text
<i>BDB</i>	Brown-Driver-Briggs	N	noun
<i>BHS</i>	Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia	neg	negative
C	conjunction	NIV	New International Version
coh	cohortative	NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
consec	consecutive	pass	passive
cs	construct (state)	pers	personal
def	definite	pf	perfect
demonstr	demonstrative	pl	plural
f	feminine	PN	name of person/place
Fr.	French	P	preposition
G.	German	pron	pronominal
impf	imperfect	pt	participle
imp	imperative	rel	relative
indef	indefinite	S	subject
inf	infinitive	s. one	someone
interj	interjection	sg	singular
interr	interrogative	Syr	Syriac
JB	Jerusalem Bible	V	verb
juss	jussive	v.	verse
KJV	King James Version	VA	verbal adjective
loc	locative	VN	verbal noun
LXX	Septuagint		

ABBREVIATIONS OF CITED WORKS

<i>ABD</i>	Anchor Bible Dictionary
<i>BR</i>	Bible Review
<i>EQ</i>	The Evangelical Quaterly
<i>ISBE</i>	International Standard Bible Encyclopedia
<i>LTK</i>	Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche
<i>NBD</i>	The New Bible Dictionary
<i>NIDOTTE</i>	New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis
<i>TDOT</i>	Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament
<i>TDNT</i>	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament
<i>TLOT</i>	Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament
<i>TRE</i>	Theologische Realenzyklopädie
<i>TWAT</i>	Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament
<i>WMANT</i>	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament

TRANSLITERATION OF HEBREW

CONSONANTS

Hebrew Consonant	Technical Usage
כּ	k
בּ	b
גּ	g
דּ	d
הּ	h
וּ	w
זּ	z
חּ	ḥ
טּ	ṭ
יּ	y
כּ	k
לּ	l
מּ	m
נּ	n
סּ	s
עּ	‘
פּ	p
צּ	ṣ
קּ	q
רּ	r
שׁ	ś
שׂ	š
תּ	t

CHAPTER 1

THE NATURE OF ANGER AND ANGER LANGUAGE

The study of anger and aggression is of great import to modern research. Its understanding and control is paramount to our safe existence and continuity on earth (Sarles 1975:1). Despite the fact that it has attracted interest and concern in the political, psychological, philosophical and theological traditions it has eluded deep understanding with regard to its true nature.

With respect to the study of anger in the Hebrew Bible, most scholars have demonstrated excessive interest in the classical concept of impassibility and the theological problem of divine justice (cf. Boegner 1878; Kilpatrick 1908; Köhler 1966; Aloysia 1946; etc. See 2.1 and 2.3.3 below). Even studies that purport to investigate the emotions of the ancient Israelites *per se* tried to show that these are inextricably connected with their worldview, as though it could be separated from their existence in the residual body (Robinson 1925; Pedersen 1926; Johnson 1964; Von Meyenfeldt 1950; Köhler 1953; Schmidt 1964; Wolff 1973; Douglas 1975; Lauha 1983). A focal interest in all of these studies was the meanings associated with words such as לֵב “heart,” נֶפֶשׁ “soul” and רוּחַ “spirit,” which testifies to the theological-philosophical intent of describing the ancient Israelite “soul.” Emotions, in these studies, are intermediate phenomena that sometimes disappear between the supposed distinct worlds of soul and body. The ability of these theorists to conceptualise a mind without a body (usually referred to as בְּשָׂרָה) further allowed them to abstract meaning from Classical Hebrew terms as though they existed independently from the thought processes and being of the ancient Israelites (cf. Botterweck, Freedman & Lundbom 1977; Baloian 1997; Struthers 1997). Sadly, this philosophical preorientation led to whole landscapes of Classical Hebrew being unexplored.

The main objective of this study is to point to the close relation between the actual anger experience and Classical Hebrew language used to speak about this emotion. The ancient Israelite, like us today, was a processual being, observed and moulded within the cognitive structures of those around him. Anger, as all emotional experience, formed the basis of the ancient Israelite consciousness. Emotion is the most fundamental organisation of sensation that has meaning and specific experiential and motivational properties (cf. Izard 1975:81). At its most basic level, cognition is characterised by affect and emotion. We can therefore expect a fundamental emotion such as anger to have influenced most of the perceptive, cognitive and behavioural processes of the ancient Israelites.

Given the fact that emotion exerts such a wide-ranging influence on human behaviour, including social

communicative behaviour, a mere study of anger terminology would fail in the task of exploring ancient Israelite conceptions relating to this emotion. This can be illustrated briefly through a few well-known case studies. With regard to the Tahitians, for example, Levy (1984:219) found that there were no unambiguous terms that represented the concept of sadness. It received little elaboration in local doctrine or systems of naming or classification, and thus was “hypocognized.” This is not to say, however, that their biological experience of this emotion differed radically from that of ours. Levy (1984:221) explained that the feelings often were “somatised”:

Asked to describe such matters as anger, desire, fear, and so on, villagers say that their “place” is in “intestines,” referring to those sensations in the abdomen that are part of the feeling response.

If Levy had restricted his study to specific Tahitian emotion terms, such as anger and sadness, he incorrectly might have concluded that, for them, such emotions did not exist at all.

Another succinct example will illustrate how emotion terminology can fail to reveal central cultural conceptualisations about emotion. According to Briggs (1998:45-54) the Utku Eskimos consider angry thoughts and acts as extremely dangerous. It is believed that angry people are always likely to lose control, and can even commit murder. Even though anger is rare, or even absent, in Utku culture, potential eliciting events abound. Since anger is feared so intensely, these situations are constantly avoided and thus do not get the opportunity to elude emotions. Again, we could hardly expect mere anger terms to reveal such a specific cultural perception about anger by the Utku Eskimos.

As a result of such findings, many scholars have come to conclude that we most often conceptualise emotion by means of propositions that reflect our cultural, and even our ecological, background (cf. Douglas 1975; Russell 1983; Spiro 1984; Taylor 1989; Mesquita & Frijda 1992; Dirvin 1994; Matsumoto 1994, 1996; Scherer 1999a). Rather than studying no more than emotion labels, the investigation of a verifiable study of emotion would have to be extended to emotion concepts (Levy 1984; Shweder 1984; Kövecses 1990, 1995, 1999; Lakoff 1987).

More specifically, emotion concepts are bound to reveal the cultural understanding of the cognitive, physical and expressive aspects of emotion. This follows from, not only the realisation that emotion can best be described as a process comprising several elements (cf. Marshall 1998; Parrot 1995; Scherer, Bänziger, Grandjean, Meylan & Wranik-Odehnal 2000; Ellsworth & Scherer 2002), but also from the proof that the human conceptualisation of these components can be successfully studied through language alone (Lakoff 1987; Kövecses 1990; Scherer 1993; Kruger 2000, 2001).

It should be emphasised at the outset that this study does not endeavour specialist conjectures about the definite nature of emotion (cf. Scherer 1993). Rather, its goal is the interpretation of “folkloric” conceptual models of emotion in the Hebrew Bible (cf. Kövecses 1995a; Kruger 2000, 2001). The essential features of

these cognitive models will be commented on in brief.

1.1 THE SOURCES OF ANGER CONCEPTS

Although concepts relating to human existence do not reflect reality *de facto*, their formation as mental knowledge of the world is dependent on cognitive and sensory perception of physical existence (Jackendoff 1992:54). To put it in an oversimplified way, this incoming information is mentally processed and categorised to form concepts (Jackendoff 1992:21-52).¹ Therefore, as regards the conceptual models of emotion, they can best be described as socially constructed mental frameworks epitomising the cultural knowledge of what it means to experience an emotion.

Several scholars have found that these mental designs were organised in terms of the best example, or prototype, of a particular emotion (Lakoff 1987:58-67; Taylor 1989:40-6; Kövecses 1990:1-2). Moreover, they were found to include culturally defined information about the social, mental and physical components of an emotion to correlate with emotion as a process (cf. Kövecses 1995a; Kövecses 1995b). Another parallel between the actual nature of emotion and conceptual models is that both can be described in a temporal order (cf. Scherer 1993, 2001; cf. Kövecses 1995a:51). Let's consider the different constituents of the emotional process as they stimulate the formation of emotion concepts.

1.1.1 Symbolic Prototypes

The causes and function of emotions has enjoyed privileged attention in many studies of emotion in the Hebrew Bible.² The notion of evaluation processes as they correlate with the elicitation of emotions also received a great deal of attention in the philosophical (cf. Green 1999) and scientific study of emotion (cf. Lazarus 1984; 1998; Oatley & Johnson-Laird 1987; Frijda 1989; Scherer 1993, 2001).

With regard to the study of the cognitive components of conceptual models of emotion, it is important to be mindful of the fact that a great deal of the appraisals, as they relate to the emotional process, take place on a subconscious level (Lazarus 1984; Scherer 1993, 2001). Accordingly, on the first levels of analysis, the human being makes use of cognitive schemata or symbols rather than language (Lazarus 1984:252-3). Hence, in such a context, cognition should not be equated with deliberate reflection, rationality, or awareness. On that account, it would be erroneous to identify distinct rational evaluations (cf. Baloian 1997; Botterweck, Freedman & Lundbom 1986) as part of a cognitive framework of emotion. Rather, we can expect emotion concepts to be comprised of symbolic elements as they epitomize causes in the first examples, or prototypes,

¹ Naturally, already existing cognitive structures also play a key role in our perceptive processes. See, for example, Jackendoff (1992).

² For joy, cf. Muffs 1992; for anger, cf. Boegner 1878; Baloian 1992, 1997; for pain, cf. Scharbert 1955; for fear, cf. Derrousseau 1970; for shame and guilt, cf. Klopfenstein 1972.

of emotions. To name one example, Kövecses (1990:74-78) has identified “fear is a vicious enemy/opponent” as a conceptual metaphor for fear in the English language. Kruger (2001:86) has identified expressions in the Hebrew Bible that can also be linked to this symbol.

1.1.2 The Experience of Physiological Changes

The vital importance of bodily sensations in the human conception of emotion has been brought to the fore by one of the premier American psychologists of the nineteenth century, William James (1998:21-9). Starting a new era in research on emotion, the essence of James’ theory was this (James 1998:27):

If we fancy some strong emotion, and then try to abstract from our consciousness of it all the feelings of its bodily symptoms, we find we have nothing left behind, no “mind-stuff” out of which the emotion can be constituted, and that a cold and neutral state of intellectual perception is all that remains.

Unfortunately, James has often been misinterpreted as claiming that cognition played no role in emotion at all (Ellsworth 1994:222-9).

Clarifying the role that cognition played in the interpretation of bodily changes, Schachter and Singer (1962:379-99) have demonstrated in their famous experiment that emotion labels ascribed to physiological arousal depend heavily on situational factors. Regrettably, the only somatic stimulation used in the experiment was artificially induced by means of adrenalin, and the possibility of emotion-specific bodily symptoms (cf. Wallbott & Scherer 1988:36) was ignored.

More recently, linguists have drawn attention to the pivotal role that physiological components of emotion played in emotion conceptualisation (cf. Lakoff 1987; Kövecses 1990, 1995, 1999). For example, Kövecses singled out some anger metaphors in the English language that are clearly linked to body heat as a physical constituent of this sentiment. Also with reference to emotion language in the Hebrew Bible, Smith (1998:427-36) has hypothesised that the prevalent use of internal organs, such as לב and כבד, in the context of emotion, was because the emotions in question were actually felt there.

1.1.3 The Physical Expression of Anger

Long before the present interest in the role of cognition in the emotional episode, Darwin (1981) investigated the mind’s function in the expression of emotion in man and animals. One can even expect his work to have inspired James’ emphasis on bodily changes, since Darwin himself saw somatic actions in the context of emotion as involuntary (Darwin 1998:20):

... some actions, which were at first performed consciously, have become through habit and

association converted into reflex actions, and are now so firmly fixed and inherited, that they are performed, even when not of the least use, as often as the same causes arise, which originally excited them in us through the volition.

Whereas James' focus was restricted to internal somatic changes, Darwin centred his attention on the more visible bodily reflexes, but did not exclude internal alterations, or even vocal expression (Darwin 1981:169):

Tout acte, quelle que soit sa nature, qui accompagne constamment un état déterminé de l'esprit, devient aussitôt expressif. C'est, par exemple, l'agitation de la queue chez le chien, le haussement des épaules chez l'homme, le hérissément des poils, la sécrétion de la sueur, les modifications de la circulation capillaire, la difficulté de la respiration, la production de sons divers par l'organe de la voix ou par d'autres mécanismes. Il n'est pas jusqu'aux insectes qui n'expriment la colère, la terreur, la jalousie et l'amour par leur bourdonnement.

Owing to the fact that these expressive elements are spontaneous reflexes associated with a specific state of mind, they easily become incorporated in conceptual models of emotion (cf. Lakoff 1987; Kövecses 1995a; Kruger 2000, 2001). Kövecses (1990:57-8) has demonstrated that aspects of emotion control (cf. Brody & Hall 1993; Heise 1992; Scherer 1999, 2000) can also be represented in cultural concepts of emotion.

Apropos Classical Hebrew, some lexicographers have pointed out that redness in the face as visible sign of anger probably gave rise to the common use of the Hebrew term, *הָרָחַק* "become, be hot" (Köhler & Baumgartner 1958:331) with *פָּנִים* "nose/face" as subject to speak of anger (cf. Sauer 1997:472-4; Struthers 1997:472-5).

A common weak point of studies focusing on the physical and expressive components of emotion is their failure to point to their functional significance (cf. Scherer 1984; Lemerise & Dodge 1993; Edwards 1999; Levenson 1999; Parrot 1999; Keltner & Haidt 1999). However, since our prime interest is the description of the ancient Israelite conceptual models of emotion, we will consider the functions of emotions only as they relate to the prime examples of emotion.

1.1.4 The Humoral Interpretation of Anger Phenomena

Humors represent a culturally defined cognitive system based on the concepts of wetness and dryness and heat versus cold (Banks & Thompson 1996:123). These mostly arise from the observation of fevers and chills, as well as other medical conditions (Banks & Thompson 1996:123). A worthy example in the English language is the word "choleric" when used as a synonym for "irascible" (cf. Geeraerts & Grondelaers 1995:163). The origin of this use can evidently be traced to Galen's (129-199 C.E.) theory of humors in the Classical World.

Unfortunately, some scholars have tried to emphasise the influence of humoral theories in the

conceptualisation of emotions at the expense of bodily sensations (cf. Geeraerts & Grondelaers 1995:153-79). However, the fact that humoral doctrines in China and India show remarkable similarities with that of Galen indicates that these are largely based on the interpretation of the physiology of emotions and other bodily states (cf. Banks & Thompson 1996:123). This also means that one can expect the ancient Israelites to have developed a humoral system of anger that might be analogous to that of the ancient Greeks. For example, there are indications that the ancient Israelites also associated intense anger with 'poisonous' secretions of the gall-bladder (מַרְרֵה).³

1.1.5 Environmental Phenomena

The role of environmental factors in the bodily experience of heat and cold is often underestimated. Yet it has been shown to play a weighty role in the genesis and salience of certain conceptual metaphors. For example, Boers (1995:47-56) has illustrated how bad weather conditions in the northern hemisphere can increase the use of the HEALTH metaphor due to the higher incidence of illness.

Apart from the influence of the Palestinian climate on ancient Israelite bodily experience, there may be an even more profound way in which environmental phenomena have influenced ancient Israelite conceptions of emotions – anger in particular. Meteorological elements, such as thunder, lightning, clouds and wind have made an enormous impact on the ancient Israelite mind. These were often interpreted as YHWH's advance in anger to destroy his objects of wrath (Jeremias 1965:1). One can therefore expect to find that a significant amount of conceptual metaphors for anger in the Hebrew Bible were motivated by environmental constituents.

1.1.6 Ancient Israelite Beliefs Regarding Magic and Spirits

The fact that anger terminology is more commonly applied to characterise divine anger is not without import (cf. Johnson 1973:378-89). Environmental and meteorological phenomena were commonly associated with divine irascibility, as is clearly illustrated by practically all descriptions of theophany in the Hebrew Bible (cf. Jeremias 1965:1). Correspondingly, human illnesses were often ascribed to the interference of supernatural beings in the ancient Near East. As will be illustrated, these beliefs account for a very large proportion of the ancient Israelite conceptions of anger in the Hebrew Bible.

Before detailing the ancient Israelite cognisance of anger, as inspired by its cognitive, physical, spiritual and cultural individuality, antecedent attempts that had the same goal will be analysed in the next chapter. A rundown of the chosen methodology will be given in chapter 3.

³ See 4.1.10 and 4.2.9.

CHAPTER 2

CONCEPTUAL MODELS OF ANGER IN PAST RESEARCH: A CRITICAL OVERVIEW

This chapter will provide a critical assessment of the main body of research on emotion in the Hebrew Bible as it relates to the question of how the ancient Israelites understood their emotions. In particular, the relevant work of a number of approaches to the question will be examined, and their advantages and major weaknesses evaluated. Such a review will reveal some of the breadth and depth of what is involved in a study of emotional conceptualisation.

Although the ensuing analysis of the ancient Israelite conceptions will be restricted to anger, the present review of research on emotion in the Hebrew Bible will include selected studies on the Biblical Hebrew concepts of anger and fear. The reason for this is twofold. Firstly, anger, by its very nature, is a social emotion. As a by-product of evolution it has obvious functions, not the least of which is inducing fear in others. Consequently, social-constructionist accounts of this emotion usually include fear as an apposite reaction in the conceptual definition of anger (cf. Lutz 1988). Not surprisingly, the majority of words for fear in the Hebrew Bible are descriptive of physiological concomitants of this reaction (cf. Becker 1965:1-18). Secondly, in view of the multitude of Hebrew expressions describing the phenomenology of fear,⁴ one would expect studies on the topic to take the language seriously and investigate the conceptual models that they constitute. The present survey will demonstrate that this procedure has been systematically avoided in favour of a philosophical-theological presentation of fear as an ethical and cultic concept stripped of all emotional content, in analogy to the theological equation of anger with impassable love and justice.

Since modern research on emotion in the Hebrew Bible has strong roots in Greek philosophy, we will begin our survey with a brief description of the main conceptualisations as expressed in Sophist theories. These found acceptance in the early church, as well as in modern anthropological and theological approaches to the study of emotion in the Hebrew Bible. As will be seen, most of the research has been dominated by theological and ethical considerations.

⁴ Becker (1965:1-18) lists terms in excess of thirty.

2.1 CONCEPTUAL MODELS OF ANGER IN GREEK PHILOSOPHY

Being a student of Plato, Aristotle was interested in the form of things, or its nature and essence. Talking about emotion, he argues that knowledge of its essential nature is a valuable tool in the examination of the causes of its expression (Lawson-Tancred 1986:128):

... knowledge of what a thing is [is] useful for the contemplation of the causes of those things that are attributes of the substances (*De Anima*, 402b).

However, he attached special value to an investigation of the concomitants of the emotional experience, since these had special potential to reveal the nature of emotion itself and because none of the affections seem to exist apart from the body (Lawson-Tancred 1986:128):

For when we can give a demonstration, in accordance with the appearance of the attributes, either all or most, then will we be in the best position to talk about the substance in question. ... It seems indeed to be the case that with most affections the soul undergoes or produces none of them without the body – being angry for instance, hoping, desiring and perceiving in general (*De Anima*, 402b, 403a).

Therefore, any rendition of some emotion should give an account, not only of its essence, but also of its appearance in matter. In fact, Aristotle demonstrated that the physical aspects of an emotion sometimes are the only indications of its existence (*De Anima*, 403a). This is especially the case in the event of anxiety, where physical symptoms comparable to those of the fear response are experienced in the absence of any apparent stimulus (Lawson-Tancred 1986:129):

But there is an even clearer sign in that when nothing frightening at all happens men find themselves among the affections characteristic of one who is afraid (*De Anima*, 403a).

Accordingly, the study of emotion is not a duty reserved for the logician. It is the descriptions of the physical attributes of emotion by natural philosophers that give real insight into the essence of such an emotion. Aristotle beautifully illustrated this with reference to the emotion of anger (Lawson-Tancred 1986:129):

Definitions, therefore, of the affections will be of the following kind: 'Anger is a kind of movement of the body of the given kind or of a part or capacity of such a body because of one thing and for the sake of another.' Thus it is already within the province of the natural philosopher to have a theory about the soul, either quite generally or about the given kind of soul. But the natural philosopher and the dialectician would give a different definition of each of the affections, for instance in answer to the question 'What is anger?' For the dialectician will say that it is a desire for revenge or something like that, while the natural

philosopher will say that it is a boiling of the blood and hot stuff about the heart. And of these the one will be expounding the matter, the other the form or rationale. For the rationale of the thing is indeed the one given, but it is necessary that this be in matter of the appropriate kind if it is to occur (*De Anima* 403a-403b).

Regrettably, commentary on the physical concomitants of emotion as they relate to an understanding of its essence was never the priority of subsequent philosophy, whose primary goal was freedom from any disturbance by emotions. The little interest in emotion that the Early Stoa had was limited to what Aristotle called its form (εἶδος) and essence (λόγος) (Aristotle, ΠΕΡΙ ΨΥΧΗΣ, 403b:3). Emotions were seen as rational judgements by the founding father of Stoicism, Zeno (c. 335-c. 264), as well as its second founding father, Chrysippus (c. 280-c. 206). The latter was said to define emotion as rational judgements (Galenus, *de Placitis Hippocrates et Platonis*, v 152:1-3, in: Edelstein & Kidd 1972:139. Translation by Kidd 1999:206):

Well, Chrysippus, in *On Emotions*, Bk I [*SVF*, III.461], tries to prove that emotions are judgements of a kind of the rational, while Zeno thought that the emotions are not the actual judgements, but the contractions and expansions, risings and fallings of the spirit that supervene on judgements.

These early Stoic concepts of the rationality of emotion had been severely criticised by the Middle Stoic, Posidonius, and the Late Stoic, Galen, who reintroduced the Platonic notion of emotion caused by distinct faculties outside of reason (Galenus, *de Placitis Hippocrates et Platonis*, v 152, 5-10, in: Edelstein & Kidd 1972:139; translation by Kidd 1999:206):

Posidonius differed from both, and both praised and approved of Plato's doctrine; he opposed the Chrysippean school of thought by pointing out that the emotions were neither judgements nor what supervenes on judgements, but certain motions of distinct irrational powers, given the name by Plato of desiderative and spirited.

Although the Stoics differed about the exact causes and nature of emotion, they all agreed with regard to the need of its control. Their thinking was marked by teleology, seeing the fundamental goal of man to follow the law of nature, or λόγος (Hallie 1967:19). This implied a thorough knowledge of good and bad, hence their fervent interest in ethics. A consequence of a life lived in accordance with the law of nature would be ἀπάθεια (Hallie 1967:21): freedom from all interference of emotions, pain and insecurities of life (De Labriolle 1950:486).

So fundamental was the study of emotion to the Stoic ethics that Posidonius said that all the doctrines of ethical philosophy are bound to the knowledge of the emotions and the powers of the soul to control them (Galenus, *de Placitis Hippocrates et Platonis*, v 150a, 1-10, in: Edelstein & Kidd 1972:137-8; translation by Kidd 1999:204):



And yet Plato too has written wonderfully well on that, as Posidonius points out as well; he admires Plato, calls him divine, and respects his philosophy on the emotions and mental faculties, and all he has written on preventing emotions rising in the first place, and once they had occurred, their quickest means of stopping. Posidonius says that instruction on the virtues and on the end is also tied to this, and that in short all the doctrines of ethical philosophy are bound as if by a single cord to the knowledge of the powers [or faculties] of the soul ...

Central to the Stoic teaching of self-control were the frequent references to the wise man (σοφός) as ideal personage (Hallie 1967:22). Naturally, the attitude of apathy (ἀπάθεια) was ascribed to him: “apathy is wisdom” (Diogenes Laertius 7, 117, in: De Labriolle 1950:485). All passions were to be moderated or extinguished (Hallie 1967:22; Pearson 1973:195), the only exceptions being joy (χαρά) (cf. Deogenes Laertius 7, 116, in: Chilton 1971:30) and εὐδαιμονία, the happy condition of the soul (δαίμον) when it resembles the deity, or λόγος (Hallie 1967:21).

All these Greek teachings about emotions played a significant role in the development of later theologies and anthropologies. In the second century A.D. Marcion affirmed the apathy (ἀπάθεια) of God, which led him to reject the God of the Hebrew Bible (Wilken 1987:195). Despite having been coined a heretic, his legacy lives on in the numerous examples of modern assertions of the impassibility of God (see below). Another Greek theme in ensuing theologies was the rationality of God’s anger, which was also supposed to make it just (cf. Lactantius, *de ira dei*, 17.12-3, in: Edelstein & Kidd 1972:140). Also, the main emphasis of present-day theology on the anger of man in the Hebrew Bible is on the ethic need of its control (cf. Baloiian 1992).

Regrettably, the purely ethical approach of the mainstream Greek philosophy led to a complete disregard of its material attributes as expressed in the body. As Aristotle illustrated, a rundown of these elements would lead to a better understanding of its essence. However, until very recently, no one was interested in such descriptions. Rather, the ethical and theological aspects of anger remained the pivotal point in later developments. Let us now review the promotion of the above-mentioned Greek thought in later theological conceptions about anger and fear in more detail.

2.2 CONCEPTUAL MODELS OF ANGER IN THE EARLY CHURCH

Marcion’s critique of the ‘demonic’ God of the Old Testament is widely known. He wrote the book, *Antitheses*, which is known only through fragments and allusions in the writings of his critics (Wilken 1987:195). Attempts to fully reconstruct his *Antitheses* through source criticism has been unsuccessful, but a lot could be deduced about his rejection of the Hebrew Bible as the scriptures of false Christianity (Von Harnack 1985:84). According to Von Harnack, one of the main aims of his denunciation of the Hebrew Bible

was to lay bare the merciless judgement and anger of the God of the Old Testament (Von Harnack 1985:85):

Erstlich sollte sie die unbarmherzige "Gerechtigkeit," peinigende Strenge und Grausamkeiten, Leidenschaften, Eifer und Zorn des Welterschöpfers, ferner seine bösen Parteilichkeiten, Kleinlichkeiten und Beschränktheiten, endlich seine Selbstwidersprüche und Schwächen, sein haltloses Schwanken und seine sittlich oft so bedenklichen Gebote und Befehle ans Licht ziehen.

This critique culminated in the claim that this God lies in his promises and is evil in his deeds, as can be seen from Irenaeus of Lyon's critique (*Contre les Hérésies*, 27, 2):

Marcion, ..., qui développa son école en blasphémant avec impudence le Dieu annoncé par la Loi et les prophètes: d'après lui, ce Dieu est un être malfaisant, aimant les guerres, inconstant dans ses résolutions et se contredisant lui-même (Rousseau 1985:118).

Marcion believed that the God of Jesus Christ had nothing to do with, and was superior to, the irritable God of the Hebrew Bible who created the world. He further claimed that Jesus came to reveal an utterly new and strange God, who was of pure goodness and mercy and without wrath or judgement (Wilken 1987:195).

Although we cannot speak of a Marcionite conceptual model of anger, it is clear that he conceptualised anger as something dangerous that needed to be avoided, which is consistent with the Greek goal of ἀπάθεια. Further, his reluctance to ascribe such a passionate and strong emotion to a God, who is supposed to be good, is by no means unique in the history of Christian theology. Contemporary scholarship is permeated by examples of attempts to make of divine anger something purely rational, devoid of impassioned feeling, and therefore, just.

Marcion's critique introduced the problem of impassibility to the Christian theology with special reference to the emotions of God, gods and Christ (Hallie 1950:485). As illustrated above, his teachings were met with severe criticism by Irenaeus of Lyon (*Contre les hérésies* [1985]1, 27, 2). To solve the problem of the Old Testament God's anger, Irenaeus identified it with his love (*Contre les hérésies* [1985]3, 25). Clemens of Alexandria saw the same solution to the Marcionite problem. Instead of separating and contrasting divine love and anger, one should see them as congruent (Völker 1952:83):

Dabei ist es nicht ohne Bedeutung, das Verhältnis von Liebe und Gerechtigkeit, wie es Clemens aufgefasst hat, näher zu beleuchten. Die Abwehr Marcions, der beide göttlichen Eigenschaften auseinanderriss, veranlasste ihn gleich den anderen Vätern zu ernsterem Nachdenken über diese wichtige Frage. Als Resultat ergab sich ihm die enge Zusammengehörigkeit von Liebe und Gerechtigkeit und deren gegenseitiges Sichdurchdringen.

This allows Clemens to occasionally speak of *Good Justice* (Stromata 7, 15, 4; 3, 12, 2) and *Just Goodness* (Paed. 1, 88, 2; 1, 142, 1) while, at the same time, putting divine anger in the context of punishment as a pedagogical instrument (Paed. 1, 64, 3; 1, 128, 2f.; Paed. 1, 70, 3; 1, 131, 6f.) (Völker 1952:83). Völker (1952:84) points out that the pedagogical significance of punishment has its origin in Greek philosophy with Plato. This subordination of divine wrath to love, depicting it as a rational apathetic decision to punish sin, is still present in contemporary theology (cf. Peels 1992; Baloian 1992).

The topic of the anger of man also entered Christian theology under the influence of Stoic ethics. Origen admired the flexible Chrysippean approach to controlling the passions, but he saw the Christian dogma and Gospel as a very successful new method of mastering the emotions (*Contre Celse* 1, 64, 31-5; translation by Borret 1967:257):

Mais les accusateurs du christianisme ne voient pas le grand nombre d'hommes dont les passions et le débordement sont réprimés ou dont les caractères sauvages se trouvent adoucis en raison de notre doctrine. C'était un devoir, à ces gens qui préconisent le bien commun, d'avouer leur reconnaissance à cet Évangile qui par une nouvelle méthode a retiré les hommes de tant de vices; bien plus, de rendre témoignage, sinon à sa vérité, du moins à son utilité pour le genre humain.

Clemens of Alexandria associated emotions with the work of demons (Völker 1952:186). The battle against the emotions was therefore a battle against demons, since emotional components are demonic (Strom. 7, 20, 3-5; 3, 14, 23ff.). The holy should therefore master his passions (Strom. 2, 97, 1), or even eliminate them altogether (Strom. 7, 14, 2). Clemens thus furthers the principle of impassibility, and puts it forward as a prerequisite for knowledge of God (Völker 1952:187).

In the West, the theologians were less optimistic about the human achievability of impassibility (*ἀπάθεια*) in this life. Augustine associated the term with sinless perfection, a state that no one can attain in this life (*De Civitate Dei* 14, 9, 93-101; translation by Bettenson 1972:564):

At this point, we may examine that condition which in Greek is called *apatheia*, which might be translated in Latin by *impassibilitas* (impassibility) if such a word existed. Now, bearing in mind that the reference is to a mental, not a physical condition, if we are to understand it as meaning a life without the emotions which occur in defiance of reason and which disturb the thoughts, it is clearly a good and desirable state; but it does not belong to this present life. For it is not the voice of men of any and every sort, but the voice of the most godly of those advanced in righteousness and holiness, which says, "If we say that there is no sin in us, we are fooling ourselves, and we are remote from the truth." And since this state of *apatheia* will not come until there is no sin in man, it will not come in this present life.

Augustine consequently taught that certain emotions cannot be avoided in this life, but they should be felt in conformity with the Holy Scriptures, that is, governed by their love for God (*De Civitate Dei* 14, 9, 4-9; translation by Bettenson 1972:561):

Among us Christians, on the other hand, the citizens of the Holy City of God, as they live by God's standards in the pilgrimage of this present life, feel fear and desire, pain and gladness in conformity with the Holy Scriptures and sound doctrine; and because their love is right, all these feelings are right in them.

Especially the emotion of fear of sin and eternal judgement is encouraged (*De Civitate Dei* 14, 9, 9-17). This 'fear that is pure' is an act of will with a tranquillity based on love (*De Civitate Dei* 14, 9, 129-32; translation by Bettenson 1972:565):

The phrase 'fear that is pure' signifies without doubt the act of will which makes it inevitable that we shall refuse to sin and that we shall be on our guard against sin, not with the anxiety of weakness, in fear of sinning, but with a tranquillity based on love.

Similarly, Jerome quoted scripture to prove that sinless anger was possible (*Epistula* 13; translation by Labourt 1949:32):

Pour que, nos vieux dissentiments abdiqués, nous préparions pour Dieu une demeure pure en notre cœur. "Irritez-vous, dit David, mais ne péchez pas!"

The implication is that anger can be felt, but it should be controlled. We detect minor differences in the teachings of emotion between the East and the West. Although both strived towards a life without the emotions that occur in defiance of reason and which disturb the thoughts, the West affirmed that emotion could be felt in conformity with the Holy Scriptures.

We are now in a position to summarise our findings regarding the conceptualisation of the emotions of fear and anger in the Early Church. There was a clear distinction between divine and human anger, and between natural and ethical fear:

Divine Anger:

1. Cause: Human sin
2. Appraisal: Rational decision to punish sin
3. Reaction: Just punishment in love
4. Result: Repentance, spiritual growth

Human Anger:

1. Cause: Injustice towards self
2. Effect: Demonic inspired desire to revenge

3. Reaction 1 (sinful): Revenge
- Reaction 2 (ideal): Control

Sinful Fear:

1. Cause: Possible divine anger
2. Effect: Obedience to his laws
3. Result: Fear disappears

Ideal Fear:

1. Cause: Love for God
2. Effect: Obedience to his laws

These conceptions are clearly motivated by theological and philosophical presuppositions, and have little to do with the understanding of anger as reflected in the Classical Hebrew language (cf. Kruger 2000, 2001). As will be seen in the next section, these theological and philosophical preconceptions played a defining role in the modern-day theologies of anger and fear in the Hebrew Bible.

2.3 CONCEPTUAL MODELS OF ANGER IN MODERN THEOLOGY

In this section the major recurrent themes in theological conceptions of anger will be reviewed before an attempt will be made to set out the conceptual models reflected in these. An extensive evaluation of theological approaches to the study of emotion is necessary to show how theological intent can lead to the extrication of emotional content from the conceptions of emotion.

2.3.1 The Stoic Wise man in Pre-War Theology

The influence of Greek philosophy on pre-war theology is conspicuous. Two examples will suffice to illustrate this. Boegner (1878) spoke of the form and essence of anger in order to contrast the divine and human angers; and Kilpatrick (1908) referred to the wise man to illustrate God's just and rational anger.

Boegner, (1878:248) writing about the anger of God says that it is a "notion biblique d'une importance capitale pour l'intelligence de la redemption." This theological vantage point clearly influenced his conception of the biblical understanding of this emotion. For example, he felt the need to distinguish between the nature of divine and human anger by keeping the "essence" and "form" of anger apart; "essence" being the feeling of discontent caused by an external object, and "form" being some violent reaction against this object (Boegner 1878:148). This reminds of Aristotle's theory of the emotions who also spoke of the form (εἶδος) and essence (λόγος) of emotion. Only with him, these two terms were exchangeable (ΠΕΡΙ ΨΥΧΗΣ 403b:3). That what Boegner called "form" Aristotle called "matter" (ΠΕΡΙ ΨΥΧΗΣ 403b:2). According to Boegner, God's anger, being perfect and holy, is totally devoid of the "form" as savage reaction.

Boegner (1878:148) even saw the Hebrew terminology as referring to different degrees of anger, thus supporting such a conceptualisation. The most important metaphor of anger being fire, *חרה* refers only to the burning of *אף*, which is the seat of anger; *קצף* to foam in the mouth because of panting; and *עברה* to anger that boils over. Boegner is patently selective in his choice of terms, and assigned meaning to them to support his predetermined conclusions.

Furthering his theological interpretation of anger in the Hebrew Bible, Boegner (1878:248) regards the “essence” of anger to be passive and natural, whereas its “form” is not only accidental, but also active and moral:

Mais il y a lieu de distinguer, dans la colère humaine, entre l'essence et la forme accidentelle. Cette dernière est le plus souvent entachée de péché, mais il n'en résulte pas que la première le soit également.

This enabled Boegner (1878:249) to define a “holy anger,” ascribed to God, who was in total control of his anger, and able to intensify or reduce it (cf. his gradation of anger terminology above). This puts one in mind of the ancient Greek ideal of emotion control and the theological notion of God being the perfect example to follow.

This is further illustrated by Boegner's (1878:249) justification of divine wrath. As stated by Boegner, God's anger functioned in accordance with the convention of love, its “norm.” God's anger was motivated by his jealousy, which, according to him, testified to the simpler and more profound emotion that we know as love. Because YHWH loved Israel absolutely and perfectly, she, on her part, also had the obligation to love him in the same way. The function of divine anger is therefore to “sanctify” Israel:

La colère divine, c'est le Dieu saint affirmant son droit à l'amour exclusif de sa créature par un feu qui la ramène, si elle se repent, ou qui la détruit, si elle s'endurcit.

In his description of the biblical conceptualisation of anger Kilpatrick (1908:477) also saw the need to emphasise the “finitude and imperfection” of human anger as opposed to the “absolute perfection” of divine anger. His major concern is clearly not to give a psychological account of anger as presented in the Hebrew Bible, but rather to theologially idealise and justify the anger of God as it is directed towards Israel. Therefore, he is quick to point to God's being confronted by the:

... ignorance and slowness of men, ... their self-will and hostility. These awaken in Him such feelings as would be stirred in the heart of a wise and good man, in view of the hindrances and oppositions with which he met in the course of some great and beneficent enterprise (Kilpatrick 1908:477).

Here we see the Stoic concept of the wise man (*σόφως*) combined with the usual attempt to theologially

justify divine outrage. Conveniently, the only function of anger identified by Kilpatrick (1908:477-8) is theological: God seeks Israel's salvation, and his anger is a means of education. This is further justified by his jealousy and love, which were the motivating forces behind his wrath:

He is their husband and Lord; they are his spouse. Sin on their part is conjugal infidelity, the most awful outrage that can be committed against love. In such figures the prophets depict the grief and jealousy of God, and seek to measure the fierceness of His wrath (Ezek 23; Am 3:2; Deut 4:24, 5:9, Zeph 1:18; Ps 78:58) (Kilpatrick 1908:478).

But there was yet another aspect of classical Greek scholarship that was to exert a profound influence on modern research on ancient Israelite conceptions of emotion, namely etymology as a means to get to the essence of something, especially the nature of gods.

2.3.2 The Demonic in YHWH

Attempts to make out of Israel's fear of God something pious and ethical are copious. Otto (1959:26-39) tried to give it a noble quality by describing it as part of man's belief in the *Mysterium Tremendum*. Fear was the emotion the ancient Israelites felt "in the presence of that which is a mystery inexpressible and above all creatures" (Otto 1959:27). He further explained that this fear should not be confused with fear proper. Rather, to ascribe to God יְהוָה, "fright, horror" (Köhler & Baumgartner 1958:38), or even wrath (Otto 1959:32-3), is to put him in the realm of the numinous. Therefore, the biblical teaching of the fear and the wrath of God expresses one thing: awe (Otto 1959:28).

Although Otto (1959:30) admitted that this fear could have stemmed from a "demonic dread" in the "religion of primitive man," it was "later overborne and ousted by more highly developed forms of the numinous emotion."

Cassirer (1925) adopted a more etymological approach to the study of divine nature and emotion. With regard to Greek mythology, he argued that divine names were not mere designations of a reality that still has to be defined theologically. Rather, the name and the being was one and the same thing, so that all the powers associated with the deity were contained in the name (Cassirer 1925:2):

Hier im Reich der Spukgestalten und Dämonen, wie im Bereich der höheren Mythologie schien immer wieder das Faustische Wort sich zu bewähren: hier glaubte man das Wesen jeder einzelnen mythischen Gestalt unmittelbar aus ihrem Namen ablesen zu können. Dass Name und Wesen in einem innerlich-notwendigen Verhältnis zueinander stehen, dass der Name das Wesen nicht nur bezeichnet, sondern dass er das Wesen selbst ist und dass die Kraft des Wesens in ihm beschlossen liegt: dies gehört zu den Grundvoraussetzungen der mythischen Anschauung selbst.

This follows from the fact that, because of the ease through which spiritual experience is triggered, any concept or object can be elevated to the spiritual realm (Cassirer 1925:15). According to Cassirer (1925:15) the Greek *Gattungsbegriff* for these spiritual concepts or objects is δαίμων. The Greeks also knew these demons as *Augenblicksgötter* because of their association with subjective experience, which comes and goes. However, in the course of the development of man and religion, man ceased to be the victim of his own experiences, and started to assign to the gods, not momentary subjective experiences, but that which is dependent on the acts of man (Cassirer 1925:15).

A short, but compelling application of Cassirer's theory to the language of anger in the Hebrew Bible can be found in Boehmer (1926). He (Boehmer 1926:320-1) finds it significant that in most of the instances where the words are used to denote divine anger, they occur without mention of him. He (Boehmer 1926:321) concludes:

Mit Dämonen also, mit Dämonen, die von der höchsten Gottheit noch nicht gebändigt und aufgesogen waren, haben wir es zu tun, wen von "Zorn" in verschiedenen Gestalten und Benennungen die Rede ist.

A belief in these demons, whose essential nature is reflected by words later used to denote anger, is not a prerequisite for such a conclusion (Boehmer 1926:321):

Auch als sie in der Tat längst gebändigt und aufgesogen waren, führten sie in der Sprache ihr eigenes Dasein weiter. Als sie im öffentlichen Leben und offiziellen Kult längst verpönt waren, durften sie insgeheim, im Sonderbewusstsein und im Unterbewusstsein ihr Wesen weiter treiben.

This belief in demons, as weaker and lower gods, predated the formation of the Hebrew Bible, but the etymological proof of its former existence is cogent. For example, *קצף* is very often accompanied by the adjective *גדול*, possibly referring to the pre-biblical belief in a demon with the same name (Boehmer 1926:321). Further, in 1 Chr 21:1 *שטן* is used in parallel with *קצף* of 1 Chr 27:24. These demons, after having been defeated by God, continued their existence as no more than character traits of this God (Boehmer 1926:322).

This explanation also elucidates the warning against the use of the name of God (cf. Lev 24:16), because (Boehmer 1926:322):

... mit der Nennung Gottes, mit dem Gebrauch alles dessen, was irgend mit der Gottheit zusammenhängt, das ganze Heer der von ihm mühsam gebändigten kleineren Geister, der Dämonen, wieder aufgeweckt zu werden drohte und alsbald seine unheimliche Macht auszuüben wieder instand gesetzt zu sein schien.

However, biblical theology was always unenthusiastic to address itself to the dreadful aspect of the fear of God. By way of illustration, Van der Leeuw (1933[1977]:527-36) argued that, although an element of dread with regard to demons and spirits might have survived in the ancient Israelite fear of God (1933[1977]:530), it could best be seen as related to the vague and complex emotion of anxiety (1933[1977]:528-9) expressing itself in awe. Consequently, this “fear” can also include elements of respect and love; and can even be regarded as the prerequisite for experiencing guilt (Van der Leeuw 1933[1977]:530-3).

Becker (1965:v) ascribed the total failure of theology to conduct an objective study of the concept of the fear of God in the Hebrew Bible to the ambition of freeing ancient Israelite religion from the dreadful emotion of fear. After a preliminary study of the etymology and semantics of פָּחַד and other related terms, Becker (1965:55-6) concluded that these roots, in their primary sense, denote an emotion proper, including subjective experience and various accompanying physiological concomitants.

The immense importance of this finding stands in stark contrast with the brevity that Becker treated these terms. He (Becker 1965:1-17) is content to list some seventeen terms for fear and give a brief description of their possible meanings. He (Becker 1965:17-8) regards the other related terms to be of less importance, since they describe ‘real fear’ without limiting the numinous aspect much more than the preferred terminology. As a result, Becker’s characterisation of fear in the Hebrew Bible does not differ much from the conventional view that regards it as a mere theological concept stripped of its emotional and physiological content. The primary meaning of פָּחַד “tremble, quaver” (Becker 1965:1) and the related roots receive passing attention and their semantic development into terms denoting cultic reverence and ethic obedience are overemphasised. This, of course, brings us closer to an acceptable theology of the Old Testament, but not to a better understanding of the ancient Israelite concepts underlying the multitude of terms describing an emotion in glowing terms.

Theologians have been all too embarrassed by the fact that the ancient Israelites based their concept of God on inexplicable terrifying phenomena in nature and history (cf. Becker 1965:37). These were commonly interpreted as his works, or even as his punishments in anger (Becker 1965:38). Although Yahwistic theology succeeded in preventing disturbing features from developing into demonic ones, the ancient Israelites were surprisingly tolerant with regard to various experiences of the divine as conceptualised in the broader ancient Near Eastern world (Keel 1997:221). To a great extent, the Hebrew Bible is a product of this ancient culture, and not only of a number of theologians. Perhaps we owe it to them to see through the theological bias of certain Biblical authors and try to put our own favouritism aside until we came to a real appreciation of the concepts that defined the emotions that governed their relationships with each other and with the celestial. This, in view of the fact that theology has been unable to distinguish between the ethics of love on the one hand, and anger and fear as ‘real’ emotions on the other. Almost all theologies are extremely unforgiving of any notion of the demonic in YHWH, and focussed almost exclusively on his impassable justice in his dealings with ancient Israel.

2.3.3 Rationality and Love in the “Wrath of God” and the “Fear of God”

Mainstream theology always saw it as its responsibility to justify divine wrath (cf. Creel 1986). This was rather comfortably achieved by describing it as a subordinate of divine mercy and justice. This has already been noted in the works of Boegner (1878) and Kilpatrick (1908). However, the suggestions that there might be something demonic ascribed to the nature of YHWH (cf. Boehmer 1926) lead to a more polemic approach on the part of theologians.

Köhler (1966:34-6) saw God’s anger as linked to his holiness. This holiness can be defined as independence of thought and action:

Dass Gott heilig ist, bedeutet hier, dass er in seinen Entschlüssen unabhängig und frei ist. Heilig heisst überlegen, in eigener Vollmacht handelnd. ... Gott ist frei von Rücksichten und Bindungen, seines Willens unbedingt freier Herr, seiner Empfindungen, auch seines Zornes, mächtig, keiner Verantwortung oder Rechtfertigung unterstellt, völlig erhaben, völlig überlegen.

Because of his absolute freedom and ability to self-control he is to be feared (Köhler 1966:35): “Heilig ist gleich erhaben, überlegen und furchtbar.” This assertion clearly identifies fear with awe, and thus defines it as a religious virtue. None is said about its quality as a human emotion that is felt and expressed in bodily sensations.

Aloysia was uneasy with the fact that some manipulated the Old Testament as “a source from which may be drawn instances of swift and dire punishment” (Aloysia 1946:407). Such usage not only leads to rejecting the Old Testament in favour of the New, but also suggests that any manifestation of God’s love in the Old Testament would be rare, or very limited and reserved (Aloysia 1946:407-8).

Her essay on the wrath of God then turns into an ode to the liturgy of the Church, which “abounds in most tender expressions of God’s love and mercy, drawn largely from the Old Testament” (Aloysia 1946:409). She concludes that:

... the actual punishments inflicted by Him are in the temporal order, and because of that, no matter how frightening or how numerous, they are not so severe as the sanctions of the New Testament, in the eternal order (Aloysia 1946:411).

Further, despite the fearful threats expressed by the prophets, there was always the promise of the revoking of the sentence, if only there was evidence of repentance (Aloysia 1946:411). In fact, punishment is always the consequence of sin, and thus it is something that we bring upon ourselves (Aloysia 1946:412). Because of the rationality and control of his anger, we can fear him with a “filial” fear (Aloysia 1946:415):

He does wish His children to fear Him, but with filial fear, and not with the exaggerated dread which must grow out of meditation on God threatening and striking at the least provocation. By such thoughts men are driven from Him, and confidence and love become difficult indeed when terror grips the mind.

Her theological intent allows her to conclude that justice and mercy “can not only be reconciled, but that justice presupposed mercy. It is mercy, however, that exerts the greater force” (Aloysia 1946:415).

Aloysia clearly did not come close to giving an account of anger and fear as they existed apart from theology as real emotions. In fact, experiencing it would be irreverent to God, since the fear of God excludes the possibility of love for him.

Hanson (1946-7:216-8) adopted a similar approach to the problem as Aloysia. One should not reject the God of wrath of the Old Testament in favour of the generous gospel of love revealed in the New Testament (Hanson 1946-7:216). Rather, one should try to see the love behind his wrath.

As point of departure, Hanson (1946-7:216) chose Isa 63:1-9, where divine wrath (Isa 63:1-6) is clearly overshadowed by divine mercy and love (Isa 63:7-9). He claims that the love that is spoken of in these verses are repeated and expounded upon in the New Testament (Hanson 1946-7:217).

Hanson (1946-7:217) takes the argument a bit further in a way that reminds of Boegner (1878) and Kilpatrick (1908) in that he equates love with jealousy as the cause of God’s anger:

God’s love is a jealous love, an absorbing, engrossing love, in the best sense of the word an intolerant love.

This love and jealousy is of a different quality than any other, since it claims the right to our allegiance (Hanson 1946-7:217):

... this is so just because He is God, because when He chooses to enter our lives with His demands upon us, it is no ordinary person whose credentials we can examine, whose authority we can question, but it is God Himself who accosts us, our Creator, our Redeemer, before whom we have of ourselves no status, no ground for arguing.

That being so, if a man rejects God’s love he must fall under God’s wrath, just because it is God who is offering him this love (Hanson 1946-7:217):

Man must encounter that love; if he accepts it, in the form of love; if he rejects it, in the form of wrath.

God’s wrath is therefore simply the other side of his love (Hanson 1946-7:218). Even more, a grasp of God’s love is a prerequisite to understand divine wrath, since it is love that gives it its full significance (Hanson

1946-7:218).

Hanson's definition of divine wrath is intelligibly influenced by his theology. There is not even a modest attempt to describe the phenomenology of anger in the slightest detail (cf. Boegner 1878). It therefore adds nothing to our understanding of the ancient Israelite conception of anger as reflected in Classical Hebrew words and expressions (cf. Kruger 2000).

Morris (1952:142) rightly observed that there "has been a general abandonment of crude and unworthy views of 'the wrath'" in conventional theology. He went on to describe this wrath as an activity, to prevent any false opinion that it was an attribute (Morris 1952:142-3). In doing so, he was in a better position to describe it as an emotion. Indeed, he came close to just such a definition in saying that "God wills to pour out the vials of His wrath upon them who commit sin" (Morris 1952:143). Predictably, however, his theological intent took precedence over an objective rendition of anger as an emotion proper, and he pronounces it as subjugated by divine mercy (Morris 1952:143):

Indeed, it is largely because wrath is so fully personal in the Old Testament that mercy becomes so fully personal, for mercy is the action of the same God who was angry allowing his wrath to be turned away.

His theological intimation becomes further evident by identifying sin as the cause of God's anger, which is therefore just (Morris 1952:144). By contrast, human anger is (Morris 1952:144):

... marred by elements of anger and loss of self-control, and if we feel that these are essential components of wrath we have no option but to discard the term, for we cannot ascribe to God an irrational passion.

In fact, Morris (1952:144) denies that 'passion' belongs to the 'essence' of anger. Rather, it should be seen as moral action, "a fiery zeal for the right in the service of the highest moral ends." On that account, divine anger "is free from the imperfections always associated with it in men" (Morris 1952:144). In addition, it is perfectly compatible with divine love (Morris 1952:145). It can even be seen as "the sterner side of love," or jealousy:

The love of God is a love which is so jealous for the right and for the good of the loved one that it blazes out in fiery wrath against everything that is evil.

The closest Morris came to giving an account of the ancient Israelite conception of anger was in defining it as a fiery will to punish sin. Even this denotation is loaded with theological intent and not of too much use for an understanding of the phenomenology of anger as an emotion in the Hebrew Bible.

Yet another example of the failure to define biblical anger in psychological terms can be found in an article written by Farr. He (Farr 1952:135) found it unfortunate that we should speak of God's "anger," since

it implies a “selfish, malicious or vindictive personal feeling.” Not even attempting to describe the ancient Israelite conceptualisation of anger as a human reality in further detail, he simply defined the anger of God as “the response of His holiness to outbreking sin.”

As most other theologians, Simpson (1988:1134-5) thought of divine anger as outweighed by his mercy. The emotional language used to describe this anger is only to make it more personal. However, rather than viewing it as an emotion, one should regard it as a permanent state of rational retributive justice (Simpson 1988:1135).

This rational retributive justice was never in competition with divine love. The basis of the covenant was God’s desire to love a particular people, and therefore his anger cannot be seen as arbitrary or malicious (Simpson 1988:1135):

His wrath was distinguishable from the usual arbitrary maliciousness of deities of other ancient Near Eastern religions. It was understood as His response to sin, the antipathy of the holy toward that which is unholy, directed especially against Israel’s breaches of the covenant.

Simpson’s unequivocal denial that divine anger was an emotion is regrettable. The colourful way in which it is described goes completely unnoticed and it doesn’t add to our knowledge of ancient Israelite conceptions of this emotion.

Haney (1960:11) makes it no secret that his approach to the study of divine anger in the Former Prophets has as its goal to reconcile this concept with the ethics of justice and the love of God:

The purpose of this treatise is to suggest an interpretation of the wrath of God from selected references in the Former Prophets. The problem entails a consideration of whether or not the wrath of God is an ethical concept true to the character of God in His dealing with sinful men.

To arrive at this end, Haney (1960:13) limits his anger terminology to five roots, of which he dismisses the etymology as insignificant and non-distinctive (Haney 1960:15). He (Haney 1960:13) furthermore completely rejects poetic accounts of divine wrath and replaces them with arbitrarily chosen “stories” that do not even include references to anger, but illustrate the conclusion he wants to arrive at. Not surprisingly, Haney succeeds in defining a divine anger dispossessed of emotional facets of feeling in total harmony with the ethics principles of justice, love and faithfulness:

The very character of God provided the ethical basis for His wrath. His righteousness caused His wrath to be punitive wherever there was sin; His love caused His wrath to be remedial wherever there were repentance and faith; His faithfulness caused His wrath to be condemnatory wherever there were persistent unrepentance and faithlessness. The wrath of

God was never capricious nor arbitrary, but was always exercised in accordance with the ethical principles that governed them (Haney 1960:74-5).

Eichrodt (1961:258-69) was one of the first to explicitly describe anger as an emotion proper before considering it from a theological perspective. He saw the language of anger as pointing to a conception of anger as some inner fire (Eichrodt 1961:258-9):

The inward fire of the emotion of anger is described by חרון and חמה; its operation on its environment, when pictured in terms of 'snorting' by חרר and חא, of 'foaming' or 'boiling over' by עברה, ועם, ועף, and קצף, of the breaking forth of something under pressure by קצף.

This is arguably the closest any theologian came to describing the conceptual content of anger as interpreted by the ancient Israelites and expressed in their language. He also distinguishes himself from the conventional theologising about anger in that he does not consider the anger of God to be essentially different from that of man (Eichrodt 1961:259):

With God, as with men, anger primarily refers to any sort of displeasure and the venting of that displeasure regardless of its particular causes.

Unfortunately, Eichrodt regards the essential nature of divine anger as having been changed by the Sinai covenant. From that moment on, God's anger was seen as the decided "reaction against offence against the covenant or its Creator" (Eichrodt 1961:259). It is simply a testimony to the determination of the covenant God to have fellowship with his people (Eichrodt 1961:262). He denies that God's dealings with man has anything demonic to it (Eichrodt 1961:261):

Even if it is sometimes unintelligible, Yahweh's anger has nothing of the Satanic about it; it remains simply the manifestation of the displeasure of God's unsearchable greatness, and is far above human conception.

Just like all other theologians, Eichrodt (1961:263-4) regards the chief concept in the ancient Israelite understanding of God's anger to have been that of rational, retributive justice. Being strictly limited to punishing judgement, his anger is not eternal, and can be averted by repentance (Eichrodt 1961:266-7).

Eichrodt's account of anger's phenomenology was very promising. Unfortunately, it gave way to the theological aspects of interpretation too quickly. Nevertheless, Eichrodt's study confirms that a lot remains to be said about Classical Hebrew words for anger and the conceptions about anger that they reveal.

Heschel (1962:61) realises that it is the terminology of anger that caused the biggest problems to theologians, who are determined to describe God as loving and just:

As psychological terms, the words suggest the emotional excitement induced by intense displeasure, implying the loss of self-control, compulsiveness, temporary derangement of the mind, and the desire or intent to avenge or punish. Anger is, therefore, a passion which we are urged to curb and to suppress.

He (Heschel 1975:61-4) points out that God's anger, although described by words that suggest something "passionate" is rather "pathos." For him (Heschel 1975:62) pathos is a theological concept that refers to the biblical understanding of divine sovereignty, righteousness, and freedom. Rather than being an emotion with connotations of spite, recklessness, and iniquity, it is a disposition governed by love and mercy (Heschel 1975:63):

As long as the anger of God is viewed in the light of the psychology of passions rather than in the light of the theology of pathos, no adequate understanding will be possible (Heschel 1975:62).

Unfortunately, as long as divine anger is viewed in the light of the theology of pathos as defined by Heschel, no sound understanding of the ideal cognitive model of anger in the Hebrew Bible will be attainable.

Vögtle (1965:1403-5) seems more aware of the authentic way in which God's anger is described in the Old Testament. He (Vögtle 1965:1403) admits that it is sometimes irrational (cf. Gen 32:23-33; Ex 4:24-26; 1 Sam 26:19), but quickly goes on to say that the decided way in which it is designated as God's reaction to sin predominates. He (Vögtle 1965:1404) further deprecates the symbolic language used to speak of wrath by saying that these were apocalyptic and discontinued in the New Testament:

Obwohl das affektive Element im Vergleich zum Alten Testament – trotz apokalyptischer Verwendung seiner Bilder (Feuer, Hauch, Wein, Becher, Schalen, Posaunen des Zorns) – im Neuen Testament stark zurücktritt, bleibt neben der erbarmenden Liebe auch hier der Zorn Gottes ...

Were Vögtle not so concerned with the theology of human and divine wrath he might have increased our understanding of the ancient Israelite conception of anger. However, he did not even cite biblical references for his so-called affective apocalyptic symbols for anger. Clearly, biblical scholars are intimidated by the explicit way in which the authors of the Hebrew Bible describe divine anger as a passionate emotion comparable to that of human beings. Yet, these conceptions of anger are part of the biblical heritage, and they deserve recognition.

Wolff (1969:59-72) views the fear of God as a notion that should be ascribed to the Elohist in his source critical approach to the problem. As such, it is defined as obedience to the Law of God (cf. Gen 12:10-20; 26:7-11), trust in God (cf. Gen 22), integrity (cf. Gen 42:15f) and the growth of Israel into a great nation (cf. Ex 1:15-21) (Wolff 1969:63-5). Wolff's approach is clearly theological and avoids the question as to the

essential qualities of fear as a human emotion.

With regard to human anger, Stöger (1970:1006) is interested only in its ethics. It is “justified and holy only in as far as it vindicates the rights of others and especially God’s sovereignty and sanctity.” Further, it is clearly condemned in the wisdom literature, where it is said to result in injustice and work disaster (Prov 14:17; 29:22). Stöger (1970:1006) also points out that it was said to destroy health and impedes on God’s mercy (Prov 27:4). Only fools are quick-tempered (Prov 14:29; 15:18; 16:32; 14:17, 29) (Stöger 1970:1006). Stöger maintains that God even punishes anger at the good fortune of the wicked, since they would be judged by himself (Prov 24:17f; Ps 37:7-9).

Stöger (1970:1006-7) is also of the opinion that the use of anthropomorphism was discontinued in later periods, so that the biblical authors cease to ascribe anger as an emotion to God. It was therefore no longer described “as an inner fire, and its effect as the snorting, foaming, boiling, and bursting of pent-up energy (see Isa 30:27f; 34:5-10).” Instead, God’s anger was replaced by ‘Satan’ (1 Chr 21:1) (Stöger 1970:1007). Further, the incomprehensibility of God’s anger should not be seen as ‘demoniacal,’ since the expression of his displeasure is not arbitrary (Stöger 1970:1007). His anger is a reaction against man’s violation of the covenant and sin.

He (Stöger 1970:1007) further sees a pattern in the wrath of God as depicted in the period of the judges and kings. Apostasy was followed by God’s wrath, which, on its turn, led to repentance. In the prophets it was seen as motivated by his offended love (Hos 5:10; 8:5; Isa 9:11). The exile was also seen as the result of God’s wrath (Am 5:18f). In the prophetic books even the fate of the individual was interpreted as caused by divine discontent (Job; Ps 88:16f; 90:7f). God’s mercy is seen in the fact that he gives time for repentance (Jon 4:2) (Stöger 1970:1008).

Stöger’s account of anger is noticeably inspired by theological and ethical considerations, which leads him to belittle the figurative language used to describe divine anger. He regards anger as a dangerous emotion that should be controlled and that can be contrasted with that of God, which is devoid of passion, controlled and just.

Derausseau (1970) approaches the problem of the fear of God from the perspective of religious development. Analysing the use of the root $\text{סָׁרַ$ in the Hebrew Bible as employed by authors and editors, he comes to the conclusion that the fear of God is intimately linked to the belief in God the Father (cf. New Testament) (Derausseau 1970:359). In its early stages, religion was a religion of the mother, particularly in the agrarian civilisations (Derausseau 1970:359). In this stage, fear was hardly present:

La peur y est fort peu marquée; ce qui domine c’est le sentiment océanique de plénitude heureuse, la fusion affective dans l’indistinction des personnes.

In addition, everybody experienced him- or herself as part of the whole, devoid of personality. Consequently, this stage was also characterised by a lack of a concept of morality (Derausseau 1970:359-60).

The second development was that of the belief in what Otto (1959) called the *mysterium tremendum* (Drousseau 1970:360). This was a sign of growth towards maturity, since the existence of something other than the self was recognised. This “Other,” however, was numinous, incomprehensible and holy, which inspired a dreadful fear in man (Drousseau 1970:360).

The Hebrew Bible revealed a religion of the Father, based on his authority and love. The Yahwist contrasted itself with the source documents of the South, in that it did not depict God as menacing and mysterious (Drousseau 1970:361). The emotions created by a relationship with YHWH are that of joy, security and optimism (Drousseau 1970:362). The Elohist traditions of the North are marked by a reaction to idolatry and vassal treaties (Drousseau 1970:362). Accordingly, the fear of God could best be described as “love” in the treaty sense of obedience and service (see also, Moran 1963:77-87; Thompson 1977:475-81; Muffs 1992). This fear was marked by severity, since the father laid down the rules and demanded absolute obedience. The idea of morality and obedience of the law occupied a special place in this phase of religious development (Drousseau 1970:363).

The concept of the fear of God in the wisdom literature was stripped of all emotional content (Drousseau 1970:363). Here it referred to moral behaviour that resulted in joy. Eventually, God was seen as the loving and tender father, who, through the ages, leads his child to adulthood through teaching him/her about reality and responsibility.

Drousseau’s chronicle of the fear of God beautifully put it in its proper historical and developmental context. It also allows insight into the possible psychological development of the emotion in children, but the theological intent to relieve it from emotional content was all too obvious. One is left with a view of fear that has no sensational or physical elements - which is, in fact, no emotion at all.

Tasker (1980:1657) describes divine wrath as “the permanent attitude of the holy and just God when confronted by sin and evil ...” It is the righteous side of his love that prevents it from becoming pure sentimentality. Tasker (1980:1657) regrets that divine anger has to be described in human language:

His wrath, however, even though like his love it has to be described in human language, is not wayward, fitful or spasmodic, as human anger always is. It is as permanent and as consistent an element in his nature as is his love.

He (Tasker 1980:1657) therefore regards it to be part of the so-called *Tun-Ergehen Zusammenhang* where “the injustice and impiety of men, for which they have no excuse, *must* be followed by manifestations of the divine wrath in the lives both of individuals and of nations.” The only escape from this divine order in the world is repentance, which leads to God’s wrath being tempered with mercy.

Rejecting the Classical Hebrew language as appropriate for an apt description of divine anger and viewing it as an attribute makes it impossible for Tasker to denote it as a real emotion that was conceptualised according to the feelings associated with it.

Westermann (1981:147-56) is one of the few scholars who started their study with a commentary on the phenomenology of anger. He (Westermann 1981:147) defines anger as a reaction to something that happened. Moreover, it is an emotion that is characterised by heat, which can burst into flame or cool down. Most importantly, it has a beginning and end.

The concept of heat related to anger is also expressed in words referring to the bodily expressions of anger, such as הָרָחַק and אֵת (Westermann 1981:147). He (Westermann 1981:147) also makes the important observation that the emotion cannot be limited to the human psyche. It affects man in his totality.

However, Westermann's main goal is not to give a rendition of the phenomenology of anger. Instead, he is interested in an understanding of God's anger as described in relation to the history of Israel (Westermann 1981:145). To achieve this, he adopts a diachronic approach.

For his study on divine anger in the deuteronomistic literature, Westermann (1981:150) chooses Ex 32-34 as a model. He concludes that God's anger is usually ignited by disobedience on the part of his people. However, prayer could be used successfully to calm his anger down.

In the prophets, divine anger was intimately bound to the concept of judgement (Westermann 1981:152). The cause, however, stayed the same as in Exodus 32-34, namely, the disobedience of his people. The pattern that divine anger followed in the prophets was uncomplicated: Israel guilty – divine anger – divine judgement (Westermann 1981:153). The pivotal point here is that anger was not presented as something irrational. On the contrary, it was necessary.

Reinelt (1982:1934-6) also enters into a polemic with those who ascribe demonic characteristics to God. Those places where his wrath seems incomprehensible (cf. Ex 4:24-26; 1 Sam 6:19) can be explained with reference to ritual transgressions (Reinelt 1982:1935). One should see his anger as balanced out by his justice and mercy (Reinelt 1982:1935). Again, no attempt is made to give an account of non-theological conceptions of anger or fear.

Bible dictionaries and lexicons usually include an etymology, distribution and meaning of the words listed and, as such, they are invaluable sources in the search of emotional meaning. However, Botterweck, Freedman and Lundbom's (1973:182-88) treatment of the root הָרָחַק in the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* does not prove to be of too much use for a better understanding of the ancient Israelite conception of anger. They (Botterweck *et al.* 1986:171-2) list all the possible meanings of the root in the different formations, and its use with other roots also denoting anger, such as קָצַף "to be angry" (Köhler & Baumgartner 1958:848) and כָּעַס "to make discontent, grief" (Köhler & Baumgartner 1958:449) is pointed out.

One advantage of this study is that הָרָחַק is viewed as referring to an emotional response, since the authors' (Botterweck *et al.* 1986:172-3) analysis of the root's usage in the Old Testament identifies situations in which anger occurred, followed by a citation of polite circumlocutions in the speech of the patriarchs intended to avert another's anger.

Fuhs (1990:290-315) agrees with the opinion that “fear” should be regarded as the earliest term for religion in Biblical Hebrew. He (Fuhs 1990:300-4) argues that the numinous nature of fear is still clearly visible in several Old Testament passages. However, he refrains from commenting further on the nature of this emotion and contends himself with pointing to the development of fear into love as loyalty to the God of the Covenant (Fuhs 1990:306-9), fear of God as a moral response (Fuhs 1990:309-13) and devotion to the Torah (Fuhs 1990:313-4). The ancient Israelite conception of fear as an emotion remains a mystery.

Herion (1992:989-96) is well aware of the influences of Greek philosophy on the theological characterisation of anger. To avoid imposing such non-Semitic ideas on the concept of divine anger, he first gives consideration to the Classical Hebrew terminology of anger and their meanings (Herion 1992:990).

For Herion (1992:991) the key to a sound understanding of divine anger lies in emphasising it as a “pathos,” which, according to his definition, is “an act formed with care and intention, the result of determination and decision.” Pathos is to be contrasted with “passion,” characterised by loss of self-control, and typical of human anger in the Old Testament (Herion 1992:991):

“Passion” can be understood as an emotional convulsion which makes it impossible to exercise free consideration of principles and the determination of conduct in accordance with them. Although the Old Testament discusses human anger much less frequently than divine wrath, it tends to portray human anger as such as a loss of self-control and then censures it, particularly in the wisdom writings.

God’s anger, on the other hand, is controlled and ethical (Herion 1992:991-2). Relating historical events to the divine will, wrath is legitimately occasioned by human offences against the righteous intent of God.

Herion (1992:994-5) further argued that references to the wrath of God could be a device to acknowledge his omnipotence, since it could be analogous to the calculated and disciplined control over human affairs. Thus, (Herion 1992:995) “YHWH’s wrath is a component not of emotion but rather of omnipotence.”

Although the introduction to Herion’s study seems to hold promise in that he promised to give a true account of the Semitic understanding of anger, it can only be described as a complete failure to see anger freed from theological notions. As a “passion” in humans it has to be controlled, and in God it has nothing to do with this sinful emotion.

Seeing that the Classical Hebrew language describes anger as an emotion, one would expect that Hebrew Lexicons and Dictionaries would be valuable sources of information about the ancient Israelite conceptualisation of anger. However, even these sometimes give evidence of theological bias.

The theological approach of Van Pelt and Kaiser’s (1997:527-33) definition of the meaning of אָרָץ becomes evident in their association of fear with respect and worship (Van Pelt & Kaiser 1997:527-9):

The concept of terror can be weakened to express respect, which can once again be

intensified to express worship.

They avoid describing fear as an emotion with physical concomitants, and only identify certain possible causes of fear (Van Pelt & Kaiser 1997:528-9).

Let us now consider the entry of the root אָנָן in the *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Struthers (1997:462-5) analyses the etymology, distribution, semantic field and theological nuances of the verb אָנָן and its derived noun אָנָן . She shows how, in the case of אָנָן , the meanings of nose and anger can overlap (Job 4:9; Ps 18:15[16]). She (Struthers 1997:463) notes that אָנָן conveys an intense emotional state:

To be angry is not simply being upset or indignant at someone or something. It is the type of anger in which the face may turn red and the passions are aroused. This type of anger in humans may indicate an irrational, out-of-control anger (cf. Num 22:27; 1 Sam 20:30).

Pointing to the possible significance of language for our understanding of the ancient Israelite interpretation of bodily changes accompanying the emotion of anger, Struthers comes close to giving a clear account of the nature of anger in the Hebrew Bible. However, her remarks about the cognitive and psychological components of the emotion quickly give way for theological observations. For example, after characterising human anger as intense and emotional, she contrasts it with God's anger, which was "rational and controlled." This, and the fact that she considered a limited number of roots belonging to the same semantic field (חָמָה , עִבְרָה , זַעַף , קִצָּף and רָחַח), means that her entry does not come close to a comprehensive survey of anger concepts in the Hebrew Bible.

Sauer (1997:472-4), writing about חָרַה "to burn" for the *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament* (cf. *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament*), points out that the root is used only figuratively in the psychological realm. Although it has אָנָן as subject in two-thirds of all its occurrences it is not necessary to trace the two terms back to their basic meanings ("the nose burns"). Sauer (1997:473) also lists the other nominalizations related to this root. חָרַי "inflammation," as well as חָרָוֶן "heat" mostly appears in a construct combination with אָנָן so that the basic meaning of "burning" survives. Unfortunately, Sauer does not include any remarks as to the significance this might have had for our understanding of the ancient Israelite conceptualisation of their bodily experience of anger (cf. Smith 1998:432).

Klopfenstein (1997:33-43) points out that the root גָּעַר "to rebuke" (Köhler & Baumgartner 1958:191) is often used in the context of anger (Isa 51:20, 54:9, 66:15; Nah 1:4). More specifically, it suggests God's defeat of the forces of chaos in language reminiscent of the Ugaritic myth of Baal's fight against the sea monster, Yam (cf. Nah 1:4) (Klopfenstein 1997:35-6). Thus, it has its *Sitz im Leben* in the cult, where it was used to worship YHWH for his potency in keeping the threatening foreign powers at bay (cf. Ps 76:7) (Klopfenstein 1997:38-9; see also, Brüning 1998:250-5).

Although Klopfenstein's main intent is to put the wrath of God in a positive light, he shows how mythic language could be used, consciously or subconsciously, to speak of historical events (Klopfenstein 1997:43). Whatever the fear of Israel at that moment in time, it was symbolised as a sea monster. This latter idea can therefore be seen as a prototype of objects to be feared in the conceptualisation of ancient Israel.

Faessler's (1997:91-108) primary goal was to describe "*La 'sainte colère' de Dieu biblique.*" His rendition betrays a strong influence by Westermann (1981). He (Faessler 1997:93-7) also begins his study with an account of the phenomenology of anger, which later allows him to contrast divine and human anger (cf. Westermann 1981:147). What is more, he (Faessler 1997:97-108) also used Exodus 32-34 as a model for the Biblical teaching of the wrath of God (cf. Westermann 1981:148).

Faessler regards a sharp distinction between divine and human anger as the key to a biblical understanding of this emotion. To illustrate how these two kinds of anger were diametrically opposed, he presents an interpretation of the story of the Golden Calf in Exodus 32 (Faessler 1997:97-108). He views human anger in the Hebrew Bible as characterised by impatience, blindness, uncontrollability, and loss of speech. By contrast, divine anger always returns to him and is never expressed:

celle de Dieu ..., ancrée dans la sainteté, revient sur elle-même, et celle de Moïse ..., perdue dans l'émotion humaine, se prolonge en violences (Ex 32, 1-29) (Faessler 1997:98).

Baloian's (1997:377-85) theological intent, too, dominates his understanding of the conceptualisation of anger in the Hebrew Bible in that he considers the language of anger mainly with reference to their distribution and the fact that the same words are used of both human and divine anger (Baloian 1997:377). No attempt is made to understand the Biblical Hebrew words for anger's conceptual content beyond the primary meanings as rendered by dictionaries (see also, Baloian 1992:5-7).

Baloian's main emphasis was the need for anger control. In both his monograph (Baloian 1992:20-8) and his article (1997:377-8) the introduction is followed by an account of the biblical admonitions to control anger (Ps 37:8; Prov 12:16, 17:27, 19:11), and to avoid situations wherein they may be elicited (Prov 29:8, 20:3, 25:23, 25:17).

Again, as with most of the above-mentioned scholars, Baloian's foremost concern proves to be some justification of divine anger at the cost of describing the cognitive, psychological and physical components of the emotion process as clearly described in the Hebrew Bible.

Baloian's (1997:380-2) intent to describe divine anger as unemotional provides further evidence of his theological bias. He (Baloian 1997:377-81) explains that, whereas human anger may be caused by frustration, pride and injustice, divine anger should be seen in the context of his "resolve." For Baloian (1997:380-1) divine anger is not so much an emotion as it was judgement proceeding from a just, legal context. Therefore, the writers of the Hebrew Bible try their best to justify these acts of wrath, and almost always include some motive clause as explanation (Baloian 1997:381-2).

The above examples clearly show that most of the studies of anger in the Hebrew Bible are theologically motivated. This inevitably results in a biased understanding of the nature and conception of anger. Typically, the rational unemotional divine anger is contrasted with the passionate uncontrollable human anger. Such an account of ire conceals its nature as a human phenomenon with physical and cognitive concomitants.

Certain components of the emotional process, such as its elicitation and expression, are clearly underrepresented and often receive no attention at all. Although these works may have value in teaching the reader important theological truths with regard to certain emotions ascribed to God by biblical authors, their value as systematic descriptions of the cognitive interpretation of emotions in the Hebrew Bible are limited to the bare minimum.

2.3.4 Anger and Fear in Historical Criticism

2.3.4.1 Divine Wrath as a Structural Device

Some studies have approached the references to divine anger from a purely diachronic approach. These are mostly of very little value for a study of the conceptualisation of anger in the Hebrew Bible, since their results only implicate the history of redaction. We need only to refer to a few examples to show the limited value that diachronic studies have for the student of emotion concepts.

McCarthy (1974:97-110) views the mention of God's anger as a structural device in the deuteronomistic history used to contrast the cyclic pattern of history in Deuteronomy, Joshua and Judges with the linear pattern in the history of the kings. The two basic phrases used to speak of wrath are *הכעס את יהוה ב* or *התאנף יהוה*. In addition, McCarthy identifies a provocation formula often used in the deuteronomic history, namely, *הכעס את יהוה*.

The wrath formulae in Deuteronomy, Joshua and Judges invariably occur with a change of leadership (McCarthy 1974:100). It typically starts with an explicit affirmation that the covenant was broken, tied to a proclamation of a divine judgement that coincides with the departure of a leader (McCarthy 1974:101-2). Significantly, in the story of the introduction of the kingship (1 Sam 12) there is no mention of divine wrath. Rather, it is accompanied by a reaffirmation of the covenant. The absence of the wrath formula thus structures history by demarcating the transition from one form of leadership to another (McCarthy 1974:104). In the subsequent deuteronomic history attention is turned away from the people and focussed on the kings (McCarthy 1974:104-5). Divine penalty now affects royalty itself. With regard to the people, there is a diminished insistence on the danger of wrath. This lasts only until the reports of the last reigns. The kings provoke JHWH and insistently lead the people to provoke him, which, as a matter of course, leads to divine wrath in the exile (McCarthy 1974:105). The cycle of Judges therefore also applies to the history of the

kingship.

Although McCarthy's analysis of the structural use of wrath formulae proves interesting, it adds nothing to our knowledge of the conceptual content of anger language and has implications only for theology.

Similarly, Latvus (1998), a student of the Göttingen School, shows that references to divine wrath are the additions of DtrN to DtrH (Latvus 1998:85-6). The major themes of the DtrN editors are the law, other nations, and their idols (Latvus 1998:18-9). Confronted by the hard realities of the exile, they try to relate the concept of God to the question of justice (Latvus 1998:87):

Because they did not want to give up the idea of the powerful God who also guaranteed justice on Earth they had to rationalise the meaning of exile and say that it was caused by the anger of God which in turn was caused by the idolatry of the Israelites.

In as much as the creation of the anger of God was motivated by an attempt to rationalise the exile, the theology of divine anger is motivated by an attempt to rationalise anger. One may ask if the DtrN editors would not have done better rationalizing the exile without reference to anger terminology, since it poses a problem to theologians of all ages.

2.3.4.2 The Fear of God and the Sanctioning of Wisdom Literature

Cazelles (1955:26-32) views the fear of God as it often appears in wisdom literature as unrelated to its teachings. He (Cazelles 1955:28-9) points to the polemic between prophets and sages as revealed in the Hebrew Bible and explains that, after the return from exile, wisdom literature was canonized by equating it to the fear of God, a deuteronomic concept meaning obedience and service of the covenant of God.

Pfeiffer (1965:133-58) sees this attempt to subjugate wisdom to religion as unsuccessful in Ecclesiastes. The fear of God was supposed to denote covenant obedience, but in the context of the vanity and meaninglessness of everything, God himself became distant and incomprehensible. Fear became once again the dread of the numinous in this book (Pfeiffer 1965:158). However, the majority of wisdom literature equates the fear of God (יִרְאַת יְהוָה) with departing from evil and hating it (Clines 1974:12). It therefore repeatedly appears as a parallel to various terms for the law, which allows it to be conceptualised as a source of knowledge and wisdom (Clines 1974:14).

Although the wisdom literature may be a rich source with regard to ancient Israelite concepts of fear, most studies have avoided an investigation of expressions that may illuminate these aspects. As a rule, scholars have centred their attention on the role of the theological concept of the "fear of God" in the endorsement of wisdom literature.

2.3.4.3 The Day of Wrath

Ringgren (1963:110) regards the “Day of Wrath” as a cultic concept, used in worship to celebrate YHWH’s victory over his enemies, especially during the national festivals (Ringgren 1963:113). In the instances where there is talk of the Day of Wrath, YHWH was commonly depicted as a storm- and weather god, who has parallels in the Akkadian hymns about Enlil and Adad.

The only possible significance this might have for an understanding of the Hebrew conceptualisation of emotions is that the Sumerian fears of flooding, expressed in a worship of weather gods, also found entrance into the mind of the ancient Israelites. Because of the exile in Babylon, storms and deluge became part of the prototypes of fear expressed in mythical and religious language.

Eppstein (1968:93-97) argues that the Day of YHWH in Jer 4:23-28 refers to the destruction associated with the land of Judah. The passage depicts a return to primeval chaos brought about by the overthrow of Judah (Eppstein 1968:93-4). Some scholars (cf. Althann 1985:19-28) have tried to show that the qualification of v 27, “I will not make a full end,” i.e., it would not be total annihilation, should not be rejected as a later insertion, even though it does not harmonise with the unrelenting tone of v 28. In this way, theologians have endeavoured to portray the anger of God in a just way, as a punishment, rather than malicious destruction.

Spieckermann (1989:194-208) also associates the Day of Wrath with the exile. He shows how, in the Akkadian hemerological texts the nineteenth day of the month was called “Day of Wrath” (Spieckermann 1989:201) What is more, every day of the month was assigned to a certain deity, which makes it possible to equate the “Day of Wrath” with the “Day of YHWH” (Spieckermann 1989:201-4).

Though it was originally used to speak of the destruction of Jerusalem, the Day of Wrath was increasingly used in a futuristic sense of other nations so that it became associated with hope of redemption rather than dreadful fear of God (Spieckermann 1989:206). God was increasingly seen as slow to anger אִתְּנֶה אַפַּי and repenting from evil רָעָה (Spieckermann 1989:207). This allows Spieckermann to suggest a replacement of the term “dies irae” with “dies illa,” i.e. “that Day,” referring to Israel’s eschatological hope.

Spieckermann’s study proves very insightful, but is of no value for an understanding of the ancient Israelite conception of anger or fear. Like many other theologians, he wants to point to the continual decrease in dread of YHWH in ancient Israel.

2.3.4.4 Vengeance

Füglister (1970:117-33) wishes to point to the justice behind the “prayers for vengeance” in the Psalms. This vengeance was directed against “demonic powers,” which tried to destroy the divine order of the world through the practice of “evil” (cf. Ps 18:4-21) (Füglister 1970:122). In this way, the prayers did not include any element of personal hatred. Rather, the oppressed is YHWH himself. He is also the one who is supposed to take revenge (Füglister 1970:124-5). Far from being prayers for the downfall of personal enemies, they are

prayers for the glorification of YHWH's name (Füglister 1970:126). In addition, the shocking images contained in these prayers should be seen as figurative ways of expressing moods, rather than actual wishes (Füglister 1970:128-9). So, the prayer for violence against children of foreign nations in Psalm 137 should be seen as a figurative way of expressing love for Zion (Füglister 1970:129).

Füglister goes to great lengths to sanctify images of violence in the Hebrew Bible. This is strongly reminiscent of the attempts to rationalise and justify divine wrath. The emphasis falls on the ethics of anger control and justice at the expense of a description of the phenomenology of anger.

Dietrich (1976:450-72) also concerns himself with contrasting the theological concept of vengeance (נקם) with that of psychology. Psychologically speaking, vengeance should be seen as aggression (Dietrich 1976:451). As such, it is socially destructive behaviour in that it hinders the proper functioning of society (Dietrich 1976:452).

By contrast, the נקם of the Old Testament has as synonyms שפט, ג' and פקד, all referring to justice (Dietrich 1976:455). Vengeance is elicited by murder, oppression and spiritual transgressions and as such has a positive connotation (Dietrich 1976:456-7). Just like Füglister (1970), Dietrich (1976:457-8) claims that the language of vengeance is figurative, and that God alone has the right to vengeance. Moreover, prayers for justice are not prayers for the destruction of enemies, but rather for the purification of their sins (Dietrich 1976:464).

Balentine (1989:597-616) affirms that the vengeance of God is not automatic. Several texts in the Hebrew Bible prove the fact that prayer could temper it (cf. Ex 32:7-14; Gen 18). God's wrath is provoked by some serious breach in the relationship with God (Balentine 1989:604), which results in an anticipation of divine judgement. On several occasions, prayers for justice avert God's wrath (Balentine 1989:604-6). The result was that God's integrity and innocence are defended at the expense of human integrity and innocence (Balentine 1989:611).

In his monograph, Peels (1992) limits his study to the meaning of the root נקם and its theological usage in the Old Testament. He comes to the conclusion that vengeance as expressed by the root נקם should be viewed in a positive sense as punishing retribution (Peels 1992:265). The emotional component as expressed in combination with terms denoting anger, such as אף, נטר, חמה, קנאה and נחם is overshadowed by the predominant thought of justice and retribution (Peels 1992:266-7).

All of the studies on vengeance listed above made reference to the psychological concomitants of vengeance only by way of contrast with theological vengeance, which are just and objective. Comparable to the theologies of anger discussed above, the purpose seems to be an elimination of emotional content, which would make the phenomenon suit ethical presuppositions.

Without exception, the foregoing studies approach the themes of anger and fear from a theological perspective. References to the phenomenology of these emotions are made only by way of contrast to emphasise the impassionate nature of divine anger and the ideal fear of God. The conceptual models resulting

from these would be the same as those identified for the theology of the Early Church (see above).

2.4 ANGER IN SOCIOLOGICAL AND ANTHROPOLOGICAL STUDIES OF THE ANCIENT ISRAELITE CULTURE

The value of sociology and anthropology for a better understanding of the Hebrew Bible cannot be denied (cf. Kruger 2000a:137-73). For example, with regard to the emotions, scholars have shown how the fear of supernatural dangers gave rise to purity laws and ritual (cf. Smith 1923:152-4; Frazer 1934; Douglas 1975; Caplice 1974). These findings have been applied successfully by theologians to make sense of the, often ambiguous, purity regulations (cf. Kutsch 1965:28; Wenham 1981, 1983; Wright 1987; Podella 1997).

However, these studies are of limited value to an understanding of the ancient Israelite conception of emotion since they only identify conscious and subconscious causes for fear and its expression in ritual. Therefore, we will restrict our survey of anthropological approaches to those that are expected to have implications for an appreciation of the concepts of fear and anger as they relate to physical experience and expression.

The discovery of the central nervous system and its implications for cognition and emotion in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries led to a slow abandonment of the Greek notion of an incarnated soul. Old Testament scholars then tried to contrast Israelite thinking with that of Greek, claiming that the unity of soul and body was always implied by the ancient Israelites. Therefore, the Greek dualism of soul (πνεῦμα) and body (σάρξ), especially in the Pauline epistles, was foreign to Israelite thinking.

Part of the quest to describe the Hebrew thinking as devoid of dualism, was to show that the words that were usually translated as soul (שֵׁנַה) and spirit (רוּחַ) in fact often refer to material things. Weill (1926:62-3), for example, shows that שֵׁנַה could be used to speak of the throat. Others tried to uncover some holistic Hebrew thinking in the use of such terms.

Robinson holds that the failure to distinguish between the material and spiritual is a common trait of “primitive peoples”:

The primitive Semitic idea of man seems to have been very much like that which we find amongst other primitive peoples, of the ancient or of the modern world. There is no distinction of the psychical and ethical from the physical, so that the actual breath of man can be thought of as his “soul,” and the reek of hot blood identified with this breath-soul. Psychical and ethical functions are considered to be just as appropriate to the bodily organs as the physiological ...” (Robinson 1925:353).

Further, Robinson (1925:354) is of the opinion that the ancient Israelites assigned to bodily organs psychical

functions due to their ignorance of the brain and central nervous system. He develops the notion of a diffusion of consciousness:

Though there was entire ignorance of the nervous system, man's consciousness, with its ethical qualities, was thought to be so diffused through the whole body that the flesh and bones, as well as the mouth, eye, ear, hand, had a quasi-consciousness of their own. Man's organism is in fact a "United States," rather than a monarchic or imperialistic realm.

Robinson limited his investigation to the Hebrew terms נפש, רוח and לב to show how Hebrew psychology was tied up with their conception of the body. He (1925:355) argues that נפש later was used to speak of the body, which suggests that, "the body is the predominant partner in the Hebrew idea of personality." Robinson (1925:361) concludes that נפש and רוח designates the same thing, namely the conscious life of man, associated with the breath as the vital principle. They were used to talk about the "breath-soul" which primarily represented emotional phenomena. In fact, for Robinson (1925:361) it symbolises much more:

... because "spirit" originally denoted an energy acting on man from without, a divine energy, it naturally suggests a higher conception of the life of man, as drawn from God.

This spiritualization of the emotional life of the Hebrew man leads him to declare Saul's anger and madness as "inspired" by the "energy (רוח) of YHWH" (Robinson 1925:358-9).

The rest of the organs denote the "heart-soul," due to its chief importance (Robinson 1925:362-4). לב is used to suggest the mental rather than emotional activities of consciousness. According to Robinson (1925:363-4) its most important and characteristic use is for volition, which is primary in Israelite ethics.

Robinson's unwillingness to accept that body parts could have been used metaphorically to refer to perceived bodily changes accompanying specific emotions is a major drawback in his work. This prevents him (Robinson 1925:354) from recognising a clearer structure in the emotional conceptualisation of the ancient Israelites, and he remarks:

The usage of psychological terms in the Old Testament is not systematic, but syncretistic; a number of originally independent explanations, such as blood-soul, breath/soul, heart, etc. have been brought together by popular use, and have settled down into a sort of working agreement and division of labor, though with much overlapping.

More recently it has been realised that the psychological use of body parts in the Hebrew Bible are due to the actual physical sensations felt during specific emotional episodes (Smith 1998) and that they can refer to specific conceptualisations of such distinct emotions (Kruger 2000, 2001).

Pedersen (1959:99-262) also thought of the Hebrew soul not as part of the body, but rather as denoting

man in its totality. He (1926[1959]:171) refers to the creation story to illustrate this inseparability of body and soul:

The man of clay was a dead thing, but by the breath of God he was entirely changed and became a living soul. Soul and body are so intimately united that a distinction cannot be made between them. They are more than “united”: the body is the soul in its outward form.

Like Robinson, he argues that this idea of unity was essentially expressed by the Hebrew words נפש, רוח and לב (1926[1959]:102-6), but also includes other organs in his review (Pedersen 1959:171-5). These organs are so filled with soul that their movement should not be seen as the expression of inner states. More precisely, these are the activities of the soul itself (Pedersen 1959:176):

All of these examples show how the Israelite sees the soul manifesting itself in the body. It bears witness to his psychological observation and his sense of reality. He concludes not from the movements of the body to an underlying soul, which uses and moves the body, but in the activity of the soul he sees the soul itself.

Pedersen’s major purpose being to designate the Hebrew soul as a totality, he does not care much for an account of the ancient Israelite conceptions of emotions. Nevertheless, he makes a few observations as to how the bodily organs relate to the Hebrew abstractions of emotions.

With regard to the emotion of fear, Pedersen identifies several expressions. The anguished soul is narrow, (Job 7:11; Ps 4:2, 143:11) trembles, (Isa 15:4) and quakes and quivers (1 Sam 4:13, 28:5; Jer 4:19). When this emotion is experienced, the heart (לב) may also melt (Lev 26:16; Ps 107:26) and become like water (Josh 7:5). The emotion of fear is also characterised by not having spirit (רוח) (Josh 5:1 cf. 2:11). Rather than seeing these as expressions of feeling states, he regards them as indicating the loss of “creative power” and the falling apart of the “soul” (Pedersen 1959:150). The bowels can also roar in fear or anger (Isa 16:11). However, Pedersen (1959:173) sees such expressions as allocating mental activity to them.

Pedersen’s descriptions of the ancient Israelite “soul” include a lot of indirect descriptions of several emotions, but unfortunately it lacks completeness and cohesion due to his determination to denote the Hebrew man as a soul. His results are further impaired by his focal interest in the terms נפש, רוח and לב. Yet another important drawback is his simplistic translation of these terms as “soul.” Their metaphoric use with reference to the physiology of the emotions seems to go completely unnoticed. For example, there are instances where רוח clearly refers to the blowing through the nostrils when experiencing an intense form of anger (cf. Job 4:9; Ps 18:15[16]).

Johnson (1964:37) had the same approach to the study of Hebrew psychology as Robinson and Pedersen. References to parts of the body indicate psychic activities, and therefore proof that the ancient Israelites thought of man to be a psychophysical whole:

The conception of man as a psycho-physical organism may be seen equally clearly when one examines the use of the terminology for the various parts of the body; ... they are sometimes spoken of as themselves actively engaged in some form of personal behaviour or as characterised by some personal quality.

Johnson (1964:2-3) makes נפש the main focus of his study, but maintains that “the soul-stuff or soul-substance is perceived, not only in the various members and secretions of the body, but also in a more extended form in whatever bears traces of contact with him.” For example, he illustrates how the face could reveal various emotions, moods, and dispositions (Johnson 1949:40-1). It is described as expressing anger (Gen 31:2, cf. v 5), joy (Job 29:24), fear (Isa 13:8; Ezek 27:35; Joel 2:6; Nahum 2:11), anguish (Jer 30:6), or some corresponding form of distress (Gen 40:7; Job 16:16; Eccl 7:3; Neh 2:2,3).

Johnson (1964:6-7) is one of the first to admit the metaphoric use of body parts to speak of physiological changes accompanying certain emotions. About נפש he writes that it was used to denote breathing as a metonymy of anger:

Indeed there is something of a parallel in the case of the term נחש, which could be used equally well of the ‘nostril’ and of that quick nasal breathing which is indicative of anger.

Johnson’s work added valuable insight in the ancient Israelite conception of a wide range of emotions. Unfortunately, he often glosses over the use of emotion terminology and presents no integrated conceptual model for distinct emotions.

Johnson (1964:39) also criticises Robinson’s theory of the “diffusion of consciousness” on the basis that the different parts of the body are often used as synecdoches for a man’s person or self as a whole. For example, the bones (sg עצם) are said to decay or become soft with fear or distress (Hab 3:16; Jer 23:9) and so “provide an obvious parallel to the term נפש” (Johnson 1964:67-8). Unfortunately, in seeing עצם as a synecdoche for נפש, its obvious metaphoric use to refer to bodily sensations as felt in the event of fear is ignored.

Von Meyenfeldt (1950:137-42) gave only passing attention to the heart being used in the context of emotion. He saw its primary function as reinforcing emotions such as distress and joy. This is especially true when used with the prepositions על and אל (Von Meyenfeldt 1950:137):

Beide voorzetsels zijn richtingaangevend, in dit geval de richting van de oppervlakte naar de diepte. Het is geen overdreven, maar *echte* smart

The incomprehension of subjective feeling as source of these expressions is once again striking. This is also true of his review of לב’s use to speak of other emotions. With regard to fear, for example, he lists the passages where it occurred, noted that the heart is said to become weak, melt away, and shiver (Von

Meyenfeldt 1950:139-40). From this he concluded that the heart was conceptualised as a mouldable or fusible substance (Ned. *kneedbare of smeltbare massa*), and a suitable breeding place for anxiety (Von Meyenfeldt 1950:140). No further attempt is made, however, to give an account of the cultural conceptualisation of these emotions as they relate to subjective experience. Hence, the insights gained remain superficial and incomplete.

Köhler (1953:101) is very reluctant to attempt a coherent and understandable description of the psychological world of the ancient Israelites, since he feels that such an exercise would be futile. He (Köhler 1953:101) is of the opinion that the emotional life of an ancient culture is relatively “dry” compared to that of a contemporary culture. By “dry” he does not mean cold-blooded. About the ‘Hebrew Soul’ he claims:

Sie ist rascher, aber nicht bloß rascher, sondern auch stärker, leidenschaftlicher, bis ins äußerste hinein bewegbar und erregbar (Köhler 1953:109).

Unfortunately Köhler (1953:101) does not believe that a description of the ancient Israelite conception of emotion would be possible, since, according to him, modern cultures had complex systems of emotional meaning, and it would be too difficult to describe psychological phenomena of an ancient culture in modern words and concepts:

Darum wäre es unzulässig, in einem geschlossenen Gefüge die Einzelseiten des geistigen Bildes des hebräischen Menschen abhandeln zu wollen. Viele Seiten blieben inhaltslos, und das Ganze der Darstellung böte sich als ein trockenes und wenig, wenn nicht nichts sagendes Nacheinander von Angaben dar.

Dhorme (1963) comes close to a systematic description of the psychology of ancient Israel by taking a close look at their metaphoric use of body parts. He is not interested in proving the homogeneity of an Israelite person, which allows him to see the real metaphoric value of the countless anatomic references in the Old Testament. Dhorme (1963:3) is concerned about the insufficiency of classification in dictionaries and wants to investigate the development of metaphoric meaning in Hebrew and Akkadian literature. A comparative study would not only reveal how the same images were used in different Semitic cultures, but also throw light on the more specific metaphoric use by biblical poets (Dhorme 1963:3).

One brief example will suffice to illustrate his sensitivity to the origin of metaphors in sensation. About the nose, Dhorme (1963:80-1) holds that it was above all the organ of breathing, and it was the acceleration of nasal respiration that struck the Israelites as a symptom of anger. This symptom can be regarded as the source for the metaphor, *נִשְׁמַת נַחֲשׁוֹת*, "breath of the nose," which is used to designate anger (Job 4:9). As might be expected, *אֵרָא* and *אֵרָאָה* became synonyms for anger (Dhorme 1963:81). Dhorme (1963:81) clearly affirms that these expressions are due to the effects of anger on breathing: “Ce qui a permis cet usage, c’est l’influence de la colère sur la respiration” (Dhorme 1963:81). He goes on to illustrate how this physical

concomitant of anger gave rise to other related metaphors:

Ainsi, dans Sir 5:11, nous aurons ארך רוח “longueur de souffle” pour représenter la patience, le retard apporté à la colère. Mais, dans Prov 25:15, ce sera ארך אפים “longueur des narines” avec le même sens.

Although Dhorme is aware of anger’s association with the heat metaphor (Dhorme 1963:81), he fails to illustrate that the expression איה איה is probably attributable to the redness in the face associated with anger. Furthermore, איה’s use with words expressing heat is far more recurrent than its use with רוח (cf. Kruger 2000). Thus, it is possible that איה’s use to refer to anger could be due to its becoming red during anger rather than its association with breathing.

Dhorme’s cognisance of the organic basis of metaphors is commendable. However, since his primary interest was isolated metaphors rather than the conceptual models of emotion underlying these, metaphors of great import received only passing attention.

Schmidt (1964:374-90) is concerned about the way in which the ‘concepts’ נפש, רוח, לב and בשר are usually translated. Just like his predecessors (cf. Robinson 1925; Pedersen 1926; Johnson 1964) Schmidt (1964:375) is worried that a translation of these terms might wrongly convey some implied dualisms:

Zwischen der eigenen Wiedergabe und den Texten selbst besteht ein charakteristischer Unterschied in den Begriffen. Die Wahl anderer Begriffe zieht jedoch einen Unterschied in der Sache nach sich. So gewichtige, bei der Exegese oft vorausgesetzte Gegensätze, wie Form und Inhalt, Körper und Seele oder Geist, Physisches und Psychisches oder Geschichte und Natur, sind dem Alten Testament fremd.

Having been a student of Wolff (cf. *Anthropologie des Alten Testaments*, 1973), he wanted to answer the question: “Wie denkt das Alte Testament selbst” (Schmidt 1964:375). He is of the opinion that the answer lies in the *Hauptbegriffen vom Menschen*, namely נפש, רוח and בשר:

... der Sache nach [ist] in allen drei Begriffen nicht jeweils ein Teil des Menschen neben anderen, sondern der Mensch als ganzer und als Einheit gemeint (Schmidt 1964:376).

Schmidt goes on to list all the different possible meanings of these terms. Unfortunately, his analysis of their use with relation to emotion is very brief. Like Dhorme (1963), he points out that to be “short of נפש” meant to be impatient (Num 21:4; Judg 10:16, 16:16; Zech 11:8), whereas being “long of נפש” denoted patience (Ezek 6:11), “denn bei Ungeduld atmet man schneller, während eine ‘langatmige’ Rede die Geduld des Hörers beansprucht” (Schmidt 1964:380). He (Schmidt 1964:382) argues that רוח is often used to designate the seat of feelings, and can become bitter, or anguished (Gen 26:35). Similarly, לב could shiver when afraid

(Isa 7:5; cf. Ps 27:3) (Schmidt 1964:383-6).

Schmidt's focus on the terms נפש, רוח, לב and בשר is a major flaw, but at least he is aware of the fact that some expressions on the subject of emotions had their origin in subjective experience.

Collins (1971:18-38) takes the view of the unity of the Hebrew body and soul a step further. He argues for a psychosomatic conception of grief where distressing circumstances produced a physiological reaction in man that actually changes his somatic composition:

This physiological disturbance is actually a change in the physical composition of the inner organs, a general softening up, which initiates an outflow of the body's vital force. This outflow proceeds through the throat and eyes, and issues in the form of tears which are nothing less than the oozing out of the body's vital force (Collins 1971:18).

He (Collins 1971:20) took Lamentations 2:11 as his point of departure, where the liver (כבד), as a synecdoche for intestines (מעיים), was said to be poured out (שפך). Further, also in the context of grief, we read in Lamentations 1:20: נהפך לבי בקרבי. Instead of translating this as "my heart turned within me" (cf. Köhler & Baumgartner 1958:240), Collins (1971:30) contended that the ni הפך actually referred to a physical change of composition. This rendition seems less plausible in the light of the fact that the ni הפך meaning "to be changed" is usually followed by the preposition ל (cf. Köhler & Baumgartner 1958:240) which in this case it is not. Rather, it is followed by בקרבי, which clearly means "within me" (cf. Köhler & Baumgartner 1958:853).

In a second part of his paper on the *physiology of tears* in the Old Testament, Collins (1971:184-97) demonstrates how his theory could help to avoid confusing weeping descriptions from that of sickness.

One can easily associate with Collins' attempt to lay bare the ancient Israelite conceptions of emotions as preserved in the poetic vocabulary "in a fossilized form long after the original understanding was dead and forgotten" (Collins 1971:19), but care should be taken not to take an interpretation too far when the evidence is not convincing.

Wolff's (1973) approach to ancient Israelite psychology does not differ much from that of Robinson (1925), Pedersen (1926), Johnson (1964) and Schmidt (1964) in that he makes specific terms (*G. Begriffe*) his point of departure in his attempt to describe ancient Israelite anthropology. His list of principal terms includes the usual נפש, רוח, בשר and לב (Wolff 1973:21). Again, the main concern is to prove that these terms did not reflect any dualism in thinking:

Wenn die häufigsten Hauptwörter in der Regel mit "Herz", "Seele", "Fleisch" und "Geist" übersetzt werden, so sind damit folgenschwere Missverständnisse erzeugt worden. Sie gehen schon auf die altgriechische Übersetzung der Septuaginta zurück und verführten zu einer dichotomischen oder trichotomischen Anthropologie, in der der Körper und die Seele

und der Geist in Gegensatz zueinander geraten (Wolff 1973:21).

Consequently, as with the other anthropologists, these terms' use in emotional contexts received only secondary attention. For example, Wolff (1973:35-7) thinks that נפש, although often used in relation to several different emotions, primarily denoted 'man in need'. When meaning "throat" it can also mean "breathing," just as "nose" can be used metaphorically to denote "breath," so that "das Organ der Atmung und der Atem selbst zusammengesehen werden" (Wolff 1973:29). Again no structured conceptual model for any emotion is attempted.

Lauha (1983:22) is aware of the limitations of an attempt to find emotional meaning through an exclusive focus on the terms נפש, רוח and לב. He (Lauha 1983:10-24) criticises the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, as expressed by Wolff (1973), Pedersen (1926) and Johnson's (1964[1949]) theory that ancient Israelite language determined Hebrew thinking. Rather, everyone is born with a pre-programmed universal grammar, which means that there is no word or concept in one language that cannot be adequately translated into another (Lauha 1983:15). Further, Lauha (1983:24-30) sees a distinct danger in any approach that limited its investigation to isolated terms. This, he claims (Lauha 1983:26-7), could lead to illegitimate meanings being ascribed to such words. One should rather identify a semantic field and consider all the different words that add to the meaning of this concept (Lauha 1983:24-28).

Lauha applies this theory to the concepts נפש, רוח and לב to indicate how they are used with other roots to typify joy, mourning and pain, courage, fear, pride, humility, love, hate and anger. Let's consider his results with regard to the emotions of fear and anger.

In Deut 28:65-66 the parallel expressions of לב רגז and כליון עינים are used to describe physical symptoms of פחד, as roots denoting fear (Lauha 1983:144). Similarly, חרד, which is commonly used on its own to designate anger, can be used to express trembling of the heart (1 Sam 4:13; 28:5) (Lauha 1983:145). Lauha (1983:146-8) also identifies other roots denoting fear through movement, especially shivering. When the heart is used in connection with these, it should not always be regarded as a synecdoche, but rather as referring to the physical symptom of shivering. נפש, רוח and לב are also used with roots denoting weakness to illustrate the loss of courage associated with fear (Lauha 1983:149-55).

לב is also used with expressions of heat to speak of anger (Lauha 1983:224). In Deut 19:6 it is said of a person that takes revenge that his heart burns: כי חמם לבבו (see also Ps 39:4). The imagery of fire (אש) and smoke (עשן) is also quite common in this context (Lauha 1983:224). נפש and רוח can also denote anger on their own (Lauha 1983:227). In Proverbs 29:11 the expression רוחו יוציא means giving free vent to one's anger (Lauha 1983:152).

Lauha identified numerous roots and expressions for anger and fear. However, since he was primarily interested in the semantics of נפש, רוח and לב he showed little interest in the possible conceptual content that these might have had. For example, he declines any attempt to link anger with breath (Lauha 1983:228).

Nevertheless, his lists of words relating to the semantic field of distinct emotions are comprehensive and estimable.

Lauha's study by no means heralds the cessation of endeavours to see in נפש, רוח and לב a Hebrew anthropology of unity. Ben-Chorin (1986:55) denied the existence of a Pauline dualism between body and spirit in the Hebrew Bible. For him, נפש and רוח are encompassed by the body בשר.

Brotzman (1988:400-9), too, saw נפש as a key term whose meaning pointed to a holistic view of man. He concludes (Brotzman 1988:407) that נפש basically meant "being" or "creature" as a unit, and that this:

... is decidedly opposed to the common Greek idea of a "soul" imprisoned in a body, and to the idea expressed by some branches of Protestant and Roman Catholic thought that the pathway to righteousness is found by downplaying the body and encouraging "the higher part of man."

With regard to the emotions, Brotzman (1988:403-4) simply points out that the semantic fields of נפש and רוח could overlap and they were used to allude to such emotions as impatience, bitterness and sadness. רוח on its own was used to speak of pride, humility, anger and self-control (Brotzman 1988:404). No consideration is given to its possible use as a tool to express conceptual meaning with regard to emotion (cf. Cant 5:6).

Schroer and Staubli (1998:68-73) were also quick to point to the inadequacy of ψυχή to translate נפש: "Denn die Seelenbegriff der griechischen Philosophie ist mit der hebräischen Vorstellung von der נפש überhaupt nicht zu vergleichen" (Schroer & Staubli 1998:68). Its application to express emotion did not come into play in their work. Rather, emotion is localised in the organs (Schroer & Staubli 1998:75). For example, the liver כבד was associated with grief (Lam 2:11) and happiness (Ps 16:9) (Schroer & Staubli 1998:77). Also the heart and kidneys were referred to in the context of grief (Ps 73:21) (Schroer & Staubli 1998:77). The loss of heart in the context of fear was also a common concept in the ancient Near East (Schroer & Staubli 1998:48). Emotions such as sadness, fear, contempt and shame can be expressed in the face (Schroer & Staubli 1998:95-7). Heavy breathing was equated with anger, which gave rise to the metaphoric use of נש in this context (Schroer & Staubli 1998:105-6).

Schroer and Staubli devote little attention to emotional expression in the body. The traditional contrast between Greek and Hebrew thinking is evident, as well as the notion of emotion being located in body parts.

North (1995:33) also regards the heart as the seat of emotions. It can be gladdened (Prov 27:11), saddened (Neh 2:2), frightened (1 Sam 4:13), courageous (2 Sam 17:10) and full of love (Deut 6:5). However, his way of proving the holistic ways of Hebrew thinking was to argue that the Israelites had an understanding of some central nervous system:

Ancient Israelites had no word for brain and did not associate thinking with the head.

Instead, thought and will were entwined with what we call emotions. The biblical לב corresponded largely to the functioning of the nervous system, which the ancients identified as the internal organs of the torso.

We can conclude that the major interest in twentieth century research on emotion in the Hebrew Bible concerned itself with proving that the ancient Israelites had a holistic view of man. A convenient and successful way to do this was to produce evidence that body parts were seen to be the seats of emotions. The recurrent argument is: since emotions are located in, or bound to body parts, they cannot exist apart from the body. Ergo, there is no Greek dualism in Hebrew thought.

Regrettably, this line of thinking obscured the fact that allusions to viscera and other parts of the human anatomy can be explained by the fact that the emotions in question were actually felt there (Smith 1998:427-36). Words such as נפש, רוח, לב, כבד and מעים are not mere labels for different emotions. They are metaphoric ways of speaking about emotion whereby the ways in which the ancient Israelite experienced and understood their emotions are revealed (cf. Kruger 2000, 2001).

The study of the emotional use of language referring to human anatomy unquestionably added to our knowledge of the ancient Israelite conception of their emotions. In spite of the fact that the investigations were mostly limited to the use of only a few terms, notably נפש, רוח, לב and בשר, investigations such as the ones listed above, led to a new appreciation of the uniqueness of the ancient Israelite way of thinking. From the above survey it is clear, however, that a full understanding of the psychology of emotions cannot be arrived at when the emotional use of these terms are considered only in a secondary sense. As a result no integrative, systematic description of the ancient Israelite perception of emotions has yet been achieved by this approach. This can partly be by reason of the fact that scholars have always been very hesitant to ascribe any structure to the psychological or emotional life of the ancient Israelites. Many have noticed the importance of such terms as נפש, רוח, לב, and occasionally בשר in their conceptualisation of the emotions, but few have attempted a detailed description of distinct emotions.

2.5 CONCEPTUAL MODELS OF ANGER IN NON-VERBAL COMMUNICATION

The study of the non-verbal communication of emotion in the Hebrew Bible is of special importance to a better understanding of ancient Israelite conceptions of anger. Darwin (1904:28) points out that:

Certain complex actions are of direct or indirect service under certain states of the mind, in order to relieve or gratify certain sensations, desires, etc; and whenever the same state of mind is induced, however feebly, there is a tendency through the force of habit and

association for the same movements to be performed, though they may not be of the least use.

Darwin even makes use of examples from the Bible to illustrate how bodily action can be expressive of emotional states. With regard to fear, he holds (Darwin 1904:308):

There is a well-known and grand description in Job: "In thoughts from the visions of the night, when deep sleep falleth on men, fear came upon me, and trembling, which made all my bones to shake. Then a spirit passed before my face; the hair of my flesh stood up: it stood still, but I could not discern the form thereof: an image was before mine eyes, there was silence, and I heard a voice, saying, Shall mortal man be more just than God? Shall a man be more pure than his Maker?" (Job 4:13).

The Hebrew Bible being so rich in examples of the physical expression of different emotions, it is surprising that Darwin's work inspired so few Biblical scholars to do an extensive study of the subject (see also Kruger 1998). One of the first investigations of the subject in the Old Testament was done by Vorwahl (1932) more than half a century after Darwin's book on the expression of emotion was first published. Focussing on non-verbal expression in general, Vorwahl's treatment of specific emotions was perfunctory. The emotions of fear and anger received the least attention and his discussion of these spanned less than three pages (1932:16-8).

With regard to fear, Vorwahl notes that its expression is motivated by the propensity to flee and to hide oneself (Vorwahl 1932:16). In the Hebrew Bible, the emotion is associated with paleness in the face (Jer 30:6; Nah 2:11; Dan 5:6, 10:8), the quavering of the lips and body (Hab 3:16), the shaking of bones (Jer 22:9) and the separation of knee and hips (Nah 2:11; Ps 8:9; Dan 5:6), so that fear was often expressed by putting one's hands on the hindquarters (Isa 42:14; Jer 22:23, 30:6). Further, fear could lead to weakness in the arms and hands (Isa 13:7; Ezek 30:25; Zeph 3:16; Ezr 4:4; Neh 6:9), and even falling limp to the ground (1 Sam 28:14; Dan 10:8, 8:17). Finally, Vorwahl (1932:17) lists the same example as Darwin in Job, of hair straightening out as involuntary expression of fear (Job 4:15).

On the subject of anger, Vorwahl reckons its manifestations in the Hebrew Bible to be associated with self-defence (Job 31:21), petulance in the context of fasting (Isa 58:4; Job 31:21) and pride (Ex17:11). The indications of anger that he identifies are hitting or waving with a fist (Isa 9:10, 10:4, 58:4; Job 31:21; Ps 106:9), stretching out an arm (Gen 16:12; Ex 14:8, 17:11, 24:11; Isa 5:25; cf. Prov 1:24) and clapping of hands (Num 24:10; Job 27:23). Vorwahl (1932:18) also argues that prints of the hand in Hebrew and Phoenician iconography should be interpreted as indicating threatening anger.

Vorwahl (1932:18) also identifies several facial indications of anger, namely the rolling of the eyes (Job 15:12), a sullen (אָמָר) or angry face (Dan 3:19), an evil look (Gen 31:2; Am 9:4),⁵ hiding of the face (Isa

⁵ The expressions in these two verses seem to refer to the Evil Eye as a witchcraft technique whereby affliction is caused to a subject. Cf. 4.1.4.

54:8; 59:2; Ezek 39:23; cf. Job 13:24) and steam escaping from the nostrils (2 Sam 22:9; Isa 65:5; Ps 18:9, 74:1).

Vorwahl's work is followed by a long period of neglect with regard to the study of emotional expression in the Hebrew Bible. Fortunately, the recent upsurge in research on emotion coincided with serious attention being given to its expression, especially in the face (see e.g. Izard 1977). This renewed interest in emotion is also reflected in Biblical scholarship. Gruber's (1980) investigation of non-verbal communication in the ancient Near East included accounts of non-verbal indications of sadness, anger and happiness. Let us assess his description of anger expressions.

Gruber (1980:483) made the very important observation that the "somatic expressions of anger should have given rise to verbs, nouns, and idioms denoting anger." With regard to the metaphoric use of אַף, he points to the limitations of approaches that viewed references to the organs as mere idioms expressing emotion (Gruber 1980:486):

Thus while experimental psychology demonstrates a direct connection between anger and specific somatic reactions including the face and the nose, standard reference works and specialized studies on Biblical Hebrew give the impression that any such connections reflected in Biblical Hebrew are to be regarded as at best arbitrary but more likely foolish.

He listed the expression אַף חָרָה as denoting "be angry" saying that it derived from the "well-known reddening of the faces of angry persons" (Gruber 1980:491). Other expressions derived from the same physiological effect, are the synonymous אַף בָּעַר and אִשׁ בְּאֵפִי (Gruber 1980:500-1).

Gruber (1980:502-50) also identifies expressions for anger deriving from other physiological concomitants of anger. These include expressions stemming from frowning, such as קָצַר אִפִּים (lit. "short of face") and הִחֲזִיק אֶף, "to stiffen the face" (Gruber 1980:503). In addition, עָלָה עֲשָׁן בְּאֵפוֹ "smoke went up from his nose" refers to the same effect as the English "fuming" to denote anger. Gruber (1980:510-50) furthermore argues that אַף חָמָה should be rendered as "foaming at the mouth" as an expression of anger. He bases this argument on the fact that the primary meaning of חָמָה was "venom, poison" whose side effects could create effects similar to epileptic seizures. Anger could have been perceived as an extreme form of epilepsy (Gruber 1980:540).

Unfortunately, Gruber's application of psychological theories is questionable. For example, on the basis of the fact that some psychodynamic theories defined sadness as anger turned towards the self, Gruber (1978:89-97) insists that the expression לָ חָרָה denoted sadness rather than anger. This would mean, for example that Cain, instead of being angry, became depressed when God chose the offer of Abel over his. This affirmation has been questioned by some commentators (cf. Hamilton 1990:224-5) and largely ignored by lexicographers (cf. Sauer 1997).

Regrettably, he only covered the emotions of sadness, anger and joy (see Kruger 1998). A further

limitation of his work, as well as that of Vorwahl, is that the language originating in subjective experience of the emotions are left untouched. Consequently, a lot of information about the ancient Israelite understanding about internal bodily processes associated with specific emotions do not come into play (cf. Smith 1998).

Nevertheless, the study of emotional expression made a very important contribution to our understanding of the ancient Israelite conception of emotion in that it shows that gestures and corporeal language are expressions of inner states, and thus have communicative intent. A study of a culture's perception about an emotion should therefore take its bodily expression seriously. However, since expression remains only one component of the overall emotional process (Scherer 2001), even a very detailed account of the expressive features of an emotion will not suffice to describe the cultural understanding of an emotion in a comprehensive way.

2.6 CONCLUSION

So far we have surveyed some of the philosophical, theological, lexical, socio-anthropological and non-verbal communicative approaches to the study of emotion conceptualisation in the Hebrew Bible. Despite the diversity of their definitions of emotions, they all seem to have one important limitation in common: emotion as a cognitive, psychological and physical reality receives only secondary attention.

Most of the studies on anger and fear in the Hebrew Bible seem to have been dominated by theological intent, aiming only at some theological delineation of the wrath and the fear of God. This proves to be true even of entries in biblical lexicons and encyclopaedias. They all lacked interest in the cognitive interpretation of emotions by the ancient Israelites. Although bible scholars succeed in giving an account of the different meanings of נפש, רוח, לב and בשר, a description of the emotion processes comprising different cognitive, psychological and physiological components was not arrived at (cf. Frijda 1989; Kövecses 1990, 1995, 1999; Ellsworth & Scherer 2002; Scherer 2001). The listing of different expressive components of several emotions by Vorwahl and Gruber arguably come closer to an integrated conceptual definition of such emotions, but even here a lot of language relating to subjective feeling states seemed to have gone unnoticed (cf. Smith 1998), thus leaving gaps in the picture.

We conclude, "the subject of emotions in the Hebrew Bible is a most neglected theme and deserves extensive treatment" (Kruger 2000:181). A mere study of anthropological terms expressing emotional meaning will not suffice. Even an intensive study of all the terms for a specific emotion will not serve the purpose, since conceptualisations about its physiology and phenomenology have to be inferred from metaphoric expressions (cf. Kövecses 1990:32; Kruger 2000:187-91, 2001:77-87). Therefore, a new approach to the study of emotion in the Hebrew Bible will have to be defined that allows for approaching emotion as a process involving cognitive, expressive, and physiological components (cf. Kövecses 1990, 1995, 1999; Mesquita & Frijda 1992; Scherer 2001, Ellsworth & Scherer 2002).

CHAPTER 3

CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR: THEORY AND METHODOLOGY

At the heart of the methodology of this study of emotion concepts in the Hebrew Bible is language. Conventionalised language can reveal a great deal about our experiences of emotion and serves as an important tool in discovering the structure and contents of conceptual models of emotion (Kövecses 1990:3).

This chapter will briefly review different approaches to the study of emotion, explore the relation between emotional expression and metaphor, and define a conceptual metaphor methodology for the study of emotion in the Hebrew Bible.

3.1 APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF EMOTION

The present interest in emotion may be partly attributed to the great advances in clinical research on the brain and its role in cognition and emotion (cf. Scherer, Bänziger, Grandjean, Meylan & Wranik-Odehnal 2000:33-47). So far, the role of the amygdale in the fear response is regarded as one of the greatest breakthroughs in research on the role of the physiology of the brain in emotional processes (Scherer *et al.* 2000:41). It has been found that this anatomical part in the lower brain initiates a fear response even before receiving feedback from the visual cortex (LeDoux 1994:38). Thus, the bodily response to a fear stimulus is in full swing even before the brain has clearly and consciously analysed the situation. The amygdale may function the same way in respect to other emotions (Scherer *et al.* 2000:41). This finding may explain why most cultures, especially the ones traditionally regarded as 'primitive,' metaphorically identify emotions through reference to the body part/s where the emotion is actually 'felt' (cf. Dhorme 1963; Levy 1984; Smith 1998; etc.).

Unfortunately, a lot still has to be learned about the neural mechanisms that are responsible for our emotive responses and feelings, especially with regard to the more complex ones (Scherer *et al.* 2000:41). Further, findings in this field, although indispensable for a sound, scientific understanding of emotion, is of limited use for the student of emotion concepts in ancient Israel. At most, it serves as a source of hypotheses and comparative deductions that may clarify common sense interpretations of Hebrew metaphors relating to the emotions (cf. Smith 1998).

Another very promising contemporary approach to the study of emotion is the Component Process Approach (cf. Scherer 1984; 1993; 2000). This system successfully incorporates insights from clinical

neuroscience in that it regards emotion primarily as a cognitive process involving rapid, even subconscious, evaluations of situations, which result in the unfolding of an emotional episode (cf. Scherer *et al.* 2000:17).

Although appraisal theorists are mainly interested in the conscious and subconscious evaluations involved in emotion (cf. Lazarus 1984:247-56; Oatley & Johnson-Laird 1987:29-50; Scherer 2001; Ellsworth & Scherer 2002), other aspects, such as subjective feeling (cf. Russell 1983:1281-8), the physical expression of emotion (cf. Scherer 1999) and emotion talk (cf. Scherer 1999a) also come into play. Research done in this field has produced inspiring results and its view of emotion as a process involving several concomitants holds promise. Alas, the only entrée into the ancient Israelite emotional episodes and all the elements constituting them is language. Regrettably, the student of the Hebrew Bible has no access to subjects who lived in ancient Israel to study their appraisal processes and interpretation of emotional episodes by means of questionnaires and descriptive accounts, which are most commonly used by appraisal theorists (cf. Russell 1983; Scherer 1993; etc.).

Initially, the study of emotion through language proved tedious and mind numbing. Following early scientific theories of emotion, the folk understanding of sensations regards emotion terms as mere labels for the entity (e.g. physical arousal) for which it stands (Kövecses & Palmer 1999:241). Schachter and Singer (1962:398) have found that the label given to a state of physical arousal depends on cognitive aspects of the situation. The limitations of an approach that regards language as mere labels for reality has been accentuated by studies pointing to the wealth of conceptual content associated with emotion terminology (cf. Kövecses 1990; Wierzbicka 1995; etc.).

Unfortunately, the autonomous linguistics approach has contributed to the stripping of much of the connotative meaning of many emotion terms. This has also been done with emotion terminology in the Hebrew Bible. Lauha (1983:215-21) argued that all the terms for anger in the Hebrew Bible are used interchangeably, which means that they can all be regarded as exact synonyms, simply meaning 'anger'. He denies that the Hebrew language of anger may be indicative of culture specific concepts that can be contrasted with those of other languages (Lauha 1983:22-3). Being interested only in the denotative meaning, Lauha has relieved these terms of their metaphorically constituted conceptual content, leaving them subject to gross misinterpretations. To further regard the German term 'Zorn' as an apt equivalent of these terms may lead to Germanic content being projected onto them. It is therefore not surprising that Lauha's contribution to our understanding of the ancient Israelite conceptualisation of anger is limited to the listing of a few 'synonyms' for anger and the mention of a few causes that can lead to this state of mind (Lauha 1983:217-21).

Wierzbicka (cf. 1995:17-47) has demonstrated that all concepts are language and culture bound, which makes their translation into other languages extremely difficult. For example, the English term 'emotion' denotes a concept that "links the idea of cognitive based feelings with the idea of something like a 'bodily disturbance'" (Wierzbicka 1995:22). However, the words that are commonly used to translate this concept in German (Gefühl), French (sentiment) and Polish (uczucie) are largely devoid of the notion of bodily

symptoms (Wierzbicka 1995:21). She (Wierzbicka 1995:20) argues that the only way to translate these concepts in a universally understandable way would be to make use of semantic primitives. These identified semantic primitives are the only known universal concepts, and can thus be regarded as an innate semantic meta-language. Using these primitives to translate concepts would help us guard against imposing an ethnocentric perspective on them (Wierzbicka 1995:17).

Although the semantic primitives approach can be invaluable for the defining of core emotion concepts in a universally understandable way, it does not seem to present the ideal method for describing the peripheral attributes of emotion conceptualisations in the Hebrew Bible (cf. Kövecses & Palmer 1999:242). For example, Wierzbicka's definition of anger, making use of only semantic primitives, seems elementary: "X feels as one does when one thinks that someone has done something bad and when one wants to cause this person to do something he doesn't want to do" (quoted in Kövecses & Palmer 1999:242). There are at least ten terms in Classical Hebrew for anger, most of which are metaphorically constituted and dispose of unique conceptual content. The Wierzbicka method seems cumbersome and unsuitable for developing the finer detail of these metaphors and for demonstrating their interrelatedness.

The sociological and anthropological approaches to the study of emotion are of great value in that they emphasise the social nature and cultural specificity of emotions (Kövecses & Palmer 1999:247-8). Smith (1923:152-4) has demonstrated, for example, that the Semitic ideas of holiness and taboo are almost exclusively based on fear of the supernatural, such as evil spirits. Douglas (1975:58) de-emphasises the aspect of terror in pollution beliefs in 'primitive' cultures, and defined them as perceptual processes that impose order on (abnormal) experiences and thus reduce dissonance (Douglas 1975:53-4). Thus, pollution is applied to anything that blurs, smudges, contradicts or confuses accepted classifications. This differs considerably with the association between 'dirt' and hygiene in the modern Western civilisation (Douglas 1975:51).

Unfortunately, the sociological and anthropological approach as applied to the study of the Hebrew Bible is relatively new and lacks a tradition, shared language of concepts and methods (Kruger 2000a:163). Further, social constructionists tend to view emotions as arbitrary social-cultural products and often fail to notice the experiential basis on which some metaphors are based (Kövecses & Palmer 1999:248). The fact that human bodies have obvious universal properties and functions are overlooked and universalities in emotion concepts and emotion language are usually denied (Kövecses & Palmer 1999:248).

Kövecses (1990; 1995; 1999) has demonstrated that emotion concepts are partly constituted through conceptual metaphors and metonymies. Figurative expressions are the largest source of conceptual content and are therefore central to the semantic study of emotion language. It is therefore not surprising to find that metaphor has been successfully applied to the study of emotion concepts in divergent languages, including Indo-European languages (cf. Kövecses 2002). It can be argued that this approach to the study of affect in the Hebrew Bible will be even more productive, since Classical Hebrew, and the Semitic mind in general, has a special affinity for metaphor (Dhorme 1963:2; Malina 1993:73). Particularly on the level of anthropological

concepts, the Israelites seem to have been far less theoretical and analytical than the Greek philosophers (Malina 1993:73).

In fact, most of the ancient Israelite worldview was based on bodily experience (Dhorme 1963:2; Malina 1993:73). Rather than abstracting specified terminology for intangible concepts, the ancient Israelites interpreted their world and experiences metaphorically, for the most part, using parts of the human organic whole in a figurative way (Malina 1993:73-4). Dhorme (1963:2) regards this, what he calls the “humanization of nature,” as the most interesting aspect of the history of language. Although it is especially visible in Classical Hebrew, this phenomenon is common to all languages (Dhorme 1963:2):

C'est une loi commune que les noms des diverses parties qui composent le corps humain soient transférés aux animaux, aux végétaux, aux objets inanimés, quelquefois même à des abstractions. L'homme se projette ainsi au dehors, exactement comme lorsqu'il prête ses sentiments ou ses émotions aux êtres qui l'entourent. L'hébreu et l'akkadien marchent côte à côte dans cet emploi métaphorique des mots qui primitivement étaient appliqués à la désignation du corps de l'homme ou de l'animal. Sans doute, beaucoup de ces métaphores sont naturelles, on les retrouve non seulement dans les langues sémitiques, mais dans toutes les langues.

Being almost exclusively based on bodily experience, metaphor is closely associated with another very important source of information about emotion concepts and cultural thought in general, namely nonverbal communication. Indeed, no study of the conceptualisation of emotion in the Hebrew Bible will be complete without a thorough investigation of nonverbal communication relating to the emotions in question. Far from being mere trivial accompaniments to analytical reflection and speech, nonverbal communication is a significant indicator of affect and even mentality. As such, it offers a key to some of the fundamental values and assumptions underlying any particular society (Thomas 1991:5). It's value as a tool for historians who study the conceptual make-up of ancient cultures cannot be underestimated (cf. Kruger 1994:213). A short definition of this indispensable source of conceptual information, and its relationship with metaphor will be briefly outlined.

3.2 NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION

Although the term ‘nonverbal communication’ can have a much wider application, its use in this study will be limited to an indication of all the ways in which communication is effected between people when in each other's presence, by means other than words. An explanation of Kendon (1981:3) defines this use more precisely:

It refers to the communicational functioning of bodily activity, gesture, facial expression

and orientation, posture and spacing, touch and smell, and of those aspects of utterance that can be considered apart from the referential content of what is said.

With regard to the study of nonverbal communication as it relates to emotion, it seems helpful to distinguish between affect display on the one hand, which includes involuntary facial expressions, expressive emotion words and gesture (cf. Ekman & Friesen 1981:102), and symbolic acts, which, although they may have an emotive component attached to them, are limited to acts bringing about legal changes. Nonverbal communication has for long been neglected as a key to the study of emotion in past civilisations. Historians have only recently started to become interested in gesture as a key to the cultural codes of past civilisations. With regard to the study of ancient Near Eastern civilisations, this was inevitable:

The people of the ancient Near East often used forms of communication other than words, and symbolic gestures in particular, in order to express their emotions and in connection with religious and legal observances. The culture of ancient Israel is no exception in this regard; and the Hebrew Bible reveals many instances of this type of communication (Kruger 1994:213).

Indeed, there is no scarcity of data on gestures and nonverbal communication in antiquity and the Hebrew Bible relating to the emotions (for a thorough study of gestures of ancient Greeks and Romans in relation to anger, see Sittl 1970:14-9). Unfortunately, the inspiring trends in the research on nonverbal communication have received scant attention from Biblical scholars (Botha 1996:1). Although there are many studies listing various kinds of gesture in the Hebrew Bible, scholars are often at a loss as to how present them in a meaningful way (Botha 1996:15). Botha (1996:15) has suggested that findings need to be incorporated into models to make them more comprehensible and meaningful:

With regard to the study of gesture it is thus of extreme importance that some kind of conceptual model must be developed with which to analyse and interpret the social phenomenon of gesture and gesticulation. This has not been attempted so far, and must be urgently pursued.

Surprisingly, Botha (1996:16) suggests “a model which would incorporate the three zone model discussed by Malina (1993:74-77).” Unfortunately, the model does not seem to lend itself to a presentation of gesture in a “comprehensive and meaningful way.” Malina (1993:73) developed the model to describe the “makeup of human beings,” the categories of which are ideal for a staging of ancient Semitic anthropology, but not for gesture and nonverbal communication on a more specific level.

We need to list only a few examples to show the inappropriateness of this model for nonverbal communication. The expression, “looking daggers at me” found in Job 16:9 is clearly an expression of anger involving the eyes (cf. Kruger 2000:190). However, the Three-Zone Model of Malina presents the eyes as

belonging to the zone of “emotion-fused thought” (Malina 1993:74). However, in the expression listed above, the eyes do not at all function as “eyes that fill the heart with data” (Malina 1993:74). Further, Malina’s model identifies the hand as belonging to the zone of purposeful action (Malina 1993:75). Yet, in Isaiah 66:15 it functions equally well as an expression of “emotion-fused thought” by metonymically and metaphorically indicating anger. In this specific context, it stands in parallel to another term for anger (קִצְוֹ) that is associated with a very common metonymy for rage, “anger is foaming at the mouth” (cf. Gruber 1980:513-49). In the Malina model, the mouth is associated with “self-revelation through speech, communication with others,” which, unfortunately, does not include foaming at the mouth as an indication of a major epileptic attack perceived as anger (cf. Gruber 1980:540).

With regard to an analysis of nonverbal communication as it relates to the emotion of anger in the Hebrew Bible, it seems better to interpret references to body parts as figurative expressions indicating the emotion as a whole. Even if the body part in question is indeed involved in a real gesture related to the emotional experience, it would change nothing in the interpretation of the meaning of the gesture. Lifting the hand is an expression of anger (Kruger 1994:215), whether it is meant figuratively or not. Besides, if an action is repeatedly used with reference to a specific emotion, it will inevitably, in time, acquire metaphoric status (cf. Dirvin 1994). Sometimes, even distinguishing between conventional and creative metaphors change little with regard to the meaning and interpretation of the metaphor in question. In the end, the goal is to meaningfully present the gesture within the context of ancient Israelite concepts regarding the emotion.

Kövecses (1999:167-87) has demonstrated that abstract cultural models emerge metaphorically. Trying to create a model based on literal, first meaning concepts, such as the Three-Zone Model of Malina, a lot of the structure of the model and its specific content, will be unaccounted for. Neither, claims Kövecses (1999:186), do models emerge from basic human experience, since such ones would disregard important parts that are metaphorically conceived. Thus, a first step in the development of a suitable model for the interpretation of anger in the Hebrew Bible would be to do a careful investigation of all the metaphors and metonymies relating to this emotion.

Even more might be gained by distinguishing between metaphor and metonymy. In metonymy, actions, real or figurative, often stand for an emotion. In the examples above, glaring and lifting the hand are signs of hostility. But sometimes a body part can also metonymically indicate a hostile action, as the hand in Isaiah 66:15. Thus, while the hand can be regarded as a metaphor for anger/hostility, it also functions as a metonymy representing the action of lifting it. Although the distinction between metaphor and metonymy sometimes seems arbitrary (cf. Barcelona 2000) it helps us to make better sense of references to body parts and gestures in the Hebrew Bible. Metonymy, in particular as indicating actions and gestures that are emotionally motivated, will be of great value in delineating the emotional experience as conceptualised by the ancient Israelites. This conceptualised emotional experience, in turn, serves as the best conceptual model for interpreting the gestures and other cognitive concomitants of anger (cf. Kövecses 1990:67-8). It provides

a neat, coherent, understandable structure in terms of which all nonverbal communication relating to the anger experience can be interpreted.

Many studies have indicated that the basic image schematic structure of the anger concept is the same in different cultures (Kövecses 1995a:49-71). Not only do all cultures' studies so far view the body and its organs as containers (with regard to Classical Hebrew, see Kruger 2000:181-93), but the physiology of the emotion as conceptualised by various languages, show remarkable similarities (Kövecses 1995a:70). This means that the emotional episode, as understood by people of various origins, will be highly comparable. With regard to the study of the nonverbal communication of anger, the best model therefore has to be the prototype model, as defined by Kövecses (1995:3-15). In comparison with several other models, it proved to have the best explanatory power for many aspects of meaning (Kövecses 1995:3-15; Kövecses & Palmer 1999:237-260).

The prototype of an emotion can in some ways be compared to the "best example" of an emotion in terms of its situational script, scenario and model (Kövecses 1995:9). This mould is based on experience in that it combines a variety of events, including gesture and nonverbal communication, which are causally and temporarily related. Being metaphorically constituted, the model is also motivated by common sense, which makes it easy to interpret.

It should be clear by now that metaphor is approached from the perspective of cognitive linguistics, which differs starkly from autonomous linguistics, which dominated much of the previous century's methodologies of linguistic research. Before a further word is said about the methodology that will be utilised in this study, metaphor and metonymy need to be more clearly defined as tools of the cognitive linguist.

3.3 A COGNITIVE APPROACH

At first, an attempt to detail the ancient Israelite conception of their emotions through a study of language alone might seem impracticable, especially from the traditional autonomous linguistics point of view. For a long time, the language faculty had been regarded as existing independently from one's thoughts and conceptual world (Taylor 1989:16-18). The long-established view is that language is merely a computational system for generating sentences and thus has nothing to do with the way in which a person conceptualises his world, how he perceives it and how he interacts with it (Taylor 1989:17). Propitiously, the past few decades saw a renewed appreciation of the value of language in studying human cognition, and especially emotion (cf. Davitz & Mattis 1964; Lakoff & Kövecses 1987; Geeraertz & Grondelaers 1995; Wierzbicka 1995; Matsuki 1995; Kövecses 1990, 1995a, 1995b, 1999).

In his linguistic approach to the study of emotion concepts in the English language, Kövecses (1995:3-4) distinguishes between expressive and descriptive emotion words. Interjections, such as *wow!* and *yuk!* are used to express inner states, but contain little conceptual content (Kövecses 1995:3).

Emotion terms, such as ‘anger’ and ‘fear,’ that are used to label emotional states, are more descriptive in nature (Kövecses 1995:3-4). However, many languages, including Classical Hebrew, fail to comply with the tendency of Indo-European languages to create abstract ‘labels’ for emotional states (Von Humboldt 1968:323-32). In addition, different languages categorise their emotional domains of experience in quite divergent ways (Wierzbicka 1995:17-47). Even the term “emotion” can be regarded as a cultural artefact of the English language that doesn’t have exact equivalents in other languages (Wierzbicka 1995:17).

For ‘descriptive’ emotion language one has to turn to figurative language (Kövecses 1995:4-5). This category of linguistic expressions is ubiquitous and includes much conceptual content. It goes beyond a mere labelling of distinct emotions in that it reveals how a cultural group interpreted certain facets of emotions (Kövecses 1995:4). A figurative expression can therefore throw light on conceptions regarding an emotion’s phenomenology, such as its intensity, cause, and control. Therefore, a study of emotion in the Hebrew Bible should not be limited to a mere semantic categorisation of abstract emotion terms or expressions (cf. Lauha 1983), but should include an analysis of its interpreted nature, as disclosed by conceptual metaphor and metonymy (Kövecses 1995:4).

The theory of conceptual metaphor and metonymy is a forte of the cognitive linguistic enterprise (Barcelona 2000:2). The cognitive linguistic approach to metaphor and metonymy sharply contrasts with the autonomic linguistic view of the same, which, despite their all-pervasiveness, try to avoid these figures of speech (Taylor 1989:122-3). However, the limitations of this approach are being recognised, as is evidenced by the rediscovery of the principles of linguistic relativity.

3.3.1 Linguistic Relativity

The present interest in metaphor, especially motivated by the work of Lakoff and Johnson (1980), squarely falls within the tradition of linguistic relativity (Dirvin 1994:5). Although this theory is usually attributed to the linguists Sapir (1967) and Whorf (1962), it is now acknowledged that it had existed long before the twentieth century.

One of the most important founders of the theory of linguistic relativity was Von Humboldt (1968). As a comparative linguist, Von Humboldt argued that all thought was relative and could not be defined without reference to language. He (Von Humboldt 1968:23-6) emphasised that language was a tool that sprung from the human need to define a worldview shared by other members of one’s culture (Von Humboldt 1968:26):

Die Hervorbringung der Sprache ist ein inneres Bedürfniss der Menschheit, nicht bloss ein äusserliches zur Unterhaltung gemeinschaftlichen Verkehrs, sondern ein in ihrer Natur selbst liegendes, zur Entwicklung ihrer geistigen Kräfte und zur Gewinnung einer Weltanschauung, zu welcher der Mensch nur gelangen kann, indem er sein Denken an dem gemeinschaftlichen Denken mit Anderen zur Klarheit und Bestimmtheit bringt,

unentbehrliches.

In sum, language's reason for being is the refinement of thought. This view connects language with thought in such a way that it sharply contrasts with the traditional view of language as a mere system of communication. Von Humboldt (1968:53) believes that language and thought were so inter-connected that one could derive all thought from discourse (Von Humboldt 1968:107):

... nichts in dem Inneren des Menschen ist so tief, so fein, so weit umfassend, das nicht in die Sprache überginge und in ihr erkennbar wäre.

Von Humboldt (1968:107-20) was therefore more interested in the conceptual world underlying language, which he called its 'inner form' (G. *Innere Sprachform*), than in its outer form. In fact, he was of the opinion that writing a grammar would be a futile exercise of categorisation, since it wouldn't be able to express the finely established meanings of language (Von Humboldt 1968:57). His real curiosity was the way that languages go about building ideas (G. *Ideenbildung*) (Von Humboldt 1968:107).

Von Humboldt (1968:107) further maintains that language, being in the service of creating ideas, could be described as an intellectual activity that is totally dependent on the inner organisation of a culture's conceptual world:

Ihre intellektuellen Vorzüge beruhen daher ausschliesslich auf der wohlgeordneten ... und klaren Geistesorganisation der Völker...

In his theory, language is an indication of a culture's inner strength (G. *Geisteskraft*) to express its national worldview (Von Humboldt 1968:17). Very important in this regard is the language's freedom in forming new words to express concepts (Von Humboldt 1968:62). The most important factors at play in this process of concept formation are imagination and experience (Von Humboldt 1968:114).

Being largely based on imagination, the words chosen to denote a concept have a figurative sense. This is especially true of nouns, which rarely give proof of singular 'literal' meanings. One should therefore distinguish between the term and the concept that it stands for (Von Humboldt 1968:112):

Da es hier aber immer die Bezeichnung unsinnlicher Begriffe, ja oft blosser Verhältnisse gilt, so muss der Begriff für die Sprache oft, wenn nicht immer, bildlich genommen werden

...

Despite his cognisance of the importance of the metaphoric process in concept formation, Von Humboldt shows bias for the Indo-European languages' ability to form new 'abstract' concepts by means of affixation. Languages that deviated from this rule, like Classical Hebrew, were imperfect (Von Humboldt 1968:323). For example, he regards Classical Hebrew's rigid three-consonant stem-formation and its resistance to

affixation as a drawback. This, he says (Von Humboldt 1968:331), testifies to a national interest in deducing new meanings from already existing concepts, rather than contrasting meanings and keeping them apart. Such a system of concept formation should be seen as unsuccessful, since figurative language, unlike abstract concepts, so plentiful in the 'normal' languages, are not free from the interference of associated meanings (Von Humboldt 1968:114). The strength of Classical Hebrew is its ability to be poetic (Von Humboldt 1968:322-3).

Sapir (1967:120-1) severely criticises the favouritism of nineteenth century linguistics. He rejects the claim that some Indo European languages are more refined and superior to others (Sapir 1967:120-1):

Il n'était pas malaisé pour eux de se persuader que ces langages familiers représentaient la suprême évolution que la parole ait atteinte et que tous les autres types n'étaient que des échelons menant à ce type "infléchi" qui leur était si cher. Tout ce qui se rattachait à ce système du sanscrit, du grec, du latin et de l'allemand, fut reconnu comme la forme la plus élevée; tout ce qui s'en écartait était considéré comme une infraction à la règle, ou au mieux comme une intéressante aberration.

Sapir's general theory of language has much in common with that of Von Humboldt. He (Sapir 1967:16) defines the elements of language as symbols of mental images or concepts. He also regards language and thought to be inseparable, language making thought possible (Sapir 1967:20):

... la pensée la plus intangible peut fort bien n'être que la contrepartie consciente d'un symbolisme linguistique inconscient.

The focus of linguistics should not be the words and symbols making up a language, but rather the product, or concepts, to which these symbols point (Sapir 1967:20).

Like Von Humboldt, Sapir typifies languages according to their methods of creating concepts. According to Sapir (1967:125,139), Hebrew belongs to the group of languages where the concepts are grouped closely together and words have a more concentrated meaning. In this kind of language, it is more difficult to understand the meaning of a word outside of its context (Sapir 1967:125). Sometimes abstract meanings are derived from word stems that one would never imagine possible. Sapir would therefore agree with Von Humboldt that Classical Hebrew has a great affinity for figurative language where meaning is motivated by already existing concepts.

Probably the most zealous exponent of the theory of linguistic relativity was Whorf (1962; see Dirvin 1994:4-5). Whorf, who was trained for chemical engineering, sees linguistics as an exact science (Whorf 1962:220-32). He (Whorf 1962:252) is of the opinion that the linguistic order embraced all symbolism, all symbolic processes and all processes of reference and of logic. For example, in the English language we deal with size by breaking it into size classes, such as small, medium and large. This, despite the fact that (Whorf

1962:259):

... size objectively is not divided into classes, but is a pure continuum of relativity. Yet we think of size constantly as a set of classes because language has segmented and named the experience in this way.

Applied to the study of emotion concepts in the Hebrew Bible, the theory of linguistic relativity would warn against an approach where emotion categorisation of English would be imposed on Classical Hebrew (Wierzbicka 1995:17). This doesn't mean that we should expect emotion concepts in Classical Hebrew to differ radically from that of English. Cassirer (1961) argued that the origin of emotion language should be sought in sensations, such as pleasure and pain. Through subject imagination human beings started talking about these by making use of spatial representation. In other words, people would talk about emotions by referring to the parts of the body where they were felt (Cassirer 1961:206-7; see also Smith (1998) for an application of this theory to the Hebrew Bible). Since the bodily experience of human beings is quite universal with regard to certain fundamental emotions, we can expect figurative language related to these to be similar.

3.3.2 Cognitive Linguistics

Contemporary cognitive linguists continue building on the tradition of linguistic relativity. By regarding linguistic features as symbols corresponding to elements in the conceptual world, the inadequacy of the autonomous approach with regard to conceptual description can be overcome (Jackendoff 1992:48-52). The traditional black-and-white categorisations of autonomous linguistics often left out conceptual elements that were of real importance for the understanding of a lexeme (Persson 1990:175).

Rather than forming categories in terms of a limited list of necessary and sufficient features, cognitive linguists show that the mind categorises in terms of prototypes based on connotation rather than denotation (Taylor 1989:40-1). These categories often overlap and are not always clearly kept apart (Persson 1990:176). Our knowledge of words is therefore encyclopaedic. It includes relevant background information ordered as a network of shared, conventionalised and idealised knowledge embedded in a pattern of cultural beliefs and practices (Taylor 1989:83; Persson 1990:176).

On the basis of linguistic evidence, Lakoff and Johnson (1980:4) have found that most of our ordinary conceptual system is metaphorical in nature. Metaphor and metonymy are regarded as the most important processes whereby mental categories get extended to form new concepts (Taylor 1989:122; Kövecses 1999:167-88). Classical Hebrew's ability to create concepts through meaning extension by means of metaphor and metonymy is therefore not a weakness, but an asset. Let us now consider more closely the nature and function of conceptual metaphor and metonymy as defined by cognitive linguistics.

3.4 CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR AND METONYMY

In scholarly circles as well as in the popular mind metaphor is still regarded as some linguistic phenomenon that is used for artistic and rhetorical purposes (cf. James 1960:103). Language is often viewed as a system of words of which the meanings have all the necessary and sufficient features to express ideas (Taylor 1989:130). In this view, metaphor is thought to be superfluous and reserved for gifted writers who have mastered the art of a conscious and deliberate use of words to achieve a special effect.

Early research on the language of emotion also reflects an ignorance of metaphor's presence in everyday language. Davitz and Mattis (1964:157-76) define metaphor as a deviation from the literary meaning on the basis of some likeness or analogy between two entities. In order to obtain metaphors for their study, Davitz and Mattis (1964:158) deem it necessary to ask subjects to actively produce these by means of the Rorschach technique responding to an inkblot. They (Davitz & Mattis 1964:174) expect these to be quite different from the emotion metaphors that one would find in the work of "writers, poets, or others actively engaged in any of the arts concerned with the use of language."

Countering such misconceptions, Lakoff and Johnson (1980:3), show that most of our conceptual system is metaphoric in nature:

We have found ... that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980:5) see the essence of metaphor as understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another. It's value lies in the fact that more abstract and intangible areas of experience can be conceptualised in terms of the familiar and concrete (Taylor 1989:132). Metaphor is thus motivated by a search for understanding. Being aware of our metaphoric ways of thinking can lead to better mutual and self-understanding (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:231-4).

3.5 THE DEFINITION OF CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR

The word metaphor goes back to the Greek verb *meta-ferrein*, which means, "to carry over." This describes the nature of metaphor in very clear terms, since, in the cognitive linguistic view, metaphor is defined as understanding one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain (Dirvin 1994:8). The common shorthand way of capturing this view of metaphor is the following: CONCEPTUAL DOMAIN A IS CONCEPTUAL DOMAIN B (Kövecses 2002:4). A very typical domain of experience from which many terms have been transferred is the domain of the human body, as can be seen in examples such as the *mouth* of a river and the *foot* of the mountain (Dirvin 1994:8).

Cognitive linguists usually find it important to distinguish between metaphoric linguistic expressions and conceptual metaphors. Metaphoric linguistic expressions merely make manifest conceptual metaphors in that they are words, or other linguistic features that come from the language terminology of the more concrete conceptual domain (i.e. domain B) (Kövecses 2002:4). To take a classic example, also listed in the groundbreaking work of Lakoff and Johnson (1980:4), the expression “I demolished his argument,” the word “demolished” comes from the domain of war and is a linguistic metaphorical expression, whereas the corresponding conceptual metaphor that it makes manifest is ARGUMENT IS WAR. The use of small capital letters indicates that the particular wording does not occur in the language as such, but it underlies conceptually other linguistic metaphorical expressions (Kövecses 2002:4).

The two domains that participate in a conceptual domain have special names. The domain that we use to understand the other, i.e. from which we draw metaphorical expressions, is called the *source* or *donor domain*. The conceptual domain that is understood in terms of the first is called the *target* or *recipient domain* (Barcelona 2000:3). Hence, in the above example, argument is the target domain, while war is the source domain.

An important finding that cognitive linguists made from their study of metaphor was that conceptual metaphors typically employ a more abstract concept as target and a more concrete or physical concept as their source (Kövecses 2002:6). Typical target domains are argument, love (and other emotions), idea and social organisation, whereas common source domains include war, journey, food, body and plant. It makes sense, of course, that our experiences with the physical world would serve as a natural and logical foundation for the comprehension of more abstract domains.

The projection, or superimposition, of an experiential domain onto another is commonly referred to as a mapping (Barcelona 2000:3). Typically, a large number of aspects, such as attributes, entities and propositions, are mapped from the source domain to the target domain. This means that we often find a set of systematic correspondences between the source and the target in the way that constituent elements in the source domain correspond to constituent elements of the target domain.

An important quality of metaphor is that its elaboration is typically open-ended. This means that it can be creatively exploited in text and in conversation (Barcelona 2000:4). The only restriction on the possibility of mappings is the Invariance Hypothesis, which basically means that a mapping cannot violate the basic structure of the target domain (Barcelona 2000:4). The principle of unidirectionality expresses the same idea, namely, that the metaphorical process typically goes from the more concrete to the more abstract (Kövecses 2002:6).

3.6 LINGUISTIC METAPHOR

Most cognitive linguists believe that linguistic metaphor makes manifest conceptual metaphor (Kövecses

2002:4). However, as Steen (1999:57) points out, few scholars have been able to show how they got from linguistic metaphoric expressions to conceptual metaphor:

It has sometimes remained an act of faith that particular metaphors in language reflect particular metaphors in thought.

Since most conceptual metaphors are derived from discourse, it makes sense to attempt a demonstration of how stretches of discourse can be said to express certain conceptual metaphors as opposed to others (Steen 1999:57). A very successful technique of elucidating conceptual metaphor as expressed in language is considering the structure of the linguistic expression.

3.6.1 The Structure of Metaphor

The structure of metaphor should not be confused with the systematicity of conceptual metaphor, which means that the whole structure of the metaphor system is derived from the most specific metaphorical concept (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:9). Conceptual metaphor, as it exists in relation to linguistic metaphor, can be seen as a complex system entailing several elements, namely a vehicle, an image, a tenor and ground (Dirvin 1994:12).

Dirvin (1994:12-16) illustrates how these elements combine to form the structure of metaphor by means of the Afrikaans expression *jouself vir iemand uittrek* lit. “take off your clothes for somebody.” This expression contains a term from the source domain of undressing, which is transferred to the target domain of interpersonal behaviour, indicating generous, helpful behaviour to someone in need (Dirvin 1994:13).

The *vehicle* of the metaphor in this example is constituted by the linguistic expression *jouself uittrek* “to undress yourself.” In Steen’s methodology of metaphor identification the *vehicle* is called the metaphor *focus* (Steen 1999:60). The first step in our systematic demonstration of the relation between linguistic and conceptual metaphor, therefore, consists of identifying the linguistic element that facilitates the conceptual mapping from one domain to another.

The *image* is taken from the source domain of undressing and consists of the idea of taking off one’s clothes (Dirvin 1994:13). An important fact to bear in mind is that the same image can be arrived at through different vehicles, which makes the distinction between the non-linguistic image and its verbal expression important (Dirvin 1994:13).

The *tenor* can be defined as the complex meaning of the metaphor. This is what the metaphor is about, what it wants to say (Dirvin 1994:13). The meaning of a metaphor is never explicitly spelled out and needs to be inferred. This makes the notion of *tenor*, as indication of the general drift of thought, necessary. In the above example, the *tenor* would be something like “generous help for someone in need” (Dirvin 1994:14). This process of inferring meaning has also been called “metaphor idea identification” in Steen’s methodology

of metaphor analysis, where *idea* corresponds to *tenor* (Steen 1999:62-66).

Dirvin uses a third term to describe the structure of the metaphor referred to above, namely the *ground* (Dirvin 1994:14). This can be described as the link that is felt to exist between the first and the second domain. Although the use of metaphor is mostly spontaneous and we draw links between domains automatically (Kövecses 2002), this ground is not always immediately evident when we try to identify it. In the above-mentioned example the link would be something like “to give away things you need yourself to someone else who is in need” (Dirvin 1994:14).

Identifying the structure of metaphor in this way helps us to get from linguistic to conceptual metaphor in an acceptable way (Steen 1999:57-77). It shows that the link in metaphor is not arbitrary, but based on free and creative associations between two domains of experience (Dirvin 1994:15).

3.6.2 The Context of Metaphor

When talking about the structure of metaphor, one should guard against the view of metaphor as a systematic and objective mapping of a ‘literal’ term to an abstract domain. Cognitive linguists have become increasingly aware of the fact that metaphorical transfers need not depend on similarities that are already present at the conceptual level. Rather, it may involve the attribution of a feature that is ‘created’ depending on the meaning that the speaker intends to convey (Leezenberg 2001:285). The vehicle that is used should therefore not be seen as having a ‘literal’ meaning. It can best be described as an ad hoc concept that applies equally well to the referents of both the source and the target concepts (Leezenberg 2001:285).

In accordance with this view, some cognitive linguists have argued that mapping is not a one-way process, but involves input from the source and the target that is mapped onto a blended space (Barcelona 2000:7). This ‘generic’ space contains skeletal conceptual structure taken to apply to both source and target. Still in accordance with the principle of unidirectionality, the fundamental inferences are projected from the blend to the target, not to the source (Barcelona 2000:7-8).

The fact that metaphor is not the mere mapping of a term with a ‘literal’ meaning to another domain makes awareness of the context and speaker intention with regard to an utterance crucially important. Leezenberg (2001:287) remarks that:

... in the absence of a contextually specified goal, cognitive agents will typically not be able to form any specific ad hoc concept, just as semantically, a metaphor often seems false or anomalous when taken out of its context.

Therefore, in our search for an understanding of conceptual metaphor and its relation with linguistic expressions, we should guard against the temptation to see it as inspired by some ‘literal’ meaning as found in the dictionary. Rather, contextual information should determine the meaning that we ascribe to it. For the

sake of clarity, the author will quote metaphoric expressions from the Hebrew Bible in its wider context where necessary. This usually enables a more verifiable interpretation of metaphorical conceptualisation. With regard to the meaning of lexemes, references to the lexicographical works of Strong (1961) and Davidson (1967) will sometimes be included merely for the purpose of illustration and do not imply an acceptance of their methodologies.

3.7 TYPES OF METAPHOR

Metaphors can be subdivided according to various criteria such as the linguistic level at which the transfer from one domain of experience to another takes place, its conventionality, the proximity or the distance between the two domains, or its cognitive function (Dirvin 1994:16; Kövecses 2002:29).

3.7.1 The Classification of Metaphor According to Lingual Levels

Since metaphor is above all a conceptual process, we cannot predict the linguistic level at which a metaphor is realised in language. Metaphor is not limited to word or sentence level, but can occur at all levels of linguistic expression. Dirvin (1994:16-19) distinguishes between phonological, morphological, lexical, sentential, and discourse metaphors.

Phonological metaphors are also traditionally known as sound symbolisms and occur at the level of sound production mechanisms that indicate meaning. Dirvin (1994:17) lists the example of the /sw/ sound in English which necessitates a quick turning of the tongue ending at the lips. This sound becomes a symbol for the tenor of a “curved fast motion” which occurs in such words as *swerve*, *swipe*, *swift*, *swing*, *swarm*, *swell* (Dirvin 1994:17).

Morphological forms or processes can also serve as vehicles to express new ideas in a metaphoric way (Dirvin 1994:17). This is especially evident in the use of reduplication in various African languages to the effect of metaphoric plurality. The mere repetition of a word or item becomes the vehicle for the denotation of “several” or “many.” This Bantu reduplication pattern is also used in Afrikaans. Dirvin (1994:17) lists the example *In die Vrystaat sal dit plek-plek reën* “In the Freestate it will rain lit. “place-place,” i.e. “in places.” In the case of verbs, it can also denote frequency. Thus, in some Bantu languages *hoshaba* is the word for “kick” and *hoshabashaba* means “to kick repeatedly” (Dirvin 1994:17).

Lexical metaphors occur at the level of words. A common case is the transfer of terms for parts of the body to phenomena of nature such as structural parts of an entity, as in the example *foot of the mountain* (Dirvin 1994:17). Just like in English, the “heart” (לב) is often used in Biblical Hebrew to spatially indicate the centre of something: the heart of the sea (Ex 15:28), the heart of the heavens (Deut 4:11), the heart of a tree (1 Sam 18:14) (Von Meyenfeldt 1950:194-5).

Phrasal metaphors consist of a combination of two or more words in a phrase. The essence of this metaphor is that one part can be the vehicle, but that it cannot exist as such without the other part of the phrase as in the Afrikaans “hoendervleis gee” (lit. “give someone gooseflesh,” Dirvin 1994:18). It is the phrase as a whole that guarantees the transfer from the domain of animal skin to the domain of human emotions, in this case fear. With regard to anger, the Biblical Hebrew phrase קצר אף “quick tempered,” literally “short of spirit” (cf. Prov 15:18; 16:32; 19:11; 25:15) (Struthers 1997:464), serves as a good example.

Sentential metaphors contain no single lexical or phrasal metaphor, but the sentence, as a whole, cannot be taken completely literally. Dirvin (1994:18) gives the typical example of *The outcome of the debate will see many changes to the bill*. In this case the metaphor compresses a construction such as “at the outcome of the debate we will see ...” into a new subject, i.e. “the outcome of the debate will see ...”

Discourse metaphors may range from the smallest type of discourse such as proverbial sayings where everything is to be taken metaphorically, to a whole narrative structure, of which animal epics, such as *Animal Farm* by George Orwell can serve as an illustration.

3.7.2 The Classification of Metaphor According to Conventionality

Another way in which metaphors can be classified is their degree of conventionality (Kövecses 2002:29). This has to do with how deeply entrenched a metaphor is in everyday use by ordinary people.

Many metaphors are *dead*, which means that the common language user has lost the feeling that there was historically a transfer of a term from one domain to another. For example, “bottleneck” no longer evokes the image of the neck of the human body and the figurative meaning becomes the new literal meaning (Dirvin 1994:9). However, when the new meaning of bottleneck as a receptacle with a narrow passage gets applied to traffic, the literal meaning “neck of a bottle” is not dead and can easily be activated again. In such a case the metaphor is *conventional*.

Kövecses (2002:iv) warns against the danger of regarding conventional metaphors as devoid of any influence on our thought. Thus, although אף “anger” can be described as a dead metaphor that developed from the meaning “nose,” the image of a “burning nose” as a metonymy for anger is easily activated when אף is used with words primarily denoting heat, such as הרה “to glow, burn” (Gen 30:2), הרה “burning, glowing” (Deut 13:18), and הרה “burning, glowing” (Ex 11:8) (Köhler & Baumgartner 1958:75) (see Chapter 4). The fact that these expressions are deeply entrenched and effortlessly used does not mean that their images are inactive. They are very much alive and probably even governed the ancient Israelites’ thoughts (see Chapter 4). Dirvin (1994:10) also points out that such images are often used in creative writing.

When a conventional metaphor is used to map an even more abstract domain, such as *bottleneck* to progress or politics indicating something that holds up progress we have to do with an *innovative* metaphor

(Dirvin 1994:9). Another example is the conventional metaphor of ‘cold’ used to refer to a person who is ‘sexually unresponsive’ that leads to the innovative metaphor, where someone is called “a block of ice” (Dirvin 1994:9). In Classical Hebrew, the term חמה “heat, agitation” (Köhler & Baumgartner 1958:309) is conventionally used to denote anger (cf. 2 Kgs 22:13; Isa 51:20; Jer 6:11; etc.). When it is used in the construction בעל חמה “God of wrath” (Nah 1:2), one can probably speak of an innovative metaphor. Kövecses (2002:32) points out that artists, poets, and scientists often make use of innovative metaphors to offer us new ways of understanding the world around us.

3.7.3 The Classification of Metaphor According to the Proximity of the Domains

In the cognitive linguistic view metaphorical processes include all conceptualisations of new experiences, new phenomena, or new aspects of them by means of more familiar concepts. Often the only difference between the processes is the distance between the two domains where the transfer takes place (Dirvin 1994:19-20). Metaphorical processes may range over extremely close domains, as in metonymy and synecdoche, or they may range over more remote domains as in synaesthesia and metaphor proper (Dirvin 1994:19).

(i) *Metonymy* is a conceptual projection whereby the target domain is partially understood in terms of the source domain included in the same experiential domain (Barcelona 2000:4). The metonymic mapping causes the mental activation of the target domain, as when ‘the crown’ is used to talk about ‘the monarch.’ Typical relationships of transfer in metonymy are (Dirvin 1994:20; Barcelona 2000:4):

- (a) The whole instead of a part of something, e.g. *blond* for ‘blond-haired person’
- (b) The container instead of the contained, e.g. *That was a fine dish* for ‘That was fine food’
- (c) The place instead of the inhabitants, e.g. *The whole university protested* for ‘All the staff and students protested’
- (d) The producer instead of the product, e.g. *Lakoff and Johnson has become a bestseller*
- (e) The name instead of the product, e.g. *I’ll have a Heineken*
- (f) The effect instead of the cause, e.g. *He walked with drooping shoulders. He had lost his wife*

(ii) *Synecdoche* is a subcategory of metonymy but refers specifically to the use of the part instead of the whole (Dirvin 1994:20-1). An example from the Hebrew Bible would be שׁוֹן “throat” used to refer to the whole person (Westermann 1997:743).

(iii) *Synaesthesia* is a metaphorical process whereby an experience in one sub-domain of sensory experience is transferred to some other sub-domain of sensory experience, as in *a sweet melody* (Dirvin 1994:21). The original experience of *sweet* keeps nothing of its ‘taste’ attributes when transferred to the experience of hearing. The metaphorical process involves a re-interpretation of the original experience

(Dirvin 1994:21).

(iv) *Metaphor proper* is not restricted to specific kinds of linguistic units or domains for its realisation (Dirvin 1994:21). Whereas metonymy is mainly restricted to nouns and synaesthesia mainly to adjectives, metaphor can occur with verbs, prepositions and particles or any other linguistic category as well.

Metaphor is often also sub-categorised according to its function. On this basis Kövecses (2002:32-6) distinguishes three kinds: structural, ontological, and orientational.

- (a) In *structural metaphor* the source domain provides a relatively rich knowledge structure for the target concept which enables the speaker to understand the target domain in terms of the structure of the source domain, i.e. the conceptual structure of a body is transferred to that of a mountain so that we can speak of the foot, the shoulder and the head of a mountain (Dirvin 1994:21-2).
- (b) The main function of *ontological metaphors* is to give ontological status to general categories of abstract target concepts. For example, by conceiving of fear as an object, we can conceptualise it as a possession (Kövecses 2002:35). Thus Classical Hebrew can linguistically refer to fear as *יְהוָה יִרְאָה* “the fear of YHWH.”
- (c) *Oriental metaphors* have to do with basic human spatial orientations, such as up-down, centre-periphery, whole-part, in-out, front-back and others (Kövecses 2002:36). A way to indicate an increase in anger in Classical Hebrew is to say: “his anger rose up (*עָלָה*)” (2 Sam 11:20). Such image schemas are bipolar, so that target concepts are evaluated in a positive-negative way (Kövecses 2002:36).

3.8 THE BASIS OF METAPHOR

Cognitive linguists have found that source domains for a particular target cannot be predicted within a given language (Kövecses 2002:76). The traditional view of metaphor explains the choice of a specific source on the basis of similarity. Hence, if no similarity exists between two entities we cannot metaphorically use one to talk about the other (Kövecses 2002:67). This assumption of autonomous linguistics is motivated by its ideal to be an exact science that would allow scientists to predict linguistic phenomena such as metaphor.

Cognitive linguistics breaks away from this notion of the predictability of metaphor and replaces it by the theory of motivation (Kövecses 2002:67). In this view, the choice of source domains depends on common everyday experiential bases (Kövecses 2002:76). They are motivated by human factors that reflect non-objective, non-literal, and non-pre-existing similarities between the source and the target domain. In some broad sense, all conceptual metaphors are taken to arise from bodily experience, and it is this ‘experientialism’ that distinguishes the cognitive approach from other theories of language and thought that are more abstract and formal (Grady, Taub & Morgan 1996:177). Most typically, conceptual metaphor is

motivated by correlations in experience, perceived structural similarities between entities and perceived structural similarities induced by basic metaphors (Kövecses 2002:76).

The psychobiological basis of feeling states and its influence on the conceptualisation of emotions is a very good example of metaphoric concepts being motivated by experience (cf. Kövecses 1999:254). The experience of heat in the event of anger seems to be universal and has led to metaphoric concepts of anger in different languages based on the concept of heat (Kövecses 1995b:181). In English it has led to expressions such as “he got hot under the collar” and “they had a heated argument” (Kövecses 2002:171). In Japanese “my head got hot” means “I got angry.” In Polish, to say somebody’s blood boils implies that the person is in a state of anger, and in Zulu an individual is said to be hot when angry (Kövecses 2002:171-2).

Apart from physiological experiences, perceived structural similarities can also lead to mappings from source to target domains (Kövecses 2002:76). Again with regard to the emotions, the body seems to be conceptualised as a container for the emotions. In the case of anger, Kövecses (2002:165-71) has found that it is conceptualised as hot fluid in a container in many cultures. While the word for human blood is present in many of the examples, it is reasonable to assume that it is mainly blood that accounts for the fluid component of the metaphor (Kövecses 2002:173). Very often, bodily organs are seen as the containers for the emotions (see Smith 1998).

Despite these broad similarities with regard to the human conceptualisation of universal experiences, it is important to note that there exist important differences in the more detailed aspects of the conceptualisation (Kövecses 2002:183-195). The American folk model for the circulatory system, for example, is based on ‘plumbing’ (Banks & Thompson 1996:99-126). In this model the heart is seen as a ‘pump’ and the arteries and veins as tubes through which blood flows (Banks & Thompson 1996:104-6). This conceptual metaphor is hardly based on scientific findings, and the only reason for its prevalence is the fact that it provides a schema for the intake and storage of information based on a well-known experience from the cultural environment (Banks & Thompson 1996:103). However, we can hardly expect to find the same conceptual metaphor in Classical Hebrew, since the notions of plumbing and pumping was non-existing at the time of its writing.

The study of Boers (1999:47-56) provides yet another example of the influence of environmental influences on the use of metaphor. Conducting a study on health metaphors used in *The Economist*, Boers found that they were far more frequently used in winter (Boers 1999:55). He argued that this was because awareness of one’s bodily existence is enhanced when it starts malfunctioning, like in cases of illness. In the Northern Hemisphere many common illnesses are related to bad weather conditions, which explains the increase in frequency of HEALTH metaphors in winter. One can therefore conclude that a source domain is more likely to be used for metaphorical mapping as it becomes more salient in everyday experience (Boers 1999:55). The salience of a source domain depends greatly on environmental and cultural factors.

3.8.1 Primitive and Compound Metaphors

Grady, Taub and Morgan (1995:177-87) address the problem that important aspects of the source domain often fail to map to the target domain. As an example, they refer to the THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS metaphor where salient parts of buildings, like floors, walls, ceilings, potential occupants and functions, such as shelters, homes, and workplaces, do not get mapped.

In addition, this conceptual metaphor seems to lack direct bodily experiential basis, a quality that is considered vital in the cognitive approach to emotion (Grady, Taub & Morgan 1995:177-9). Unlike the oft-cited example of MORE IS UP where it is easy to see the correlation between an increase in substances or objects and the observation of levels rising, as when a glass is filled up with a liquid, there is no straightforward correlation underlying this conceptual metaphor based on bodily experience (Grady, Taub & Morgan 1995:179).

To solve this problem, the authors suggest a distinction between primitive and compound metaphors (Grady, Taub & Morgan 1995:181-5). By definition, primitive metaphors always have independent experiential basis and linguistic evidence. By contrast, compound metaphors are composed of coherent primitive metaphors (Grady, Taub & Morgan 1995:185).

This solution requires a close attention to detail of the linguistic and conceptual data and to the experiential motivations underlying the metaphors (Grady, Taub & Morgan 1995:185). They show, for example, that the entities and relations which are usually taken to make up the metaphor THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS can better be taken to underlie the primitive metaphors LOGICAL STRUCTURE IS PHYSICAL STRUCTURE and PERSISTING IS REMAINING ERECT which combine to form the compound VIABLE LOGICAL STRUCTURES ARE ERECT PHYSICAL STRUCTURES (Grady, Taub & Morgan 1995:182-3).

Grady, Taub and Morgan (1995:186) further argue that distinguishing between these two kinds of metaphors would allow for a more specific comparison of complex metaphors within a language as well as cross-linguistically. Being more directly based on bodily experience, primitives can be expected to be more common than compounds cross-linguistically (Grady, Taub & Morgan 1995:186).

3.8.2 Humoral Theories

In a very stimulating paper Geeraerts and Grondelaers (1995:153-79) criticise Kövecses' a-historical approach to the study of emotion concepts searching for motivation only on the basis of bodily experience. By showing that the humoral doctrine in Classical and Medieval physiology accounts much better for a number of anger expressions in several occidental languages (Geeraerts & Grondelaers 1995:155), they argue that a diachronic approach to a study of anger concepts in English would be more successful in showing the decisive influence of this theory on contemporary vocabulary (Geeraerts & Grondelaers 1995:155).

Geeraerts and Grondelaers (1995:162) demonstrate the value of being cognisant of this most influential

theory by pointing to the direct relation between contemporary emotion words such as Fr. *colère* “anger,” Dutch *zwartgallig* “sad, depressed” and the humoral view. In addition, fire being the element corresponding to the choleric personality, the origin of expressions such as “he is a fiery person” is better sought in this theory than in mere physiological sensations (Geeraerts & Grondelaers 1995:158).

In addition, Geeraerts and Grondelaers (1995:166-9) show that Kövecses’ analysis of the complex conceptual metaphor ANGER IS THE HEAT OF A FLUID IN A CONTAINER neatly fitted into the humoral view of human physiology (Geeraerts & Grondelaers 1995:166-7):

...the body is the container of the four cardinal fluids, and anger involves the heating up of specific fluids (either yellow bile as the direct source of ire, or blood as the mixture of the four humors).

Thus, it seems better able to motivate the reference to fluids in the expressions, since in Kövecses’ model the fact that the body is a container for the emotions does not predispose an interpretation of the emotions as fluids, whereas emotions in the humoral theory are directly related to the fluids (Geeraerts & Grondelaers 1995:167). This also explains why the fluid version of the HEAT metaphor is more elaborate than the one relating to solids.

By emphasizing the influence of the humoral view Geeraerts and Grondelaers (1995:170) do not try to deny the importance of physiological influences on emotion vocabulary. There even exists the possibility that they interact with the historical humoral influences (Geeraerts & Grondelaers 1995:170). This possibility becomes especially plausible in view of the fact that similar humoral theories are developed, apparently independently, in other parts of the world (Banks & Thompson 1996:123).

3.8.3 Magic and Spirits

Banks and Thompson (1996:122-3) identify another very important source of conceptual metaphors relating to ideas about the physical world, namely magic and spirits. They are of the opinion that even though Westerners dismiss this realm as superstition they cannot really claim to be free from it (Banks & Thompson 1996:122):

We see it commonly in faith healing, in the use of protective or healing amulets, and perhaps in the power of the placebo effect.

They claim that health (and emotion, we may add) beliefs are imbedded in a larger world system that includes spiritual theories of physics, weather, dreams, and so on (Banks & Thompson 1996:123). The truth of this claim becomes evident when one considers that a very common word for anger in the Hebrew Bible אַרְצָה was originally the name of a demon whose character was probably ‘choleric’ (see Boehmer 1926).

3.8.4 Conclusion

From the above it is clear that in our quest to understand emotion concepts as they are revealed in language, we need to pay careful attention to the possible experiential basis that underlie most of all conceptual metaphors. But our investigation should not end here, since primitive metaphors often combine to form more complex ones that further structure our conceptual understanding of the emotions. Equally important is not to underestimate the possible influence of cultural humoral theories based on the concepts of wetness versus dryness and heat versus cold (Banks & Thompson 1996:123). Finally, awareness of beliefs in magic and spirits, even if they are not held anymore, might throw light on the origin of certain metaphoric concepts of which the direct experiential basis is not that evident.

3.9 THE SCOPE AND THE FOCUS OF METAPHOR

In the study of conceptual models for emotion it has been observed that several different source domains can be used for mappings (Kövecses 2000:79-93). Happiness, for example, is characterised by conceptual metaphors such as VITALITY, AN OPPONENT, INSANITY and many others in Kövecses' analysis of the understanding of this emotion in English (Kövecses 2000:79). However, the fact that a single source domain could serve as motivation for mappings to many different target domains has received very little attention in the study of conceptual metaphor until now (Kövecses 2000:79). The range of cases, or the kind and quantity of target domains, to which a source domain applies, is called the scope of metaphor (Kövecses 2002:108).

Studying the scope of metaphor is useful in the sense that it helps us to determine the main focus of the conceptual metaphor (Kövecses 2000:81-3). Analysing the scope of the FIRE metaphors in English, Kövecses (2000:86) demonstrates that the main meaning focus of this metaphor as applied to emotions is intensity. This strongly suggests a conceptualisation of emotional states as motivated by physiological changes, such as raised body temperature and increased heartbeat, which accompany states of arousal (Kövecses 2000:89).

Establishing the main meaning focus of a source domain allows for better cross-linguistic comparison of conceptual metaphors, since the experience that underlie these mappings are often culturally determined (Kövecses 2000:84). The occurrence of heat metaphors with reference to emotions in other languages does not mean that their main focus should be intensity. A study of the scope of the HEAT metaphor in Sotho languages has revealed that their main focus is unpleasantness (Taylor 1989:140):

..., any abnormal or unpleasant condition of the body or psyche is understood in terms of being hot: bereavement, physical pain, illness (not only fever), extreme tiredness, insanity, menstruation, pregnancy, childbirth, as well as (and here the Sotho understanding coincides with English) agitation, impatience, and anger.

Rather than being merely based on the experience of physiological changes, the heat metaphor in Sotho seems to be better explained as part of a cultural humor theory. The heat associated with anger characterises it as an uncomfortable, negative experience. This is also suggested by the fact that there exists a common treatment of these unpleasant states (Taylor 1989:140):

A person in one of these conditions has 'hot blood' which needs 'cooling' (e.g. with cold water, or with cold ash from a burnt-out fire). Furthermore, he must be kept away from family and cattle, in case he infects these with his heat.

Again, to say that the conceptual HEAT metaphor in Sotho is motivated by a cultural humor theory does not mean that it is independent from direct bodily experience. Rather, it is closely linked to environmental factors that have a profound influence on physical understanding (Taylor 1989:140):

The experiential base of the metaphors is no doubt to be found in the physical environment of the speakers. The Sothos live in a hot arid plateau, where the search for water is a major concern. It is not unreasonable to suppose that, in this environment, heat gets metonymically associated with negatively valued states (HOT IS BAD) and coolness with positively valued states (COOL IS GOOD).

It cannot be denied that a study of the scope of central metaphors has special potential to expose the close link between cultural and environmental factors and metaphorical conceptualisations. This was also demonstrated by a comparison of the scope of the windmill metaphor in Afrikaans and Dutch by Dirvin (1994). Dirvin (1994:23-4) showed that the windmill is one of the most common source domains for conceptual metaphors in Dutch due to its salience in the flat Low Countries with its strong winds. The weather, climate and landscape in South Africa did not favour the use of windmills, which lead to a very sharp decline in the use of windmill metaphors and idioms in Afrikaans. The few who did survive were sometimes slightly adapted to make up for the lack of image (Dirvin 1994:25).

With regard to the study of emotion in the Hebrew Bible it is therefore of extreme importance to establish the focus of the conceptual metaphor and analyse the way in which they extend to other target domains. The above findings suggest that an investigation of the scope of the most salient source domains could serve as a guard against unfounded generalisations from our own experience. This will briefly be demonstrated by way of allusion to the FIRE metaphor in American English and Classical Hebrew.

It has already been mentioned that the FIRE metaphor in English, as applied to the emotions, focuses on the aspect of intensity (Kövecses 2000:86). Many linguistic expressions suggest that the experiential basis of this figure in American English is the bodily heat that we experience when we engage in intense situations (Kövecses 2000:89). This is especially clear in emotion concepts relating to anger, such as the following (Kövecses 2000:84-9):

- Frostman was a deeply angry man, *burning* with resentment
- As a child I had a real *hot* temper.
- He was *blazing* with rage.
- He thought from the change in her face that she was going *to flare up* in anger.
- Baxter *smouldered* as he drove home for lunch.

By contrast, the FIRE metaphor in Classical Hebrew clearly focuses on the notion of destruction.⁶ Although there is no lack of linguistic expressions that are motivated by the bodily experience of heat in the Hebrew Bible,⁷ the FIRE metaphor is motivated by cognisance of the destructive power of insatiable fire (cf. Prov 30:16). Hence, YHWH is often depicted as blowing some consuming fire that destroys the objects of his wrath in theophanies:

(1) עלה עשן באפו ואש מפיו תאכל גחלים בערו ממנו

'lh 'sn b'pw w's mpyw t'kl ghlym b'rw mmnw.

V: go up (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: smoke P: in N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and N: fire (f) P: from N: mouth + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: eat (qal impf 3rd sg, f) N: coals V: burn (qal pf 3rd pl) P: from + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“Smoke went up from his nostrils, and devouring fire from his mouth; glowing coals flamed forth from him” (Ps 18:9 = 2 Sam 22:9; translation by Fuhs 1975:464).⁸

(2) תהרו חשש תלדו קש רוחי כמו⁹ אש תאכלכם

thrw ḥšš tldw qš rwḥy kmw 'š t'klkm.

V: conceive (qal impf 2nd pl) N: chaff (def) V: bear (qal impf 2nd pl) straw N: breath + pron suffix (1st sg) P: like + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: fire V: eat (qal impf 3rd sg, f) + pron suffix (2nd pl, m).

“You conceive chaff, you give birth to straw; my breath is like a fire that consumes you” (Isa 33:11).¹⁰

This divergence in metaphor focus also reflects in the scope of the American English and Classical Hebrew versions of the FIRE metaphor. The American English version, focussing on intensity, includes targets such as curiosity, love, hope, interest, enthusiasm, sexuality-lust, argument, pressure, and the like (Kövecses 2000:84-7). By contrast, the FIRE metaphor in the Hebrew Bible limits itself to target concepts that relate to the notion of destruction, such as distress in war (Num 21:28; Isa 10:16; Ps 78:63), judgement (Isa 66:11), chasing the defeated enemy (1 Sam 17:53; Lam 4:19; cf. Wenham 1994:277) and anger (cf. Hamp 1974:423-

⁶ See 4.2.2.

⁷ See 4.2.1.

⁸ Also see 4.2.1.2 and 4.2.2.6.

⁹ Instead of רוחכם (see *BHS* and Watts 1987:423). It seems improbable that the victims' own breath would act as the agent of destruction. The proposed emendation of the Targum Secundum and the Vulgate seems cogent in view of the fact that YHWH's breath is commonly depicted as a devouring fire (see 4.2.3).

¹⁰ Also see 4.2.2.2 and 4.2.2.6.

5).

The main meaning focus and scope of a metaphor has important consequences for the interpretation of linguistic data. For example, Lakoff (1987:409-15) has indicated that the conceptual model of the American English ANGER metaphor shows remarkable similarities with that of LUST. The overlap in conceptual framework of these two physical-emotional phenomena seems to have led to conceptual links between femininity and provocation, where femininity elicits lust and frustration draws out anger. This close link between anger and lust in American English may cause the reader of the Hebrew Bible to misinterpret the FIRE metaphor in Proverbs 6:27f as targeting LUST elicited by the whorish women (cf. Hamp 1974:424):

(3) אל תחמד יפיה בלבבך ואל תקחך בעפעפיה ... היחתה איש אש בחיקו ובגדיו לא תשרפנה
'l tḥmd ypyh blbbk w'l tqḥk b'p'pyh ... hyḥth 'yš 'š bḥyqw wbgdyw l' tśrpnh.

Neg particle V: desire (qal impf 2nd sg, m) N: beauty + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) P: in N: heart + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and Neg particle V: take (qal impf 3rd sg, f) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) P: with N: eyelids + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) ... Interr particle V: fetch (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: man N: fire P: in N: lap + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and N: clothes + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) Neg particle V: burn (ni impf 3rd f, sg).

“Do not desire her beauty in your heart and don’t let her take you with her eyelids ... Can a man take fire in his lap and his clothes not burn?” (Prov 6:25, 27).

Some commentators have pointed to the long-standing tradition of associating the whore-like woman with fire, which in this context may be strengthened by the similar sounding אש (v 27) “fire” and אשה, “woman” (v 26). There is a marked difference, however, with the anger-lust relationship in American English. The adulterous woman, much more than merely evoking lust in another man, also effects his destruction through the anger and vengeance of her husband (v 34). This latter concept may in fact fit the FIRE metaphor in verses 27-28 much better, since lust, in the Hebrew Bible, is often merely conceptualised in terms of HEAT (cf. 1 Kgs 1:2; Isa 57:2):

(4) כי קנאה חמת גבר ולא יחמול ביום נקם
ky qn'h ḥmt gbr wl' yḥmwł bywm nqm.

C: because N: jealousy N: anger (cs) N: man C: and Neg particle V: spare (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: in N: day (cs) N: vengeance.

“For jealousy arouses a husband’s fury, and he will show no mercy when he takes revenge” (Prov 6:34; NIV).

3.10 THE RELATION BETWEEN METAPHOR AND CONCEPTUAL MODELS

Another debate in cognitive linguist circles concerns the relationship between conceptual metaphor and ideal cognitive models. While some scholars argue for a view where conceptual models are constituted by metaphor (cf. Kövecses 1999:167-88), others insist that the relationship between the two is variable and unpredictable (cf. Emanatian 1999:205-18).

If we understand cultural models as the coherent conceptual organisation of human experiences it comes close to the notion of schemas as used by some cognitive linguists (Emanatian 1999:205). They can be defined as emergent and mutable patterns we absorb, use, change, reject, and pass on (Emanatian 1999:205). Not all cultural models involve metaphorical understanding based on mappings from one domain to another. Emanatian (1999:214) mentions the American schema of going to the Laundromat as an example of a model for which there exist no metaphors. In addition, our concepts for objects such as chairs, balls, rocks and the like do not require metaphorical understanding (Kövecses 1999:167).

However, the more abstract the domain of experience, the more dependent the conceptual model would be on metaphorical conceptualisation (Kövecses 1999:167). For example, Kövecses (1999:186) shows that a rendition of the American concept of marriage based on evidence excluding metaphor left out a large and significant portion of this concept from which the expectational structure of marriage derived. Similarly, the lack of experiential basis in the concepts of the 'Anger of God' in the studies cited in Chapter 2 can be attributed to the fact that they are based on theological belief, which disregards conceptual metaphor as revealed in language.

The study of Emanatian (1999:205-19) also shows that, even where gender differences in cultural models with regard to abstract concepts exist, they are reflected in conceptual metaphor. In Chagga, a Bantu language of Tanzania, sex and lust is commonly conceptualised by means of the source domains of eating and heat (Emanatian 1999:206-9). Unlike men, however, females are not only searching for sexual partners, but for progeny (Emanatian 1999:211). This is reflected in the expression used uniquely of woman "I am thirsty," which translates into, "I want to have more intercourse" (Emanatian 1999:211). Another expression revealing the female interest in pregnancy and conceiving children rather than mere lust is, "she's searching for milk," where milk metaphorically stands for semen (Emanatian 1999:211). The difference in male and female sexuality is also reflected in the initiation rituals of this culture (Emanatian 1999:210-11). While young men usually stalk prey and hunt for food, females 'hunt' for small animals, such as grasshoppers and tadpoles. This female hunting contrasts with the male hunting, and has the implication of seeking out progeny (Emanatian 1999:210).

Emanatian's reluctance to unconditionally admit a strong link between conceptual models and metaphor is probably attributable to her view of conceptual metaphor as based solely on language (Emanatian

1999:204), while the rituals that she refers to can also be regarded as realisations of metaphorical understanding. It may be true that conceptual metaphor as reflected in language alone cannot always exhaust conceptual models, but in the view of present evidence, it is indeed unthinkable that abstract concepts can exist independently of metaphorical meaning.

3.11 CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

The cognitive theory of conceptual metaphor presents itself as an ideal tool for an investigation of anger concepts in the Hebrew Bible. In the ensuing part of the study linguistic expressions taken from the Hebrew Bible will be analysed under headings that represent the conceptual metaphors and metonymies that they convey. The method of listing linguistic expressions as vehicles of conceptual metaphors and metonymies has been successfully applied to the study of folk models for anger in various languages (cf. Kövecses 1995a; Matsuki 1995; Kruger 2000). While more than one source can serve as motivation for metaphoric linguistic expressions, certain utterances will be restated under relevant headings. Where applicable, comments will be added to explain possible 'blends' and the compound nature of particular metaphors.

CHAPTER 4

CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS AND METONYMIES FOR ANGER IN THE HEBREW BIBLE

From an evolutionary perspective the functional significance of anger is conspicuous. It has evolved to enhance the adaptation and survival of the species through its ability to mobilise one's energy and enable defence with vigour and strength (cf. Izard 1977:333-4). In addition to being an energiser and organiser of behaviour, it is a social signal that regulates interpersonal behaviour (Lemerise & Dodge 1993:537-8). It is also thought to serve an important function in the acquiring and protection of resources (Edwards 1999:142).

With the rise of civilisation these functions became less in demand so that scientists now consider it as more of a handicap than an asset (Izard 1977:333). Paradoxically, the manifestation of violence seems to be increasing even in the developed world (cf. Talos 2002:6). As a consequence, research on the phenomenology of anger and aggression has entered centre stage in scientific research.

Focussing on the ethics of emotions, theology largely overlooks the motivational significance of anger and proves little interest in its bodily expression (see chapter 2). Yet, it is the bodily experience of emotions that makes the biggest impression on us and finds its way into our everyday vocabulary (cf. Kövecses 2002). In an application of the Kövecses model, Kruger (2000:187-9) identified several metonymies for anger in the Hebrew Bible based on physical agitation and heat. With at least 10 roots commonly denoting anger (אָנַף, זַעַם, זַעַף, חַמָּה, חָרָה, כַּעַס, עָבַר, קִצְף, רָגַז, רִוַח; cf. Johnson 1973:379-81; Kruger 2000:182), the popular theory of divine impassibility (cf. Creel 1986) seems to find little support here.

Since metaphor often builds on metonymy (Kövecses 1995b:191), it seems fitting to start this study of the ancient Hebrew conceptualisation of anger with an investigation of how elements of the physical experience of anger are used to symbolise anger.

4.1 CONCEPTUAL METONYMIES FOR ANGER

In conceptual metonymies for anger, the physiological effects of anger stand for anger (Kövecses 1990:52). Kövecses (1990:51) identifies the following physiological concomitants when anger is experienced:

The physiological effects of anger are increased body heat, increased internal pressure (blood pressure, muscular pressure), agitation, and interference with accurate perception.

Since the physical experience of anger is similar across cultures (Kövecses 1995, 1995b), we find conceptual metonymies for anger reflecting these experiences in the Hebrew Bible as well.

4.1.1 Body Heat

The rise in body temperature is a characteristic feature of anger among all mammals (see Gruber 1978:91). It is therefore to be expected that many words used to speak of anger in the Hebrew Bible have the basic meaning of heat (cf. Schunk 1977:1033). About חמה, the second most common word for anger (Johnson 1973:382), Sauer (1997a:435) writes:

In view of the meaning of the word, the basic meaning of חמה may indicate “being hot (from excitement),” thus e.g., “boiling,” then “wrath” ...

(5) ויקצף המלך מאד וחמתו בערה בו

wyqšp hmlk m'd whmtw b'rh bw.

C: and V: angry (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: king (def) Adv: very C: and N: anger (f) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: burn (qal pf 3rd sg, f) P: in + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“And the king was very angry and his anger burned in him” (Esth 1:12).¹¹

(6) תבער כמו אש חמתך

tb'r kmw 'š hmtk.

V: burn (qal impf 3rd sg, f) P: like N: fire N: anger + pron suffix (2nd m, sg).

“Your anger burns like fire” (Ps 89:47).¹²

The root חמה is also associated with fever as an effect of divine wrath (Keel 1997:80). Sauer (1997a:435) concludes that חמה refers to the inner fire of anger, an interpretation which is supported by the fact that חמה is probably derived from the root חם “to be hot” (Johnson 1973:380), which, in its turn, is derived from the root חם “to be warm” (Schunk 1977:1032):

(7) פן ירדף גאל הדם אחרי הרצח כי יחם לבבו

pn yrdp g'l hdm 'hry hršḥ ky yḥm lbbw.

C: lest V: pursue (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: avenger of bloodshed P: after N: manslayer (def) C:

¹¹ Also see 4.2.1.

¹² Also see 4.2.1 and 4.2.2.

because V: hot (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: heart + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“Lest the avenger pursue the slayer because he is angry (lit. his heart is warm)” (Deut 19:6) (See Von Meyenfeldt 1950:141).

In Hosea 7:4-7 the picture of heat caused by poisoning occurs side by side with that of a hot oven indicating the heat of anger. In v 4, the kings and officials are said to be as hot as an oven with a fire so great that it would need no tending from the time the dough was kneaded with yeast until it had risen (i.e. an hour or two; Stuart 1987:119):

(8) כֹּלֵם מִנְאֲפִים כְּמוֹ תֵנוּר בְּעֵר הֵם¹³ אִפֶּה יִשְׁבוֹת מֵעִיר מְלוֹשׁ בְּצֶק עַד חֲמֻצְתּוֹ

klm mn'pym kmw tnwr b'r hm 'ph yšbwt m'yr mlwš bšq 'd ḥmšt̄w.

Indef Pronoun: all VN: adulterer (pi pt pl, m) P: like N: oven V: burn (qal pt sg, m) Pronoun: they (m, pl) N: baker V: cease (qal impf 3rd sg, m) V: stir up (hi pt sg, m) P: from VN: knead (qal inf cs) N: dough P: until V: be leavened (qal inf cs) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“They are all adulterers, burning like an oven whose fire the baker need not stir from the kneading of the dough till it rises” (Hos 7:4, NIV).

Stuart (1987:119) points out that “the catchword ‘adulterers’ (מִנְאֲפִים) is here also a pun on אִפֶּה “to bake,” v 4, and אַנְי “anger,” v 6, words which sound rather similar to it.”

The way in which the simile of the oven describes the body heat concomitant of anger as anger is also enhanced when one considers the nature of the oven that is brought to mind by the above expression. Stuart (1987:119) describes the oven (תֵנוּר), which indeed can be likened to the body, in detail:

It was a round, domed, beehive structure made from fired clay with floor-level apertures and a large door on top. ... A roaring fire was built inside and allowed to burn until the interior was glowing hot. The coals were left, not swept out as with more modern brick ovens. ... The door at the top of the oven was sealed, and the bread was left to bake in the retained heat, which would not dissipate for hours ...

The mere presence of the word תֵנוּר “furnace” may add to the notion of body heat in that it is probably derived from the root נוֹר, “to shine,” or the Aramaic substantive נוֹר, “fire” (Davidson 1967:766). The image of somatic temperature is further reinforced with a reference in v 5 to poisoning as a means of executing political contenders (Gruber 1980:526-7; cf. Van Leeuwen 1978:154). The simile of the oven dominates, however, as it is taken up again in v 6 and continues through v 7:

(9) כִּי קִדְחוּ¹⁵ כִתְנוּר לִבָּם בְּעֵר בָּם¹⁴ כֹּל הַלִּילָה יִשֶׁן אִפְהֵם בְּקֶר הוּא בְעֵר כֹּאֵשׁ לִהְבֵּה כֹלֵם יִחְמוּ

¹³ Instead of מֵ בְעֵרָה מ (See BHS). This suggested reading seems more likely in view of the fact that תֵנוּר is a masculine noun, which makes the feminine participle questionable.

ky qdhw ktnwr lbm b'r bm kl hlylh yšn 'phm bqr hw' b'r k's lhbh klm yhmw ktnwr.

C: because V: burn (qal pf 3rd pl) P: like N: furnace N: heart + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) V: burn (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: in + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) Indef pronoun: all N: night V: sleep (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: anger + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) N: morning Pronoun: it V: burn (qal pt sg, m) P: like N: fire (f) N: flame Indef Pronoun: all V: be warm (qal impf 3rd pl, m) P: like N: furnace.

“Indeed, they are inflamed like an oven, their heart burns within them. All night their fury slumbers; in the morning it blazes up like a roaring fire. All of them are as hot as an oven” (Hos 7:6-7, translation by Stuart 1987:114).

Another very common word that is used to speak of the heat caused by anger is חרה “to glow, burn” (Johnson 1973:380). Although the verb and the substantives of this root are used only figuratively in the psychological realm to refer to anger (Sauer 1997b:473), its nature as a metonymy based on the bodily experience of heat should not be underestimated (Westermann 1981:147):

Der Zorn hat immer körperliche Begleiterscheinungen, das bringt sowohl das Verb חרה wie auch das Nomen אף zum Ausdruck. Zorn also ist kein geistiger oder seelischer Vorgang, er kann nicht auf die Psyche des Menschen beschränkt werden.

Gruber (1978; 1980) has gone through great lengths to illustrate that when חרה is accompanied by the preposition ל instead of the substantive אף “nose,” it means: “to be depressed” (Gruber 1978:93). Writing about the story of Cain and Abel (Gen 4), Gruber (1978:90-1) argues that Cain clearly felt dejected, since it is said, “his face fell” (ויפלו פניו; Gen 4:5b). The preceding phrase, ויחר לקין מאד, “and it became very hot to him” (Skinner 1994:106, Gen 4:5b), should therefore be translated: “and Cain became very depressed,” where ל חרה indicates depression as anger turned upon the self according to the definition of Karl Abraham and Sigmund Freud (Gruber 1978:92-3).

Apart from Gruber (1978:93), few scholars have had a problem with Cain being both angry and depressed. Skinner (1994:106) describes Cain’s anger as a mixture of anger and dejection. Kruger (2000:182-3) explains that these two negative emotions sometimes occur together in the Hebrew Bible (cf. Gen 34:7; 1 Kgs 21:4), since they can be elicited by the same event. It is therefore not surprising that few commentators have taken notice of Gruber’s suggestion to render ל חרה “to be depressed.”¹⁶ While few commentators had

¹⁴ Reading בער במם instead of the implausible MT באר במם “their intrigue” (Stuart 1987:116; Van Leeuwen 1978:155). The proposed emendation suits the predominant image of burning, which is emphasised throughout the pericope (also see v 4).

¹⁵ Instead of MT קברו “they approached,” which is clearly doubtful in view of the comparison with תנור “oven” (cf. Stuart 1987:116).

¹⁶ Following Gruber, Hamilton (1990:224) chose to depart from the usual translation of ל חרה with “anger” in Gen 4:6, but not in Gen 4:5. See also Matthews (1996:268), who says that Gruber’s attempt to define Cain’s reaction as “depression” rather than “anger”

a problem reading חרה as “anger,” some have questioned the lack of subject in the ל חרה combination (cf. Soggin 1997:100; Wenham 1987:94). Soggin (1997:100) contends that the אף is implied: “[der] Subjekt ist das unerwähnte, jedoch implizierte ‘sein Gesicht’.” However, in view of the fact that body heat is not restricted to the face (cf. Kövecses 1990:51), ל חרה may very well be regarded as a metonymy for anger, even when unaccompanied by אף:

(10) ויחר לקין מאד

wyħr lqyn m’d.

C: and V: burn P: to PN: Cain Adv: much.

“And Cain became very angry (lit. ‘it became hot to him’)” (Gen 4:5).

The substantives of the root חרה are also accompanied by אף in the majority of cases (Struthers 1997:436). In all six of its occurrences חרי “heat, burning” is modified by אף (Struthers 1997:436). The noun חרון occurs eight times in Jeremiah alone (Struthers 1997:436), only once without אף: Jeremiah 25:38:

(11) כי היתה ארצם לשמה מפני חרון היונה ומפני חרון אפו

ky hyth ’rṣm lšmh mpny ħrwn hywnh wmpny ħrwn ’pw.

C: because V: become (qal pf 3rd sg, f) N: land + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: to N: horror P: because of N: heat (cs) N: oppressor (def) C: and P: because of N: heat (cs) N: anger.

“For their land became a horror because of the burning of the oppressor and the heat of his anger” (Jer 25:38).¹⁷

Translators and commentators have been troubled by the חרון היונה construct, especially since חרון occurs twice in the v (cf. Feinberg 1986:537). A score of Hebrew MSS, the LXX, Vulgate, and Targum read חרב “the sword” (so NIV) instead of “the heat” (Craigie, Kelley & Drinkard 1991:373). Although the reading חרון “burning” (Gruber 1980:492) would make sense from the cognitive perspective, reading it as a metonymy for anger, it is very difficult to defend in this text (Lange 1871:236; Cheyne 1950:553).¹⁸ However, it does occur elsewhere as such, unaccompanied by אף:

(12) עלי עברו חרונך

’ly ’brw ħrwnyk.

P: over + pron suffix (1st sg) V: pass over (qal pf 3rd pl) N: wrath (pl) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).

“Your wrath has swept over me” (Ps 88:17, NIV).¹⁹

“smacks of modern distinction.”

¹⁷ Also see 4.1.7.

¹⁸ Cheyne (1950:553) points out that even the punctuation is more in favour of the variant reading. See also Jer 46:16 and 50:16.

¹⁹ Also see 4.1.10 and 4.2.8.

(13) כי חרון אל כל המונה

ky ḥrwn 'l kl hmwnh.

C: because N: wrath P: to Indef pronoun: all N: crowd + pron suffix (3rd sg, f).

“For wrath is on her whole crowd” (Ezek 7:12).

The articulation of the aspect of heat as a concomitant of anger is not restricted to חמה, חרה, and אף. Wiklander (1977:623, 625-6) points out that these stems also sometimes combine with other words for anger to express the idea of heat in connection with anger (e.g. with זעם: Isa 66:14-15).

A root that is often overlooked as a metonymic indication of body heat in relation to anger is זלעפה, “violent heat” (Davidson 1967:239). It is related to another term for anger, זעף, “to boil over, anger” (Strong 1961:36; cf. Davidson 1967:239). While it is used in Psalm 11:6 to describe the hot easterly wind in Palestine as metaphor for divine wrath,²⁰ it refers to bodily heat as a metonymy for anger in Psalm 119:53:

(14) זלעפה אחזתני מרשעים עזבי תורתך

zl'ph ḥztny mrš'ym 'zby twrtk.

N: violent heat V: lay hold of (qal pf 3rd sg, f) + pron suffix (1st sg) P: because of N: impious (pl) V: abandon (qal pt pl, m) (cs) N: law + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).

“I am seized with passionate fury in reaction to the wicked who abandon your Torah” (Ps 119:53; translation by Allen 1983:128).

4.1.2 Quickened Breathing

The word אף “anger” (Sauer 1997:166) is so commonly used to denote anger that its primary meaning, “nose,” (Holladay 1971:24) is often overlooked. Struthers (1997:463) draws attention to the fact that:

אף is by far the most common word used to denote anger. Its occurrences are distributed throughout the Old Testament: 40 times in the Pentateuch, 34 times in the historical books, 62 times in the poetical books, and 88 times in the prophetic books. By comparison, the nominative חמה “wrath” occurs 125 times.

Its use in the sense of anger is so dominant that lexicographers gloss over the fact that Classical Hebrew is the only Semitic language in which the double meaning “nose” and “anger” is attested (Johnson 1973:397). As a consequence, the metaphoric use of the word is often misunderstood. To put this figurative use of אף “anger” into perspective, its primary meaning has to be rediscovered.

Dhorme (1963:80) asserts that אף “nose” and the dual אפִּי “nostrils” should be viewed primarily as

²⁰ See 4.2.3.

organs of respiration. Further, it is the seat of life (נשמה/רוח חיים), without which man is no more than a lifeless pot of clay (Dhorme 1963:4):

... l'hébreu [emploie] tantôt le singulier ... נַסְּף tantôt le duel ... אַפִּים, avec le sens de “nez, narines”. C’est avant tout l’organe de la respiration. Lorsque Dieu crée l’homme, il souffle “dans les narines” l’esprit de vie נשמת חיים (Gen 2:7). Les vivants sont tous ceux qui ont “dans leurs narines” l’esprit du souffle de vie נשמת רוח חיים (Gen 7:22). L’homme est celui “qui a un souffle dans son nez” אשר נשמת באפו (Is 2:22). Ce souffle vivificateur sera le symbole de celui qu’on aime autant que la vie: “l’oint de lavé, le souffle de nos narines” (Thren. 4:20) (Dhorme 1963:80).

It is in the context of the nose as the location of breath, or life, that references to anger involving רוח should be understood, since (Dhorme 1963:81):

C’est l’accélération de la respiration nasale qui a surtout frappe les Hébreu comme symptôme de la colère.

Grether and Fichtner (1967:392) go even further by suggesting that the meaning of נַסְּף, “nose” is secondary to the primary meaning “snort” as a metonymy for anger:

Hebrew is rich in terms for wrath, each of which originally denotes a specific aspect of anger. The most common of these words is נַסְּף, which derives from אָנַף “to be angry,” originally “to snort,” so that the basic meaning may well be “snort.” Hence the meaning “nose,” “nasal cavity.”

Thus, the common coupling of נַסְּף and אַפִּים with רוח “breath/wind” in descriptions of anger is based on the perception of quickened breathing in angry persons (cf. Struthers 1997:463; Sauer 1997:168; Johnson 1973:379). Grether and Fichtner (1967:394) points out that רוח can hardly be called a true term for wrath, but in the nuance “snort” it comes close to this sphere. Dhorme (1963:81) mentions the example in Exodus 15:7, where YHWH gets angry (חמה) with the Egyptians. In v 8 Moses sings:

(15) וברוח אפיך נערמו מים

wbrwḥ ’pyk n’rmw mym.

C: and P: with N: breath N: nose + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) V: dammed up (ni pf 3rd pl) N: waters.

“And with the blast of your nose the waters were gathered together” (Ex 15:8; KJV).

This blast is called a rebuke (נערה) in Psalm 18:16 and, according to Job 4:9, can cause death. In Isaiah 25:4, it is used to denote “the furious snorting, raging of the violent ones” (Lange 1878:278):

- (16) ויגלו מוסדות תבל מגערתך יהוה מנשמת רוח אפך
wyglw mwsdwt tbl mg'rtk yhwh mnšmt rwḥ 'pk.
 C: and V: exposed (ni impf 3rd pl) N: foundations (cs) N: world P: by N: rebuke (f) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) PN: YHWH P: by N: blowing (cs) N: breath (cs) N: nose + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).
 “The foundations of the earth were exposed by your rebuke, YHWH, at the blast of the breath of your nostrils” (Ps 18:16).
- (17) מנשמת אלוה יאבדו ומרוח אפו יכלו
mnšmt 'lwh y'bdw wmrwḥ 'pw yklw.
 P: by N: blowing (cs) PN: Eloah V: perish (qal impf 3rd pl) C: and P: by N: breath (cs) N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: be destroyed (qal impf 3rd pl).
 “By the breath of Eloah they will perish and by the blast of his nose they will be destroyed” (Job 4:9).
- (18) כי רוח עריצים כזרם קיר
ky rwḥ 'ryšym kzrm qyr.
 C: because N: breath (cs) N: violent (pl) P: like N: heavy rain N: wall.
 “For the breath (i.e. anger) of the violent ones was like a storm against the wall” (Isa 25:4).

In addition to רוח, the root נחם can also be regarded as a metonymy for anger indicating the physical concomitant of snorting. It is usually translated with words indicating regret and compassion (cf. Holladay 1971:234-5). This, however, doesn't explain the common use of the term in the context of anger (cf. Gen 6:6-7; 27:42; Judg 21:6). In Genesis 6:6 it stands in parallel to the verb עצב, which “is used to express the most intense form of human emotion, a mixture of rage and bitter anguish” (Wenham 1987:144; also see Dhorme 1963:119). It therefore seems best to regard the verb as describing the physical symptom of sighing, which would suit both the context of compassion/regret and anger. As in the case of the root's Arabian etymological counterpart, the primary meaning, “to sigh, i.e. to breathe strongly” (Strong 1961:77) should therefore not be left out of consideration if the metaphoric meaning of the word is to be fully appreciated:

- (19) וינחם יהוה כי עשה את האדם בארץ ויתעצב אל לבו
wynḥm yhwh ky 'šh 't h'dm b'rš wyt'sb 'l lbw.
 C: and V: breathe strongly (Strong 1961:77) PN: YHWH C: because V: make (qal pf 3rd sg, m) Nota accusativi N: man (def) P: on N: earth (def) C: and V: cut oneself (hitp 3rd sg, m) P: to N: heart + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).
 “And YHWH was wroth because he made man on the earth and he was bitterly enraged” (Gen

6:6).²¹

(20) עשו אחיך מתנחם לך להרגך

'šw 'hyk mtnḥm lk lhrḡk.

PN: Esau N: brother + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) V: breathe strongly (hitp pt sg, m).

“Esau, your brother, is very angry” (Gen 27:42).

In these examples, snorting as a concomitant of anger is used to denote anger proper. It is this same metonymic use of אַף that allowed for it to become a synonym for anger (Dhorme 1963:81):

Tout naturellement les mots אַף et אַפִּים deviendront synonymes de colère. Ce qui a permis cet usage, c'est l'influence de la colère sur la respiration.

The figurative use of אַף denoting breathing symptoms as an indication of anger is particularly manifest in the synonyms קצר רוח “shortness of breath” (Prov 14:29) and קצר אַפִּים “shortness of nostrils” (Prov 14:17) (Dhorme 1963:81). These are used as antipodes to ארך רוח “lengthiness of breath” and ארך אַפִּים “lengthiness of nostrils” (Prov 14:29; 25:15) or ארך אף “to lengthen the nose” (Prov 19:11; Isa 48:9), which indicates anger control:

Avoir le nez long ou court, c'est donc bien avoir le souffle long ou court, c'est à dire contenir ou ne pas contenir la colère (Dhorme 1963:81).

Gruber (1980:504) has pointed to the inadequacy of translations that render אף “anger.” The danger of an incautious treatment of the term is illustrated by many translations of the expression, אף ארך. Gruber (1980:504) comments on the routine translation of the locution in Isaiah 48:9:

Assuming that in the expression אף ארך the word אף denotes ‘anger’, RSV following KJV and RV renders Hebrew אף ארך in Isaiah 48:9 “I defer my anger.” Similarly, NJV translates “I control my wrath.” These renderings, like *BDB*'s “postpone anger,” are purely *ad hoc* treatments of the verb ארך, which everywhere else means ‘lengthen’. Here too, therefore, if אף really means ‘anger’, אף ארך should mean ‘I shall prolong my anger’, the opposite of what is called for in Isaiah 48:9.

In this verse, the expression, אף ארך, stands in parallel to the verb ארך, which has the literal meaning, “to muzzle” (Davidson 1967:255), and is related to the noun of the same stem, “nose-ring” (Lange 1878:519; Kruger 2000:190). The verb always takes a concrete object, which here is left out (Gruber 1980:505).

²¹ Also see 4.1.9 and 4.2.8.1.

Consequently, some commentators have proposed to understand אפי, “my nose” to be the direct object (cf. Watts 1987:175). The resulting expression, לחטם לך אפי can then be rendered, “I will muzzle my nose from fuming at you” (Gruber 1980:505). Correspondingly, אף in the expression, אף ארך should be taken as a metonymy for “breath,” as in Proverbs 19:11. Thus, the combination indicates the restraining of the quickened breathing of anger, as a metonymy for anger control:

(21) למען שמי אאריך אפי וחהלתי אחטם לך

lm'n šmy 'ryk 'py wthlty 'h tm lk.

P: for the sake of N: name + pron suffix (1st sg) V: lengthen (hi impf 1st sg) N: nose + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and N: renown + pron suffix (1st sg) V: restrain (qal impf 1st sg) P: for + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).

“For my name’s sake I lengthen my breath (i.e. calm down my anger); for the sake of my praise I hold it back from you” (Isa 48:9).

In the wisdom literature of the Hebrew Bible, this ability to calm the physical symptoms of anger was presented as an attribute of great value. Proverbs 19:11 ascribes this capacity to prudence (שכל). It is a trait associated with the discerning of spirit that contrasts sharply with the fool’s inability to control anger (cf. Prov 14:29; 25:15): In Proverbs 16:32 this same quality is presented as manifesting great inner strength, comparable to that needed to conquer a city:

(22) שכל אדם האריך אפו ותפארתו עבר על פשע

škl 'dm h'ryk 'pw wtp'rtw 'br 'l pš'.

N: insight (cs) N: man V: lengthen (hi inf cs) N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and N: honour + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: pass over (qal inf cs) P: over N: offence.

“A man’s insight makes him calm down his anger; it is to his honour to overlook an offence” (Prov 19:11).

(23) טוב ארך אפים מגבור ומשל ברוחו מלכד עיר

twb 'rk 'pym mgbwr wmsl brwḥw mlkd 'yr.

Adv: better N: long (cs) N: nostrils P (comparative): than N: warrior C: and VN: master (qal pt sg, m) P: in N: anger (lit. breath) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: (comparative): than VN: conqueror (qal pt sg, m) N: city.

“He that controls²² his anger is stronger than a warrior, a man who masters his ire²³ than one who

²² For the meaning of ארך אפים, “to control anger,” see Dhorme (1963:81).

²³ אף here functions as a synonym for אפים “anger” (Dhorme 1963:81).

takes a city” (Prov 16:32).²⁴

Gruber (1980:506) observes that the locution אַרְךְ אֵף, which occurs only in Jeremiah 15:15, has been mistranslated “patience” due to its confusion with the idiom אַרְךְ אַפַּיִם “patient” (Num 14:18). Unfortunately, he (Gruber 1980:506-7) misapprehends the expression to mean “long (or great) with respect to anger”:

(24) אַל לְאַרְךְ אַפְךָ תִּקְחֵנִי

ʾl l'rk 'p k tqḥny.

Neg particle P: in N: length (cs) N: nose + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) V: seize (qal impf 2nd sg, m) + pron suffix (1st sg).

“Do not kill me in Your extreme anger” (Jer 15:15b; translation by Gruber 1980:507-8).

However, it seems more plausible to read לְאַרְךְ אַפְךָ as corresponding to הִאֲרִיךְ אֵף, “to cool down anger” (cf. Isa 48:9; Prov 19:11 above). The preposition, לְ, has a similar effect to הִ, אַרְךְ, for it is used causatively, meaning, “in order that” (Holladay 1971:169; cf. Isa 10:2). The phrase, לְאַרְךְ אַפְךָ should therefore be rendered, “in order that your breath [becomes] long,” i.e. “so that your anger cools down.”

This notion neatly fits into the wider conceptual context. The prophet pleads for mercy: “do not kill me” (אַל תִּקְחֵנִי, cf. Gruber 1980:507). It is well known that anger is accompanied by a strong impulse to strike out, to attack the source of anger (Izard 1977:331). According to the cognitive theory of anger, the level of tension drops to zero when anger is acted out (Kövecses 1990:68). In view of this, the prophet probably pleaded, “do not kill me in order to calm down your fury.”

Another instance where slackened breathing (רַפְתָּה רוּחַ) is used in a metonymy for anger cooling down is found in Judges 8:1. Gideon is involved in a quarrel (רִיב) with the Ephraimites (Judg 8:1). Instead of reacting in anger, he praises them, which results in their cooling down (lit. “their breathing slackened,” רַפְתָּה רוּחַם):

(25) רַפְתָּה רוּחָם מֵעָלְיוּ בְּדַבְּרוֹ הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה

rpṯh rwḥm m'lyw bdbrw hdbr hzh.

V: become slack (qal pf 3rd sg, f) N: breath + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: toward + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: when V: speak (pi inf cs) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: word Demonstrative pronoun: this.

“Their breathing slackened (cf. KJV, ‘their anger was abated’) toward him when he said that” (Judg 8:3).

In Zechariah 6:8, the expression נוֹחַ רוּחַ, “to quiet breathing,” is found as a synonym for רַפְתָּה רוּחַ:

²⁴ Also see 4.2.10.

(26) הניחו את רוחי בארץ צפון

hnyḥw 't rwḥy b'rš špwn.

V: quiet (hi pf 3rd pl) Nota accusativi N: breath + pron suffix (1st sg) P: in N: land (cs) A: north.

“They have quieted my breath in the North Country” (Zech 6:8;ZK).

It is not surprising to find the two roots together in Ecclesiastes 10:4, where they also indicate the calming down of anger (רוח). Although the meaning of הניח, “to put to rest” (Glen 1994:328) is clear, its use with חטאים, “faults” (Holladay 1971:101) as a direct object has caused commentators difficulties (cf. Murphy 1992:98). Glen (1994:328) correctly points out that “faults” here actually refers to anger (רוח) as a metonymy of cause for effect. רוח, which is clearly a metonymy of effect (breathing) for cause (anger) (Murphy 1992:98), is already the implied object of רפה, “to become slack” (Holladay 1971:344) (cf. Judg 8:3 above). Although there is a repetition of ideas, a restatement of words is neatly avoided through the use of metonymy in this verse, which reads as follows:

(27) אם רוח המושל תעלה עליך מקומך אל תנח כי מרפא יניח חטאים גדולים

'm rwḥ hmwšl t'lh 'lyk mqwmk 'l tnh ky mrp' ynyḥ ḥt'ym gdwlym.

C: if N: breath (f, cs) N: ruler (def) V: go up (qal impf 3rd sg, f) P: over + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: from VN: post (qal inf cs) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) Neg particle V: leave (hi impf 2nd sg, m) C: because V: make slack (pi pt sg, m) V: lay aside (hi impf 3rd sg, m) N: errors A: great.

“If a ruler’s anger (lit. breath) rises against you, do not leave your post, for slackening [of breath/anger] lays great errors (i.e. anger) to rest” (Eccl 10:4).

Another verse where רוח “breath” is clearly used as a metonymy for anger, is Proverbs 29:11, where it occurs with the verb נצח, “to give free reign to” (Murphy 1998:220; Plöger 1984:340). This stands in contrast with the wise man that controls his anger, expressed by the utterance ישבחנה באחור. This combination has been interpreted in various ways. Some have proposed to render שבה II with “to calm, hush” and באחור, “in the back” with “afterward” (so Deane 1950:554). The second hemistich would then read, “but the wise calms it afterward,” “it” referring to the anger of the fool (cf. Lange 1869:241). However, taking באחור (lit. “in the back”) according to its spatial sense, would make more sense, since anger control clearly precedes expression. The expression may therefore point to the wise man’s ability to control his angry breathing (רוח) by calming it inside of him instead of letting it out (Murphy 1998:220; Keil & Delitzsch 1973:248):

(28) כל רוחו יוציא כסיל וחכם באחור ישבחנה

kl rwḥw ywšy' ksyl wḥkm b'ḥwr yšbḥnh.

Indef pronoun: all N: breath + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: send forth (hi impf 3rd sg, m) N: fool C: but N: wise P: in N: back V: keep in (pi impf 3rd sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, f).

“A fool lets out all his anger, but the wise man calms it down inside of him” (Prov 29:11).

4.1.3 Frowning

It has been shown beyond any reasonable doubt that the facial expression of anger is an innate, trans-cultural phenomenon (cf. Izard 1977:84). Consequently, its characteristic facial expression is recognizable by people of all cultures all around the world (Izard 1977:329). Izard (1977:330) describes the distinctive facial look of anger as follows:

In the innate expression of anger, the muscles of the brow move inward and downward, creating a frown and a foreboding appearance about the eyes, which seem to be fixed in a hard stare toward the object of anger. The nostrils dilate and the wings of the nose flare out. The lips are opened and drawn back in a rectangle-like shape, revealing clinched teeth. Often the face flushes red.

Frowning is clearly one of the dominant features of an angry person’s face. It also seems to be one of the elements that are hardest to control (cf. Izard 1977:331). It is therefore to be expected that we find several expressions in the Hebrew Bible denoting frowning in the face as some metonymic indication of anger.

One of the first expressions encountered in the Hebrew Bible that may convey the image of frowning as an expression of anger is נפל פנים ‘the face falls’ in Genesis 4:6 (Dhorme 1963:45):

(29) למה חרה לך ולמה נפלו פניך

lmh ḥrh lk wlmh nplw pnyk.

Interr pronoun: why V: burn (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: to + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and Interr pronoun: why V: fall (qal pf 3rd pl) N: face + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).

“Why are you angry and why has your face fallen?” (Gen 4:6).

Although Gruber’s (1980:503) rendering of קצר אפים, “short of face” as a symptom of anger is doubtful,²⁵ he mentions two other expressions that clearly bespeak the frowning of annoyance, namely החזיק אף, “stiffen the face” (Mic 7:18) and עו אף, “hard of face, frowning” (Ps 90:11; Ezek 8:22):

(30) מי אל כמוך נשא עון ועבר על פשע לשארית נחלתו לא החזיק לעד אפו כי חפץ חסד הוא

my ’l kmwk ns’ ’wn w’br ’l pš’ lš’ryt nḥltw l’ ḥḥzyq l’d ’pw ky ḥpš ḥsd hw’.

Interr pronoun: who PN: god P: like + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) V: forgive (qal pt sg, m) N: iniquity C: and V: pass over (qal pt sg, m) N: transgression P: for N: remnant (cs) N: heritage + pron suffix (3rd

²⁵ See 4.1.2.

sg, m) Neg particle V: stiffen (hi pf 3rd sg, m) Adv: forever N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: because V: be pleased (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: kindness Pronoun: he.

“Who, O God, like You forgives iniquity and overlooks offence for the sake of the remnant of His heritage by not being angry forever, because He is one who delights in kindness?” (Mic 7:18; translation by Gruber 1980:508).

Gruber (1980:508) regards חזק פנים in this v as a parallel for the חזק פנים, “to stiffen the face” as a metonymy for anger in Jeremiah 5:3:

(31) חזקו פניהם מסלע

ḥzqw pnyhm msl'.

V: stiffen (pi pf 3rd pl) N: faces + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P (comparative): than N: rock.

“They have made their faces harder than a rock” (Jer 5:3; KJV).

The expression עו פנים, “hard of face, frowning, angry” is used to the same effect in Deuteronomy 28:50 (Gruber 1980:508):

(32) גוי עו פנים אשר לא ישא פנים לזקן ונער לא יחן

gwy 'z pnyw 'šr l' yš' pnyw lzqn wn'r l' yḥn.

N: nation (cs) A: hard (cs) N: face Rel. pronoun: that Neg particle V: lift (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: face P: to N: old (man) C: and N: boy Neg particle V: show favour (qal impf 3rd sg, m).

“A frowning nation which will neither smile upon an elder nor show favour to a youth” (Deut 28:50; translation by Gruber 1980:508-9).

The עו פנים in Ecclesiastes 8:1 is often correctly translated (cf. “hardness of face,” Murphy 1992:79; “hard appearance,” NIV), but routinely misinterpreted as an unpleasant (Murphy 1992:82) or even imbecilic appearance (Deane 1950a:199). Gruber (1980:508) reads it as an expression of sadness, due to the fact that it is juxtaposed with האיר פנים, “to make the face shine,” which he regards as an utterance indicating joy (Gruber 1980:561). However, Eaton (1994:299) points out that the latter generally speaks of favour, so that it acquires the meaning, “to be gracious to” (cf. Num 6:25) (Murphy 1992:82; cf. Glenn 1994:322). By contrast, “hardness of face” metonymically indicates “anger, disfavour,” as in Deuteronomy 28:50 above. Most commentators read שנה “to change” (cf. שנה) (so NIV; Aalders 1948:173; Deane 1950a:199; Delitzsch 1973:336-7; Lauha 1978:144; Murphy 1992:80):

(33) חכמת אדם האיר פניו ועו פניו ישנא

ḥkmt 'dm t'yr pnyw w'z pnyw yšn'.

N: wisdom (f, cs) N: man V: make shine (hi impf 3rd sg, f) N: face + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and N: hardness (cs) N: face + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: shine (pu impf 3rd sg, m).

“Wisdom makes lightens up a man’s face, and so the hardness of his face is changed” (Eccl 8:1).

As in the case of *חזק פנים* and *חזק אף*, *עו אף* forms a parallel to *עו פנים*. Gruber (1980:509) observes that, “while *אף* and *פנים* are often synonymous, it is not surprising that ‘anger’ is denoted by *עו אף* ‘hardness of face, frown’ in Psalm 90:11”:

(34) מי יודע עו אפך

my ywd‘ ‘z ‘pk.

Interr pronoun: who V: know (qal pt sg, m) N: hardness (cs) N: face + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).

“Who knows your anger?” (Ps 90:11a; translation by Gruber 1980:509).

Although the expression *ועזו ואפן* in Ezra 8:22 is easily identified as an hendiadys (cf. Williamson 1985:114), *עו* is often wrongly taken to indicate the intensity of anger (Williamson 1985:112, “fierce wrath”; NIV, “great anger”). Gruber (1980:510) correctly observes that it denotes, “his hardness of face,” in accordance with the meaning in Psalm 90:11:

(35) יד אלהינו על כל מבקשיו לטובה ועזו ואפן על כל עזביו

yd ‘lhyw ‘l kl mbqšyw lṭwbh w‘zw w’pw ‘l kl ‘zbyw.

N: hand (cs) N: god + pron suffix (1st pl) P: on Indef pronoun: all V: seek (pi pt pl, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: for N: good C: but N: strength + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: on Indef pronoun: all V: forsake (qal pt pl, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“The favourable hand of our God is upon all who seek Him, but His frowning face is upon all who reject Him” (Ezra 8:22b; translation by Gruber 1980:509).

Gruber (1980:509) opines that the common expression *יד אלהים (הטובה)*, “God’s (favourable) hand” (Ezra 7:6, 9, 28; 8:18, 22, 31; Neh 2:8, 18) is probably derived from the idiom *יד החזיק* “take the hand, help, show favour,” which also has an equivalent in Akkadian. Here it is contrasted with God’s *עו אף* “hardness of face,” i.e., “anger, disfavour”:

The juxtaposition of the two anatomical idioms *יד לטובה* ‘favourable hand’ and *עו אף* ‘frowning face’ cannot be fortuitous. This brilliant incorporation of body language in literature is thoroughly lost in the standard translations of which RSV’s “and the power of his wrath is against all that forsake him” is typical.

Lastly, we find a parallel facial description of anger in cognate Aramaic in Daniel 3:19, which may hint at the ‘frowning’ or the ‘foreboding’ appearance of the countenance associated with anger:

(36) באדין נבוכדנצר התמלי חמא וצלם אנפודי אשתנו

b’dyn nbwkdnsr htmly ḥm’ wšlm ‘npwhy ‘štnw.

C: then PN: Nebuchadnezzar V: be filled with (hitpeel pf 3rd sg, m) N: rage C: and N: features (cs) N: face + dual pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: change (itpaal pf 3rd pl, m).

“Then Nebuchadnezzar was filled with rage and the features of his face changed” (Dan 3:19).

4.1.4 Glaring Eyes

Research has demonstrated that the human gaze is a powerful means of communication (Ellsworth 1975:53-75). It is often picked up in the pre-conscious scanning of the environment and generally causes physical arousal in the observer. It is therefore highly likely to elicit interpretation in view of factors, such as timing, relations, motivation and goals. Although it is not a specific sign, it is highly significant and is often associated with states of anger and hostility (Ellsworth 1975:73).

In folkloric wisdom, the eyes are regarded as the window to the soul. This obviously suggests that the human eye is more revealing with regard to inner mental states than anything else. This being so, the language with respect to the eyes as an agent of communicating emotional disposition is bounteous. Kövecses (1990:64) lists several examples of English expressions related to the “foreboding appearance of the eyes” and the “fixed ... stare towards the object of anger,” which is commonly thought to be universally recognizable (Izard 1977:330):

- She was *looking daggers* at me.
- He *gave me a dirty look*.
- If *looks could kill*, ...
- He was *glowering* at me.

Naturally, one would expect that comparable expressions existed in the language of the ancient Israelites, especially in view of the fact that the facial expression of anger seems to be innate and cross-culturally recognizable (cf. Izard 1977:330). However, the ancient Israelites viewed the eye slightly different from us today, a fact that is attested to in the Hebrew language. In the ancient Mediterranean World, the eye was thought of, “not as a sense organ subordinate to the brain, but as an agent in its own right” (Derrett 1995:67). This noticeable difference in conceptualisation has given rise to expressions in Classical Hebrew that could easily be misunderstood by a scholar of the universally recognizable innate expression of anger in the eyes. Let us consider one example.

In Genesis 31:35, Rachel excuses herself to her father for not standing up on the basis that she is ritually unclean in an attempt to hide the household deities (תַּרְפִּים, *t'raphim*) that her dad was looking for in the tent by sitting on them. The words that she uses read as follows:

(37) אֵל יָחַד בְּעֵינַי אֲדַנִּי כִּי לֹא אוֹכַל לָקוּם מִפְּנֵיךְ
'l yhr b'yny 'dny ky lw' 'wkl lqwm mpnyk.

Adv (neg): not V: be hot (qal juss 3rd sg, m) P: in + N: eyes (cs) N: master + pron suffix (1st sg) C:

because Adv (neg): not V: can (qal impf 1st sg) P: to V: rise up (qal inf cs) P: from P: before + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).

“Let it not become hot in my lord’s eyes, for I am unable to stand up before you” (Gen 31:35).

At first glance, this seems to be a plain example of anger being expressed in the eyes (cf. Vorwahl 1932:18). This interpretation seems especially likely in view of the fact that the root חרה “to burn” is used with reference to the eyes. It will be remembered that this stem is very commonly used to denote anger, especially in relation to אף “nose.”²⁶ Further, the eyes were sometimes utilised as a metonymy for the face (part for the whole) (Dhorme 1963:76). However, the cultural and conceptual context in which this sentence is uttered may have caused a *double entendre* with the reader. This dual meaning is deduced by the use of ‘eyes’ (עינים) instead of the usual ‘nose’ (אף).

In Genesis 31:5, Jacob declares to his wives that his father-in-law’s (Laban’s) countenance (פנים) has changed towards him. Dhorme (1963:44) has pointed out that the face is sometimes used as a metonymy for the eyes (whole for part). This accusation should be considered in the context of the last v of chapter 30 (v 43), where it is stressed that Jacob became exceedingly rich. It is therefore suggested that Laban’s countenance was changed because Jacob became so wealthy. The emotion implied in this, of course, is envy. In the ancient Mediterranean world, it was believed that jealousy, via envy, could be invested with malign power, which manifested in the Evil Eye (Derrett 1995:67).

In most of the ancient Mediterranean world, the Evil Eye was known as a witchcraft technique. For example, in Babylonia, it was recognised as the prime cause of illness (Derrett 1995:65). This belief is also attested in the Hebrew Bible (Cant 4:9). In the story under discussion, Jacob accuses Laban of bewitching him, causing fever at day and sleeplessness at night (Gen 31:40). Jacob seems to suggest that it was the ‘Fear of Isaac’ (פחד צחק) and the ‘gods’ of Abraham (אלהי אברהם), probably demons, who have been haunting him (Gen 31:42). He could not have stolen Laban’s divination image (תרפים) out of his fear (כסף) for these spirits, as Laban suggested (v 30), for the ‘gods’ (אלהים) haunted (כח) him the previous night as well (Gen 31:42)!

Jacob was unaware of the fact that Rachel had stolen her father’s תרפים . These images were commonly associated with divination in the Hebrew Bible (Wenham 1994:273; cf. Judg 17:5ff; 18:14ff; 1 Sam 15:23; Ezek 21:21; etc). This may provide an answer to the elusive question as to why Rachel stole her father’s images (cf. Wenham 1994: 273-4). Some suggest that she did it to ensure fertility (cf. Wenham 1994:274). It seems more likely, however, that she stole them in order to protect her family against her own father. She may have expected her father to use them in divination techniques against them if he found out that Jacob had secretly fled with his daughters and all his wealth.

In view of this, Rachel’s words may have been carefully chosen. By using ‘eyes’ instead of ‘nose,’ she

²⁶ See 4.1.6 below.

wanted to communicate that she was aware of the fact that her father possessed an Evil Eye. But through deception that can only be matched by her husband, she succeeded in limiting the evil powers that he could use against them (cf. Gen 31:29).

Similarly, when God regards Israel with an evil eye (Amos 9:4), it suggests more than a mere facial expression of anger. His eyes effect disastrous outcomes, described in metaphors commonly used to detail the devastation of divine anger (cf. the flood images used in Chapter 8 and 9):

(38) וּשְׂמַתִּי עֵינַי עֲלֵיהֶם לְרָעָה

wśmtý 'yny 'lyhm lr'h.

C: and (consec) V: place (qal pf 1st sg) N: eyes + pron suffix (1st sg) P: on + pron suffix (3rd pl, m)
P: to + N: evil.

“And I turned my eyes on them for evil” (Am 9:4).

Dhorme (1963:44) regards this expression as indicating a facial communication of anger. Similar expressions are found in Leviticus 20:5 and Jeremiah 24:6. The locution פָּנִים שִׁים, ‘to place the face’ should be regarded as a metonymy for שִׁים עֵינַי, ‘to place the eyes’ (Dhorme 1963:44). The use of this expression in Leviticus 20:5 clearly functions as an idiomatic indication of anger as expressed in the face. This said, the possibility that magical powers associated with the eye were implied, cannot be ruled out:

(39) וּשְׂמַתִּי אֲנִי אֶת פְּנֵי בְּאִישׁ הַדָּוָא

wśmtý 'ny 't pny b'yš hhw'.

C: and V: place (qal pf 1st sg) Pronoun: I Nota accusativi + N: face + pron suffix (1st sg) P: in/with/against N: man Demonstr pronoun: that.

“And I will place my face against that man” (Lev 20:5).

In Psalm 34:17 the verb שׂוּם is absent, but the meaning clearly corresponds to that of the expression listed above (Dhorme 1963:47):

(40) פְּנֵי יְהוָה בַּעֲשֵׂי רָע

pny yhw h b'sy r'.

N: face (cs) PN: YHWH P: against N: doer (qal pt pl, m, cs) N: evil.

“The face of YHWH is against the doer of evil” (Ps 34:17).

Placing the face against somebody serves as an idiom for anger, and needs to be distinguished from the belief that seeing the face (פָּנִים) of God caused death (Becker 1965:28; cf. Gen 16:13; 32:31; Ex 19:21; 24:10-11; Judg 6:22-23; 13:22; 1 Sam 6:19; 1 Kgs 19:13; Isa 6:5). This conviction was one of the reasons why the ancient Israelites feared God so deeply in the early stages of religion (Becker 1965:28-30).

Vorwahl (1932:18) mentions yet another expression that is indicative of the universally recognizable

facial expression of anger. He (Vorwahl 1932:18) regards the *hapax* verb in Job 15:12, קרץ, as indicating ‘restlessness’ in the eye that can be associated with anger. Davidson (1967:680) renders the verb, “to be fixed, fastened,” which emphasises the impression of glaring eyes. This meaning is sadly lost in the KJV, which translates it with “wink”:

(41) ומה ירזמון עיניך

wmh yrzmwn ‘ynyk.

C: and Adv (interrogative): what V: disturb (qal impf 3rd pl) N: eyes + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).

“And what do your eyes disturb?” (Job 15:12).

This interpretation of the above verse is supported by a semantic equivalent in Psalm 35:19. Here, ‘winking’ the eye is mentioned as an expression indicating contempt:

(42) שנאי חנם יקרצו עין

sn’y hnm yqršw ‘yn.

V: hate (qal pt pl, m, cs) Adv: in vain V: pinch (qal impf 3 pl, m) N: eye.

“Those who hate pinch with their eye in vain” (Ps 35:19).

At first glance, it is not clear if the subject of the above expression is ‘my enemies’ or ‘eyes’. From parallel expressions, however, it becomes clear that the eyes are understood as agents of affliction, analogous to the Evil Eye:

(43) קרץ עין יתן עצבת

qrš ‘yn ytn ‘šbt.

V: pinch (qal pt sg, m) N: eye V: give (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: wound.

“Pinching the eye causes a wound” (Prov 10:10).

Hence, the evil man (אדם בליעל; Prov 6:12) can also pinch *with* (ב) the eye:

(44) קרץ בעינו

qrš b‘ynw.

V: pinch (qal pt sg, m) P: with N: eye + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“He pinches with his eyes” (Prov 6:13).

It should be clear from the above that the eye in ancient Israel was more than just a ‘mirror’ to the soul. It was an active agent with real power.²⁷ Thus, when Saul ‘eyed’ (עון) David, he not only glared at him angrily, but he revealed the fact that he was jealous and wanted to inflict harm on him:

²⁷ Vorwahl (1932:18) speaks of “der Auge als Kraftherd” to bring out this concept.

(45) ויהי שאול עון את דוד מהיום ההוא והלאה

wyhy š'wl 'wn 't dwd mhywm hhw' whl'h.

C: and V: be (qal impf 3rd sg, m) PN: Saul V: eye (qal pt sg, m) Nota accusativi + PN: David P: from N: day Demonstrative pronoun: that C: and Adv: thence forth.

“And Saul eyed David from that day onwards” (1 Sam 18:9).

4.1.5 Gnashing of Teeth

Apart from the one instance where it stands in the context of pain (Ps 112:10), the gnashing of teeth metonymy seems to be indicative of anger in the majority of its occurrences (Ps 35:16; 37:12; Job 16:9; Lam 2:16). In at least two of these cases, the idiom is accompanied by animal imagery (Job 16:9; Lam 2:16), which suggests a connection with the ANGER IS A DANGEROUS ANIMAL metaphor, discussed below (4.2.11):

(46) אפו טרף וישטמני חרק עלי בשניו צרי ילשוש עיניו לי

'pw trp wyštmny ḥrq 'ly bšnyw šry yltwš 'ynyw ly.

N: anger (lit. nose) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: tear (qal pf 3rd sg, m) C: and V: hate (qal impf 3rd sg, m) + pron suffix (1st sg) V: gnash (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: on + pron suffix (1st sg) P: with N: teeth + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: adversary + pron suffix (1st sg) V: sharpen (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: eyes + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: to + pron suffix (1st sg).

“His anger tears, and he who hates me gnashes on me with his teeth. My enemy looks daggers at me” (Job 16:9; ZK; cf. Kruger 2000:190).²⁸

(47) בחנפי לעגי מעוג²⁹ חרק עלי שנימו

bḥnpy l'gy m'wg ḥrq 'ly šnymw.

P: with N: godless (pl, cs) VN: mockers (qal pt pl, m, cs) VN: cripple (pu pt sg, m) V: gnash (qal inf cs) P: on + pron suffix (1st sg) N: teeth + pron suffix (3rd pl, m).

“With godless mockers of a cripple they gnash on me with their teeth” (Ps 35:16).

(48) זמם רשע לצדיק וחרק עליו שניו

zmm rš' lšdyq whrq 'lyw šnyw.

V: plan evil (qal pt sg, m) N: impious P: to N: righteous (def) C: and V: gnash (qal pt sg, m) P: on + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: teeth + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“The impious plans evil against the righteous and gnashes against him on his teeth” (Ps 37:12).

(49) פצו עליך פיהם כל אויביך שרקו ויחרקו שן אמרו בלענו

²⁸ Also see 4.2.11.

²⁹ See Holladay (1971:205).

pšw 'lyk pyhm kl 'wybyk šrqw wyḥrqw šn 'm rw bl'nw.

V: open up (qal pf 3rd pl) P: on + pron suffix (2nd sg, f) N: mouth + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) A: all N: enemies + pron suffix (2nd sg, f) V: whistle (qal pf 3rd pl) C: and V: gnash (qal impf 3rd pl, m) N: tooth V: say (qal pf 3rd pl) V: swallow up (pi pf 1st pl).

“All your enemies open their mouth against you. They whistle and gnash their teeth, saying: ‘We’ve swallowed [her] up.’” (Lam 2:16).

4.1.6 Internal Pressure

The metonymic expressions relating to pressure are put into perspective when considered within the context of the experiential concomitants of anger. Izard (1977:331) gives an apt description of what it feels like to be angry:

In anger the blood “boils,” the face becomes hot, the muscles tense. ... The stronger the anger the stronger and more energetic the person feels and the greater the need for physical action. In rage the mobilization of energy is so great that one feels one will explode if one does not bite, hit, or kick something, or “act out the anger” in some way.

The metonymy of internal pressure with reference to anger is well developed in the English language. It is reflected in expressions such as (Kövecses 1995b:187):

- Don’t get a *hernia!*
- He almost had a *haemorrhage*.
- When I found out, I almost *burst a blood vessel*.

The latter metonymic expression is clearly related to the English conceptualisation of the circulatory system in terms of plumbing (cf. Banks & Thompson 1996:99-126). The ancient Israelites were in all likelihood ignorant of the physics of plumbing, and images of pressurized containers exploding were lacking. Nevertheless, there are expressions in Classical Hebrew that convey the notion of internal strain. Noteworthy are those that include the words מלא “to be full of” and כול “to contain” (Holladay 1971:152, 196).

In Jeremiah 6:11 the two words are used together to sketch the uncomfortable feeling of pressure caused by anger. The prophet says that he is full of (מלא)³⁰ the fury (חמה) of YHWH and that he is weary with holding it in (כול) (Craigie, Kelly & Drinkard 1991:101; Lange 1871:81). The image is clearly that of internal pressure.

Another text that has been quoted as pointing to this physical concomitant of anger in the Hebrew Bible, is Proverbs 30:33 (Kruger 2000:188). The text says that: “stirring up (ביץ) anger (אפי) produces

³⁰ The root is also used as a substantive to refer to a pregnant woman in Eccl 11:5 (Holladay 1971:196).

strife (רִיב)”(NIV).

The key to the sound interpretation of this v is the meaning of the *hapax legomenon* מִיָּד “pressure” (Murphy 1998:234), which is repeated three times. The translation of the word in the two preceding analogies is unchallenging: “the churning (מִיָּד) of milk produces butter, and the wringing (מִיָּד) of the nose draws blood” (Prov 30:33, Hubbard 1995:373). The problem lies with understanding how the “pressing” of anger produces strife.

Gruber (1980:544-5) suggests that the מִיָּד in the third clause represents the derived noun from the stem, which has survived in rabbinic, medieval and Modern Hebrew: “juice.” With this ingenious proposal, the image becomes clear. The text forms a logical unit with v 32, which warns against haughtiness and spiteful words (Hubbard 1995:373; Lawson 1980:553; Murphy 1998:237; Ross 1991:1126). Such foolishness could result in intense anger that ‘boils over’ in the form of strife. The echoing of the word מִיָּד with the meanings “pressure” and “juice” successfully creates an image of internal physical pressure as anger provoked by incitement (cf. Kruger 2000:188):

(50) כִּי מִיָּד חֵלֵב יוֹצֵא חֲמָאָה וּמִיָּד אֵף יוֹצֵא דָם וּמִיָּד אַפִּים יוֹצֵא רִיב

ky myš ḥlb ywšy’ ḥm’h wmyš ’p ywšy’ dm wmyš ’pym ywšy’ ryb.

C: because VN: pressing (qal inf cs) N: milk V: bring forth (hi impf 3rd sg, m) N: butter C: and VN: pressing (qal inf cs) N: nose V: bring forth (hi impf 3rd sg, m) N: blood C: and VN: pressing (qal inf cs) N: nostrils V: bring forth (hi impf 3rd sg, m) N: strife.

“For as churning the milk produces butter, and as twisting the nose produces blood, so stirring up anger produces strife” (Prov 30:33, NIV)

4.1.7 Redness in the Face/Neck

In the typical experience of anger, the blood “boils” and the face becomes hot (Izard 1977:331). This experience forms the basis of the widely held assumption that increased body heat causes redness in the face and neck area. Hence, expressions indicating a flushed face are commonly used as metonymies for anger (Kövecses 1990:52). It is to be expected that vocabulary linking anger with redness in the face and neck were identified in disparate languages, such as English, Chinese, Japanese and Hungarian (Kövecses 1995b:189). In Hebrew the words for heat often combine with אֵף “nose” and אַפִּים “nostrils/face” to indicate the glowing of the face in the event of anger (cf. Struthers 1997:463):

The literal meanings of אֵף חָרָה “the face burns” and אֵף, חָרוֹן אֵף, חָרִי אֵף “burning of the face,” derive from the well-known reddening of the faces of angry persons (Gruber 1980:491).

(51) וַיַּחַר אֵף יַעֲקֹב בְּרַחֵל

wyḥr 'p y'qb brḥl.

C: and V: burn (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: nose (cs) PN: Jacob P: against PN: Rachel.

“And Jacob’s face glowed against Rachel” (Gen 30:2)

(52) וַיִּקָּם יְהוֹנָתָן מֵעַם הַשִּׁלְחָן בַּחֲרֵי אָף

wyqm yhwntn m'm hšlḥn bhry 'p.

C: and V: rise (qal impf 3rd sg, m) PN: Jonathan P: from N: table (def) P: in N: burning (cs) N: nose.

“And Jonathan rose from the table with a glowing face” (1 Sam 20:34).³¹

(53) כִּי הִיָּתָה אֲרֻצָּם לְשֹׂמָה מִפְּנֵי חֲרוֹן הַיּוֹנָה וּמִפְּנֵי חֲרוֹן אָפוֹ

ky hyth 'rṣm lšmh mpny ḥrwn hywnh wmpny ḥrwn 'pw.

C: because V: become (qal pf 3rd sg, f) N: land + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: to N: horror P: because of N: heat (cs) N: oppressor (def) C: and P: because of N: heat (cs) N: anger.

“For their land became a horror because of the burning of the oppressor and the heat of his anger (Jer 25:38).³²

In almost half the passages that treat human wrath, אָף is associated with חָרָה (Sauer 1997:168), of which the basic meaning is “to glow, to burn” (Johnson 1973:380). The development of meaning from “glowing nose” to “anger” is easily understood (Sauer 1997:168). Gruber (1980:493) explains:

Since Hebrew אָף denotes both “face” and “nose” and since the reddening of the face (including the nose) is a characteristic symptom of anger in humans and since the primary meaning of Hebrew חָרָה is “burn,” it is not surprising that in forty-seven cases Biblical Hebrew expresses “be angry” by חָרָה אָף.

Gruber (1980:500-1) regards בָּעַר אָף as a synonymous expression to חָרָה אָף, also having derived from the perception of the flushing of the face in anger as “burning.” Together with nine other anatomical expressions, it occurs in the cultic theophany in Isaiah 30:27-33. As all the other anthropomorphic references, אָף (v 27) should be understood in its primary sense, “nose,” which in this case “burns” (Gruber 1980:500; Watts 1987:405):

(54) הִנֵּה שֵׁם יְהוָה בָּא מִמְּרָחֵק בָּעַר אָפוֹ וּכְבַד מִשָּׂאָה שִׁפְתָיו מִלֹּא זַעַם וּלְשׁוֹנוֹ כֹּאֵשׁ אֹכֶלֶת

hnh šm yhwḥ b' mmrḥq b'r 'pw wkbd mś'h šptyw ml'w z'm wlšwnw k's 'klt.

Particle of focus (Van der Merwe, Naudé & Krause 1997:270): behold N: name (cs) PN: YHWH V:

³¹ Also see 4.3.2.

³² Also see 4.1.1.

come (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: from N: distant place V: burn (qal pt sg, m) N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and A: heavy VN: rising (qal pt sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: lips + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: be full (qal pf 3rd pl) N: foam C: and N: tongue + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: like N: fire (f) V: consume (qal pf 3rd sg, f).

“Behold, the name of YHWH comes from afar, his nose burns and his rage is overwhelming.³³ His lips are full of foam and his tongue is like a devouring fire” (Isa 30:27).³⁴

The expression also metonymically indicates anger in Psalm 2:12:

(55) כִּי יִבְעַר כְּמַעַט אָפוּ

ky yb‘r km‘t ‘pw.

C: because V: burn (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: like N: little while N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“For his wrath can flare up in a moment” (Ps 2:12; NIV).

Gruber (1980:501) identifies yet another expression which appears to derive from the awareness that the nose (or face) of the angry person glows, namely, קִדְחָה אֵשׁ בְּאַפִּי “a fire is kindled in my nose” (Deut 32:22; Jer 15:14b; 17:4a):

(56) כִּי אֵשׁ קִדְחָה בְּאַפִּי וְתִקַּד עַד שְׂאוֹל תַּחֲתִית וְתֹאכַל אֶרֶץ וְיִבְלֶה וְתִלְהַט מוֹסְדֵי הָרִים

ky ‘š qdḥh b‘py wtyqd ‘d š‘wl tḥtyt wt‘kl ‘rṣ wyblh wtlḥt mwšdy hrym.

C: because N: fire (f) V: kindle (qal pf 3rd sg, f) P: in N: anger (lit. nose) + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and V: burn (qal impf 3rd sg, f) P: until PN: Sheol (grave, hell) A: lowermost C: and V: consume (qal impf 3rd sg, f) N: earth C: and N: produce + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) C: and V: blaze (pi impf 3rd sg, f) N: foundations (cs) N: mountains.

“For a fire is kindled in my nose, and will burn unto the deepest parts of Sheol, and will consume the earth and its produce, and burn the foundations of the mountains” (Deut 32:22).³⁵

(57) כִּי אֵשׁ קִדְחָה בְּאַפִּי עֲלֵיכֶם תּוֹקֵד

ky ‘š qdḥh b‘py ‘lykm twqd.

C: because N: fire (f) V: kindle (qal pf 3rd sg, f) P: in N: nose + pron suffix (1st sg) P: on + pron suffix (2nd pl, m) V: burn (qal impf 3rd sg, f).

“For a fire is kindled in my nose; it will burn against you” (Jer 15:14; Gruber 1980:501).

(58) כִּי אֵשׁ קִדְחָתֶם בְּאַפִּי עַד עוֹלָם תּוֹקֵד

ky ‘š qdḥh³⁶ b‘py.

³³ See Kruger (2000b:155-62).

³⁴ Also see 4.1.10, 4.2.1, 4.2.1.2, 4.2.2 and 4.2.7.

³⁵ Also see 4.2.2.6.

³⁶ See BHS.

C: because N: fire V: kindle (qal pf 2nd pl, m) P: in N: nose + pron suffix (1st sg) Adv: forever V: burn (qal impf 3rd sg, f).

“For you kindled a fire in my nose; it will burn forever” (Jer 17:4; translation by Gruber 1980:502).

Because of these expressions, אַף came to denote anger on its own. Thus, it developed into a conventional metaphor, where the original image does not always have to figure.

4.1.8 Agitation

One of the archetypal indicators of anger is muscle tension, which coincides with a low level of control (Izard 1977:331). Anger is therefore often accompanied by some uncontrollable motor activity (Izard 1977:331):

... anger causes the person to feel great tension, second only to that of fear, and far more self-assurance than in any other negative emotion. ... The mean for the dimension of control ... was lower in anger than in any other emotion. ... The combination of muscle tension (strength), self-assurance, and impulsiveness help explain the individual's readiness to strike out or engage in some kind of motor activity.

This explains why some words for anger in the Hebrew Bible have movement as their basic meaning. זָרַח, for example, is mostly used to indicate quivering in the event of strong emotions, such as anger and fear (Vanoni 1993:326-30). Although it is often translated with “rage,” it can best be seen as a metonymy for anger, indicating physical agitation. It seems to be equivalent to English expressions such as (Kövecses 1990:52):

She was *shaking* with anger.

He was *quivering* with rage.

I was *hopping* mad.

(59) יען התרגזך אלי
y'n htrgzk 'ly.

C: because of VN: quivering (hitp inf cs) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) P: against + pron suffix (1st sg).

“... because of your quivering rage against me” (2 Kgs 19:28).

(60) כעמק בנבעון ירגז
k'mq bgb'wn yrgz.

P: like N: valley P: in PN: Gibeon V: quiver (qal impf 3rd sg, m).

“He will shake with anger in the valley of Gibeon” (Isa 28:21).

The root זָעַף also seems to have as its primary meaning “to be agitated” (Johnson 1973:380). In Jonah 1:15 it is used of the raging movement of the sea. In humans, this inner fury is often accompanied by action. King

Asa put the seer in prison, because he was hopping mad with him (כִּי בִזְעַף עִמּוֹ) (2 Chr 16:10). One can also kill in this state:

(61) וַתִּהְרַגוּ בָם בִּזְעַף עַד לְשָׁמַיִם הַגִּיעַ

wthrgw bm bz'p 'd lšmym hgy'.

C: and V: murder (qal impf 2nd pl, m) P: with + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: in N: rage P: unto N: heaven V: reach (hi pf 3rd sg, m).

“And you have slain them in a rage that reached up to heaven” (2 Chr 28:9).³⁷

The use of קִצְרֵ רוּחַ/אִפְיִם “shortness of breath” as metonymy for anger control has already been pointed out (see 4.1.2; Lauha 1983:229-31; Kruger 2000:184). Wolff (1973:64) says that it refers to “der Kurzatmige als der Aufgeregte.” With regard to references to breathing in the context of anger, Johnson (1973:381) writes that:

[es handelt sich] um das heftige Atemholen bei starker Erregung.

(62) וְלֹא שָׁמְעוּ אֶל מֹשֶׁה מִקְצַר רוּחַ

wl' šm'w 'l mšh mqsr rwḥ.

C: and Neg particle V: hear (qal pf 3rd pl) P: to PN: Moses P (adverbial): because N: shortness (cs) N: breath.

“And they did not listen to Moses because they were upset” (Ex 6:9).

(63) לֹא תִקְצַר רוּחִי

l' tqsr rwḥy.

Neg particle V: be short (qal impf 3rd sg, f) N: breath + pron suffix (1st sg).

“Should not I be troubled?” (Job 21:4).

(64) הֲקִצְרֵ רוּחַ יְהוָה

hqsr rwḥ yhwḥ.

Interr particle V: be short (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: breath (cs) PN: YHWH.

“Is YHWH upset?” (Mic 2:7).

These physiological effects of anger are not only used metonymically to indicate the presence of anger, but they also motivate other complex metaphors that are very common in the Hebrew Bible.

4.1.9 Internal Agitation

³⁷ Also see 4.2.1.1.

The peoples of ancient cultures localised several emotions, such as love, joy, desire, sadness and hatred, in the heart (Dhorme 1963:118; cf. Smith 1998). The physical effects of anger on the heart are universally recognised and also easily sensed. It is therefore not surprising to find that this organ was the principle foyer for anger in Akkadian (Dhorme 1963:118). In analogy to the Greek $\theta\upsilon\mu\acute{o}s$, which can denote both “heart” and “anger,” Akkadian *labābu* “to be angry” and *libbātu* “fury” may be derived from *libbu* “heart” (Dhorme 1963:188). The heart commonly serves as the subject for verbs for anger and the usual ideogram for verbs or nouns for fury is *šag-dib-ba* “take the heart” (Dhorme 1963:118). This expression finds a clear parallel in the Biblical Hebrew לקח לב “take the heart” in Job 15:12:

(65) מה יקחך לבך ומה ירזון עיניך

mh yqḥk lbk wmh yrzmwn ‘ynyk.

Interr pronoun: what V: take (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: heart + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and Interr pronoun: what, why V: be fixed, fastened (cf. Davidson 1967:680) (qal impf 3rd pl, m) N: eyes + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).

“What angers you and why do your eyes glare?” (Job 15:12).

The above expression is probably motivated by the sensation of increased heart activity associated with the anger episode. This feeling of internal agitation was also associated with the liver in the ancient Mediterranean (Dhorme 1963:130). As will be demonstrated, it was not only the Greeks that assumed a close relation between the liver, which secretes bile ($\chi\omicron\lambda\acute{\eta}$, from which “choler” is derived), and anger. The liver often stands as the complement of a verb with the meaning, ‘to calm down’ in Akkadian supplications for the deity to calm down his anger (Dhorme 1963:130). Yet again, there may exist a parallel for this Akkadian expression in the Hebrew Bible. In the cultic theophany of Isaiah 30 we find the expression, וכבד משאה, “and heavy is his uprising” (cf. Kruger 2000b:160). Hummel (1957:100), however, has suggested the text be emended כבדו מִשָּׂאָה “his liver raging.” This ingenious correction is supported by the fact that the expression is surrounded by four other anatomic references (Watts 1985:403-4). However, it has been rejected on the grounds that the use of the liver with reference to anger is not supported elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible (Kruger 2000b:156; cf. Smith 1998). This said, Aramaic כבד is sometimes used with the sense “to be angry” (Dhorme 1963:130). The fact that the liver is so commonly used in expressions for anger in related Northwest Semitic languages should be enough reason not to completely rule out the possibility that the above Hebrew locution is a reminiscence of the localization of anger in the liver.

Yet another Akkadian expression for anger that has a Classical Hebrew semantic equivalent is *kiš libbi* “bruise of the heart” (Dhorme 1963:119). The Akkadian word *kiš* is related to the Hebrew root קצץ, “to cut asunder” (Davidson 1967:664). Again, the semantic correspondence with עצב אל לב, “to cut oneself to the heart” in Genesis 6:6 as an expression for anger is conspicuous:

(66) וינחם יהוה כי עשה את האדם בארץ ויחעצב אל לבו

wynḥm yhwḥ ky 'śh 't h'dm b'rṣ wyt'šb 'l lbw.

C: and V: breathe strongly (Strong 1961:77) PN: YHWH C: because V: make (qal pf 3rd sg, m)
Nota accusativi N: man (def) P: on N: earth (def) C: and V: cut oneself (hitp 3rd sg, m) P: to N: heart
+ pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“And YHWH was wroth because he made man on the earth and he became furious” (Gen 6:6).³⁸

A further physical concomitant of anger that was linked with the viscera in the ancient Near East, is bodily heat. Unsurprisingly, there are several expressions for anger in Akkadian that are based on the concept of the heart and liver being inflamed (Dhorme 1963:118, 130). Once more we find examples of semantic equivalents in the Hebrew Bible. Psalm 39:4, where the heart is clearly used metonymically for the internal, unseen part of man, will suffice as an example (cf. Dhorme 1963:109-10).³⁹

(67) פן ירדף גאל הדם אחרי הרצח כי יחם לבבו

pn yrdp g'l hdm 'hry hršḥ ky yḥm lbw.

C: lest V: pursue (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: avenger of bloodshed P: after N: manslayer (def) C:
because V: hot (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: heart + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“Lest the avenger pursue the slayer because he is angry” (Deut 19:6) (See Von Meyenfeldt 1950:141).

4.1.10 Slaver at the Mouth

A strong link between anger and epileptic attacks has always been assumed to exist by various peoples all through the ages. In Antiquity, strong anger was recognised as a causing factor for a seizure (Temkin 1994:34). An epileptic was also perceived to be readily roused to anger for no major reason (Temkin 1994:38). The Stoics, among whom anger and its evil consequences were a favourite topic for moral reflection, also recognised similarities between the two phenomena. Philodemus, for example, was reminded of the same symptoms in epileptics by the trembling, moving, yet paralysed limbs of an angry man (Temkin 1994:90).

This assumed relationship has been confirmed by modern science. Several nineteenth century scientists have proven that irritability and anger are salient features of the epileptic character (Temkin 1994:316-24). Hence, they speak of “epileptic anger” and “epileptic fury” referring to seizures (Temkin 1994:317). This kind of anger is special in nature in that it is mostly associated with violent, instantaneous, unmotivated acts (Temkin 1994:321). In a recent clinical study on anger, it has been found that anger often precipitates an

³⁸ Also see 4.1.2, 4.2.8.1.

³⁹ Also see 4.1.1.

attack (Gruber 1980:540). This means that the subject is freed from all inhibitions and is thus unable to control his anger (Temkin 1994:359).

The symptom that probably made the biggest impression on witnesses of a seizure is frothing. The oldest account of epilepsy is found in an Akkadian text where the disease is called *antašubbû* (Wilson 1967:201-2; Temkin 1994:4). In this description, froth flowing from the mouth is mentioned next to tension in the hands and feet, eyes wide open and strenuous breathing (Wilson 1967:202; Temkin 1994:3).

Classical attempts to explain the condition in terms of the humoral theory also seem to have focussed on this symptom. Hippocrates suggests that phlegm caused derangement of the mind through interfering with breath. Too much breath restricts blood-flow, which results in distortions of the body. The air rises to the mouth, carrying along the finest part of the blood, which explains the symptom of froth exuding from the mouth (Temkin 1994:54-5). He thus sees the condition as a phlegmatic disease. For Plato, however, “white” phlegm mixing with black bile are the morbid agents of the illness (Temkin 1994:54). Aristotle, too, characterises epilepsy as a melancholic disease engendered by black bile (Temkin 1994:55). It may be due to their exclusive focus on the cold saliva as a symptom of epilepsy that these Classical authors never considered the hot, yellow bile, which is also the cause of choleric anger, as a possible source of epilepsy.

Seeing that violent anger and epilepsy indeed sometimes co-occur, it is not surprising to find that descriptions of extreme anger in English every so often make allusion to frothing. Gruber (1980:539) lists the following examples from English publications:

- Legree, foaming with rage, smote his victim to the ground.
- Poor father foamed with rage when I told him I would no longer obey him.
- I expected every moment to see them fall down in convulsions and foam at the mouth.

This is also true of Classical Hebrew. There are several common terms for anger that have as their basic meaning, “foam.” In his study on biblical *hapax legomena* in the light of Akkadian and Ugaritic, Cohen (1979:24-5) showed conclusively that קצף II, “twig broken off” (Holladay 1971:322) should rather be rendered “froth” (Grether & Fichtner 1967:393) and is actually a homonym of קצף I, “anger, rage” (Holladay 1971:322). The only place where the supposed *hapax legomenon*, קצף II occurs, is in Hosea 10:7:

(68) נדמה שמרון מלכה כקצף על פני מים

ndmh šmrwn mlkh kqšp ‘l pny mym.

V: be silent (ni pf 3rd sg, m) N: Samaria N: king + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) P: like P: on N: face (cs) N: waters.

“The king of Samaria is quiet as foam on the surface of the waters” (Hos 10:7).⁴⁰

As proof for his thesis that קצף denotes “foam,” Cohen (1979:24-5) makes allusion to a parallel simile in an

⁴⁰ Also see 4.2.8.

Akkadian text dating from some time between the eleventh and the ninth centuries B.C.E. (Era IV:67-68):

You broke the population in its midst like a reed; You brought their din to an end like foam on the surface of the water.

The etymology “foam, anger” for the substantive קצף is further supported by the existence of other terms in various Semitic languages including the semantic range “anger” and “foam” (Cohen 1979:25):

Examples of words exhibiting this semantic range are Hebrew חמה and its Akkadian etymological equivalent *imtu* which share the common meaning “venom, poison” and which, when taken individually, include the meanings “wrath” and “foam.” Furthermore, the Aramaic root חחח is a clear example of a Semitic root denoting both “to be angry” and “to foam, to bubble.” The relevance of the latter to our v is confirmed by the occurrence of חחח in Targum Jonathan translating קצף in Hosea 10:7.

From the above, it seems reasonable to conclude with Gruber (1980:540) that the expression “foam at the mouth” as an indication of anger probably derived from the perception of froth exuding from the mouth of epileptic individuals. He (Gruber 1980:547) does well to translate חמה and קצף where they occur together in Deuteronomy 9:19a with “foam” to bring out the primary meanings of these terms:

(69) כי יגרחי מפני האף והחמה אשר קצף יהוה עליכם להשמיד אתכם

ky ygrty mpny h'p whhmh 'sr qsp yhwh 'lykm lhšmyd 'tkm.

C: because V: fear (qal pf 1st sg) P: because of N: nose (def) C: and V: foam (def) Rel pronoun: that V: foam (qal pf 3rd sg, m) PN: YHWH P: on + pron suffix (2nd pl, m) P: to V: destroy (hi inf cs) Nota accusativi + pron suffix (2nd pl, m).

“For I was afraid of the foaming at the mouth with which YHWH foamed at you to destroy you” (Deut 9:19; cf. Gruber 1980:547).

While considering the etymology of קצף one should not forget the plausible theory of Boehmer (1926:321-2) that this term for anger originally was the name of a demon in pre-Yahwistic Israel (See also 2.3.2). This is especially likely in the few instances where there is talk of קצף גדול (cf. 2 Kgs 3:27; etc). This possibility does not have to stand in conflict with the meaning “foam,” since demons in the ancient Mediterranean world was often associated with illnesses and physiological symptoms (cf. Keel 1997:78-80).⁴¹ However, to draw a link between epileptic seizure as anger and קצף, the demon, would be pure conjecture.

For Gruber (1980:537-8) the meaning of חמה “foam” is the key to understanding the frequent juxtaposition of חמה and אף “face/nose.” In Ezekiel 38:18 foam (חמה) is said to flow from (עלה, cf. Jer

⁴¹ “plague” and “pestilence,” for example, are often meant as personifications of demons (Jeremias 1965:47-8).

47:2) YHWH's face (פָּנָיו). This representation is perfectly intelligible when considered as deriving from epileptic imagery:

(70) העלה חמתי באפי

t'lh ḥmty b'py.

V: flow (hi impf 3rd sg, f) N: foam (f) + pron suffix (1st sg) P: from (lit. in) N: nose + pron suffix (1st sg).

"... foam shall flow from My face" (Ezek 38:18; translation by Gruber 1980:538).

Also in Ezekiel, we frequently encounter the expression, "I will spill (שָׁפַךְ) my foam (חִמָּה) on them to spend (כָּלָה) my anger (אָנִי)." This expression may be based on the common belief that an epileptic attack abates after froth flows from the mouth (cf. Temkin 1994:36):

(71) עתה מקרוב אשפוך חמתי עליך וכליתי אפי בך

'th mqrwb 'špwk ḥmty 'lyk wklyty 'py bk.

Adv: now Adv: shortly V: spill (qal impf 1st sg) N: foam (f) + pron suffix (1st sg) P: on + pron suffix (2nd sg, f) C: and V: spend (qal pf 1st sg) N: nose + pron suffix (1st sg) P: on (lit. in) + pron suffix (2nd sg, f).

"I will spill my foam on you shortly to finish my anger on you" (Ezek 7:8).

Alternatively, פָּנָיו may be conceptualised as a fluid in parallel to חִמָּה when they occur together (cf. Block 1997:629). A similar situation can be observed in the use of נִפְשָׁה, which is often said to waste away (כָּלָה) (cf. Lev 26:16; Ps 31:10-11; 84:3; 119:81-82) and spilled (שָׁפַךְ) (1 Sam 1:15; Ps 42:5; Ezek 27:31) in the form of tears (cf. Collins 1971):

(72) ואמר לשפך חמתי עליהם לכלות אפי בהם בתוך ארץ מצרים

w'mr lšpwk ḥmty 'lyhm lklwt 'py bm btwk 'rṣ mšrym.

C: and V: say (qal pf 1st sg) P: to V: spill (qal inf cs) N: foam (f) + pron suffix (1st sg) P: on + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: to V: spend (qal inf cs) N: nose + pron suffix (1st sg) P: on + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: in Loc: the midst of N: land (cs) PN: Egypt.

"Then I said I would pour my foaming wrath on them to vent all my anger against them in the land of Egypt" (Ezek 20:8).

(73) ואמר לשפך חמתי עליהם לכלות אפי בם במדבר

w'mr lšpwk ḥmty 'lyhm lklwt 'py bm bmdbr.

C: and V: say (qal pf 1st sg) P: to V: spill (qal inf cs) N: foam (f) + pron suffix (1st sg) P: on + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: to V: spend (pi inf cs) N: nose + pron suffix (1st sg) P: on + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: in N: wilderness (def).

“Then I said I would spill my foaming rage on them to vent all my anger against them in the wilderness” (Ezek 20:21).⁴²

ףא is again clearly conceptualised as a fluid in Jeremiah 7:20, where it is used as a synonym for חמה “foam” (cf. Brongers 1969:179). This may support the premise that the nose was conceptualised as the organ where the foam originated from:

(74) הנה אפי וחמתי נתכת אל המקום

hnh 'py whmty ntkt 'l hmqwm.

Particle of focus: behold N: nose + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and N: foam (f) + pron suffix (1st sg) V: pour forth (ni pf 3rd sg, f) P: to N: place (def).

“Behold, my anger and my fury will boil over on this place” (Jer 7:20).⁴³

The vehicles for the metonymy FOAM AT THE MOUTH is not restricted to חמה and קצף. The primary meaning of the root זעם, which is also commonly used to denote anger, is “froth at the mouth” (Strong 1961:36). There are several instances where זעם clearly means “foam, foaming rage” (Lange 1878:337; Delitzsch 1975:39-40). For example, in the cultic theophany of Isaiah 30:27-33, YHWH’s lips (שפה) are full of (מלא) foam (זעם). The theophany noticeably has as its goal to depict YHWH as advancing in furious anger against Assyria (Jeremias 1965:53-6; Kruger 2000b:155-62). Here, as in Deuteronomy 19:9, the image is almost certainly derived from the perception of foam at the mouth of an epileptic:

(75) הנה שם יהוה בא ממרחק בער אפו וכבד משאה שפתיו מלאו זעם ולשונו כאש אכלת

hnh šm yhwh b' mmrḥq b'r 'pw wkbd mś'h śptyw ml'w z'm wlšwnw k's 'klt.

Particle of focus: behold N: name (cs) PN: YHWH V: come (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: from N: distant place V: burn (qal pt sg, m) N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and A: heavy VN: rising (qal pt sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: lips + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: be full (qal pf 3rd pl) N: foam C: and N: tongue + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: like N: fire (f) V: consume (qal pf 3rd sg, f).

“Behold, the name of YHWH comes from afar, his nose burns and his rage is overwhelming. His lips are full of foam and his tongue is like a devouring fire” (Isa 30:27).⁴⁴

In Jeremiah 6:11, we find the unusual image of the prophet being a container for the foam of YHWH. In keeping with epileptic imagery, the foam (חמה) fills (מלא) him to the extent that he cannot hold it in (כול) anymore. Involuntarily, he then spills (שפך) it on the victims of divine anger:

⁴² Also see 4.1.11.

⁴³ Also see 4.2.1.3.

⁴⁴ Also see 4.1.7, 4.2.1, 4.2.1.2, 4.2.2 and 4.2.7.

(76) ואת חמת יהוה מלאאתי נלאיתי הכיל שפך על עולל בחוץ

w't ḥmt yhwh ml'ty nl'yty hkyl špk 'l 'wll bhws.

C: but Nota accusativi N: foam (f, cs) PN: YHWH V: fill (qal pf 3rd sg, f) + pron suffix (1st sg) V: be tired (ni pf 1st sg) V: contain (hi inf cs) V: spill (qal inf cs) P: on N: child Adv: outside.

“But I am full of the froth of YHWH; I am tired with holding it in. I will pour it out on the children abroad” (Jer 6:11).

This image of froth spilling from the mouth of an epileptic as a result of a seizure provides the background for the very common combination, שפך חמה/זעם/אף, “to pour out foam” (Isa 42:25; Jer 6:11; 10:25; 42:18; Ezek 7:8; 14:19; 20:8, 13, 21, 33, 34; 22:22; 30:15; 36:18; Ps 69:25; 79:6; Lam 2:4). This is also true of the cases where these nouns are put forward as the subject of the ni passive form of the verb נתך “to pour out” (Jer 7:20; 42:18; 44:6; Nah 1:6; 2 Chr 12:7; 34:21, 25). Significantly, the image is that of froth pouring forth by itself (Johnson 1973:386):

(77) כי גדולה חמת יהוה אשר נתכה בנו

ky gdwlh ḥmt yhwh 'šr ntkh bnw.

C: because A: great N: foam (f, cs) PN: YHWH Rel pronoun V: pour forth (ni pf 3rd sg, f) P: on (lit. in) + pron suffix (1st pl).

“For the fury of YHWH that is poured out on us is great” (2 Chr 34:21).

YHWH's anger is again depicted in terms of an epileptic fit in Isaiah 26:20-21. People are advised to go into their rooms and shut their doors for a little while (מעט רגע) until the foaming (זעם) of YHWH has passed (עבר). As in Isaiah 30, this violent scenario occurs in the context of theophany, which primarily concerns itself with the depiction of brutal divine anger (Jeremias 1965:1). The phrase, “for behold, the Lord is coming out of his dwelling” (כי הנה יהוה יצא ממקומו), is taken literally from the theophany in Micah 1. Since theophany is often accompanied by storm imagery, some scholars have wrongly rendered זעם “storm of wrath” (so Lange 1878:290; cf. Rawlinson 1950b:416). The image is clearly that of a subject in epileptic rage that has to be avoided (cf. Temkin 1994:11, 90). The literal meaning of זעם, “froth at the mouth” (Strong 1961:36) therefore needs to be retained:

(78) לך עמי בא בחדריך וסגר דלתך בעדך חבי כמעט רגע עד יעבור זעם כי הנה יהוה יצא
ממקומו

*lk 'my b' bḥdryk wsgr dltyk⁴⁵ b'dk ḥby km't rg' 'd y'bwr z'm ky hnh yhwh
yš' mmqwmw.*

V: walk (qal imp sg, m) N: people + pron suffix (1st sg) V: go (qal imp sg, m) P: in N: rooms + pron

⁴⁵ See BHS.

suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and V: close (qal imp sg, m) N: doors + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) P: behind + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) V: hide (qal imp sg, m) P: as A: a little N: moment P: until V: pass (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: foam C: because Particle of focus: behold PN: YHWH V: go out (qal pt sg, m) P: from N: place + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“Come, my people, enter into your rooms and shut your doors; hide yourself for a little while until the foaming has ceased. For behold, YHWH comes out of his dwelling” (Isa 26:20-21).⁴⁶

In language very similar to Ezekiel 7:8, the prophet declares that the foaming anger (זעם) of YHWH will end (כלה) in a little while (מעט מזער) in Isaiah 10:25. Some scholars have mistaken the “very little while” to be dependent on YHWH’s inclination (so Brueggemann 1998:96). Rather, as in Ezekiel 7:8 and Isaiah 26:20, discussed above, it probably affirms the known fact that epileptic fits are of limited duration and is about to cease when frothing starts. YHWH can produce only a limited amount of foam that will be used up (כלה, Köhler & Baumgartner 1958:437) soon:

(79) כי עוד מעט מזער וכלה זעם ואפי על תבליחם

ky ‘wd m‘t mz‘r wklh z‘m w‘py ‘l tbylthm.

C: because Adv: still N: while A: little C: and V: finish (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: foam C: and N: nose + pron suffix (1st sg) P: on N: destruction + pron suffix (3rd pl, m).

“For in a little while my foaming rage will end, and my anger in their destruction” (Isa 10:25).

Analogously, the עד כלה זעם in Daniel 11:36 should be rendered, “until the foaming has ceased” and not “until the time of wrath is completed” (so Blenkinsopp 2000:257):

(80) והצליח עד כלה זעם

whšlyh ‘d klh z‘m.

C: and V: prosper (hi pf 3rd sg, m) P: until V: finish (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: foam.

“And he will prosper until the foaming has ended” (Dan 11:36).

Contrary to the references above where there is talk of anger as epileptic seizures lasting for a limited time period, the psalmist declares that divine frothing (זעם) will last the whole day (בכל יום) in Psalm 7:12. It is likely that the author wanted to emphasise the intensity of the godly anger. Unlike epileptic episodes that are of short duration, his fit will last the whole day:

(81) ואל זעם בכל יום

w‘l z‘m bkl ywm.

C: and PN: El V: foam (qal pt sg, m) P: in Indef pronoun: all N: day.

⁴⁶ Also see 4.3.1.

“And El foams the whole day” (Ps 7:12).

Analogous to חמה, the root זעם is used with פן in its meaning “nose/face” to create the metonymy for anger, “foam of the nose/face” (cf. Ezek 38:18 above). What becomes increasingly clear is that this metonymy is almost exclusively used to denote violent anger, which agrees with the perception that epileptic fits are often accompanied by vicious, unprovoked acts:

(82) וינאץ בזעם אפו מלך וכהן

wyn'š bz'm 'pw mlk wkhn.

C: and V: despise (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: in N: froth (cs) N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: king C: and N: priest.

“... and in the frothing of his face has despised the king and the priest” (Lam 2:6).

The locution, פן חרון “burning of the nose/face” commonly functions as a synonym for זעם and חמה in the Hebrew Bible indicating froth exuding from the nose. In these instances, פן may designate both the origin of the foam as well as the foam itself (see Jer 7:20; Ezek 20:8, 13; etc.).

(83) שפך עליהם זעמך וחרון אפך ישיגם

špk 'lyhm z'mk wħrwn 'p k yšygm

V: pour (qal imp sg, m) P: on + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) N: froth + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and N: spume (lit. burning, cs) N: nose + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) V: reach (hi impf 3rd sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m).

“Pour your foam on them and let the spume of your face reach⁴⁷ them” (Ps 69:25).

In Isaiah 13:9 אף חרון stands in parallel with עברה, “overflowing,” which strengthens the image of froth exuding from the nose. In Psalm 88:17 אף חרון is even said to overflow (עבר) the victim of wrath:

(84) הנה יום יהוה בא אכזרי ועברה וחרון אף

hnh ywm yhwh b' 'kzry w'brh wħrwn 'p.

Particle of focus: behold N: day (cs) PN: YHWH V: come (qal pf 3rd sg, m) A: cruel C: and N: overflowing C: and N: spume (lit. burning, cs) N: nose.

“Behold, the day of YHWH comes, cruel, with overflowing and burning of the nose” (Isa 13:9).

(85) עלי עברו חרוניך

'ly 'brw ħrwnyk.

P: over + pron suffix (1st sg) V: pass over (qal pf 3rd pl) N: wrath (pl) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).

“Your wrath has swept over me” (Ps 88:17, NIV).⁴⁸

⁴⁷ For נשג “to reach, as from the hand to the mouth,” see Davidson (1967:565).

In Zephaniah 3:8 אף חרון is preceded by the determiner כל “all,” which indicates that a substantive is implied by this combination. Instead of indicating heat in the face as metonymy for anger, it again seems to function as a synonym for זעם “foam,” by which it is preceded:

(86) לכן חכו לי ... ליום קומי ... לשפך עליהם זעמי כל חרון אפי כי באש קנאתי תאכל כל הארץ
lkn ḥkw ly ... lywm qwmy ... lšpk ‘lyhm z‘my kl ḥrwn ‘py ky b’s qn’ty t’kl kl h’rš.

C: therefore V: wait (pi imp, m) P: for + pron suffix (1st sg) ... P: for N: day (cs) VN: rising (qal inf cs) + pron suffix (1st sg) ... P: to V: pour (qal inf cs) P: on + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) N: foam + pron suffix (1st sg) Indef pronoun: all N: burning (cs) N: nose C: because P: in N: fire (cs) N: fervour + pron suffix (1st sg) N: consume (qal impf 1st sg) Indef pronoun: all N: earth (def).

“Therefore, wait for me ... until the day of my rising ... to pour on them all my burning anger, for in the fire of my zeal all the earth will be destroyed” (Zeph 3:8).⁴⁹

Lamentations 4:11 provides further evidence that אף חרון is interchangeable with חמה. The usual process seems to be inverted. Whilst it is usually אף that wastes away (כלה) and is spilled (שפך) in the form of foam (חמה) (Ezek 7:8; 20:8, 21), here it is חמה that is consumed and אף חרון that is spilled:

(87) כלה יהוה את חמתו שפך חרון אפו ויצת אש בציון ותאכל יסודתיה
klh yhwh ‘t ḥmtw špk ḥrwn ‘pw wyšt ‘š bsywn wt’kl yswdtyh.

V: finish (pi pf 3rd sg, m) PN: YHWH Nota accusativi N: foam + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: pour (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: burning (cs) N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and V: kindle (hi impf 3rd sg, m) N: fire (f) P: in PN: Zion C: and V: consumed (qal impf 3rd sg, f) N: foundations + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“YHWH has used up his poisonous foam; he has poured out his burning anger and kindled a fire in Zion that devoured its foundations” (Lam 4:11).

In the theophany in Nahum 1:6, אף חרון is used in parallel to both חמה and זעם. There seems to be no differentiation in meaning between these terms:

(88) לפני זעמו מי יעמוד ומי יקום בחרון אפו חמתו נתכה כאש
lpny z‘mw my y‘mwd wmy yqwm bḥrwn ‘pw ḥmtw ntkh k’s.

P: before N: foam + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) Interr pronoun: who V: stand (qal impf 3rd sg, m) C: and Interr pronoun: who V: rise (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: before N: burning (cs) N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg) N: foam + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: pour forth (ni pf 3rd sg, f) P: like N: fire.

⁴⁸ Also see 4.1.1 and 4.2.8.

⁴⁹ Also see 4.2.1 and 4.2.2.1 and 4.2.2.6.

“Who can stand before his foaming and who can stand up before the froth of his face – his spume is poured out like fire” (Nah 1:6).⁵⁰

חרון אף, “the fire of my overflowing” in Ezekiel 21:36 seems to correspond semantically to אש עברתי, since it stands in parallel to זעם “foam” and also evokes the image of heat:

- (89) ושפכתי עליך זעמי באש עברתי אפיח עליך
wšpkyt 'lyk z'my b's 'brty 'py ḥ 'lyk.
 C: and V: pour (qal pf 1st sg) P: on + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) N: foam + pron suffix (1st sg) P: in N: fire (f, cs) N: overflow + pron suffix (1st sg) V: blow (hi impf 1st sg) P: on + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).
 “I will spill my foam on you; I will blow my fiery outpouring⁵¹ on you” (Ezek 21:36).⁵²

Corresponding to the imagery of epilepsy discussed so far, there are several texts that picture a subject becoming full of (מלא) foam. This precedes the pouring forth of foam from the mouth or nose and leads to intense physical discomfort. This is why the subject sometimes cannot hold it in (כול) any more:

- (90) לא ישבתי בסוכ משחקים ואעלו ... כי זעם מלאחתי
I' yšbty bswd mšḥqym w' 'lz ... ky z'm ml'tny.
 Neg particle V: sit (qal impf 1st sg) P: in N: assembly (cs) VN: happy (pi pt pl, m) C: and V: jump for joy (qal impf 1st sg) ... C: because N: foam (cs) V: fill (pi pf 2nd sg, m) + pron suffix (1st sg).
 “I do not sit in the company of happy people, nor do I jump for joy ... for you have filled me with frothing anger” (Jer 15:17).
- (91) לא יכלו גוים זעמו
I' yklw gwym z'mw.
 Neg particle V: contain (hi impf 3rd pl, m) N: nations N: foam + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).
 “Nations cannot contain his foaming anger” (Jer 10:10).
- (92) הנה שם יהוה בא ממרחק בער אפו וכבד משאה שפתיו מלאו זעם ולשונו כאש אכלה
hnh šm yhwḥ b' mmrḥq b'r 'pw wkbd mś'h šptyw ml'w z'm wšwnw k's 'kl.
 Particle of focus: behold N: name (cs) PN: YHWH V: come (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: from N: distant place V: burn (qal pt sg, m) N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and A: heavy VN: rising (qal pt sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: lips + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: be full (qal pf 3rd pl) N: foam C: and N: tongue + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: like N: fire (f) V: consume (qal pf 3rd sg, f).

⁵⁰ Also see 4.1.14 and 4.2.1.3 and 4.2.2.6.

⁵¹ For עברה “outpouring,” cf. Lange (1876:209).

⁵² Also see 4.2.1.

“Behold, the name of YHWH comes from afar, his nose burns and his rage is overwhelming. His lips are full of foam and his tongue is like a devouring fire” (Isa 30:27).

Corresponding semantically to זַעַם אֶפֶס “foam of the face” is זַעַם לְשׁוֹן “foam of the tongue.” In Hosea 7:16 it is used in parallel with לַעַג “to ridicule” as a metonymy for anger (Holladay 1971:178):

(93) יִפְּלוּ בַחֲרֵב שְׂרִיחַם מִזַּעַם לְשׁוֹנָם זֶה לַעֲגָם בְּאַרְץ מִצְרַיִם

yplw bḥrb śryhm mz‘m lšwnm zw l‘gm b’rṣ mšrym.

V: fall (qal impf 3rd pl, m) P: by N: sword (def) N: princes + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: because of N: foam (cs) N: tongue + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) Rel pronoun: which N: derision + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: in N: land (cs) PN: Egypt.

“Their princes will fall by the sword because of their anger (lit. foam of their tongue), which is their ridicule in Egypt” (Hos 7:16).

The conceptualisation of anger in terms of epileptic seizures also provides a conceivable explanation for the adjective, פָּחַז, “reckless” (Holladay 1971:291) which is used to describe violent people in the Hebrew Bible (Judg 9:4; Zeph 3:4). The root means, “to boil over” in Aramaic (Davidson 1967:623) and probably has a related meaning in Classical Hebrew (Holladay 1971:291):

(94) וַיִּשְׂכַּר אֲבִימֶלֶךְ אַנְשִׁים רֵיקִים וּפְחֹזִים

wyškr ‘bymlk ‘nšym ryqym wphzym.

C: and V: hire (qal impf 3rd sg, m) PN: Abimelech N: men A: worthless C: and A: violent.

“And Abimelech hired worthless and violent men” (Judg 9:4).

(95) נְבִיאֵיהָ פְּחֹזִים אַנְשֵׁי בְגָדוֹת

npy‘yh phzym ‘nšy bgdwt.

N: prophets + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) A: violent N: men (cs) N: treachery.

“Her prophets are violent, men of treachery” (Zeph 3:4).

The fact that at least three terms for anger have as their basic meaning “foam” firmly establishes FROTH AT THE MOUTH as a central metonymy for anger in the Hebrew Bible. The commonality of the metonymy as evidenced by all the expressions mentioned above makes the ignorance with which it is treated all the more startling. As will be seen, the metonymy also served as a major motivation for the metaphor ANGER IS POISON.⁵³

⁵³ See 4.2.9.

4.1.11 Lifting the Hand

Vorwahl (1932:17) pointed out that Darwin interpreted the making of a fist as an innate gesture with the functional significance of self-defence. In the ancient Near East, this gesture is of even more consequence, since it is sometimes presented as having magical powers (Vorwahl 1932:17):

(96) כפך מעלי הרחק ואמתך אל תבעתני

kpk m'ly hrḥq w'mtk 'l tb'tny.

N: palm (of hand) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) P: from + pron suffix (1st sg) Adv: far C: and N: horror (f) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) Neg particle V: make afraid (qal impf 3rd sg, f) + pron suffix (1st sg).

“Withdraw your hand far from me; and don’t let your horror⁵⁴ make me afraid” (Job 13:21).

In Isaiah 58:4, however, the gesticulation is mentioned with strife as an expression of anger and irritation due to fasting (Vorwahl 1932:17):

(97) הן לריב ומצה תצומו ולהכות באגרף רשע

hn lryb wmṣh tṣwmw wlhkwt b'grp rš'.

Particle of focus: behold P: for N: dispute C: and N: quarrel V: fast (qal pf 2nd sg, m) C: and P: to V: strike (hi inf cs) P: with N: fist N: injustice.

“Behold, you fast in order to dispute and quarrel and to wrongfully strike with the fist” (Isa 58:4).

In like manner, the verb נגע, “to touch, smite violently” (Davidson 1967:535) often stands next to other figures for anger. In Amos 9 it is preceded by the metonymy GLARING EYES⁵⁵ and followed by the metaphor of ANGER IS A FLOOD:⁵⁶

(98) ואדני יהוה הצבאות הנוגע בארץ ותמוג ... ועלתה כיאר כלה ושקעה כיאר מצרים

w'dny yhwḥ ḥṣb'wt hnwg' b'rṣ wtmwg ... w'lth ky'r klh wšq'h ky'r mšrym.

C: and PN: Adonai PN: YHWH (cs) N: hosts (def) V: smite (qal pt sg, m) N: land C: and V: melt (qal impf 3rd sg, f) ... C: and V: rise (qal pf 3rd sg, f) P: like N: flood Indef pronoun: all + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) C: and V: sink down (qal pf 3rd sg, f) P: like N: flood (cs) PN: Egypt.

“And Adonai, YHWH of the hosts will smite the land, and it will melt ... and all of it will rise like a flood, and it will be overflowed as by the flood of Egypt” (Am 9:5).⁵⁷

This rather physical expression of anger provides the conceptual framework for several related expressions involving the hand. For example, the expression, ‘to swing the hand over somebody’ can be regarded as an idiom for anger (Vorwahl 1932:17):

⁵⁴ אמה commonly appears as a demon in the Hebrew Bible (cf. Ps 55:4; Gen 15:12, 16; Ex 23:27; Deut 32:25).

⁵⁵ See 4.1.4.

⁵⁶ See 4.2.8.

⁵⁷ Also see 4.2.8.1.

(99) אם הניפותי על יתום ידי

'm hnypwty' l ytwm ydy.

C: if V: swing (hi pf 1st sg) P: over N: orphan N: hand + pron suffix (1st sg).

“If I swung my hand against an orphan ...” (Job 31:21).

Similarly, ‘to lift the hand against somebody’ was commonly used as a figurative expression indicating anger in the Hebrew Bible. Vorwahl (1932:17) lists Psalm 106:26, where the magical connotation that the ancient Israelites attached to this gesture is clearly visible, as an example:

(100) וישא ידו להם להפיל אותם במדבר

wys' ydw lhm lhpyl 'wtm bmdbr.

C: and (consec) V: lift (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: hand + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: to + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: to V: bring down (hi inf cs) Nota accusativi + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: in N: desert.

“He lifted up his hand against them to bring them down in the wilderness” (Ps 106:26).

In Ezekiel 20:33 the expression ‘to stretch out the arm’ is used instead of the usual ‘to stretch out the hand’. This metonymic (whole for a part) alteration becomes intelligible in view of the Classical Hebrew resistance to repetition. The locution is directly preceded by a parallel expression already containing “hand” (יד), namely ‘a strong hand’. Both these idioms stand next to the very common ‘foaming at the mouth’ metonymy for anger:⁵⁸

(101) ביד חזקה ובזרוע נטויה ובחמה שפוכה אמלוך עליכם

byd hzqh wbzrw' ntwyh wbhḥmh špwkh 'mlwk 'lykm.

P: with N: hand (f) A: strong (f) C: and P: with N: arm (f) V: stretched out (qal pt pass, sg, f) C: and P: with N: wrath (f) V: pour out (qal pt pass, sg, f) V: rule (qal impf 1st sg) P: over + pron suffix (2nd pl, m).

“I will rule over you with a strong hand, stretched out arm and wrath poured out” (Ezek 20:33).

‘To stretch out the hand against someone’ serves as a semantic equivalent to ‘to lift the hand against someone’. Again, the gesture seems to have been conceptualised as effecting supernatural destruction:

(102) ונשיתי את ידי עליהם ונתתי את הארץ שממה

wntyty 't ydy 'lyhm wntty 't h'rš šmmh.

C: and V: stretch out (qal pf 1st sg) Nota accusativi N: hand (1st sg) P: over + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) C: and V: make (qal pf 1st sg) Nota accusativi N: land (def) N: sinister desolation.

“And I will stretch out my hand over them and make the land a sinister desolation” (Ezek 6:14).

⁵⁸ See 4.1.10.

This expression must not be confounded with the idiom, “to stretch out the hands” in prayer (1 Kgs 8:38), or in invitation (Isa 65:2). This positive gesture is mentioned in a negative context in Isaiah 65:2, and can easily be misinterpreted as describing the divine reaction to provocation through rebellious disobedience (cf. v 3):

(103) פרשתי ידי כל היום אל עם סורר

pršty ydy kl hywm 'l 'm swrr.

V: stretch out (qal pf 1st sg) N: hand (pl) + pron suffix (1st sg) Indef pronoun: all N: day (def) P: to N: people V: be stubborn (qal pt sg, m).

“I stretch out my hands all day towards a stubborn people” (Isa 65:2).

In the anger idiom, keeping the hand stretched out, meant that the subject’s anger hasn’t abated yet:

(104) לא שב אפו ועוד ידו נטויה

l' šb 'pw w'wd ydw nṭwyh.

Neg particle V: turn back (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: anger + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and Adv: still N: hand (f) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: stretch out (qal pt pass, sg, f).

“His anger hasn’t abated and his hand is still stretched out” (Isa 9:16, cf. 10:4).

Conversely, taking the hand back means that the emotional episode has ended:

(105) ואמר לשפך חמתי עליהם לכלות אפי בם במדבר והשבתי את ידי

w'mr lšpk ḥmty 'lyhm lklwt 'py bm bmdbr whšbty 't ydy.

C: and V: think (qal pt sg, m) P: to V: pour out (qal inf cs) N: wrath + pron suffix P: on + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: to V: spend (pi inf cs) N: anger + pron suffix (1st sg) P: with + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: in N: desert (def) C: but V: turn away (hi pf 1st sg) Nota accusativi N: hand + pron suffix (1st sg).

“I thought to pour my wrath on them to finish my anger on them in the desert, but I turned my hand away” (Ezek 20:21-22).⁵⁹

Vorwahl (1932:17) regards the expression ‘with a high hand’ as a semantic equivalent to the gesture of lifting the hand against someone. In Egypt, this sign was indeed associated with anger (Vorwahl 1932:17). When Pharaoh refused to let the Israelites go, they angrily left anyway (Vorwahl 1932:17):

(106) ובני ישראל יצאים ביד רמה

wbny ysr'el yš'ym byd rmh.

C: and N: children (cs) PN: Israel V: go out (qal pt pl, m) P: with N: hand A: high (qal pt sg, f).

“And the children of Israel went out with a high hand” (Ex 14:8).

⁵⁹ Also see 4.1.10.

Although the expression could also be indicative of pride (cf. Num 15:30), it usually stands as an idiom for anger. This is the case in Exodus 17:11 where the hands of Moses served a double function. Not only did it symbolise anger against the enemy, it also magically brought victory to the Israelites (Vorwahl 1932:17):

(107) והיה כאשר ירים משה ידו וגבר ישראל וכאשר יניח ידו וגבר עמלק

whyh k'sr yrym msh ydw wgrb ysr'l wk'sr ynyh ydw wgrb 'mlq.

Discourse marker: And C: when V: lift up (hi impf 3rd sg, m) PN: Moses N: hand + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and V: be strong (qal pf 3rd sg, m) PN: Israel C: and C: when V: lower (hi impf 3rd sg, m) N: hand + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and V: be strong (qal pf 3rd sg, m) PN: Amalek.

“When Moses lifted up his hand the Israelites were strong, and when he lowered his hand the Amalekites were strong” (Ex 17:11).

The soundness of this interpretation of the gesture is confirmed by instances when an outstretched arm is mentioned in parallel with the unequivocal mention of divine anger. Such is the case in Isaiah 5:25. The exact same expression is also encountered in Proverbs 1:24 where it indicates the anger of wisdom because she is constantly ignored.

(108) על כן חרה אף יהוה בעמו ויש ידו עליו

'l kn hrh 'p yhwh b'mw wyt ydw 'lyw.

C: therefore V: burn (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: nose PN: YHWH P: against N: people + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and V: stretch out (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: hand + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: over + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“Therefore YHWH got angry with his people and stretched out his hand over them” (Isa 5:25).

(109) 'ען קראתי והמאנו נשיתי ידי

y'n qr'ty wtm'nw ntyty ydy.

C: because V: invite (qal pf 1st sg) C: and V: refuse (qal impf 2nd pl, m) V: stretch out (qal pf 1st sg) N: hand + pron suffix (1st sg).

“Because I invited and you refused, I stretched out my hand” (Prov 1:24).

Semantically related to the expression ‘to stretch out the hand over’ (נשה יד על) is ‘to stretch one’s hand toward’ (שלח יד אל; Ex 24:11), or simply, to have ‘the hand against’ (ב יד; Gen 16:12) (Vorwahl 1932:17):

(110) ואל אצילי בני ישראל לא שלח ידו

w'l 'syly bny ysr'l l' slh ydw.

C: and P: toward N: noblemen (cs) N: children (cs) PN: Israel Neg particle V: send (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: hand + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“And he did not stretch out his hand out toward the noblemen of Israel” (Ex 24:11).

(111) והוא יהיה פרא אדם ידו בכל ויד כל בו

whw' yhyh pr' 'dm ydw bkl wyd kl bw.

C: and Pronoun: he V: become (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: wild ass N: man N: hand + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: against Indef pronoun: everyone C: and N: hand (cs) Indef Pronoun: everyone P: against + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“And he will become like a wild man; his hand will be against everyone and everyone’s hand will be against him” (Gen 16:12).

Unsurprisingly, the hand (יד) figures as a synonym for indignation (זעם) in Isaiah 66:14:

(112) ונודעה יד יהוה את עבדיו וזעם את איביו

wnwd'h yd yhw'h 't 'bdyw wz'm 't 'ybyw.

C: and V: be noticed (ni pf 3rd sg, f) N: hand (cs) PN: YHWH P: by N: servants + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and N: indignation P: by N: enemies + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“And the hand of YHWH will be known by his servants and his indignation by his enemies” (Isa 66:14).

Finally, the hand also stands as a figure for violent persecution in the Hebrew Bible:

(113) תהפך לאכזר לי בעצם ידך חשטמני

thpk l'kzr ly b'sm ydk tštmny.

V: turn (hi impf 2nd sg, m) P: to N: cruelty P: to + pron suffix (1st sg) P: with N: power (cs) N: hand + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) V: persecute (qal impf 2nd sg, m) + pron suffix (1st sg).

“You are cruel to me; with your strong hand you persecute me” (Job 30:21).

The figure of the threatening hand is not limited to linguistic expressions in the Hebrew Bible. The iconographic depictions of leaders, mostly Egyptian, smiting enemies with the right hand abound in the ancient Near East (cf. Keel 1997:291-7). These portrayals of the almighty Pharaoh smiting his enemies were especially common in endangered frontier districts like Aswan and the Sinai Peninsula (Keel 1997:294). Initially it was thought that these were of psychological-propagandistic nature. This theory has since been abandoned in view of the fact that the portrayals were mostly stationed in positions that are hard to reach and invisible from everyday locations (Keel 1997:294). It is now believed that they had a magical function, making present the irresistible victorious power of the Egyptian king in areas where his power was threatened. Keel (1997:295) concludes:

The more frequently the “magical picture” was displayed, the greater grew the Pharaoh’s power to defend the land against every attack. This primary function does not exclude the fact that the representations preserve the memory of historical events, flatter the vanity of

the ruler, and exercise a discouraging effect on potential invaders.

From the middle of the second millennium BCE, the motif was diffused throughout the Mediterranean world (Keel 1997:296). The striking motif is found in miniature on scarabs found in Tell el-Far'ah, Beit Mirsim, Lachish, Megiddo, Beth-Shan, and other cities. The possibility that these iconographic motifs exerted an influence on the linguistic vehicles for the figure of the threatening hand as metonymy for anger cannot be excluded.

4.1.12 Clapping the Hands

Yet another physical expression of anger that acquired idiomatic status in the Hebrew Bible is the clapping of hands. The gesture is also sometimes encountered as an expression for joy (cf. Isa 55:12; Ps 47:2; 98:8). Consequently, it has commonly been interpreted as an expression of malicious glee when used in a negative context (cf. Vorwahl 1932:18). However, Vorwahl (1932:18) is correct in pointing out that the gesture is often brought into direct relation with terminology for anger and should therefore be interpreted as an expression of this emotion:

(114) וגם אני אכה כפי אל כפי והנחתי חמתי

wgm 'ny 'kh kpy 'l kpy whnḥty ḥmty.

C: and Particle of focus Pronoun: I V: strike (hi impf 1st sg) N: palm + pron suffix (1st sg) P: to N: palm + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and V: satisfy (hi pf 1st sg) N: wrath + pron suffix (1st sg).

“And I will clap my hands together and satisfy my wrath” (Ezek 21:22).

In Numbers 24:10, the expression is again explicitly mentioned as an expression of anger:

(115) ויחר אף בלק אל בלעם ויספק את כפיו

wyḥr 'p blq 'l bl'm wyspq 't kpyw.

C: and V: become hot (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: nose PN: Balak P: toward PN: Bileam C: and V: clap (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: with N: palms + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“And Balak got angry with Bileam and clapped his hands” (Num 24:10).

The gesture again follows on two other figures for anger in Job 27:23, namely ANGER IS LIFTING THE HAND (v 22)⁶⁰ and ANGER IS A HOT WIND (v 21):⁶¹

(116) ישפק עלימו כפימו

yśpq 'lymw kpymw.

⁶⁰ See 4.1.11.

⁶¹ See 4.2.3.

V: clap (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: over against + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: palms + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“He will clap his hands over him” (Job 27:23).

In Ezekiel 21:19, the action is encountered in the context of a curse oracle against Israel. YHWH commands Ezekiel to prophesy against Israel and bring the sword against them. Tromp (1969:108, 163) has shown that the sword (חרב), in all likelihood, had a mythological prehistory. Personification is evident, not only in this Hymn of the Sword, but also in the fierce curse of the prophet Jeremiah in Jeremiah 18:21, where the sword stands in parallel with hunger, which was closely associated with death itself (Tromp 1969:108-9). In the passage under discussion, the sword again seems to be conceptualised as an associate of death (מוֹת). She is depicted as ‘entering’ (חדר) the Israelites. The root חדר is regularly linked with the Underworld in the Hebrew Bible (Tromp 1969:156-7). One may well presume that Ezekiel’s screaming (v 17) and his clapping of hands (v 19) were supposed to have some magical effect (cf. v 26-27). In any event, the functional significance of this gesture as an expression of anger is certain, since the motif is taken up again in v 22, where it is associated with the consummation of wrath (see above):

(117) ואחזה בן אדם הנבא והך כף אל כף
w'th bn 'dm hnb' whk kp 'l kp.

C: and Pronoun: you N: son (cs) N: man V: prophesy (ni imp, m) C: and V: strike (hi imp, m) N: palm P: to N: palm.

“And you, son of man, prophesy and clap your hands together” (Ezek 21:19).

The expression, ‘to strike the thigh’ seems to function as a semantic counterpart to ‘to strike the hands together’ in Ezekiel 21:17-19. The two expressions stand in close proximity to each other and appear to be parallel in meaning:

(118) מגורי אל חרב היו את עמי לכן ספק אל ירך
mgwry 'l hrb hyw 't 'my lkn spq 'l yrk.

N: terrors P: before N: sword V: be (qal pf 3rd pl) P: with N: people + pron suffix (1st sg) C: therefore V: slap (qal imp sg, m) P: to N: thigh.

“Terrors will be upon my people because of the sword. For this, slap [your] thigh” (Ezek 21:17).

In Ezekiel 25:6-7 the two figurative expressions ‘to clap the hands over someone’ and ‘to lift the hand against someone’ are juxtaposed in an oracle against the Ammonites. Because they have treated Israel with indignation, YHWH will destroy them in his anger:

(119) ען מחאך יד ורקעך ברגל ... אל אדמת ישראל לכן הנני נשיתי את ידי עליך
y'n mh'k yd wrq'k brgl ... 'l 'dmt ys'r'l lkn hnny ntyty 't ydy 'lyk.

C: because V: clap (qal inf cs) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and V: stamp (qal inf cs) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) P: with N: foot ... P: before N: land (cs) PN: Israel C: therefore Particle of focus: behold V: stretch out (qal pf 1st sg) Nota accusativi N: hand + pron suffix (1st sg) P: over + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).

“Because you have clapped your hands and stamped with your foot ... over against the land of Israel, therefore I will stretch out my hand against you” (Ezek 25:6-7).

4.1.13 Stamping the Feet

It has been demonstrated above that iconographic representations and linguistic expressions relating to the striking down of the enemy was a very common motif in the ancient Near East.⁶² Especially in Egypt it achieved a very high degree of symbolic power and became of central importance (Keel 1997:297). In a rare variation of this motif, the Pharaoh does not smite the victim, but runs him through instead (Keel 1997:296). According to Keel (1997:296) the Egyptizing portrayal of the king in the psalms combine Canaanite and Egyptian aspects of kingship in that it puts the smiting and stamping motifs in parallel. Psalm 18:39 may serve as an illustration:

(120) אִמְחַצִּים וְלֹא יִכְלוּ קוּם יִפְלוּ תַחַת רַגְלִי

'mḥṣm wl' yklw qwm yplw tḥt rgly.

V: smite (qal impf 1st sg) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) C: and Neg particle V: be able to (qal impf 3rd pl)

V: rise up (qal inf cs) V: fall (qal impf 3rd pl) P: under N: feet + pron suffix (1st sg).

“I smote them and they were not able to rise up; they fell under my feet” (Ps 18:39).

In another version of the same psalm, the image is expanded on in vivid detail in later verses (2 Sam 22:39-43). The enemy is ground and stamped, probably with the feet,⁶³ until they are as fine as dust (2 Sam 22:43; cf. Ps 18:43):

(121) וְאִשְׁחַקֵּם כַּעֲפַר אֲרֶץ כְּשֵׁיט חוֹצוֹת אֲדָמָה אֲרַקְעֵם

w'sḥqm k'pr 'rṣ ktyt ḥwṣwt 'dqm 'rq'm.

C: and V: grind down (qal impf 1st sg) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: like N: dust (cs) N: earth P: like N: mud (cs) N: streets V: crush fine (hi impf 1st sg) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) V: stamp (qal impf 1st sg) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m).

“I ground them down like the dust of the earth, I crushed them fine like the mud of the streets; I stamped them” (2 Sam 22:43).

⁶² See 4.1.11.

⁶³ In Ezek 6:11 and 25:6 רַקַּע has the foot as object.

Predictably, this image is found in parallel with other figures for anger. In Ezekiel 25:6 (listed above) it is juxtaposed with the expression ‘to clap the hands over against someone’ and in Ezekiel 6:11 it stands next to the striking motif:

(122) כה אמר אדני יהוה הכה בכפך ורקע ברגלך

kh 'mr 'dny yhwh hkh bkpk wrq' brglk.

Adv: thus V: say (qal pf 3rd sg, m) PN: Adonai PN: YHWH V: strike (hi imp sg, m) P: with N: palm + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and V: stamp (qal imp sg, m) P: with N: foot + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).

“Thus says Adonai YHWH: strike with your hand and stamp with your foot” (Ezek 6:11).

4.1.14 Violent, Frustrated Behaviour

It has already been pointed out that muscle tension is a sign of anger.⁶⁴ Izard (1977:331) indicated that anger is accompanied by “a feeling of power and an impulse to strike out, to attack the source of anger.” This feeling coincides with a strong lack of self-control, which may be the reason why violent behaviour as a metonymy for anger is also conceptualised as a manifestation of *dementia* (Kövecses 1990:60).

Violent behaviour indicative of frustration is viewed as a form of insane behaviour. According to our cultural model of anger, people who can neither control nor relieve the pressure of anger engage in violent frustrated behaviour.

Foam at the mouth as a metonymy for anger expressed by חמה “heat, poison, anger” (Holladay 1971:108) and “foam, foaming rage” (Cohen 1979:25-9) certainly has a conceptual element of madness associated with it (Gruber 1980:532). The frothing anger in Deuteronomy 19:9⁶⁵ is aimed at “exterminating” (שמד, Holladay 1971:375) the object of wrath:

(123) כי יגרתני מפני האף והחמה אשר קצף יהוה עליכם להשמיד אתכם

ky ygrty mpny h'p whh'mh 'sr qsp yhwh 'lykm lhšmyd 'tkm.

C: because V: fear (qal pf 1st sg) P: because of N: nose (def) C: and V: foam (def) Rel pronoun: that V: foam (qal pf 3rd sg, m) PN: YHWH P: on + pron suffix (2nd pl, m) P: to V: destroy (hi inf cs) Nota accusativi + pron suffix (2nd pl, m).

“For I was afraid of the foaming at the mouth with which YHWH foamed at you to destroy you” (Deut 9:19; cf. Gruber 1980:547).

In Psalm 102:11, YHWH is pictured as foaming at the mouth in extreme anger, picking up and hurling the

⁶⁴ See 4.1.8.

⁶⁵ See 4.1.10.

psalmist to the ground:

(124) מפני זעמד וקצפך כי נשאחתי ותשליכני

mpny z'mk wqšpk ky ns'tny wtšlykny.

P: because of N: foam + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and N: froth + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: because V: lift up (qal pf 2nd sg, m) + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and V: throw down (qal impf 2nd sg, m) + pron suffix (1st sg).

“Because of your foaming anger you have picked me up and thrown me down” (Ps 102:11).

Proverbs 27:4 also makes reference to violence as anger. As most translations indicate, the construct *אכזריות חמה* “cruelty of wrath” (Deane 1950:515) has the value of a subject and predicate (Lange 1869:229): “anger is cruel” (NIV). The word “cruelty” (Holladay 1971:14) occurs only here, and is related to the word “to act harshly, violent” (Strong 1961:12). This cruelty of wrath is vividly described as an overwhelming flood (פַּשַׁף) against which no one can defend himself.⁶⁶

The word *קנאה* “fervour” (Sauer 1997c:1145) that occurs here in parallel with *אף* and *חמה* is often indicative of strong anger. It appears in the rhetorical question just following the flood metaphor: *ומי יעמד לפני קנאה* “but who can stand before jealousy” (Prov 27:4; NIV). Murphy (1998:206) correctly points out that “the argument is *a minore ad majus*, from the less to the greater.” By implication, *קנאה* indicates an anger that is even more violent and devastating than a flood.

(125) אכזריות חמה ושטף אף ומי יעמד לפני קנאה

'kzrywt ḥmh wšṭp 'p wmy y'md lpny qn'h.

N: cruelty (indef) N: froth (indef) C: and (conj) N: flood (indef) N: nose (indef) C: but [and] (consec) Interr pronoun: who V: stand (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: before N: fervour.

“Wrath is cruel and anger is outrageous; but who can stand before fervour?” (Prov 27:4).⁶⁷

Some commentators have pointed to the link between Proverbs 27:4 and Proverbs 6:34-5, where *קנאה* occurs with *חמה* “anger” and *נקם* “vengeance” (Holladay 1971:245):

(126) כי קנאה חמת גבר ולא יחמול ביום נקם

ky qn'h ḥmt gbr wl' yḥmwł bywm nqm.

C: because N: jealousy N: anger (cs) N: man C: and Neg particle V: spare (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: in N: day (cs) N: vengeance.

“For jealousy arouses a husband’s fury, and he will show no mercy when he takes revenge” (Prov 6:34; NIV).

⁶⁶ See 4.2.8.

⁶⁷ Also see 4.2.8.

Many translators have followed the LXX in rendering גבר “husband” (Deane 1950:138). Deane (1950:138) points out that the word’s derivation from גבר “to be strong” dominates, serving to bring out the idea of the intensity or force of the emotion. Lange (1869:86) also feels that it is contrasted with “the more rapidly evaporating wrath of women,” who show mercy.⁶⁸

Canticles 8:6 compares the merciless fervour expressed by קנאה with death (מוֹת) and the grave (שאול):

(127) כי עזה כמות אהבה קשה כשאול קנאה

ky ‘zh kmwt ’h bh qšh kš’wl qn’h.

C: because A: strong (f) P: as N: death N: love (f) A: severe (f) P: as N: grave N: fervour (f).

“For love is as strong as death, its jealousy unyielding as the grave” (Cant 8:6; NIV).

Although some have taken this dictum to illustrate the strength of love, lasting until the day of death (cf. Van Andel 1909:77; Shaw 1974:156), the description seems to gauge the violence that accompanies intense anger. The adjectives used in this verse, “strong” (עזה) and “hard” (קשה) occur together also in Genesis 49:7 to designate the passionate anger and fiery zeal of Simeon and Levi (cf. Lange 1869:129). They had the men of a whole city circumcised, after which they slaughtered them, because the son of the chief raped their sister (Gen 34). That the poet uses Genesis 49:7 as a model for this passage is also suggested by v 8-9, where there is talk of the vehement protection of a young sister against unwanted interest.

Another vehicle for the metaphor ANGER IS VIOLENT BEHAVIOUR is גרל חמה, lit. “harsh angry” (Prov 19:19; Davidson 1967:141). Commentators have struggled to make sense of the proverb in which it is found, not knowing how the harsh anger is to be rescued (נצל) repeatedly (יסף) (cf. Deane 1950:369; Lawson 1980:309; Murphy 1998:141). Lange (1869:178) points out that the נצל is used elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible with the meaning “to avert or ward off” the ruinous actions of angry men (cf. 2 Sam 14:6). Thus, the proverb focuses attention on the recurrent nature of violent anger:

(128) גרל חמה נשא ענש כי אם תציל ועוד תוסף

grl ḥmh nš’ ‘nš ky ’m tšyl w’wd twsp.

A: great N: wrath (lit. foam) V: carry (qal pt sg, m) N: fine C: because C: if V: escape (hi impf 2nd sg, m) C: and Adv: still V: continue (qal impf 2nd sg, m).

“Harsh anger carries a fine: if you ward it off, you will have to do it again” (Prov 19:19).

The idea of the cruelty of anger is so firmly established in the Hebrew Bible that references to violent behaviour sometimes becomes synonymous with anger (Kruger 2000:189-90):

(129) לפני זעמו מי יעמוד ומי יקום בחרון אפו חמתו נתכה כאש

⁶⁸ Cf. Schunk (1977:1034) who affirms that intense anger expressed by חמה is never used with a woman as subject.

lpny z'mw my y'mwd wmy yqwm bħrwn 'pw ħmtw ntkh k's.

P: before N: foam + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) Interr pronoun: who V: stand (qal impf 3rd sg, m) C: and Interr pronoun: who V: rise (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: before N: burning (cs) N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg) N: foam + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: pour forth (ni pf 3rd sg, f) P: like N: fire.

“Who can stand before his foaming and who can stand up before the froth of his face – his spume is poured out like fire” (Nah 1:6).⁶⁹

In Psalm 55:4 anger (אף) stands in parallel with words of hatred and oppression:

(130) מקול אויב מפני עקת רשע כי ימיטו עלי און ובאף ישטמוני

mqwl 'wyb mpny 'qt rš' ky ymyṭw 'ly 'wn wb'p yštmwny.

P: from N: call (cs) N: enemy P: from N: oppression (cs) N: bad person C: because V: cast (hi impf 3rd pl, m) P: on + pron suffix (1st sg) N: sorrow C: and P: in N: anger (lit. nose) V: persecute (qal impf 3rd pl, m) + pron suffix (1st sg).

“Because of the shouting of the enemy, because of the oppression of the bad person; for they cast sorrow on me, and in anger they persecute me” (Ps 55:4).

(131) ואבוס עמים באפי ואשכרם בחמתי ואוריד לארץ נצחם

w'bwš 'mym b'py w'skrm bħmty w'wryd l'rš nšhm.

C: and V: trample (qal impf 1st sg) N: peoples P: in N: wrath + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and V: make drunk (pi impf 1st sg) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: in N: anger + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and V: let run down (hi impf 1st sg) P: to N: earth N: blood + pron suffix (3rd pl, m).

“I trampled the nations in my anger; in my wrath I made them drunk and poured their blood on the ground” (Isa 63:6, NIV).

(132) הרס בעברתו מבצרי בת יהודה ... גדע בחרי אף כל קרן ישראל

hrs b'brtw mbšry bt yhwdh ... gd' bħry 'p kl qrn ysr'l.

V: destroy (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: in N: wrath (f, lit. overflow) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: fortifications (cs) N: daughter (cs) PN: Judah ... V: hew down (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: in N: burning (cs) N: anger (lit. nose) Indef pronoun: all N: horn (cs) PN: Israel.

“In his wrath he has torn down the strongholds of the sisterhood of Judah ... in his anger he has cut off every horn of Israel” (Lam 2:2-3).

(133) ויתשם יהוה מעל אדמתם באף ובחמה ובקצף גדול

wytšm yhwħ m'l 'dmtm b'p wbħmh wbqšp gdwl.

C: and V: destroy (qal impf 3rd sg, m) PN: YHWH P: from N: land (f) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: in

⁶⁹ Also see 4.1.10 and 4.2.1.3 and 4.2.2.6.

N: anger (lit. nose) C: and P: in N: wrath (lit. foam) C: and P: in N: ire (lit. foam) A: great.

“YHWH uprooted them from their land in furious anger, foaming rage and frothing ire” (Deut 29:27).

Related to this figure is the concept, AGGRESSIVE VERBAL BEHAVIOUR STANDS FOR ANGER. For example, the word רִיב, “dispute,” which is often encountered in wisdom, regularly functions as a synonym for anger. In Proverbs 20:3 it presents itself as a parallel to גִּלַע, which probably has the primitive meaning, “to become warm,” as a metonymy for anger (cf. Lange 1869:162; see also 4.1.1):

(134) כבוד לאיש שבת מריב וכל אויל יתגלע

kbwd l'yš šbt mryb wkl 'wyl ytgl'.

N: honour P: to N: man N: rest P: from N: strife C: but Indef pronoun: all N: fool V: become warm (hitp impf 3rd sg, m).

“It is a man’s honour to cool down his anger, but a fool heats up” (Prov 20:3).⁷⁰

4.2 CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS FOR ANGER

In Classical Hebrew, just as in English (Kövecses 1990:52), the most recurrent metaphor for anger is ANGER IS HEAT. According to Kövecses (1990:52), this metaphor appears in two forms, one where it applies to solids in the form of ANGER IS FIRE, the other where it is applied to fluids to engender ANGER IS THE HEAT OF A FLUID IN A CONTAINER.

4.2.1 Anger is the Heat of a Fluid in a Container

This metaphor, which is the central metaphor for anger in the English language, also exists in the Hebrew Bible (Kruger 2000:187-9). It is a compound metaphor, consisting of three other conceptual metaphors: THE BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR THE EMOTIONS, ANGER IS HEAT, and EMOTIONS ARE FLUIDS (Kövecses 1995b:184).

THE BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR THE EMOTIONS

The notion of the body or body parts as containers for emotions is widespread. In Japanese anger is said to rise from the *hara* “stomach” (Matsuki 1995:142-3). In Chinese anger is conceptualised as excess *qi*, a fluid that is thought to flow through the body (Kövecses 1995b:185). The ancient Israelites thought of the intestines (כֶּבֶד, מַעֲיִם) as containing life fluids that are spilt through tears (cf. Collins 1971). When it comes

⁷⁰ Also see 4.2.1.1.

to anger, however, the nose seems to be the main locale of activity. Dhorme (1963:81) explains how this Hebrew concept compares to the Classical idea of anger, which underlies the conceptualisation of anger in most Indo-European languages (cf. Geeraerts & Grondelaers 1995:181-96):

Chez les Grecs la colère échauffait la bile, chez les Hébreux elle enflamme le nez. L'expression courante חרה אפו "sa colère s'enflamma" et toutes celles qui en dérivent ont pour origine: "son nez fut brûlant" de colère. En français nous dirions: bouillir de colère. La localisation de la colère dans le nez a permis de se servir du verbe חנה (même racine que חנה qui est pour חנה) exclusivement dans le sens d'"être en colère", alors qu'il signifiait primitivement: avoir du nez.

Thus, although the exact location of anger is not the same in Hebrew and Greek, both clearly reflect the concept of the body as a container for this passion. There are several Classical Hebrew expressions that point to the conceptual metaphor, THE BODY IS A CONTAINER FOR ANGER (cf. Kruger 2000:187):

(135) לא יכלו גוים זעמו

l' yklw gwym z'mw.

Neg particle V: contain (hi impf 3rd pl, m) N: nations N: foam, anger + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).
"Nations cannot contain his anger" (Jer 10:10).

(136) בניך עלפו שכבו בראש כל חוצות כחוא מכמר המלאים חמת יהוה

bnyk 'lpw škbw br's kl ḥwšwt ktw' mkmr hml'ym ḥmt yhwh.

N: sons + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) V: faint (qal pf 3rd pl) V: lie down (qal pf 3rd pl) P: in N: head (cs)
Indef pronoun: all N: streets P: like N: antelope N: net N: (those) full of N: wrath (f, cs, lit. foam)
PN: YHWH.

"Your sons have fainted; they lie at the head of every street, like an antelope caught in a net – they are filled with the fury of YHWH" (Isa 51:20).⁷¹

(137) וימלא המן חמה

wyml' hmn ḥmh

V: be filled with (ni impf 3rd sg, m) PN: Haman N: foaming wrath.
"And Haman was filled with foaming wrath" (Esth 3:5).

ANGER IS HEAT

As may be gained from the quotation from Dhorme (1963:81) above, the ANGER IS HEAT metaphor is

⁷¹ Also see 4.2.9.1.

motivated by body heat and redness in the face/nose metonymies in the Hebrew Bible.⁷² These, in turn, are based on the experience that blood “boils” and the face becomes hot in the event of anger (Izard 1977:331). The metaphor is represented by the following expressions:

(138) חם לבי בקרבי בהגיגי תבער אש

ḥm lby bqrby bhgygy tb‘r ‘š.

V: be hot (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: heart + pron suffix (1st sg) P: in N: midst + pron suffix (1st sg) P: in N: complaint + pron suffix (1st sg) V: burn (qal impf 3rd sg, f) N: fire (f).

“My heart is hot within me; a fire burns in my complaint” (Ps 39:3).

(139) פן ירדף גאל הדם אחרי הרצח כי יחם לבבו

pn yrdp g‘l hdm ‘hry hršḥ ky yḥm lbw.

C: lest V: pursue (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: avenger of bloodshed P: after N: manslayer (def) C: because V: hot (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: heart + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“Lest the avenger pursue the slayer because he is angry” (Deut 19:6) (See Von Meyenfeldt 1950:141).

Anger is often said to be “like fire”:

(140) לנצח תבער כמו אש חמתך

lnšḥ tb‘r kmw ‘š ḥmtk.

Adv: forever V: burn (qal impf 3rd sg, f) P: like N: fire N: anger + pron suffix (2nd m, sg).

“Will your anger burn like fire forever?” (Ps 89:47).⁷³

ANGER IS A FLUID

There are numerous instances in the Hebrew Bible where anger is described as a fluid (Jer 6:11; 7:20; 42:18; Ezek 7:8; 14:19; 20:8; Ps 79:6; 2 Chr 12:7; 34:21, 25). Three verbs are used to create this conceptual metaphor: שָׁפַךְ “to pour out,” פָּוַץ “to overflow” and נָתַךְ “to pour forth” (Köhler & Baumgartner 1958) (Johnson 1973:386). These verbs often combine with nouns denoting anger that include the meaning of ‘foam (at the mouth),’ such as זַעַם and חַמָּה:⁷⁴

(141) עליהם אשפוך כמים עברתי

‘lyhm ‘špwk kmym ‘brty.

P: on + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) V: pour (qal impf 1st sg) P: like N: water/s (def) N: overflowing +

⁷² See 4.1.1 and 4.1.7.

⁷³ Also see 4.1.1 and 4.2.2.

⁷⁴ See 4.1.10.

pron suffix (1st sg).

“I will pour my anger on them like waters” (Hos 5:10).⁷⁵

(142) וישפך עליו חמה אפו ... ותלהטו

wyšpk 'lyw ḥmh 'pw ... wtlḥtw.

C: and V: pour (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: on + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: wrath (lit. foam) N: anger (lit. nose) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) ... C: and V: burn (pi impf 3rd sg, f) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“And he poured the heat of his anger⁷⁶ on him ... and it burned him” (Isa 42:25).

(143) הפץ עברות אפך

hpš 'brwt 'pk.

V: pour out (hi imp, m) N: outbursts (pl, cs) N: wrath (lit. nose) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).

“Let the outbursts of your anger flow” (Job 40:11).

(144) נתך אפי וחמתי על יושבי ירושלם

ntk 'py wḥmti 'i yšby yrwšlym.

V: flow forth (ni pf 3rd sg, m) N: anger (lit. nose) + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and N: wrath (lit. froth) + pron suffix (1st sg) P: on N: inhabitants (cs) PN: Jerusalem.

“My anger and fury poured forth on the inhabitants of Jerusalem” (Jer 42:18).

(145) ושפכתי עליך זעמי באש עברתי אפיח עליך

wšpkty 'lyk z'my b's 'brty 'py ḥ 'lyk.

C: and V: pour (qal pf 1st sg) P: on + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) N: foam + pron suffix (1st sg) P: in N: fire (f, cs) N: overflow + pron suffix (1st sg) V: blow (hi impf 1st sg) P: on + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).

“I will spill my anger on you; I will blow my fiery outpouring⁷⁷ on you” (Ezek 21:36).⁷⁸

The HEAT and FLUID metaphors combine logically to yield the compound metaphor:

ANGER IS THE HEAT OF A FLUID IN A CONTAINER

There are several linguistic expressions that act as vehicles of this figure in the Hebrew Bible. Noteworthy are those that involve the roots of which the semantic range include both “anger” and “froth”⁷⁹ that combine with words denoting heat to express the concept of internal hotness:

(146) ויקצף המלך מאד וחמתו בערה בו

⁷⁵ Also see 4.2.8.

⁷⁶ Watts (1987:126) argues that חמה should best be read as a construct חמת “the heat of.”

⁷⁷ See Footnote 51.

⁷⁸ Also see 4.1.10.

⁷⁹ See 4.1.10.

wyqšp hmlk m'd wḥmtw b'rh bw.

C: and V: angry (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: king (def) Adv: very C: and N: anger (f) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: burn (qal pf 3rd sg, f) P: in + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“And the king was very angry and his anger burned in him” (Esth 1:12).⁸⁰

(147) תבער כמו אש חמתך

tb'r kmw 'š ḥmtk.

V: burn (qal impf 3rd sg, f) P: like N: fire N: anger + pron suffix (2nd m, sg).

“Your anger burns like fire” (Ps 89:47).

This image of a hot liquid in a container provides the conceptual background for expressions depicting the liquid pouring forth. Not surprisingly, the concepts of heat and a liquid spilling often combine:

(148) שפך כאש חמתו

špk k'š ḥmtw.

V: pour (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: like N: fire (f) N: wrath (lit. foam, f) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“He pours his anger out like fire” (Lam 2:4).

(149) וישפך עליו חמה אפו ... ותלהטו

wyšpk 'lyw ḥmh 'pw ... wtlḥṭw.

C: and V: pour (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: on + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: wrath (lit. foam) N: anger (lit. nose) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) ... C: and V: burn (pi impf 3rd sg, f) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“And he poured the heat of his anger⁸¹ on him ... and it burned him” (Isa 42:25).

About these two verses, Johnson (1973:386) writes:

Zweimal wird merkwürdigerweise der Ausdruck [dass der Zorn wie Wasser ausgegossen wird] mit Feuer verbunden (Kl 2:4; Jes 42:25), obwohl die beiden Bilder eigentlich logisch unvereinbar sind.

In fact, there are more instances where שפך “to pour” is used together with images of fire to figuratively describe anger. In at least two instances, the Hebrew noun זעם “anger” (Wiklander 1977:622) is used with both שפך “to pour” and אש “fire” (Wiklander 1977:624):

(150) ואשפך עליהם זעמי באש עברתי

w'špk 'lyhm z'my b'š 'brty.

C: and V: pour (qal impf 1st sg) P: on + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) N: froth + pron suffix (1st sg) P: in N:

⁸⁰ Also see 4.1.1.

⁸¹ See Footnote 76.

fire (f, cs) N: wrath (lit. overflow) + pron suffix (1st sg).

“And I will pour my indignation on them in the fire of my wrath” (Ezek 22:31; ZK; cf. Ezek 21:36).

- (151) לכן חכו לי ... ליום קומי ... לשפך עליהם זעמי כל חרון אפי כי באש קנאתי תאכל כל הארץ
*lkn ḥkw ly ... lywm qwmy ... lšpk ‘lyhm z‘my kl ḥrwn ‘py ky b’s qn’ty t’kl
kl h’rš.*

C: therefore V: wait (pi imp, m) P: for + pron suffix (1st sg) ... P: for N: day (cs) VN: rising (qal inf cs) + pron suffix (1st sg) ... V: pour (qal inf cs) P: on + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) N: foam + pron suffix (1st sg) Indef pronoun: all N: burning (cs) N: nose C: because P: in N: fire (cs) N: fervour + pron suffix (1st sg) N: consume (qal impf 1st sg) Indef pronoun: all N: earth (def).

“Therefore, wait for me ... until the day of my rising ... to pour on them all my burning anger, for in the fire of my zeal all the earth will be destroyed” (Zeph 3:8).⁸²

The metaphor, ANGER IS THE HEAT OF A FLUID IN A CONTAINER, satisfactorily explains the combination of these two images. The notions of fire in these verses probably metonymically refer to the heat, or burning, effect of anger, which would make it compatible with the FLUID metaphor.

Just as in English, this conceptual metaphor is productive (cf. Kövecses 1990:54-8, Kruger 2000:187-9). Several details of the source, HEAT OF A FLUID IN A CONTAINER, is mapped onto the target domain, anger. Although there exist striking similarities with the entailments of this metaphor in English, important differences can be observed, mainly due to the absence of the notion of explosion in ancient Israelite culture. The following mappings can be identified.

4.2.1.1 Increase in the Intensity of Anger is the Rising of the Fluid

The obscure combination מִשְׁאָה כִּבֵּד in Isaiah 30:27 in the context of YHWH’s advance in anger has caused considerable discussion. Some scholars take it to refer to a dense cloud of smoke accompanying the fire of his anger (Cf. Raymond 1958:29; Delitzsch 1975:39). However, Kruger (2000b:155-62) suggests that it is best to stay with the literal “(his) rising up,” which can be interpreted as an entailment of the ANGER IS HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER, namely: When the anger increases, the fluid rises (Kruger 2000b:159). Thus, the phrase would read: “his anger (מִשְׁאָה) is heavy/overwhelming (כִּבֵּד):”

- (152) הנה שם יהוה בא ממרחק בער אפו וכבד משאה שפתיו מלאו זעם ולשונו כאש אכלת
*hnh šm yhwh b’ mmrḥq b’r ‘pw wkbd mš’h šptyw ml’w z’m wlšwnw k’s
'kl.*

Particle of focus: behold N: name (cs) PN: YHWH V: come (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: from N: distant place V: burn (qal pt sg, m) N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and A: heavy VN: rising (qal pt sg,

⁸² Also see 4.1.10, 4.2.2.1 and 4.2.2.6.

m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: lips + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: be full (qal pf 3rd pl) N: foam C: and N: tongue + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: like N: fire (f) V: consume (qal pf 3rd sg, f).

“Behold, the name of YHWH comes from afar, his anger burns and his anger is overwhelming. His lips are full of foam and his tongue is like a devouring fire” (Isa 30:27).⁸³

A vivid description of this entailment is found in Proverbs 17:14. The aphorism warns against the danger of losing control of one’s anger, a common theme in wisdom (Lange 1869:162; Deane 1950:333; Lawson 1980:265-6):

(153) פוטר מים ראשית מדון ולפני התגלע הריב נטוש

pwṭr mym r’šyt mdwn wlpny htgl’ hryb nṭwš

V: burst through (qal pt sg, m) N: water/s N: beginning (cs) N: quarrel C: and P: before V: break out (hitp pf 3rd sg, m) N: strife (definite) V: abandon (qal imp sg, m).

“The beginning of strife is like waters breaking through; therefore abandon anger before it breaks out” (Prov 17:14).⁸⁴

Much uncertainty exists about the interpretation of התגלע (cf. Deane 1950:333). It is often explained as indicating the pouring forth of water (Lange 1869:162; Deane 1950:333). Some commentators have pointed to the link of the root גלע with Arabic and Aramaic cognates, meaning, “to become warm” (Lange 1869:162; Deane 1950:333). Accepting this sense, the purport of the axiom becomes explicit. If one would let the heat of anger get out of control, it would rise up and eventually spill forth, just as water boils over the sides of a container with too much heat.⁸⁵

It has already been pointed out that ריב, “dispute” (Holladay 1971:338) sometimes functions as a synonym for anger. LXX renders it θυμός, “anger,” which also derived from the primal signification, “to well up,” “to boil up” (Büchsel 1965:167). In this v it is encountered as the object of the verb ישב, “to sit down” (Prov 20:3; Lange 1869:177).⁸⁶ The thrust of the combination would therefore be, “to calm/cool down anger,” as opposed to heating up (גלע):

(154) כבוד לאיש שבת מריב וכל אויל יתגלע

kbwd l’yš šbt mryb wkl ’wyl ytgl’.

N: honour P: to N: man N: rest P: from N: strife C: but Indef pronoun: all N: fool V: become warm (hitp impf 3rd sg, m).

⁸³ Also see 4.1.7, 4.1.10, 4.2.1.2, 4.2.2 and 4.2.7.

⁸⁴ Also see 4.2.8.

⁸⁵ See 4.2.1.3.

⁸⁶ Lange (1869:177) points out that attempts to interpret שבת as a substantive of the same root find little support in the Hebrew Bible.

“It is a man’s honour to cool down his anger, but a fool heats up” (Prov 20:3).⁸⁷

The *bon mot* in Proverbs 19:3 identifies the heart as the subject of boiling:

(155) אולת אדם תסלף דרכו ועל יהוה יזעף לבו

’wit ’dm tslp drkw w’l yhwh yz’p lbw.

N: foolishness (f, cs) N: man V: wrench (pi impf 3rd sg, f) N: road + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and
P: against PN: YHWH V: boil up (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: heart + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“The fool makes his own way uneven,⁸⁸ but his heart boils⁸⁹ against YHWH” (Prov 19:3).

Other articulations of this entailment are encountered throughout the Hebrew Bible:

(156) העלה חמתי באפי

t’lh hmti b’py.

V: flow (hi impf 3rd sg, f) N: foam (f) + pron suffix (1st sg) P: from (lit. in) N: nose + pron suffix (1st sg).

“... foam shall flow from My face” (Ezek 38:18; translation by Gruber 1980:538).

(157) אם העלה חמת המלך

’m t’lh hmt hmlk.

C: if V: rise up (hi impf 3rd sg, f) N: wrath (lit. foam, f, cs) N: king (def).

“If the anger of the king rises” (2 Sam 11:20).

(158) ואף אלהים עלה בהם

w’p ’lhym ’lh bhm.

C: and N: wrath (lit. nose, cs) PN: Elohim V: rise up (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: in + pron suffix (3rd pl, m).

“And the anger of Elohim rose up against them” (Ps 78:31).

(159) ותהרגו בם בזעף עד לשמים הגיע

wthrgw bm bz’p ‘d lšmyim hgy’.

C: and V: murder (qal impf 2nd pl, m) P: with + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: in N: rage P: unto N: heaven V: reach (hi pf 3rd sg, m).

“And you have slain them in a rage that reached up to heaven” (2 Chr 28:9).⁹⁰

(160) אחר הדברים האלה כשך⁹¹ חמת המלך

⁸⁷ Also see 4.1.14.

⁸⁸ Cf. Lange 1869:172.

⁸⁹ For זעף “to boil up” see Strong (1961:36).

⁹⁰ Also see 4.1.8.

⁹¹ שכך “to go down, abate” (Köhler & Baumgartner 1958:969) is also used of floodwater (Gen 8:1).

’hr hdbrym h’lh kšk ḥmt hmlk.

P: after N: thing (pl) Demonstr pronoun: these P: as V: go down, abate (qal inf cs) N: anger (cs) N: king (def).

“After these things, as the anger of the king abated ...” (Esth 2:1; ZK. Also see Esth 7:10).⁹²

4.2.1.2 Intense Anger Produces Steam

Kövecses (1990:54) interprets English expressions such as “I was fuming” as underlying the metaphoric entailment INTENSE ANGER PRODUCES STEAM. It is indeed easy to see how the primary meaning of fume, “to emit smoke” lead to the secondary meaning, “to be angry” (cf. Gruber 1980:511). This mapping is also present in Biblical Hebrew (cf. Gruber 1980:510-3; Kruger 2000:188):

As in English ... so also in ... Biblical Hebrew we find references to the strong breathing of anger perceived as the emission of fumes, smoke or vapour (Gruber 1980:511).

However, since the vapour in question is called עשן, lit. “smoke” (Gruber 1980: 511), it is not entirely clear if this entailment is motivated by the image of steam, as part of the ANGER IS THE HEAT OF A FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphor, or by the image of actual smoke, as part of the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS FIRE. In most cases, however, the two motifs seem to combine and need not be held separate. In fact, one may argue that the idea of smoke adds dramatic effect in evoking anger as a special destructive force. The reverse also seems to be true. Smoke from the nose of the Leviathan is depicted as steam evaporating from a boiling pot in Job 41:12:

(161) מנחיריו צא עשן כדוד נפוח ואגמן

mnḥiryw yš’ ‘šn kdwd npwḥ w’gmn

P: from N: nostrils + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: go up (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: smoke P: like N: pot A: seething (qal pt pass sg, m) C: or N: cauldron.

“Smoke goes out of his nostrils, as from a boiling pot or cauldron” (Job 41:12).

The depiction of YHWH in the ancient theophany in Psalm 18:8-16 (= 2 Sam 22:8-16) shows remarkable similarities with the description of Leviathan in Job 41:11-13 (Gordon 1986:305). Here, the smoke (עשן) rising from YHWH’s nose (אף) may also evoke the image of steam rising from a rapidly boiling cauldron.

(162) עלה עשן באפו ואש מפיו תאכל גחלים בערו ממנו

’lh ‘šn b’pw w’s mpyw t’kl ḡḥlym b’rw mmnw.

V: go up (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: smoke P: in N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and N: fire (f) P: from

⁹² Also see 4.2.8.1.

N: mouth + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: eat (qal impf 3rd sg, f) N: coals V: burn (qal pf 3rd pl) P: from + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“Smoke went up from his nostrils, and devouring fire from his mouth; glowing coals flamed forth from him” (Ps 18:9 = 2 Sam 22:9; translation by Fuhs 1975:464).⁹³

Jeremias (1965:36) comments that:

Jahweh wird als “wutschnaubender Held” gezeichnet, dessen Atem Feuer, dessen Hauch Rauch ist. Das Feuer ist wie in anderen Theophanietexten zugleich Ausdruck des furchtbaren Zornes Jahwes und grausame Vernichtungswaffe.

Apart from this well-known text, Isaiah 65:5 and Psalm 74:1 also depict vapour from an angry subject’s nose as smoke:

(163) אלה עשן באפי אש יקרה כל היום

’lh ‘sn b’py ’š yqdt kl hywm.

Demonstr pronoun: these N: smoke P: in N: nose + pron suffix (1st sg) N: fire (f) V: burn (qal pt sg, f) Indef pronoun: all N: day (def).

“These are smoke in my nose, a fire that burns all day” (Isa 65:5; KJV).⁹⁴

(164) עשן אפך בצאן מרעיתך

y’sn ’p k bš’n mr’ytk.

V: fume (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: wrath (lit. nose) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) P: against N: sheep P: of N: pasture + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).

“(Why) do you fume against the sheep of your pasture?” (Ps 74:1).

It has been pointed out above that the **בשנאה** in Isaiah 30:27 metaphorically indicates anger in pointing to the entailment WHEN THE INTENSITY OF ANGER RISES, THE (HOT) FLUID RISES. This expression is preceded and followed by images of fire: **אש**, which is used in its primary sense, “nose,” is said to “burn” (**בער**) (Gruber 1980:500)⁹⁵ and YHWH’s tongue (**לשון**) is like a devouring fire (**אש אכלת**). Accordingly, **בשנאה**, which is most likely related to the verb **נשא** “to lift up” (Watts 1985:403; Kruger 2000b:155-62), may also evoke the image of smoke/vapour rising up, as in the verses above (Jeremias 1965:56) (cf. Judg 20:38, 40):

(165) הנה שם יהוה בא ממרחק בער אפו וכבד משאה שפתיו מלאו זעם ולשונו כאש אכלת

*hnh šm ywhw b’ mmrḥq b’r ’pw wkbd mš’h šptyw ml’w z’m wšwnw k’s’
’klt.*

⁹³ Also see 3.9 and 4.2.2.6.

⁹⁴ Also see 4.2.2.6.

⁹⁵ See 4.1.7.

Particle of focus: behold N: name (cs) PN: YHWH V: come (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: from N: distant place V: burn (qal pt sg, m) N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and A: heavy VN: rising (qal pt sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: lips + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: be full (qal pf 3rd pl) N: foam C: and N: tongue + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: like N: fire (f) V: consume (qal pf 3rd sg, f).

“Behold, the name of YHWH comes from afar, his anger burns and he is fuming with rage. His lips are full of foam and his tongue is like a devouring fire” (Isa 30:27).⁹⁶

4.2.1.3 Too Intense Anger is the Fluid Boiling Over

Here we notice a marked difference with the English WHEN ANGER BECOMES TOO INTENSE, THE PERSON EXPLODES (Kövecses 1990:55). As mentioned above, this can be attributed to the total absence of words and notions for “explosion” in Classical Hebrew. When one considers the simplicity of the containers used in ancient times, this is not surprising at all. The salience of images of pressure and bursting in modern cultures is probably to be ascribed to our understanding of the human body in terms of plumbing (cf. Banks & Thompson (1996:99-126), a later development.

By contrast, the image of a cauldron on a thorn-bush fire as an image for anger is frequently encountered in the Hebrew Bible. Significantly, one of the words for thorn (סִירָה) and the word for cauldron (סִיר) probably derive from a basic root meaning “to boil up” (Strong 1961:82):

(166) בטרם יבינו סירתים אטר כמו חי כמו חרון ישערנו

bṭrm ybynw syrtym ’td kmw hy kmw ḥrwn yś’rnw.

Adv: before V: perceive (hi impf 3rd pl, m) N: pots + pron suffix (2nd pl, m) N: thorn P: like N: life P: like N: wrath (lit. burning) V: carry off in a gale? (qal impf 3rd sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m).

“Before your pots can feel the thorns, he will carry them off in the gale of his fierce anger” (Ps 58:10).

(167) כקדח אש המסים מים חבעה אש להודיע שמך לצריך מפניך גוים ירגו

kqdḥ ’š hmsym mym tb’h ’š lhwdy’ šmk lšryk mpnyk gwym yrgzw.

P: as V: burn (qal inf cs) N: fire (f) N: brushwood N: water V: make boil (hi impf 3rd sg, f) N: fire P: to V: make known (hi inf cs) N: name + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) P: to N: adversaries + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) P: before + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) N: nations V: tremble (qal impf 3rd pl, m).

“As fire kindles dry bushes, or fire makes water boil,⁹⁷ to make your name known to your adversaries, that the nations may tremble at your presence” (Isa 64:1).

An explicit vehicle for the BOILING OVER entailment in Biblical Hebrew is נָתַךְ “to gush forth” (Holladay

⁹⁶ Also see 4.1.7, 4.1.10, 4.2.1.1, 4.2.2 and 4.2.7.

⁹⁷ For this reading, see Watts (1987:325).

1971:249). This stem is sometimes used of rain flowing down from heaven (Job 3:24). It differs from שפך in that it doesn't need a subject to be instrumental in the action (Johnson 1973:386). When this verb is used, the image of BOILING OVER is ensured through an exclusive use with words of anger denoting heat, or by ascribing heat qualities to anger:

In diesem Fall heisst es nie, dass Gott den Zorn ausgiesst, sondern dass der Zorn von selbst ausströmt. Bemerkenswert ist, dass in vier von den acht Fällen, wo dieses Verb gebraucht wird, das Bild des Zorns Ähnlichkeiten mit Feuer zeigt ... Ausserdem steht נתך nur mit אף und חמה, also mit den beiden Ausdrücken, die am stärksten mit Feuer und Hitze zusammenhängen (Johnson 1973:386).

(168) הנה אפי וחמתי נתכת אל המקום

hnh 'py whmty ntkt 'l hmqwm.

Particle of focus: behold N: nose + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and N: foam (f) + pron suffix (1st sg) V: pour forth (ni pf 3rd sg, f) P: to N: place (def).

“Behold, my anger and my fury will boil over on this place” (Jer 7:20).⁹⁸

(169) לפני זעמו מי יעמוד ומי יקים בחרון אפו חמתו נתכה כאש

lpny z'mw my y'mwd wmy yqwm bħrwn 'pw hmtw ntkh k's.

P: before N: foam + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) Interr pronoun: who V: stand (qal impf 3rd sg, m) C: and Interr pronoun: who V: rise (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: before N: burning (cs) N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg) N: foam + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: pour forth (ni pf 3rd sg, f) P: like N: fire.

“Who can stand before his anger and who can stand up before his frothing rage – his spume is poured out like fire” (Nah 1:6).⁹⁹

(170) ותתך חמתי ואפי ותבער בערי יהודה

wttk hmtw w'py wtb'r b'ry yhw dh.

C: and V: flow forth (ni impf 3rd sg, f) N: wrath (lit. foam) + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and N: anger (lit. nose) + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and V: burn (qal impf 3rd sg, f) P: in N: cities (cs) PN: Judah.

“My anger and my fury boiled over and burned in the cities of Judah” (Jer 44:6).

(171) ולא תתך חמתי בירושלם

wl' ttk hmtw byrwšlym.

C: and Neg particle V: flow forth (ni impf 3rd sg, f) N: wrath (f) + pron suffix (1st sg) P: in PN: Jerusalem.

⁹⁸ Also see 4.1.10.

⁹⁹ Also see 4.1.10 and 4.15 and 4.2.2.6.

“My wrath shall not boil over on Jerusalem” (2 Chr 12:7).

(172) ותתך חמתי במקום הזה ולא תכבה

wttk ḥmty bmqwm hzh wl' tkbh.

C: and V: pour forth (ni impf 3rd sg, f) N: wrath + pron suffix (1st sg) P: in N: place Demonstrative pronoun: this C: and Neg particle V: be quenched (qal impf 3rd sg, f).

“And my anger will boil over on this place, and it won’t be quenched” (2 Chr 34:25).¹⁰⁰

Another vehicle for the image of fluid boiling over, is the term עבר I “go over,” II “to become angry” (Holladay 1971:263). In fact, one may argue that the latter meaning is derived from the first in that it signifies the hot fluid overflowing in the metaphor under discussion.¹⁰¹ A similar link exists between the derived nouns עברה I, “arrogance, abundance” and II, “wrath” (Grether & Fichtner 1967:392).

One of the places where עבר II, “to become angry,” occurs is Proverbs 20:2. Most commentators agree that מתעבר should be conceived of as a hitp participle of which the ordinary meaning passes over into the transitive idea, “to make someone angry” (Lange 1869:177; Deane 1950:383; Murphy 1998:148). More specifically, it will be argued that its meaning is derived from עבר I, and amounts to causing someone “to boil over.”

The semicolon in which מתעבר occurs, is preceded by a LION metaphor for anger, which has a close parallel in Proverbs 19:12: “The anger (זעף) of a king is like the roaring of a lion.” The clause in Hebrew is literally identical to that of Proverbs 20:2, except that the latter has אימה, “dread” instead of זעף, “to boil over, anger” (Strong 1961:36). אימה is usually read as a metonymy for anger (effect for cause) (Lange 1869:177; Deane 1950:383; Murphy 1998:148). However, *BHS* suggests conforming to Proverbs 19:12, by reading חמת, “poison of,” instead of אימה, “terror of”:

(173) נהם ככפיר אימת מלך מתעברו חוטא נפשו

nhm kkpyr 'ymt mlk mt'brw ḥwt' npšw.

N: roar P: like N: lion N: terror (f, cs) N: king V: make angry (hitp pt pl, m) V: miss (qal pt sg, m) N: throat + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“The terror of a king is like the roaring of a lion. He who provokes him to anger endangers his own life” (Prov 20:2).¹⁰²

Similar cues suggest that עבר II “to become angry” in Psalm 78:21 may in fact be related to עבר I “to go over” as a vehicle for the concept, INTENSE ANGER IS THE BOILING OVER OF THE FLUID. Immediately following this verb, we have the descriptive expressions “a fire is kindled” (נשק אש) and “anger rose up”

¹⁰⁰ Also see 4.2.2.3.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Johnson (1973:381) who argues that the supposition of two terms is unnecessary.

¹⁰² Also see 4.2.11.

(עלה אף). These expressions combine to bring into being an image of fluid in a container (pot?) rising up (עלה) because of the fire (אש), and eventually spilling over (עבר):

(174) לכן שמע יהוה ויתעבר ואש נשקה ביעקב וגם אף עלה בישראל

lkn šm‘ yhwħ wyt‘br w’s nšqh by‘qb wgm ’p ‘lh byśr’l.

C: therefore V: hear (qal pf 3rd sg, m) PN: YHWH C: and V: become angry (hitp impf 3rd sg, m) C: and N: fire (f) V: burn (pi pf 3rd sg, f) P: against PN: Jacob C: and Particle of focus: also N: anger V: go up (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: against PN: Israel.

“When YHWH heard, he boiled over: a fire was kindled against Jacob and his anger rose against Israel” (Ps 78:21).

Having identified the mappings from the source to the target domain, we can now analyse the structure of the ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphor (cf. Dirvin 1994:12-6). Spelling out the free, creative associations between the HOT FLUID and anger will help us to define the ontology of anger as understood by the ancient Israelites (cf. Kövecses 1990:56). The structure of metaphor points to the non-arbitrariness of the metaphor (Dirvin 1994:15) and serves as a guard against mappings based purely on guesswork (Steen 1999:57).

Let us first consider the link that is felt to exist between the source and the target domain (Kövecses 1990:56). The following ontological correspondences can be identified:

- The container is the body
- The hot fluid is the anger
- The heat scale is the anger scale
- Container heat is body heat
- Boiling over is expressing anger
- The burning fluid is the aggressive acts of the angry person

Based on these ontological correspondences the meaning of the metaphor becomes clearer (cf. Kövecses 1990:57):

<i>Source:</i>	<i>Target:</i>
The effect of intense fluid heat is container heat, agitation and steam.	The effect of intense anger is body heat, agitation and heavy breathing.
When the fluid is heated past a certain limit, the fluid starts boiling over.	When anger increases past a certain limit, the person expresses his anger.
Hot fluid boiling over is dangerous to bystanders.	The expression of anger is dangerous to other people.
Hot fluid boiling over burns bystanders.	The expression of anger causes pain and damage to other people.
The fluid can be prevented from boiling over by	Removing the cause of anger can prevent it being

removing the fire.

vented.

The latter correspondence derives logically from the fact that the only source of heat for containers in ancient times was fire (Hamp 1974:423-4). This can also explain the frequent appearance of fire images together with that of fluids in the context of anger (see Johnson 1973:386).

Although the metaphor ANGER IS THE HEAT OF A FLUID IN A CONTAINER is attested in the Hebrew Bible, it does not seem to be the central one, as it is in English (Kövecses 1990:58). Its potency in English probably derives from the fact that it includes notions of explosion, which adds dramatic effect. Fire being much more devastating and dangerous than fluids boiling over in ancient times, the metaphor ANGER IS FIRE seems to be more salient and much more elaborated than the HEAT metaphor as applied to fluids.

4.2.2 Anger is Fire

The importance of fire in ancient Israel is manifest (Hamp 1974:423; Lang 1968:934). It was used for cooking (Ex 12:8; 2 Chr 35:13; Jer 7:18), heating (Isa 44:15; Jer 36:22), manufacture (Gen 11:3), especially for metalwork (Jer 6:29) and destruction in war (Deut 13:17; Judg 20:48; Am 1:4; Jer 21:10; Ps 46:10). It is therefore not surprising that it also served as an important source domain for metaphoric transfer (see Lang 1968:935).

When it comes to its transferred use, the destructive power of fire predominates (Lang 1968:935). It is used as an image for a variety of destructive human passions, such as contentiousness (Prov 26:20f.), love and lust (Sir 9:8; 23:17), adultery (Job 31:12; Prov 6:27f.) and sin (Sir 3:30; 8:10). However, it is as a metaphor for divine anger that fire symbolism is most commonly encountered in the Hebrew Bible (Lang 1968:935). In Deuteronomy 4:24 it describes the jealousy of God, which can practically be equated with anger (cf. Davidson 1967:661):

(175) כִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֵשׁ אֹכֵלָה הוּא אֵל קַנָּא

ky yhw h 'lhyk 'š 'klh hw' 'l qn'.

P: for PN: YHWH N: god + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) N: fire (f) V: consume (qal pf 3rd sg, f) Pronoun: he N: god A: jealous.

“For YHWH your God is a consuming fire. He is a jealous God” (Deut 4:24).

Some of the most dramatic descriptions of anger as fire can be found in the hymnal theophanies of judgement in the Hebrew Bible (cf. Jeremias 1965:108). In almost all theophanies there is mention of fire (Lang 1968:935), and as Jeremias (1965:1) points out, theophanies are all about anger:

Die “Theophanien” reden etwa vom Kommen Jahwes in Sturm, Gewitter, Feuer etc. zum Gericht und zur Vernichtung. Eines ihrer Kennzeichen ist, dass sie stets Schrecken und Grauen für die Betroffenen heraufführen.

Some regard the Sinai theophany to be the oldest tradition in the Hebrew Bible (Jeremias 1965:101). The Y, P and D accounts of this revelation depict YHWH's advent in terms of a volcano (Jeremias 1965:103-4). In this tradition, fire is merely the phenomenon that accompanies or mediates the manifestation of YHWH (Jeremias 1965:108). Correspondingly, the witnesses are filled with fear, but the notion of fire as a destructive force does not really become apparent (Jeremias 1965:106).

In the true genre of theophanic descriptions, however, fire is presented in a much more colourful way (Jeremias 1965:108):

Es ist entweder Jahwes unwiderstehliche Waffe, die er gegen seine Feinde einsetzt (Js 29:6; 30:30; 66:15f.) oder aber Verbildlichung und Vergegenständlichung seines brennenden Zornes (vgl. Js 30:27; Nah 1:6; Ps 18:9 u.a.).

Unlike the prose genre of the Sinai account, which merely relates an event in the past, true hymnal theophanies usually address themselves to some real contemporary issue. This partly explains why these poetic descriptions of divine judgement demonstrate a strong mythological tone (Jeremias 1965:111).

The dominance of anger as expressed in judgement on contemporary enemies also sometimes leads to the adaptation of the form of the original theophanies (cf. Jeremias 1965:56-69). The earliest accounts consisted of two parts: the coming of YHWH and its effect on nature (Jeremias 1965:7-16). However, this form was subservient to the intentions of the author. For example, in Isaiah 30:27-33 and 66:15f the prophet exclusively focussed on God's anger against his enemies, so that no room was left for the reaction of nature to his advance (Jeremias 1965:56):

(176) הנה שם יהוה בא ממרחק בער אפו וכבד משאה שפתיו מלאו זעם ולשונו כאש אכלה
hnh šm yhwh b' mmrḥq b'r 'pw wkbd mš'h šptyw ml'w z'm wlšwnw k's
'klt.

Particle of focus: behold N: name (cs) PN: YHWH V: come (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: from N: distant place V: burn (qal pt sg, m) N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and A: heavy VN: rising (qal pt sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: lips + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: be full (qal pf 3rd pl) N: foam C: and N: tongue + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: like N: fire (f) V: consume (qal pf 3rd sg, f).

“Behold, the name of YHWH comes from afar, his nose burns and his rage is overwhelming. His lips are full of foam and his tongue is like a devouring fire” (Isa 30:27).¹⁰³

(177) כי הנה יהוה כאש יבוא ... להשיב בחמה אפו וגערתו בלהבי אש
ky hnh yhwh b's ybw' ... lhšyb bḥmh 'pw wg'rtw blhby 'š.

C: because Particle of focus: behold PN: YHWH P: like N: fire (f) V: come (qal impf 3rd sg, m) ... P: to V: render (hi inf cs) P: in wrath (lit. foam) N: anger (lit. nose) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and

¹⁰³ Also see 4.1.7, 4.1.10, 4.2.1.1, 4.2.1.2 and 4.2.7.

N: rebuke (f) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: with N: flames (cs) N: fire.

“For, behold, YHWH will come with fire, ... to let his anger out in fury, and his restraint¹⁰⁴ with flames of fire” (Isa 66:15).

However, depictions of anger as fire are not restricted to theophanic accounts of YHWH appearing to deal with his enemies in wrath. The metaphor is also found in everyday language, although mostly of divine anger:

(178) עד מה יהיה האנף לנצח תבער כמו אש קנאתך

'd mh yhwh t'np lnšh tb'r kmw 'š qn'tk.

P: for Interr pronoun: what PN: YHWH V: be angry (qal impf 2nd sg, m) Adv: forever V: burn (qal impf 3rd sg, f) P: like N: fire N: fervour + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).

“How long, YHWH, will you be angry? Will your fervour burn like fire forever?” (Ps 79:5).

(179) תבער כמו אש חמתך

tb'r kmw 'š hmtk.

V: burn (qal impf 3rd sg, f) P: like N: fire N: anger + pron suffix (2nd m, sg).

“Your anger burns like fire” (Ps 89:47).¹⁰⁵

This metaphor yields the following entailments:

4.2.2.1 The Damage Caused by Fire is Injury to the Offender

The destructive effect of fire is a recurrent image and plays a central role in this metaphor. It is often said that fire “consumes” (אכל lit. “to eat”), which is an obvious reference to destruction (Fuhs 1986:1026) and may derive from the ancient practice to plunder and incinerate conquered cities (Hamp 1974:424). The expression came to be used figuratively, especially in late passages (Isa 33:11; Zeph 1:8; Joel 2:3; Zech 12:6), where the concept of real judgement by fire is excluded (cf. Num 11:1) (Hamp 1974:425):

(180) לכן חכו לי ... ליום קומי ... לשפך עליהם זעמי כל חרון אפי כי באש קנאתי האכל כל הארץ

lkn hkw ly ... lywm qwmy ... lšpk 'lyhm z'my kl hrwn 'py ky b'š qn'ty t'kl kl h'rš.

C: therefore V: wait (pi imp, m) P: for + pron suffix (1st sg) ... P: for N: day (cs) VN: rising (qal inf cs) + pron suffix (1st sg) ... P: to V: pour (qal inf cs) P: on + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) N: foam + pron suffix (1st sg) Indef pronoun: all N: burning (cs) N: nose C: because P: in N: fire (cs) N: fervour + pron suffix (1st sg) N: consume (qal impf 1st sg) Indef pronoun: all N: earth (def).

¹⁰⁴ For גער indicating YHWH's “taming” the forces of chaos, see Klopfenstein (1997:33-43).

¹⁰⁵ Also see 4.1.1 and 4.2.1.

“Therefore, wait for me ... until the day of my rising ... to pour on them all my burning anger, for in the fire of my zeal all the earth will be destroyed” (Zeph 3:8).¹⁰⁶

As part of the EATING metaphor for destruction, we also encounter the image of licking. In Psalm 97:3 we read that the fire “licks up” (להט) some enemies:

(181) אש לפניו תלך ותלהט סביב צריו

’š lpnyw tlk wtlhṭ sbyb sryw.

N: fire (f) P: before + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: go (qal impf 3rd sg, f) C: and V: burn (qal impf 3rd sg, f) Adv: around N: adversaries + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“A fire goes before him and licks up his enemies round about” (Ps 97:3).

Anger is also said to be a “tongue of fire” (לשון אש):

(182) לכן כאכל קש לשון אש וחשש להבה ירפה שרשם כמק יהיה ופרחם כאבק יעלה

lkn k’kl qš lšwn ’š whšš lhbh yrph šršm kmq yhyh wprḥm k’bq y’lh.

C: therefore P: as V: consume (qal inf cs) N: straw N: tongue (cs) N: fire (f) C: and N: dry grass N: flame + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) V: consume (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: root + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: as N: rottenness V: be (qal impf 3rd sg, m) C: and N: blossom + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: as N: dust V: go up (qal impf 3rd sg, m).

“Therefore as a blaze consumes straw and its flame burns dry grass, so their root will become a musty smell and their flower will go up like dust” (Isa 5:24).

4.2.2.2 The Fuel for the Fire is the Wrongdoer

To add to the image of swift destruction, the objects of anger are likened to dry flora, which burned very quickly (Hamp 1974:424). In Isaiah 1:30 we find the image of a dry oak and a dry garden in the context of the metaphor for fire. In Isaiah 5:24 the offenders are said to burn like straw (קש) and dry grass (חשש), even though they are likened to roots (שרש) and flowers (פרח), which normally do not burn:

(183) כי תהיו כאלה נבלת עלה

ky thyw k’lh nblt ’lh.

C: because V: be (qal impf 2nd sg, m) P: like N: mighty tree V: wither (qal pt sg, f) N: leaf.

“You will be like an oak with fading leaves” (Isa 1:30, NIV).

(184) לכן כאכל קש לשון אש וחשש להבה ירפה שרשם כמק יהיה ופרחם כאבק יעלה

lkn k’kl qš lšwn ’š whšš lhbh yrph šršm kmq yhyh wprḥm k’bq y’lh.

¹⁰⁶ Also see 4.1.10 and 4.2.1 and 4.2.2.6.

C: therefore P: as V: consume (qal inf cs) N: straw N: tongue (cs) N: fire (f) C: and N: dry grass N: flame + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) V: consume (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: root + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: as N: rottenness V: be (qal impf 3rd sg, m) C: and N: blossom + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: as N: dust V: go up (qal impf 3rd sg, m).

“Therefore as a blaze consumes straw and its flame burns dry grass, so their root will become a musty smell and their flower will go up like dust” (Isa 5:24).

Since straw (קש) and dry thorns burned easily, the idea was also commonly used as an image of the guilty party promptly eradicated (Hamp 1974:424) (see also Isa 10:17; 64:2; Ps 58:9):

(185) חשלח חרנך יאכלמו כקש
tšlh ḥrnk y’klmw kqš.

V: send forth (pi impf 2nd sg, m) N: anger (lit. burning) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) V: consume (qal impf 3rd sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: like N: stubble.

“You unleashed your burning anger; it consumed them like stubble” (Ex 15:7; NIV).

Stubble (קש) often occurs in Isaiah as a “metaphor ... for extreme weakness and incapacity of resistance (cf. Isa 5:24; 40:24; 41:2) (Rawlinson 1950b:206). In Isaiah 47:14 the conflagration implied by this idea is contrasted with a fire used to warm oneself (Watts 1987:170). The swiftness and totality of destruction is therefore emphasised (Rawlinson 1950b:206):

(186) הנה היו כקש אש שרפתם לא יצילו את נפשם מיד להבה אין גחלת לחמם אור לשבת נגדו
hnh hyw kqš ’š šrptm l’ yšylw ’t npšm myd lhbh ’yn gḥlt ḥmm ’wr lšbt ngdw.

Particle of focus: behold V: be (qal pf 3rd pl) P: like N: stubble N: fire V: burn (qal pf 3rd sg, f) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) Neg particle V: deliver (hi impf 3rd pl, m) Nota accusativi N: life (lit. throat) P: from N: power (lit. hand) N: flame (f) Existential particle: there be not N: coal P: to V: make warm (qal inf cs) N: flame P: to V: sit (qal inf cs) P: in front of + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“Behold, they will be like stubble; a fire will burn them. They will not deliver themselves from the power of the flame. There will not be coals to warm up or a fire to sit by” (Isa 47:14).

In Isaiah 27 the metaphor of the vineyard is taken up again. At first it seems as though YHWH is not angry, for he says: לֹא אֵין חַמָּה אֵינִי לִי “there is no anger to me” (v 4). However, this phrase merely indicates that he is not angry at the vineyard anymore (Lange 1878:293; Rawlinson 1950b:434; Watts 1985:347; Grogan 1986:171).¹⁰⁷ Instead, He has directed his anger against the enemies of the vineyard, the thorns (שְׁמִיר) and the thistles (שִׁית):

¹⁰⁷ Hence no need to read חמה “wall” (cf. LXX, Syr).

(187) חמה אין לי מי יתנני שמיר שית במלחמה אפשעה בה אציתנה יחד

hnh 'yn ly my ytany šmyr šyt bmlhnh 'ps 'h bh 'sytnh yhd.

N: wrath (lit. foam) Existential particle: there be not P: in + pron suffix (1st sg) Interr pronoun: who
V: set (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: thorn N: wild growth P: in N: war V: stride (qal coh sg) P: in + pron
suffix (3rd sg, f) V: set on fire (hi impf 1st sg) + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) Adv: unitedly.

“I am not angry. Who would set thorns and scrub against me in battle? I would stride into it, I
would set it altogether on fire” (Isa 27:4).

The comparison of objects of anger with straw (קש), stubble (חשש) and thorns (קוצים) is again found in
Isaiah 33:11-12:

(188) תהרו חשש תלדו קש רוחי כמו¹⁰⁸ אש תאכלכם

thrw ḥšš tldw qš rwhi kmw 'š t'klkm.

V: conceive (qal impf 2nd pl) N: chaff V: bear (qal impf 2nd pl) straw N: breath + pron suffix (1st sg)
P: like + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: fire V: eat (qal impf 3rd sg, f) + pron suffix (2nd pl, m).

“You conceive chaff, you give birth to straw; my breath is like a fire that consumes you” (Isa
33:11).¹⁰⁹

(189) קוצים כסוחים באש יצחו

qwšym kswḥym b'š yštw.

N: thorns V: cut down (qal pt pass pl, m) P: in N: fire V: burn up (qal impf 3rd pl, m).

“Like cut up thornbushes they will be set ablaze” (Isa 33:12, NIV).

Sometimes the offenders were likened to a pile of wood:

(190) מדרתה אש ועצים הרבה נשמת יהוה כנחל גפרית בערה בה

mdrth 'š w'šym hrbh nšmt yhwh knḥl gpryt b'rh bh.

N: pile + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) N: fire C: and N: wood Adv: much N: breath (f, cs) PN: YHWH P:
in N: stream (cs) N: brimstone V: burn (qal pf 3rd sg, f) P: in + pron suffix (3rd sg, f).

“Its pile is fire and lots of wood, and the breath of YHWH, like a stream of brimstone, kindles it”
(Isa 30:33).¹¹⁰

(191) הגני נתן דברי בפוך לאש והעם הזה עצים ואכלתם

hny ntn dbry bpyk l'š wh'm hzh 'šym w'klm.

Particle of focus: behold V: give (qal pt sg, m) N: word + pron suffix (1st sg) P: in N: mouth + pron

¹⁰⁸ See Footnote 9.

¹⁰⁹ Also see 3.9 and 4.2.2.6.

¹¹⁰ Also see 4.2.2.6.

suffix (2nd sg, m) P: to N: fire C: and N: people Demonstr pronoun: this N: wood C: and V: consume (qal pf 3rd sg, f) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m).

“I will make my word in your mouth fire, and this people wood, and it will destroy them” (Jer 5:14).

In the context of an agricultural metaphor in Jeremiah 4, the prophet warns the people not to sow among the thorns (קוצים) (v 3), lest they become thorns themselves that burn in the fire of God’s anger (v 4):

(192) פֶּן תֵּצֵא כְאֵשׁ חֲמָתִי וּבְעֵרָהּ וְאֵינְךָ מִכְבָּהּ

pn tš’ k’s ħmty wb’rh w’yn mkbh.

C: lest V: go out (qal impf 3rd sg, f) P: like N: fire N: wrath (lit. foam, f) + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and V: burn (qal pf 3rd sg, f) C: and Existential particle: there be not VN: extinguishing (pi pt sg, m).

“Lest my fury go out like fire and burn so no one can quench it” (Jer 21:12 = Jer 4:4).

In Psalm 21:10, the victim is likened to fuel for a baking oven (תנור). Stuart (1987:119) calls these ovens “small volcanoes of flame when first lit because the fire roared out of the door at the top”:

(193) תְּשִׂיחֲמוּ כַתְּנוֹר אֵשׁ לַעֲתָ פְּנִיךָ יְהוָה בְּאִפּוֹ יִבְלַעַם וְהִאֲכַלְם אֵשׁ

tšytmw ktnwr ’š l’t pnyk yhwh b’pw ybl’m wt’klm ’š.

V: make (hi impf 2nd sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: like N: oven (cs) N: fire P: in N: time (cs) N: face + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) PN: YHWH P: in N: wrath + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: swallow (pi impf 3rd sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) C: and V: consume (qal impf 3rd sg, f) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) N: fire.

“You will make them like an oven of fire in the time of your anger. YHWH will swallow them in his anger and the fire will consume them” (Ps 21:10).¹¹¹

In Ezekiel 21:32 the evildoer becomes “food” (אכלה) for the fire:

(194) לֵאשׁ תִּהְיֶה לְאֲכָלָהּ

l’s thyh l’klh.

P: for N: fire V: be (qal impf 2nd sg, m) P: to N: food.

“You will become food for the fire” (Ezek 21:37).

4.2.2.3 The Intensity of the Fire is the Intensity of Anger

Although the notion of intensity predominates in the use of the FIRE metaphor in English, this does not seem to be the case in the Hebrew Bible. Usually, alternative related metaphors are employed when focus is

¹¹¹ Also see 4.2.11.

centred on the intensity of fire. However, there are metaphoric expressions in the Hebrew Bible that seem to derive from the notion of fire intensity. This is especially true when there is talk of anger that is not quenchable (כבדה), as in 2 Chronicles 34:25:

(195) ותתך חמתי במקום הזה ולא תכבה

wttk ḥmty bmqwm hzh wl' tkbh.

C: and V: pour forth (ni impf 3rd sg, f) N: wrath + pron suffix (1st sg) P: in N: place Demonstrative pronoun: this C: and Neg particle V: be quenched (qal impf 3rd sg, f).

“And my anger will boil over on this place, and it won’t be quenched” (2 Chr 34:25).¹¹²

(196) ויצאו וראו בפגרי האנשים הפשעים בי כי תולעתם לא תמות ואשם לא תכבה

wyṣ'w wr'w bpgry h'nšym hpš'ym by ky twl'tm l' tmwt w'šm l' tkbh.

C: and V: go out (qal impf 3rd pl, m) C: and V: see (qal pf 3rd pl) P: in + N: carcasses (cs) N: men (def) V: rebel (qal pt pl, m) P: against + pron suffix (1st sg) C: because N: worm (f) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) Neg particle V: die (qal impf 3rd sg, f) C: and N: fire (f) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) Neg particle V: be extinguished (qal impf 3rd sg, f).

“They will go out and see the carcasses of the men that rebelled against me: their worm will never die and their fire will not be extinguished” (Isa 66:24).

4.2.2.4 Igniting the Fire is Causing Anger

In his analysis of the scope of the FIRE metaphor in English, Kövecses (2000:86) has found that the word “spark” is sometimes used in the domain of emotions to convey the concept, CAUSATION IS LIGHTING AN OBJECT. In English, it mostly operates as an indication of interest being triggered. Kövecses (2000:86) lists the following examples:

- Nicholas travelled to India which helped *spark* his passion for people and paintings.
- By drawing attention to the political and social situation of their communities, they *sparked off* a renewed interest in Aboriginal culture.

The only place in the Hebrew Bible where the word “spark” (ניצוץ) occurs, it is used within the wider context of the metaphor, ANGER IS FIRE:

(197) וזיה החסן לנערת ופעלו לניצוץ ובערו שניהם יחדו ואין מכבה

whyh ḥḥsn ln'rt wp'lw lnyṣwṣ wb'rw šnyhm yḥdw w'yn mkbh.

C: and V: be (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: strong (def) P: to N: tinder C: and N: work + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: to N: spark C: and V: burn (qal pf 3rd pl) Adv: both + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) Adv: together +

¹¹² Also see 4.2.1.3.

pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and Existential particle: there be not VN: extinguishing (pi pt sg, m).

“The mighty man will become tinder and his work a spark; both will burn together, with no one to quench the fire” (Isa 1:31, NIV).

The word גִּבּוֹר , translated here with “mighty man,” occurs only here and in Amos 2:9, and in both cases it is connected with trees (Grogan 1986:33). The concept, FUEL FOR THE FIRE IS THE WRONGDOER of v 30, where the objects of wrath is compared to a dry oak tree, is therefore continued. Their “works” (פְּעֻלָּוֹת) probably refer to the “sacred oaks” that they had made to worship (v 29) (Lange 1878:49; Grogan 1986:33). These are the “spark” (נִצְרוֹת) that lighted the fire of God’s anger that is now destroying them (Rawlinson 1950b:8).

4.2.2.5 Feeding the Fire is Maintaining the Intensity of Anger

Another common entailment of the FIRE metaphor that is commonly applied to various emotions in English is, MAINTAINING THE INTENSITY OF THE EMOTION IS MAINTAINING THE FIRE (Kövecses 2000:85). Kövecses (2000:85) lists two relating to the domains of love and hate:

- ... *keeping the flames of love alive.*
- ... *fuelling the flames of hatred.*

This concept is applied to the emotion of anger in Proverbs 26:20 and 21, where the words רִיב , “quarrel” (Davidson 1967:682) and מִדּוֹן , “dispute” (Holladay 1971:183) are used as metonymies for irascibility (effect for cause). This is again likened to a fire burning that is helped along by the slanderer (נִרְגֵן) (v 20) and the contentious man (אִישׁ מִדּוֹנִים) (v 21). In v 20, the image is presented in the negative: in the absence of wood, the fire ceases:

(198) באפס עצים חכבה אש ובאין נרגן ישתק מדון

b'ps 'šym tkbh 'š wb'yn nrgn yštq mdwn.

P: in N: end (cs) N: wood V: go out (qal impf 3rd sg, f) N: fire (f) C: and P: in Existential particle: there be not N: slanderer V: calm (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: quarrel.

“Without wood a fire goes out; without gossip a quarrel dies down” (Prov 26:20; NIV).

Verse 21 is the counterpart of v 20 (Deane 1950:502; Lange 1869:225). The image is put in the positive: adding wood and coals keeps the fire going:

(199) פחם לגחלים ועצים לאש ואיש מדונים לחרחר ריב

phm lghlym w'sym l'sh w'yš mdwnym lhrhr ryb.

N: charcoal P: to N: live coals C: and N: wood P: to N: fire C: and N: man (cs) N: disputes P: to N: make glow (pilp inf cs) N: strife.

“As charcoal to burning coals and as wood to fire, so is a quarrelsome man for kindling strife”

(Prov 26:21).

The word that is usually translated “kindling” (חֲרִיר) literally means “heating up” (Buzzell 1995:338). The image is therefore one of an already existing fire that is being maintained: “As black, cold charcoal feeds glowing charcoal, as wood feeds a lighted fire, so a quarrelsome man supports and nourishes strife” (Deane 1950:502).

Some commentators see a link between these verses and Proverbs 16:27-30 (Buzzell 1995:338), where the lips (שִׁפְתָּי) of a villain (אִישׁ בְּלִיעֵל) is compared to a devouring fire (אֵשׁ צָרְבֶת) (v 27):

(200) אִישׁ בְּלִיעֵל כָּרָה רָעָה וְעַל שִׁפְתָּיו כְּאֵשׁ צָרְבֶת

'yš bly'ī krh r'h w'ī śptyw¹¹³ k's šrbt.

N: man (cs) N: worthlessness V: dig up (qal pt sg, m) N: trouble C: and P: on N: lips + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: like N: fire A: scorching.

“A scoundrel is a digger of evil, and his lips are like a scorching fire” (Prov 16:27).

Fire issuing from the mouth is aptly used as a metaphor for “the destructive effect of the speech of the ‘man of Belial’” (Murphy 1998:123; cf. Lange 1869:156; Deane 1950:315; Ross 1991:1011). Some commentators make reference to the comparable metaphor of fire applied to the tongue in the New Testament (Jas 3:6) (cf. Deane 1950:315).

V 28, which seems to be connected with the foregoing through the repetition of אִישׁ, “man” (Murphy 1998:123; cf. Lange 1869:156), casts further light on how perverse men perpetuate anger.

(201) אִישׁ תְּהַפְכוֹת יִשְׁלַח מִדּוֹן וְנִרְגַן מִפְּרִיד אֱלוֹף

'yš thpkwt yšlh mdwn wnrgez mpryd 'lwp.

N: man (cs) N: perversities V: let free (pi impf 3rd sg, m) N: quarrel C: and N: talebearer V: separate (hi pt sg, m) N: friend.

“A perverse man sends forth strife, and a whisperer¹¹⁴ separates friends” (Prov 16:28).

The verb שִׁלַּח, “to send” (Holladay 1971:371) is usually translated, “to initiate” (Murphy 1998:118), or “to stir up” (so NIV). However, the image intended seems to be the sending forth of a weapon (Deane 1950:315), which, in this case, may be the fire issuing from the mouth in v 27. Thus, the image of a fire-blowing animal is evoked,¹¹⁵ where fire is a metaphor for the destruction of anger.

It is in the light of this image that the words of Proverbs 26:22 should be understood. The *hapax*, מִתְּלַהֲמִים, is usually taken to be the hitp participle of לָהֵם, which cognate in Arabic means, “to swallow greedily” (Davidson 1967:415), thus indicating “dainty morsels” or “choice morsels” (so NIV) that are eagerly

¹¹³ See *BHS*.

¹¹⁴ נִרְגַן is derived from נִרְגַּן, a verb which cognate in the Arabic means, “to whisper” (Lange 1869:154).

¹¹⁵ See 4.2.2.6.

swallowed down. The word would then indicate the relishing of the words of a talebearer by the listeners (Deane 1950:349; Murphy 1998:133). This meaning starkly contrasts with the destruction that is usually associated with gossip (נִרְגַּן, cf. Prov 16:27-28) and is to be questioned. Dhorme (1963:133-4) indicated that the “chambers of the belly” (חֲדָרַי בֶּטֶן) here is a locus for pain, thus corresponding to the metaphoric use of heart (לֵב) and liver (כִּבְד). Dhorme (1963:133) further indicates that all the Akkadian references to the belly as metaphor for pain imply psychological hurt as occasioned by malice (Fr. “un événement fâcheux”).

Lange (1869:167) assumes לָהֵם to be cognate with לָהָה, “to play, sport.” מִתְלַהֲמִים would then indicate “the inconsiderate words of the backbiter, intended, as it were, sportively, and their deeply penetrating and sorely wounding power” (Lange 1869:167). However, נִרְגַּן, “whisperer” is here, as in Proverbs 16:27-28, used in the context of fire images signifying destruction (see v 21). לָהֵם can therefore best be regarded as a primitive root with the meaning, “to burn in” (Strong 1961:59):

(202) דְּבַרֵי נִרְגַּן כַּמְתַּלְהָמִים וְהֵם יֵרְדוּ חֲדָרַי בֶּטֶן

dbry nrgn kmtlhmym whm yrdw ḥdry bṭn.

N: words (cs) N: gossipmonger P: like N: burning substances C: and Pronoun: they V: go down (qal impf 3rd pl, m) N: chambers (cs) N: stomach.

“The words of a gossipmonger are as burning substances; they go down to the chambers of the stomach” (Prov 26:22 = Prov 18:8).

We are now in a position to identify the focus of the ANGER IS FIRE metaphor. In the examples listed thus far, the accent falls on the destructive power of fire. The main meaning focus of the source domain therefore appears to be the harmful effects of the emotion. This also seems to be the focus when the metaphor is applied to other domains. In Job 31:12 fire is used to illustrate the destructive power of adultery, one of the few passions that has fire as its source domain in the Hebrew Bible (excluding the apocrypha; cf. Lang 1968:935). Job likens adultery to a fire that burns unto Abaddon (אֲבַדּוֹן), which in Revelations 9:11 is mentioned as the Hebrew equivalent of the Greek Apollyon, the angel of the bottomless pit. In Job 26:6 Abaddon occurs in parallel to Sheol (שְׁאוֹל) as the “insatiable receptacle of the departed, demanding and drawing men into itself” (Lange 1874:510). Job’s words with regard to adultery in 31:12 reads as follows:

(203) כִּי אֵשׁ הִיא עַד אֲבַדּוֹן תֹּאכַל וּבְכָל תְּבוּאֹתַי תִּשְׂרַשׁ

ky ’š hy’ ‘k ’bdwn t’kl wbkl tbw’ty tšrš.

C: because N: fire (f) Pronoun: she P: unto N: destruction V: consume (qal impf 3rd sg, f) C: and P: in Indef pronoun: all N: harvest + pron suffix (1st sg) V: uproot (pi impf 3rd sg, f).

“For it is a fire that consumes to destruction and uproots my whole harvest” (Job 31:12).

The focus again falls on destruction when fire is used as an image for the chasing after a defeated enemy (Wenham 1994:277). The root דָּלַק “to burn, consume” (Davidson 1967:151) is used to figure soldiers

pursuing the enemy in order to annihilate them:

(204) וישבו בני ישראל מדלק אחרי פלשתים

wyšbw bny ys'r'l mdlq 'ḥ ry plštyṃ.

C: and V: return (qal impf 3rd pl, m) N: children (cs) PN: Israel P: from V: hotly pursue (qal inf cs)
P: after PN: Philistines.

“And the children of Israel returned from pursuing after the Philistines” (1 Sam 17:53).

(205) בגאווה רשע ידלק עני

bg'wt rš' ydlq 'ny.

P: in N: arrogance (cs) N: ungodly V: hotly pursue (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: poor.

“In his pride the wicked persecutes the poor” (Ps 10:2).

From the above, it seems as though the FIRE metaphor in the Hebrew Bible concerns itself primarily with destruction. According to Kövecses (2000:89) the metaphor centres on the intensity of a situation in English. This aspect is rarely accentuated by means of the FIRE metaphor alone in the Hebrew Bible. Rather, this facet is emphasised by the related metaphor, ANGER IS COALS OF FIRE, developed into detail below (4.2.2.6). A brief consideration of the scope of the FIRE metaphor will assist in the identification of the focus of this metaphor in the Hebrew Bible.

Based on the above evidence, we can now list the mappings of the ANGER IS FIRE metaphor. Similarities with the same metaphor in English can be observed in that the cause, maintenance and danger of fire are brought to the fore (Kövecses 1990:58):

- Fire is anger.
- Igniting the fire is causing anger.
- The fuel for the fire is the wrongdoer.
- The decomposition of the fuel is the extermination of the opponent.
- Maintaining the fire is maintaining the anger.
- The intensity of the fire is the intensity of the anger.

The nonliteral analogies can be summarised as follows:

<i>Source:</i>	<i>Target:</i>
Fire is dangerous.	Anger is dangerous.
Fire can burn so intensely that no one can extinguish it.	Anger can be so intense that no one can calm it.
Dry fuel burns quickly.	Wrongdoers are exterminated swiftly.
As long as there is fuel the fire keeps burning.	As long as the malefactor is there, the anger remains.
The only remains of fire are smoke and ashes.	Offenders are eliminated completely.
To prevent the fire from going out fuel must be added.	To keep anger burning tales of the victim needs to be

4.2.2.6 Other Related Metaphors

The following metaphors, also encountered in the Hebrew Bible, are closely related to the metaphor ANGER IS FIRE:

ANGER IS COALS OF FIRE

Fuhs (1975:461-5) points out that coals (גחלים) play an important role along with fire in statements concerning divine anger. “In contrast to consuming fire, they signify an intensification (Ezek 24:11), and signal the totality of destruction and the finality of judgement” (Fuhs 1975:463). In Psalm 120:3-4 divine anger is directed at a deceitful tongue (לשון רמיה). The images of arrows (חצי)¹¹⁶ and the “especially powerful coals of the broom tree” (גחלי רחמים) are used to typify his destructive rage (Fuhs 1975:463):

(206) מזה יתן לך ומה יסיף לך לשון רמיה חצי גבור שנונים עם גחלי רחמים

mh ytn lk wmh ysyp lk lšwn rmyh ḥṣy gbwr šnwnym ‘m ghly rtmym.

Interr pronoun: what V: give (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: to + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and Interr particle: what V: add (hi impf 3rd sg, m)¹¹⁷ P: to + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) N: tongue A: deceitful N: arrows (cs) N: strong V: sharpened (qal pt pass pl, m) P: with N: coals (cs) N: broom trees.

“What shall be given to you and what more shall be done to you, deceitful tongue? Sharpened arrows of the strong with coals of the broom trees” (Ps 120:3-4).¹¹⁸

Fuhs (1975:464) further regards the enigmatic Proverbs 25:22 as motivated by a form of punishment involving coals. In Egypt a rite existed in which a person expiated wrongdoing by bearing coals on the head (cf. Murphy 1998:193). However, the link with doing good deeds for your enemy (v 21) is not all that clear:

(207) כי גחלים אתה חתה על ראשו

ky ghlym ‘th ḥth ‘l r’sw.

C: because N: coals Pronoun: you V: fetch (qal pt sg, m) P: on N: head + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“For you will heap coals on his head” (Prov 25:22).

In an image reminiscent of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah by fire and brimstone, Ezekiel 10:2 pictures divine wrath in terms of coals of fire being thrown on the city of Jerusalem (Fuhs 1975:464). The man clothed in linen is told to go into the temple and fill his hands with coals, probably from the altar of

¹¹⁶ See 4.2.9.1.

¹¹⁷ יסף hi functions as an adverb in oath-formulas. See Holladay (1971:137).

¹¹⁸ Also see 4.2.9.1.

incense (cf. Lev 16:12). Then he has to scatter them over the whole city to destroy it completely:

(208) ומלא חפניך גחלי אש מבינות לכרבים וזרק על העיר

wml' ḥpnyk ghly 'š mbynwt lkrbym wzrq 'l h'yr.

C: and V: fill (qal imp, m) N: fists + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) N: coals (cs) N: fire (f) P: from P: between N: cherubim C: and V: scatter (qal imp sg, m) P: on N: city.

“Fill your hands with burning coals from among the cherubim and scatter them over the city” (Ezek 10:2; NIV).

Fuhs (1975:464) comments:

The fire kindled by the glory of Yahweh is changed into the coals of his anger, which destroys his own city with a special destructive power. And when the man clothed in linen leaves the temple with the coals, the glory of Yahweh also leaves the sanctuary and thus delivers it up to destruction.

In conclusion it can be observed that the coals metaphor slightly differs from the fire metaphor in that it foregrounds the notions of intensity and duration:

- The coals are anger.
- The object burning is the anger victim.

<i>Source:</i>	<i>Target:</i>
Coals burn more intensely than fire.	Intense anger is more devastating.
Coals burn for a long time.	Intense anger lasts longer.

ANGER IS THE FIRE OF A FURNACE

The ANGER IS THE FIRE OF A FURNACE metaphor is motivated by the metallurgy craftsmanship commonly practiced in the ancient Near East. When the objects of anger are conceptualised as fuel for the fire, it does not differ greatly from the ANGER IS FIRE metaphor:

(209) ומי העמד בהראותו כי הוא כאש מצרף

wmy h'md br'wtw ky hw' k's mšrp.

C: and Interr pronoun: who V: stand (qal pt sg, m) P: in V: appear (ni inf cs) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: because Pronoun: he P: like N: fire (f, cs) VN: refiner (pi pt sg, m).

“And who can stand when he appears, for he is like a refiner’s fire” (Mal 3:2).

For the most part, however, the victim is likened not merely to the fuel of the fire, but the dross that has to be removed from impure metal (Lang 1968:935; Hamp 1974:424):

(210) ואשיבה ידי עליך ואצרף כבר סיגניך ואסירה כל בדיליך

w'sybh ydy 'lyk w'srp kbr sygyk w'syrh kl bdylyk.

C: and V: turn (hi coh sg) N: hand + pron suffix (1st sg) P: on + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and V: purge (qal impf 1st sg) P: like N: flux N: dross + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and V: remove (hi coh sg) Indef pronoun: all N: tin + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).

“I will turn my hand on you and thoroughly purge away your dross and remove all your tin” (Isa 1:25).

(211) הנה צרפתיך ולא בכסף בחרתיך בכור עני

hnh srptyk wl' bksp bhrtyk bkwr 'ny.

Particle of focus: behold N: refine (qal pf 1st sg) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and/but Neg particle P: with N: silver P: in N: test (qal pf 1st sg) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) P: in N: furnace (cs) N: affliction.

“Behold, I have refined you, but not with silver. I have treated you in the furnace of affliction” (Isa 48:10).

The harder metals, such as copper and iron, needed more than just a mere fire to melt. For them, lasting coal that was made from fast-burning wood was used. In the oracle of judgement in Ezekiel 24:11, Jerusalem is likened to a copper pot from which the dross is removed:

(212) והעמידה על גחליה רקה למען תחם וחרה נחשתה ונתכה בתוכה טמאתה תחם חלאתה

wh'mydh 'l ghlyh rqh lm'en thm whrh nhsth wntkh btwkh tm'th ttm hl'th.

C: and V: place (hi imp sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) P: on N: coals + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) N: emptiness, worthlessness + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) C: so that V: become hot (qal impf 3rd sg, f) C: and V: burn (qal pf 3rd sg, f) N: copper + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) C: and V: be poured forth (qal pf 3rd sg, f) P: in Loc: midst + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) N: impurities + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) V: be consumed (qal impf 3rd sg, f) N: scum + pron suffix (3rd sg, f).

“Then set the empty pot on the coals till it becomes hot and its copper glows so its impurities may be melted and its deposit burned away” (Ezek 24:11; NIV).

In addition, lead was often used as a flux in the purification of these harder metals. They would remain in the oven with the alloy or oxidise and carry off the alloy (Feinberg 1986:425-6):

(213) בית ישראל לסוג כלם נחשת ובדיל וברזל ועופרת בחוך כור

byt ysrl lsgym¹¹⁹ klm nhst wbdyl wbrzl w'wpert btwk kwr.

N: house (cs) PN: Israel P: to N: dross Indef pronoun: all + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) N: copper C: and N: tin C: and N: iron C: and N: lead P: in N: furnace.

¹¹⁹ See BHS.

“The house of Israel has become dross to me; all of them are the copper, tin, iron and lead left inside a furnace” (Ezek 22:18, NIV).

(214) נחר מפחם אש תם¹²⁰ עפרת לשוא צרף צרוף ורעים לא נתקו

nḥr mḫm 'š tm 'prt lšw' šrp šrwp wr'ym l' ntqw.

V: burn (ni pf 3rd sg, m) N: bellow + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) N: fire V: ready (qal pf 3rd sg, f) N: lead Adv: in vain V: purge N: refiner C: and N: adversaries Neg particle V: tear up (ni pf 3rd pl).

“The bellows puff, the fire is ready, but the refiner purges the lead in vain, for the adversaries are not eliminated” (Jer 6:29).

The oven consisted of a hole in the ground, surrounded by three walls of clay and stone. One wall had an opening for the bellows, without which the fire would not be hot enough to purify hard metals:

(215) ונפחתי עליכם באש עברתי ונתכתם בתוכה

wnḫty 'lykm b'š 'brty wntktm btwkh.

C: and V: blow (qal pf 1st sg) P: on + pron suffix (2nd pl, m) P: with N: fire (f, cs) N: wrath (f, lit. overflow) + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and V: be poured out (ni pf 2nd pl, m) P: in N: midst + pron suffix (3rd sg, f).

“And I will blow upon you in the fire of my anger, and you will be melted in the midst of it” (Ezek 22:21).

To add to the image of intense heat, the hard metals are sometimes said to melt like silver or gold, which do not need the intense heat achieved by the use of bellows to liquefy:

(216) כהתוך כסף בתוך כור כן תתכו בתוכה

khtwk ksp btwk kwr kn ttkw btwkh.

P: like N: melting (cs) N: silver P: in N: midst N: furnace Adv: thus V: be melted (ho impf 2nd pl, m) P: in N: midst + pron suffix (3rd sg, f).

“As silver is melted in a furnace, so you will be melted inside her” (Ezek 22:22, NIV).

(217) והבאתי את השלשית באש וצרפתים כצרף את הכסף ובחנתים כבחן את הזהב

whb'ty 't hšlšyt b'š wšrptym kšrp 't hksp wbḫntym kbḫn 't hzhb.

C: and V: bring (hi pf 1st sg) Nota accusativi N: a third P: in N: fire (f) C: and V: purge (qal pf 1st sg) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: like V: refine (qal inf cs) Nota accusativi N: silver (def) C: and V: purify (qal pf 1st sg) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: as V: purify (qal inf cs) Nota accusativi N: gold.

“And I will put a third part in the fire and purge them away as silver is refined, and I will purify them as gold is purified” (Zech 13:9).

¹²⁰ Instead of מפח מאשחם, see Craigie, Kelley & Drinkard (1991:108).

From the above, we can now map the ANGER IS THE FIRE OF A FURNACE metaphor:

- The fire of the furnace is the anger
- The intensity of the fire is the intensity of the anger
- Bellows blowing to increase heat is the anger intensifying
- The refiner is the angry person
- The dross removed from the metal is the offender eliminated

The meaning of the metaphor can be outlined as follows:

<i>Source:</i>	<i>Target:</i>
Metal melts in a furnace.	Not even strong opponents can resist intense anger.
If the metal doesn't melt, the heat can be increased.	The stronger the opposition, the stronger the anger.
The only remains of the process are purified metal.	The result of anger is a world without the antagonist.

ANGER IS A VOLCANO

The motifs involving fire and coal thus far are rooted in the experiences of everyday life. An entirely different world of ideas underlie the depiction of divine wrath in Psalm 11:6, 140:11 and the description of the theophany in Psalm 18:13. In these passages, coals of fire (גחלים) are said to rain on the objects of wrath. These ideas of the destructive intervention of YHWH are probably based on the volcanic images of the Sinai theophany (Ex 19:16, 18, 19) and the old narrative of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah by fire and brimstone (Gen 19:24) that exerted a strong influence on the subsequent language of anger (Lang 1968:936; Fuhs 1975:464). Fuhs (1975:464) argues that, in these passages, גחלים should be rendered “glowing stones” or “glowing lava” (cf. Jeremias 1965:71):

(218) מיטו¹²¹ עליהם גחלים באש יפלים במהמרות בל יקומו

ymyṭw ‘lyhm għlym b’s yplm bmhmrwt bl yqwmw.

V: be cast (hi impf 3rd pl, m) P: on + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) N: coals P: in N: fire (f) V: let fall (hi impf 3rd sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: in N: miry abyss¹²² Neg particle V: rise (qal impf 3rd pl, m).

“Let glowing lava fall upon them; let them be cast into the fire, into deep pits never to rise” (Ps 140:11).

The text of Psalm 11:6 is corrupt (Fuhs 1975:464). Some have suggested amending פחמי “bird-traps” (Holladay 1971:290) פחמי “coals of” (Craigie 1983:132). On the basis of Psalm 140:11, Fuhs (1975:464) suggests reading גחלים “coals” or גחלי אש “coals of fire” instead. In any event, the image of fire and

¹²¹ This root (מוט) is commonly used to speak of the wavering of mountains (cf. Holladay 1971:185).

¹²² Lit. “the place of pouring down” (Tromp 1969:54).

brimstone raining down on the victim is unquestionable:

(219) ימטר על רשעים גחלי אש וגפרית ורוח זלעפות מנת כוסם

ymṭr 'l rš'ym pḥym 'š wgpryt wrwḥ zl'pwt mnt kws̄m.

V: make rain fall (hi impf 3rd sg, m) P: on N: evil N: coals (cs) N: fire C: and N: sulphur C: and N: wind (cs) N: glow N: portion (cs) N: cup pron suffix (3rd pl, m).

“On the wicked he will rain glowing lava and brimstone, and a burning hot wind is the portion of their cup” (Ps 11:6).¹²³

“Coals” appear twice in the ancient storm theophany in Psalm 18:8-16 (Fuhs 1975:464). The line dealing with coals in v 9: גחלים בערו ממנו, “glowing coals flamed forth from him” is usually rejected as a secondary expansion (cf. Jeremias 1965:34). Gordon (1986:305) regards the reference to coals as a mere indication of divine presence, like the smoking fire-pot and flaming torch in Genesis 15:17. However, Fuhs (1975:464) suggests that it is a cultic addition that turns fire as a sign of presence into a symbol of rage:

The coals which burn before Yahweh are nothing other than the fire transformed into the coals of his anger, kindled for praise in the Temple, which now brings about the final judgement with special destructive power.

It is worth mentioning that striking similarities exist between this depiction of divine anger and the description of Leviathan in Job 41:11-13, whose breath (נפש) blazes (להט) burning coals (גחלים) (Gordon 1986:305). The image evoked is that of liquid fire proceeding from the subject’s mouth. Therefore, analogous to its use in Psalm 140:11 and 11:6, גחלים may denote “glowing lava.” This interpretation is supported by the reference to smoke in the same verse, since “emissions of smoke are a common feature of volcanic disturbances” (Rawlinson 1950a:116):

(220) עלה עשן באפו ואש מפיו תאכל גחלים בערו ממנו

'lh 'śn b'pw w'š mpyw t'kl ḡḥlym b'rw mmmnw.

V: go up (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: smoke P: in N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and N: fire (f) P: from N: mouth + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: eat (qal impf 3rd sg, f) N: coals V: burn (qal pf 3rd pl) P: from + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“Smoke went up from his nostrils, and devouring fire from his mouth; glowing coals flamed forth from him” (Ps 18:9 = 2 Sam 22:9; translation by Fuhs 1975:464).¹²⁴

Coals are part of the original text in v 13, where it is associated with hail (Fuhs 1975:465). This unusual coupling of coal and hail makes the text very difficult to interpret, and many commentators pass over it in

¹²³ Also see 4.2.3 and 4.2.9.1.

¹²⁴ Also see 3.9 and 4.2.1.2.

courteous silence. The easiest explanation would be to understand גחלים אש as synonymous with lightning (cf. Ex 9:24) (so Rawlinson 1950a:116-7). Still, it is more likely that the idea of a storm is abandoned and that a volcanic element is introduced by the mention of fiery coals (Jeremias 1965:37; Fuhs 1975:465). Thus, it contains motifs of a storm and a volcanic eruption, just like the elemental theophany at Sinai (cf. Ex 19; 20), to which it is related:

(221) מנגה נגדו עביו עברו ברד וגחלי אש

mngħ ngdw ‘byw ‘brw brd wghly ’š.

P: from N: brightness P: before + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: clouds + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: go over (qal pf 3rd pl) N: hail C: and N: coals (cs) N: fire.

“Out of the brightness before him there broke through his clouds hailstones and coals of fire” (Ps 18:13; translation by Fuhs 1975:465).

The concept of anger as a volcano is not limited to the vehicle of fiery coals. There are several passages in the Hebrew Bible that describe anger with similes of volcanic activity, like mountains melting (Mi 1:4; Ps 97:5) (Mays 1976:43) and some unquenchable liquid fire (Jer 7:20; Zeph 3:8; Nah 1:6):

(222) לפני זעמו מי יעמוד ומי יקום בחרון אפו חמתו נתכה כאש

lpny z‘mw my y‘mwd wmy yqwm bħrwn ‘pw ħmtw ntkħ k’š.

P: before N: foam + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) Interr pronoun: who V: stand (qal impf 3rd sg, m) C: and Interr pronoun: who V: rise (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: before N: burning (cs) N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg) N: foam + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: pour forth (ni pf 3rd sg, f) P: like N: fire.

“Who can stand before his foaming and who can stand up before the froth of his face – his spume is poured out like fire” (Nah 1:6).¹²⁵

Longman (1993:790) points out that the expression “like fire” in this last v has caused commentators difficulties, since fire cannot be poured out. Deane (1950a:2) fittingly explains that anger is compared to:

... the brimstone and fire that destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, or ... the molten lava that issues from a volcano.

Other passages that depict anger in terms of a volcano are:

(223) כי אש קדחה באפי ותיקד עד שאול תחתית והאכל ארץ ויבלה ותלהט מוסדי הרים

ky ’š qdħħ b‘py wtyqd ‘d š‘wl tħtyt wt’kl ’rš wyblħ wtlħt mwšdy ħrym.

C: because N: fire (f) V: kindle (qal pf 3rd sg, f) P: in N: anger (lit. nose) + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and V: burn (qal impf 3rd sg, f) P: until PN: Sheol (grave, hell) A: lowermost C: and V: consume

¹²⁵ Also see 4.1.10 and 4.1.14 and 4.2.1.3.

(qal impf 3rd sg, f) N: earth C: and N: produce + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) C: and V: blaze (pi impf 3rd sg, f) N: foundations (cs) N: mountains.

“For a fire is kindled in my nose, and will burn unto the deepest parts of Sheol, and will consume the earth and its produce, and burn the foundations of the mountains” (Deut 32:22).¹²⁶

(224) ונמסו החרים תחתיו והעמקים יתבקעו כדונג מפני האש כמים מגרים במורד
*wnmsw hhrym thtyw wh'mqym ytbq'w kdwng mpny h's kmym mgrym
 bmwrd.*

C: and V: melt (ni pf 3rd pl) N: mountains (def) P: under + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and N: valleys
 V: be ripped open (hitp impf 3rd pl, m) P: as N: wax P: before N: fire (def) P: like V: poured out (ho
 pt pl, m) P: in N: slope.

“And the mountains will be molten under him, and the valleys ripped open, as wax before the fire, like water pouring down the slope” (Mic 1:4).

(225) הרים כדונג נמסו מלפני יהוה
hrym kdwng nmsw mlpny yhwh.

N: mountains P: like N: wax V: dissolve (ni pf 3rd pl) P: before PN: YHWH.

“The hills melted like wax at the appearance of YHWH” (Ps 97:5; KJV).

(226) לכן חכו לי ... ליום קומי ... לשפך עליהם זעמי כל חרון אפי כי באש קנאתי תאכל כל הארץ
*lkn hkw ly ... lywm qwmy ... lšpk 'lyhm z'my kl hrwn 'py ky b's qn'ty t'kl
 kl h'rs.*

C: therefore V: wait (pi imp, m) P: for + pron suffix (1st sg) ... P: for N: day (cs) VN: rising (qal inf
 cs) + pron suffix (1st sg) ... P: to V: pour (qal inf cs) P: on + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) N: foam + pron
 suffix (1st sg) Indef pronoun: all N: burning (cs) N: nose C: because P: in N: fire (cs) N: fervour +
 pron suffix (1st sg) N: consume (qal impf 1st sg) Indef pronoun: all N: earth (def).

“Therefore, wait for me ... until the day of my rising ... to pour on them all my burning anger, for in the fire of my zeal all the earth will be destroyed” (Zeph 3:8).¹²⁷

The nonliteral comparisons can be summarised as follows:

- The eruption of the volcano is the expression of anger
- The destructive lava is the expression of anger
- The objects destroyed by the lava are the objects of anger

The nonliteral analogies are:

<i>Source:</i>	<i>Target:</i>
----------------	----------------

¹²⁶ Also see 4.1.7.

¹²⁷ Also see 4.1.10, 4.2.1 and 4.2.2.1.

Volcanoes are very dangerous.	Anger is very dangerous.
Lava cannot be extinguished	The destructive force of anger cannot be stopped.

ANGER IS A FOREST FIRE

In Jeremiah 21:14 and Ezekiel 21:3 the image of a forest fire is used figuratively to describe anger (Lang 1968:935). The thrust of the image is the fact that forest fires spread easily and are difficult to put out:

(227) והצתי אש ביערה ואכלה כל סביביה

whšty 'š by'rh w'klh kl sbybyh.

C: and V: kindle (hi pf 1st sg) N: fire (f) P: in N: forest + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) C: and V: consume (qal pt sg, f) Indef pronoun: all Adv: around + pron suffix (3rd sg, f).

“I will kindle a fire in her¹²⁸ forest and it will devour everything about” (Jer 21:14).

(228) ואמרת ליער הנגב ... הנני מצית בך אש ואכלה בך כל עץ לח וכל עץ יבש לא תכבה להבת
שלהבת

w'mrt ly'r hngb^e ... hnnny mšyt bk 'š w'klh bk kl 'š lh wkl 'š ybš l' tkbh lhbt šlhbt.

C: and V: say (qal pf 2nd sg, m) P: to N: forest (cs) N: south ... Particle of focus V: set on fire (hi pt sg, m) P: in + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) N: fire (f) C: and V: consume (qal pf 3rd sg, f) P: in + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) Indef pronoun: all N: tree A: green C: and Indef pronoun: all N: tree A: dry Neg particle V: extinguish (qal impf 3rd sg, f) N: flame (f, cs) N: flame.

“And say to the forest of the South: ‘Behold, I will kindle a fire in you and it will burn every green tree in you and every dry tree; the flaming fire will not be quenched’” (Ezek 21:3).

- The fire is anger
- The trees of the forest are the offenders
- The spreading of the fire is the anger increasingly reaching more offenders.

Source:	Target:
Forest fires are very dangerous.	Anger is very dangerous.
Forest fires cannot be controlled.	Anger cannot be controlled.
Nothing is safe in a forest when it burns.	Nobody can hide from anger.

ANGER IS THE FIRE FROM A FIRE BLOWING ANIMAL

¹²⁸ The feminine suffix probably refers back to the “inhabitant of the valley” (ישבת העמק) of the previous verse, who thinks himself safe from YHWH’s anger.

There are several passages where anger is depicted in terms of fire coming from YHWH's mouth (2 Sam 22:9 = Ps 18:9; Isa 30:33; 33:11; 65:5). Hamp (1974:425) argues that these bold figures of anger originated in the world of legends, such as the one in Job 41:10-13, which tells of fire breathing animals. He (Hamp 1974:425) also points to the fire-breathing primal serpent for evidence of this theory. The descriptions indeed seem to reflect such an image:

(229) מפיו לפידים יהלכו כידודי אש יתמלטו מנחיריו יצא עשן כדוד נפוח ואגמן נפשו גחלים תלהט ולהב מפיו יצא

mpyw lpydym yhlkw kydwdy 'š ytmłtw mnħyryw yš' 'šn kdwd npwħ w'gmn npšw ġħlym tihṭ wlhb mpyw yš'.

P: from N: mouth + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: torches V: go (qal impf 3rd pl, m) N: sparks (cs) N: fire V: fly out (hitp impf 3rd pl, m) P: from N: nostrils + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: go out (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: smoke P: as N: pot V: blow (qal pt pass sg, m) C: and N: cauldron N: breath + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: coals V: scorch (pi impf 3rd sg, f) C: and N: flame P: from N: mouth + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: go out (qal impf 3rd sg, m).

“From its mouth go flaming torches; sparks of fire leap out. Out of his nostrils comes smoke, as from a boiling pot or cauldron. Its breath blazes burning coals, and a flame goes out of his mouth” (Job 41:11-13).

Many commentators see a link between the monster Leviathan, as depicted here, and YHWH in the theophany of Psalm 18 (cf. Gordon 1986:305). Just as the monster, YHWH blows smoke (עשן) and fire (אש) from his mouth (פה) and nose (ףא). Only, these are not mere indications of his terrifying, cataclysmic power (so Bergen 1996:454). Rather, they serve as an expression of his anger (Gordon 1986:305):

(230) עלה עשן באפו ואש מפיו תאכל גחלים בערו ממנו

'lh 'šn b'pw w's mpyw t'kl ġħlym b'rw mmnw.

V: go up (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: smoke P: in N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and N: fire (f) P: from N: mouth + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: eat (qal impf 3rd sg, f) N: coals V: burn (qal pf 3rd pl) P: from + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“Smoke went up from his nostrils, and devouring fire from his mouth; glowing coals flamed forth from him” (Ps 18:9 = 2 Sam 22:9; translation by Fuhs 1975:464).¹²⁹

Several metaphoric expressions in Isaiah also depicts YHWH in his anger as a fire blowing animal:

(231) מדרחה אש ועצים הרבה נשמת יהוה כנחל גפריה בערה בה

mdrrhh 'š w'sym hrb nšmt yhwh knħl ġpryt b'rh b.

¹²⁹ Also see 3.9 and 4.2.1.2.

N: pile + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) N: fire C: and N: wood Adv: much N: breath (f, cs) PN: YHWH P: in N: stream (cs) N: brimstone V: burn (qal pf 3rd sg, f) P: in + pron suffix (3rd sg, f).

“Its pile is fire and lots of wood, and the breath of YHWH, like a stream of brimstone, kindles it” (Isa 30:33).¹³⁰

(232) תהרו חשש תלדו קש רוחי כמו¹³¹ אש תאכלכם

thrw ḥšš tldw qš rwhy kmw ’š t’klkm.

V: conceive (qal impf 2nd pl) N: chaff (def) V: bear (qal impf 2nd pl) straw N: breath + pron suffix (1st sg) P: like + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: fire V: eat (qal impf 3rd sg, f) + pron suffix (2nd pl, m).

“You conceive chaff, you give birth to straw; my breath is like a fire that consumes you” (Isa 33:11).¹³²

(233) אלה עשן באפי אש יקדת כל היום

’lh ‘sn b’py ’š yqdt kl hywm.

Demonstr pronoun: these N: smoke P: in N: nose + pron suffix (1st sg) N: fire (f) V: burn (qal pt sg, f) Indef pronoun: all N: day (def).

“These are smoke in my nose, a fire that burns all day” (Isa 65:5; KJV).¹³³

The ANGER IS THE FIRE FROM A FIRE-BREATHING ANIMAL metaphor portrays the emotion as a very dangerous, awe-inspiring animal from which there is no escape. The correspondences can be listed as follows:

- The animal is the angry person
- The fire coming from the animal’s mouth is anger
- The objects burned are the malefactors

<i>Source:</i>	<i>Target:</i>
Fire breathing-animals are very dangerous.	An angry person is very dangerous.
Fire breathing-animals cannot be tamed.	An angry person cannot be controlled.
There is no defence against a fire-breathing animal.	Nobody can hide from anger.

The ANGER IS FIRE metaphor focuses on the damage that fire can cause. It is clear that fire was much feared in ancient Israel, and it is significant that it was used as a very productive source in terms of which to understand anger.

¹³⁰ Also see 4.2.2.2.

¹³¹ See Footnote 9.

¹³² Also see 3.9, 4.2.2.1 and 4.2.2.2.

¹³³ Also see 4.2.1.2.

4.2.3 Anger is a Hot Wind

The most common word for anger in the Hebrew Bible אַף, has been linked by some scholars to the heavy breathing associated with anger (cf. Sauer 1997:166).¹³⁴ The related verb, אָפַן, can also be seen as a metonymy for anger, signifying “to snort (in anger)” (Sauer 1997:166). In combination with the experiential aspect of heat in the course of anger, this metonymy may have given rise to the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS A HOT WIND.

Although this bodily symptom of anger is a likely motivation for this common metaphor, a more direct experience as basis for the trope can be identified in the sirocco, the hot easterly wind that blows in Palestine.¹³⁵ The 21 references to this wind in the Hebrew Bible testify to the fact that it made a big impression on the mind of the ancient Israelite. By contrast, the westerly wind, that blows more than twice as often, is mentioned only once (Scheepers 1960:11).

The periodic destruction brought by this wind came to be accepted as one of the laws of nature in Palestine. It threatens every form of life, bringing the highest temperatures of the year (Scheepers 1960:12). It is so hot, that with one gust it withers the vegetation of the spring rains, and so strong that it can cause severe devastation (Albertz & Westermann 1997:1203). Its most visible manifestation is the scorching of plantations and grasslands in spring and autumn. Noth (1966:32-3) describes this most feared element, sometimes referred to in the Hebrew Bible as the east wind (רוּחַ הַמִּזְרָח; Scheepers 1960:13) as follows:

When they [the east winds] occur in the fall or in the spring a withering heat often accompanies them. The sultry eastern air is known as *es-Samūn*, “poison [air].” It is carried along by the east wind in autumn and spring, when it sometimes lies dead over the land. It is usually filled with fine dust which darkens the atmosphere. ... The appearance in fall and spring of the sirocco, which lasts a number of days, means heat so unbearable that it oppresses and drains every form of life. The months of May and again September or October are the times of this sirocco. It should be noted that these are not the months of high average temperatures. Yet frequently the highest temperatures of the year occur in these months, since they have a number of these very hot days. On these days, even in Jerusalem, the thermometer can register as high as 40° C. A sirocco brings still higher temperatures to other parts of the country, such as the coastal plains and the Jordan rift. The spring sirocco has a striking effect. After the end of the rainy season, with one blast it makes the flowers of the field wither and disappear. The sirocco is meant whenever mention is made in the Old Testament of that wind which needs only to pass over the field in order to wither the grass and make the flowers wilt (Isa 40:6-8; Ps 103:15-16).

The chief characteristics of this wind are heat and devastation. As such, the figure shows similarities with the

¹³⁴ See 4.1.2.

¹³⁵ Known in Palestine as the *hamsin* (Arabic) or *sharab* (modern Hebrew) (Craigie 1983:134).

FIRE metaphor, discussed above. That being the case, the two metaphors set each other off where they are mentioned side by side in Psalm 11:6. Craigie (1983:131) aptly translates רוח זלעפות with “a burning hot wind” to highlight the idea of oppressive heat brought along by the sirocco:

(234) ימטר על רשעים גחלי אש וגפרית ורוח זלעפות מנח כוסם

ymtr 'l rš'ym p̄ym 'š wgpryt wrwḥ zl'pwt mnt kws̄m.

V: make rain fall (hi impf 3rd sg, m) P: on N: evil N: coals (cs) N: fire C: and N: sulphur C: and N: wind (cs) N: glow N: portion (cs) N: cup pron suffix (3rd pl, m).

“On the wicked he will rain glowing lava and brimstone, and a burning hot wind is the portion of their cup” (Ps 11:6).¹³⁶

In the curse supplication of Psalm 83:14-16 the sirocco is even compared to a fire blazing through a forest. While the scorching wind is associated with divine anger, the vegetation being destroyed obviously stands for the victims of this anger:

(235) אלהי שיתמו כגלגל כקש לפני רוח כאש תבער יער וכלהבה תלהט הרים כן תרדפם בסערך

'lhy šytmw knlgl kqš l̄pny rwḥ k'š tb'r y'r wklhbh tlḥt hrym kn trdpm bs'rk.

N: gods + pron suffix (1st sg) V: set (qal imp sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: as N: wheel (of war chariot) P: as N: stubble P: before N: wind P: as N: fire (f) V: burn (qal impf 3rd sg, f) N: forest C: and P: as N: flame (f) V: lick (qal impf 3rd sg, f) N: mountains Adv: thus V: pursue (qal impf 2nd sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: with N: whirlwind + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).

“My God, make them as a wheel of a war chariot, as stubble before the wind. As fire burns a forest and as a flame licks the mountains, thus pursue them with your whirlwind” (Ps 83:14-16).

The metaphor ANGER IS A HOT WIND can also be linked conceptually to the figure ANGER IS POISON. This is especially the case in the Psalms, where the wind is described as having wings, which suggests an association with Pazuzu, king of the evil spirits of the air, in ancient Mesopotamia (Keel 1997:79). Pazuzu was a winged demon responsible for a wide range of illnesses and fever. His image was often hung around the neck to ward off not only the attacking Pazuzu himself by sudden confrontation with his own image, but also Lamashtu, a principle fever-demon. In some theophanies, YHWH is presented in Pazuzu-like imagery. For example, he is described as riding on the wings of the wind in Psalm 104:3. This description provides the clue for understanding the reference to the licking fire (אש להט) in the next verse, which probably refers to some fever brought about by the wind:

(236) המהלך על כנפי רוח עשה מלאכיו רוחות משרתיו אש להט

hmhlc 'l knpy rwḥ 'šh ml'kyw rwḥwt mšrtyw 'š lḥt.

¹³⁶ Also see 4.2.2.6 and 4.2.9.1.

Rel particle V: walk (pi pt sg, m) P: on N: wings (cs) N: wind V: make (qal pt sg, m) N: messengers + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: winds VN: attendant (pi pt pl, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg) N: fire VA: burn, glow (qal pt sg, m).

“He who walks on the wings of the wind, making his messengers winds and his attendants a glowing fire” (Ps 104:3-4).

In the theophany of Psalm 18, YHWH is again described in typical Pazuzu-imagery. The darkness (חֹשֶׁךְ) that he uses as a disguise can be understood as the underworld (Tromp 1969:97). Darkness is often associated with demonic forces and death in the Hebrew Bible (Tromp 1969:96). The focus thus falls on YHWH’s advent to bring destruction:

(237) וירכב על כרוב ויעף וידא על כנפי רוח ישת חשך סחרו

wyrkb ‘l krwb wy’p wyd’ ‘l knpy rwḥ yšt ḥšk strw.

C: and V: ride (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: on N: cherub C: and V: fly (qal impf 3rd sg, m) C: and V: soar (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: on N: wings (cs) N: wind V: make (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: darkness N: garment + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“He rides on a cherub and soars on the wings of the wind, making darkness his overcoat” (Ps 18:11-12).

Customarily, the objects of divine wrath are compared to blossoming (צֹרֵחַ) vegetation that gets scorched within hours by this awe-inspiring parching wind (Keel 1997:79):

(238) בבקר כחציר יחלף בבקר יציץ וחלף לערב ימולל ויבש כי כלינו באפך ובחמתך ובהלנו

bbqr khṣyr yḥlp bbqr yṣyṣ whlp l’rb ymwl wybš ky klynw b’pk wbḥmtk nbhlnw.

P: in N: morning (def) P: like N: grass V: sprout (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: in N: morning (def) V: blossom (hi impf 3rd sg, m) C: and V: sprout (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: in N: evening (def) V: wither (pol impf 3rd sg, m) C: and V: dry out (pi impf 3rd sg, m) C: because V: be consumed (qal pf 1st pl) P: in N: anger + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and P: in N: froth + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: be terrified (ni pf 1st pl).

“In the morning he sprouts like grass; he blossoms and pushes [and] in the evening he withers and dries out, for we are consumed by your anger, we are terrified by your ire”¹³⁷ (Ps 90:5-7).

We have already noted that the hymnal accounts of theophany in the Hebrew Bible usually focus on the destructive power of divine anger (cf. Jeremias 1965:1). Being so visible in its devastating effect on nature, the sirocco qualifies as a quintessential element for theophanic descriptions of divine anger. It comes as no

¹³⁷ See 4.1.10.

surprise to find that one of the earliest theophanies in the Hebrew Bible describes the effect of YHWH's onset in terms of sirocco images:

(239) יהוה מציון ישאג ומירושלם יתן קולו ואבלו נאות הרעים ויבש ראש הכרמל

yhwh mšywn yš'g wmyrwšlym ytn qwlw w'blw n'wt hr'ym wybš r's hkrml.

PN: YHWH P: from PN: Zion V: roar (qal impf 3rd sg, m) C: P: from PN: Jerusalem V: give (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: voice + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and V: mourn (qal pf 3rd pl) N: pastures (cs) VN: shepherd (qal pt pl, m, def) C: and V: wither (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: top (cs) PN: Carmel.

“YHWH roars from Zion and thunders from Jerusalem; the pastures of the shepherds dry up, and the top of Carmel withers” (Am 1:2).¹³⁸

Jeremias (1965:13-4) comments on this verse:

Amos 1:2b spielt auf die Wirkung des heissen Glutwindes, der aus der Wüste kommt, des Schirokko, an. Die Stimme Jahwes verursacht nicht nur allgemein den Aufruhr der Natur, sondern sie vernichtet speziell das Kulturland. Die fruchtbarsten Gebiete und der durch seinen Waldreichtum ausgezeichnete Karmel verdorren.

In Isaiah 40:7, we read of the breath of YHWH (רוח יהוה) that causes grass and flowers to wither.¹³⁹ The image is clearly that of the sirocco, which is devastating to vegetation in Palestine (cf. Lange 1878:419; Rawlinson 1950b:67). Although the interpretation: אכן חציר העם “Surely the people are grass (NIV)” was probably inserted as a gloss (cf. Watts 1987:78), the interpretation accords well with v 6, where it is said that “all men (בשר) are like grass (NIV)”:

(240) יבש חציר נבל ציץ כי רוח יהוה נשבה בו אכן חציר העם

ybš ḥšyr nbl šyš ky rwh yhwh nšbh bw 'kn ḥšyr h'm.

V: wither (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: grass V: wilt (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: flower C: because N: breath (cs) PN: YHWH V: blow (qal pf 3rd sg, f) P: against + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) Adv: surely N: grass N: people (def).

“The grassland withers and the flora falls, because the breath of YHWH blows on it. Surely the people are grass” (Isa 40:7).

Rawlinson (1950b:67) aptly explains the metaphor in the following way:

When the hot winds ... blow in springtime, the flowers fade; when a destroying breath from him passes over ... men, they perish.

¹³⁸ Also see 4.2.11.

¹³⁹ See 4.1.2.

In Ezekiel 19:10-12 the heat aspect of the wind predominates again when the metaphor combines with that of fire to depict divine anger (cf. Allen 1994:290). Jerusalem is likened to a vine, planted by the water, fruitful and strong (v 10-11). It is then uprooted in fury (חמה), dried up by the east wind and burnt by fire (v 12):

(241) ותחש בחמה לארץ השלכה ורוח הקדים הוביש פריה החפרקו ויבשו מטה עזה אש אכלתהו
wttš bḥmh l'rš hšlkh wrwḥ hqdyw hwbyš pryh htprqw wybšw mth 'zh 'š ' klthw.

C: but V: be uprooted (ho impf 3rd sg, f) P: in N: anger P: to N: earth V: cast down (hi pf 3rd sg, f)
 C: and N: east wind V: make dry up (hi pf 3rd sg, m) N: fruit + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) V: break loose (hitp pf 3rd pl) C: and V: wither (qal pf 3rd pl) N: branch A: strong N: fire (f) V: consume (qal pf 3rd sg, f) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“But it was uprooted in fury and thrown to the ground. The east wind made it shrivel, it was stripped of its fruit; its strong branches withered and fire consumed them” (Ezek 19:12, NIV).

In Jeremiah 4:11 there is a reference to the רוח צח, the “dazzling, vibrating (hot) wind” (Holladay 1971:305), which brings destruction to the land (Craigie, Kelly & Drinkard 1991:76). Lange (1871:62) suggests that צח designates the brilliant clearness of the air heated by the hot wind. In any event, most commentators agree that the prophet is making reference to the scorching easterly wind as a metaphor for divine anger (Lange 1871:62; Cheyne 1950:80; Craigie, Kelly & Drinkard 1991:76):

(242) רוח צח שפיים במדבר דרך בת עמי לוא לזרות ולוא להבר
rwh šḥ špyym bmdbr drk bt 'my lw' lzwrt wlv' lhbr.

N: wind A: bright N: barren heights P: in N: desert Adv: toward N: daughter (cs) N: people + pron suffix (1st sg) Neg particle V: winnow (qalinf cs) C: and Neg particle V: cleanse (qalinf cs).

“A scorching wind from the barren heights in the desert blows toward my people, but not to winnow or to cleanse” (Jer 4:11, NIV).

Although straw was sometimes left to be blown away by the sirocco after being separated from the wheat (Cheyne 1950:335), the sirocco is most unsuitable for the winnowing process (Cheyne 1950:80; Scheepers 1960:12). Craigie, Kelly and Drinkard (1991:76) comments:

This hot and oppressive wind is of no use to either land or farmer. It blows too strongly to be used for winnowing the cut harvest; it is too dry, sucking moisture from the soil, to enrich the land.

The sirocco is more commonly known as the רוח הקדים (Jer 18:17) or the רוח מדבר (Jer 13:24) in the Hebrew Bible (Albertz & Westermann 1997:1203). In Jeremiah 13:24 and 18:17 we also have the image of chaff being blown away by the wind as a figure for anger:

(243) ואפיצם כקש עובר לרוח מדבר

w'pysm kqš 'wbr lrwḥ mdbr.

C: and V: scatter (hi impf 1st sg) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: like N: chaff V: pass over (qal pt sg, m)
P: to N: wind (cs) N: desert.

“I will scatter them like chaff, driven by the desert wind” (Jer 13:24).

(244) כרוח קדים אפיצם לפני אויב

krwḥ qkym 'pysm lpny 'wyb.

P: like N: east wind V: disperse (hi impf 1st sg) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: before N: enemy.

“Like the east wind, I will scatter them before their enemies” (Jer 18:17).

In these two verses it is clearly the aspect of force and strength of this wind that dominates. Craigie *et al.* (1991:250) comments on Jeremiah 18:17:

Yahweh ... will be like a hot, parching wind. But the metaphor is not here primarily the heat; instead it is the strong force of the wind that scatters.

The awe-inspiring effects of the hot desert wind being so deeply ingrained in the minds of the ancient Israelites, one cannot expect divine anger to be the only target concept to be conceptualised in terms of sirocco imagery. In Psalm 55:9-10 the wind serves as metaphor for the violence of the wicked. This confirms that the focus of the WIND metaphor is brutal aggression:

(245) אחישה מפלט לי מרוח סעה מסער בלע אדני פלג לשונם כי ראיתי חמס וריב בעיר

'hyšh mplt ly mrwḥ s'h ms'r bl' 'dny plg¹⁴⁰ lšwnm ky r'yty ḥms wryb b'yr.

V: hurry (hi coh sg) N: place of refuge P: to + pron suffix (1st sg) P: from N: wind (cs) V: rush (qal pt sg, m) P: from N: tempest V: destroy (pi imp, m) PN: Adonay N: split (cs) N: tongue + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) C: because V: see (qal pf 1st sg) N: violence C: and N: contention P: in N: city (def).

“I will hurry to my place of refuge away from the rushing wind, the tempest. Destroy their split tongues, Adonay, for I have seen violence and contention in the city” (Ps 55:9-10).

Yet another very prominent Classical Hebrew concept is commonly illustrated by means of sirocco conceptions, namely grief. The conceptual association in the ancient Israelite mind between violent anger and grief can therefore not be excluded, even when direct mention of divine fury is sometimes omitted:

(246) הוכה כעשב ויבש לבי

hwkh k'sb wybš lby.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Holladay (1971:292).

V: be struck down (hof pf 3rd sg, m) P: like N: green plants C: and V: dry up (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: heart + pron suffix (1st sg).

“My heart is struck down like green plants and my heart is dried up” (Ps 102:5).

Predictably, this principle of the connectivity of target concepts related to the same source can also be illustrated with instances in the Hebrew Bible. In Psalm 102:11-12 grief is depicted with the figures of the CUP OF POISON and a HOT WIND as a response to divine anger, portrayed in epileptic imagery. The severe threat to life of this intense divine emotion is emphasised through the mention of a ‘shadow’ (צל), commonly associated with death and the netherworld (Tromp 1969:140-3):

(247) וּשְׁקוּי בִבְכִי מִסִּכְחִי מִפְּנֵי זַעֲמֹךְ וּקְצַפְךָ כִּי נִשְׁאַחַתִּי וְחִשְׁלִיכֵנִי יָמֵי כֶצֶל נִטְוִי וְאֲנִי כַעֲשָׂב אֵיבֹשׁ
wšqwyy bbky mskty mpny z'mk wqšpk ky nš'tny wtšlykny ymy kšl nṭwy w'ny
k'sb 'ybs.

C: and N: drink + pron suffix (1st sg) P: with N: weeping V: mix (qal pf 1st sg) P: because of N: foaming + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and N: frothing (2nd sg, m) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: because V: pick up (qal pf 2nd sg, m) + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and V: let loose (hi impf 2nd sg, m)¹⁴¹ + pron suffix (1st sg) N: days + pron suffix (1st sg) P: like N: shadow (indef) V: go down (qal pt pass sg, m) C: and Pronoun: I P: like N: green plants V: dry up (qal impf 1st sg).

“And I mixed my drink with weeping because of your foaming and frothing. For you picked me up and let me loose. My days, like a shadow, are sent down, and I dry up like green plants” (Ps 102:10-12).

In yet another powerful image, the sirocco is used to image the sudden death of man (Ps 103:16). The understanding is again that this death is a result of divine anger, as it is contrasted with divine mercy on those who fear (i.e. respect and obey) him. The notion of anger is also suggested by the use of the terms רִיחַ and עֵבֶר, since the etymology of both these terms include anger (cf. Johnson 1973:378-89):

(248) אֲנוֹשׁ כַּחצִיר יָמָיו כְּצִיץ הַשָּׂדֶה כֵּן יִצִיץ כִּי רוּחַ עֵבֶרָה בּוֹ וְאֵינָנוּ וְלֹא יִכִּירָנוּ עוֹד מִקוֹמוֹ וְחֹסֵד יִהְיֶה
 מֵעוֹלָם וְעַד עוֹלָם עַל יְרֵאָיו
'nwš kḥšyr ymyw kšyš ḥšdh kn yšyš ky rwh 'brh bw w'yynnw wl' ykyrnw 'wd
mqwmmw whsd yhwh m'wlm w'd 'wlm 'l yr'yw.

N: man P: like N: grass N: days + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: like N: blossom (cs) N: field (def) Adv: thus V: produce blossoms (hi impf 3rd sg, m) C: because N: wind (f) V: pass over (qal pf 3rd sg, f) P: with + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and Existential particle: there is not + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and Neg particle V: know of (hi impf 3rd sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) Adv: anymore N: place + pron

¹⁴¹ This form of the verb שָׁלַךְ is usually associated with treaty-curse instruments of punishment, such as insect pests (Ex 8:17), beasts of the field (Lev 26:22), enemies (2 Kgs 15:37) and famine (Ex 14:13; Am 8:11).

suffix (3rd sg, m) C: but N: kindness (cs) PN: YHWH P: from N: long time ago C: and P: until N: eternity P: on VN: fear (qal pt pl, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“Man is like grass; his days blossom like the flowers of the field, for the wind passes over it and it is no longer; its place knows it no longer. But the kindness of YHWH has always existed and will last forever for those who obey him” (Ps 103:15-17).

In conclusion it can be observed that the HOT WIND metaphor, just like most source domains for anger, centres in on the notion of damage. When Eliphaz equates Job’s wisdom with the scorching easterly wind, he does not merely want to draw attention to the vain knowledge of his speech (Job 15:2). Employing this simile, he suggests that Job’s words have special destructive power:

(249) החכם יענה דעת רוח וימלא קדים בטנו
hḥkm y‘nh k‘t rwḥ wyml’ qkym bṭnw.

Interr particle: should N: wise (man) V: answer (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: knowledge (cs) N: wind C: and V: fill (pi impf 3rd sg, m) N: east (wind) N: stomach + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“Should a wise man utter vain knowledge, and fill his belly with the east wind?” (Job 15:2; KJV).

Thus, the following correspondences can be highlighted:

- The wind is the angry person
- The straw/chaff being blown away by the wind is the object of anger
- The plants dried up by the wind are the object of anger

The nonliteral analogies are:

<i>Source:</i>	<i>Target:</i>
The sirocco is devastating to man and vegetation.	Anger is devastating.
Straw and chaff is easily driven away by the wind.	The object of anger is defenceless in the face of the angry person.
Vegetation is withered by the wind.	Anger could be fatal.

4.2.4 Anger is an Earthquake

Consequent to its geological structure, earthquakes have been common in ancient Israel. This phenomenon has been attested in excavations and is recorded at various periods (Houston 1986:285). It may have been associated with the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (Am 4:11) and the giving of the law (Ex 19:18). As can be expected, there are some texts that identify this natural phenomenon as an expression of divine anger. It commonly co-occurs with images of fire:

(250) ובקנאתי באש עברתי דברתי אם לא ביום ההוא יהיה רעש גדול על אדמת ישראל

wbqn'ty b's 'brty dbrty 'm l' bywm hhw' yhyh r's gdwl 'l 'dmt ysr'l.

C: and P: in N: fervour + pron suffix (1st sg) P: in N: fire (cs) N: overflowing + pron suffix (1st sg)
V: say (pi pf 1st sg) Adv: surely P: in N: day (def) Demonstr pronoun: that V: be (qal impf 3rd sg, m)
N: quaking A: great P: on N: land (cs) PN: Israel.

“And in my fervour and the fire of my outpouring I have spoken. Surely, in that day there will be a great earthquake in the land of Israel” (Ezek 38:19).

(251) *מעם יהוה צבאות תפקד ברעם וברעש וקול גדול סופה וסערה ולהב אש אכלה*

m'm yhwh sb'wt tpqd br'm wbr's wqwl gdwl swph ws'rh wlhb 's 'wklh.

P: by PN: YHWH N: hosts V: be called to account (ni impf 2nd sg, m) P: with N: thunder C: and P: with N: earthquake C: and N: voice A: great N: storm C: and N: tempest C: and N: flame (cs) N: fire (f) V: consume (qal pt 3rd sg, f).

“You will be called to account by YHWH of hosts with thunder, and with earthquake, and great noise, with storm and tempest, and the flame of devouring fire” (Isa 29:6).¹⁴²

- The earthquake is anger.
- The destruction caused by the earthquake is the destruction effectuated by the angry person.

<i>Source:</i>	<i>Target:</i>
An earthquake is frightening.	(Divine) anger is frightening.
An earthquake can be devastating.	(Divine) anger can cause devastation.

4.2.5 Anger is Clouds

The menacing way in which clouds form to cover the earth and bring about storms had captured the imagination of the ancient Israelites. They used it as a source domain for concepts of misfortune, danger, sadness and even divine anger (Raymond 1958:29). In the theophany of Nahum 1 the clouds are interpreted as the dust forming around his feet in his advent:

(252) *יהוה ארך אפים וגדול כח ונקמה לא ינקה יהוה בסופה ובשערה דרכו וענן אבק רגליו*

yhwh 'rk 'pym wgdwl kh wnqh l' ynqh yhwh bswph wbs'rh drkw w'nn 'bq rglyw.

PN: YHWH A: long (cs) N: nostrils C: and A: great (cs) N: power C: and V: leave unpunished (pi pt sg, m) Neg particle V: leave unpunished (pi impf 3rd sg, m) PN: YHWH P: in N: destructive wind C: and P: in N: storm N: way + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and N: cloud N: dust (cs) N: feet + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

¹⁴² Also see 4.2.6.

“YHWH is slow to anger and great in power. He will by no means leave the guilty unpunished. YHWH’s way is in wind and in the storm, and the clouds are the dust of his feet” (Nah 1:3).

- The clouds are anger.

<i>Source:</i>	<i>Target:</i>
Clouds cover the earth.	Anger menacingly overpowers the victim.
Clouds often precede a storm.	Anger often precedes an attack.

4.2.6 Anger is a Storm

The storms in winter could be violent and very dangerous in ancient Palestine (Raymond 1958:33). This characteristic often served as an illustration for the thought of Biblical authors, especially when they described violent action or the anger of God. This is the case in Isaiah 29:6 and 28:2:

(253) מעם יהוה צבאות תפקד ברעם וברעש וקול גדול סופה וסערה ולהב אש אקכלה

m‘m yhwš šb‘wt tpqd br‘m wbr‘š wqwl gdwl swph ws‘rh wlhb ‘š ‘wklh.

P: by PN: YHWH N: hosts V: be called to account (ni impf 2nd sg, m) P: with N: thunder C: and P: with N: earthquake C: and N: voice A: great N: storm C: and N: tempest C: and N: flame (cs) N: fire (f) V: consume (qal pt 3rd sg, f).

“You will be called to account by YHWH of hosts with thunder, and with earthquake, and great noise, with storm and tempest, and the flame of devouring fire” (Isa 29:6).¹⁴³

(254) הנה חזק ואמץ לאדני כזרם ברד שער קטב כזרם מים כבירים שטפים הניח לארץ ביד

hnh ḥzq w‘mš l‘dny kzrm brd š‘r qtb kzrm mym kbyrym štpym hnyḥ l‘rš byd.

Particle of focus: behold A: mighty C: and A: strong P: to PN: Adonai P: like N: storm (cs) N: hail N: storm A: stinging P: like N: storm (cs) N: waters A: mighty V: inundate (qal pt pl, m) V: set (hi pf 3rd sg, m) P: to N: earth P: with N: hand.

“Behold, Adonai is mighty and strong, like a tempest of hail and a destroying storm, as a flood of mighty waters overflowing. He will send these down to the earth with his hand” (Isa 28:2).

The correspondences need not be elaborated on much:

- The storm is anger.

<i>Source:</i>	<i>Target:</i>
A storm could be terrifying.	Anger could be daunting.

¹⁴³ Also see 4.2.4.

4.2.7 Anger is a Burden

According to Kövecses (1990:65), anger is sometimes conceptualised as a burden in English. This experience is mainly due to two conflicting responsibilities associated with anger, namely, to control one's anger, and to take revenge (Kövecses 1990:65-6). Hence we have expressions in English, such as:

Unburdening himself of his anger gave him a sense of *relief*.

After I lost my temper, I felt *lighter*.

He *carries* his anger around with him

You'll feel better if you *get it off your chest*.

The same conceptual metaphor seems to exist in Biblical Hebrew. In Proverbs 27:3, we read of the anger of a fool that is heavier than sand and stone. Most commentators suggest that the construct כעס אױל “the anger of a fool” refers to the vexation occasioned in others by the fool (Lange 1869:229; Deane 1950:514; Murphy 1998:206). In the light of Kövecses' cognitive interpretation of anger, this unnatural reading is not necessary.

The ideal of wisdom is a man who is composed and who controls anger (Prov 29:8, 11; 17:27) (Johnson 1973:384). Therefore, the exhortation not to be angry is often heard (Ps 37:8; Prov 16:32; Eccl 7:9; Job 36:18). The fool, however, “has no government over his passions” (Lawson 1980:473 on Prov 27:3). For him, the burden to control his anger is too heavy, and he vents it easily (Prov 27:3; 14:17, 29; 29:11; Job 6:2-3). This interpretation of Proverbs 27:3 fits best with anger being ascribed almost exclusively to the fool in wisdom literature (cf. Schunk 1977:1034; Struthers 1997a:170):

(255) כבד אבן ונטל החול וכעס אױל כבד משניהם

kbd 'bn wntl hḥwl wk's 'wyl kbd mšnyhm.

A: heavy N: stone C: and A: weighty N: sand (def) C: and N: wrath (cs) N: fool C: heavy P: than N: both.

“A stone is heavy, and the sand weighty; but a fool's anger is heavier than them both” (Prov 27:3; KJV).

Job begins his speech in Job 6:2-3 using this proverb to explain his inability not to use angry words:

(256) לו שקול ישקל כעשי ... כי עתה מחול ימים יכבד על כן דברי לעו

lw šqwl yšql k'sy ... ky 'th mḥwl ymym ykbd 'l kn dbry l'w.

Conditional particle (interj): if only V: weigh (qal inf abs) V: be weighed (ni impf 3rd sg, m) N: wrath + pron suffix (1st sg) ... C: because Adv: now P: than N: sand (cs) N: seas V: be heavy (qal impf 3rd sg, m) C: therefore N: words + pron suffix (1st sg) rave (qal pf 3rd pl).

“If only my anger could be weighed ..., it would surely outweigh the sand of the seas – no wonder

my words have been impetuous” (Job 6:2-3).

Some translators and commentators have preferred to render כעש (= כעס) “grief, anguish” (so NIV; cf. Clines 1989:158). However, Job is responding to Eliphaz’ reproach in 5:2 where כעש is used in parallel with קנאה “fervour” and thus clearly has the meaning “anger” or “vexation,” as in Proverbs 27:3 (Lange 1874:345; Rawlinson 1950:103; Smick 1988:900; cf. Clines 1989:158).

This v substantiates the cognitive interpretation of Proverbs 27:3 in a real way. Job declares his violent talk (לעע) to be caused by the burden of anger. In the light of his calamity, the responsibility to control his anger is too much. He is “forced ... to utter rash and violent words” (Rawlinson 1950:103).

This interpretation also throws some light on the reason why “the fool is slain by his anger (כעש), the stupid by his fervour (קנאה)” (Job 5:2). Through his inability to carry the heavy burden of anger, he expresses it and thus makes enemies for himself (v 1, 3-5) (cf. Clines 1989:139). Hence Eliphaz declares: “it is man that breeds trouble for himself” (v 7, JB; cf. Clines 1989:116).

The reference to anger by means of the expression כבד משאה in Isaiah 30:27 is further elucidated when interpreted in terms of the conceptual metaphor ANGER IS A BURDEN. It has already been shown that משאה , which is clearly related to the root שא “to lift up” (Lange 1878:337; Rawlinson 1950b:493; Watts 1985:403; Kruger 2000b:156-8), metaphorically indicates anger (Kruger 2000b:159). כבד would then refer to the heavy burden of the punishment associated with YHWH’s wrath (Kaiser 1973:244; Wildberger 1982:1218; Oswalt 1986:566):

(257) $\text{הנה שם יהוה בא ממרחק בער אפו וכבד משאה שפתיו מלאו זעם ולשונו כאש אכלה}$
hnh šm yhwh b’ mmrḥq b’r ’pw wkbd mš’h šptyw ml’w z’m wlšwnw k’sš
’klt.

Particle of focus: behold N: name (cs) PN: YHWH V: come (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: from N: distant place V: burn (qal pt sg, m) N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and A: heavy VN: rising (qal pt sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: lips + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: be full (qal pf 3rd pl) N: foam C: and N: tongue + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: like N: fire (f) V: consume (qal pf 3rd sg, f).

“Behold, the name of YHWH comes from afar, his anger burns and his rage is overwhelming. His lips are full of foaming anger and his tongue is like a devouring fire” (Isa 30:27).¹⁴⁴

In some cases, the idea of a burden can refer not only to the difficulty of controlling anger, but also to the weight of responsibility to avenge (cf. Kövecses 1990:65-6). However, there are instances where anger is conceptualised as a burden, but where there is no connection with the responsibility to control it or to take revenge. This is elucidated when the scope of the burden metaphor is considered. In some passages, it seems as though the burden is the overwhelming effect of shame:

¹⁴⁴ Also see 4.1.7, 4.1.10, 4.2.1.1, 4.2.1.2 and 4.2.2.

(258) כי עונתי עברו ראשי כמשא כבד יכבדו ממני

ky 'wnty 'brw r'sy kms' kbd ykbdw mmny.

C: because N: punishment (pl, f) + pron suffix (1st sg) V: go over (qal pf, 3rd pl, f) N: head + pron suffix (1st sg) P: as N: burden A: heavy V: be heavy (qal impf 3rd pl) P: from + pron suffix (1st sg).

“For my iniquities have gone over my head, like a heavy burden they are too heavy for me” (Ps 38:5).¹⁴⁵

The link with anger in this passage is evident. First, the root עבר “to pass over” (Davidson 1967:584) is commonly used to denote anger (Davidson 1967:585). Further, there is reference to physical discomfort caused by “anger” (זעם), which is mentioned in parallel to “sin” (חטאה) in v 4. In this specific case, the burden can therefore also be the physical discomfort that the subject has to endure as a result of God’s punishing wrath:

(259) יהוה אל בקצפך תוכיחני ובחמתך תיסרני כי חציך נחתו בי ... אין מתם מפני זעמך אין שלום
בעצמי מפני חטאתי

*yhwh 'l bqspk twkyhny wbhmtk tysrny ky hsyk nhtw by ... 'yn mtwm bsry
mpny z'mk 'yn slwm b'smy mpny ht'ty.*

PN: YHWH Neg particle P: in N: anger (lit. foam) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) V: rebuke (hi impf 2nd sg, m) + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and P: in N: wrath (lit. foam) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) V: punish (pi impf 2nd sg, m) + pron suffix (1st sg) C: because N: poison arrows + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) V: bring down (pi pf 3rd pl)¹⁴⁶ P: in + pron suffix (1st sg) ... Existential particle: there be not N: wholesomeness P: because of N: wrath (lit. foam) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) Existential particle: there be not N: health P: in N: bones + pron suffix (1st sg) P: because of N: sin + pron suffix (1st sg). “YHWH, do not rebuke me in your anger, do not punish me in your wrath (lit. “foam”). For your poison arrows bring me down ... there is no soundness in my body because of your foaming face (i.e. anger), there is no health in my bones because of my sin” (Ps 38:2-4).¹⁴⁷

Dhorme (1963:11) indicates that בשר “flesh” originally designated the skin, or the visible part of the human body, whereas עצם “bone” denominated the internal elements.¹⁴⁸ Craigie (1983:303-4) correctly comments:

The ... description of unhealthy “flesh” and “bones” is a blanket description, the “flesh” specifying dermatological or surface complaints, the “bones” covering all internal complaints.

¹⁴⁵ Also see 4.2.8.

¹⁴⁶ For נחם “bring down” see VanGemeren (1991:307).

¹⁴⁷ Also see 4.2.9.1.

¹⁴⁸ Hence, no need to read it in its literal sense, “bones” (so Rawlinson 1950ps:298).

The psalmist understands these indispositions, which weighs him down, to be caused by anger. The way in which YHWH's arrows, as metaphor for anger,¹⁴⁹ are depicted in v 3, accords with the notion of a burden. They “come down” (נָחַר) on him, just as YHWH's hand “presses on” (נָחַר) him (cf. VanGemeren 1991:307).

The concept of affliction as a burden caused by anger also reflected in Psalm 88:8:

(260) עֲלֵי סִמְכָה חֲמַתְךָ וְכָל מִשְׁבְּרֶיךָ עֲנִיתָ

'ly smkh ḥmtk wkl mšbryk 'nyt.

P: on + pron suffix (1st sg) V: throw itself (qal pf 3rd sg, f)¹⁵⁰ N: foam [rage] + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and A: all P: with N: waves + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) V: overpower (pi pf 2nd sg, m).¹⁵¹

“Your anger attacks me, you have afflicted me with all your waves” (Ps 88:8).¹⁵²

Thus, we can identify two versions of the metaphor ANGER IS A BURDEN:

Version 1:

- The burden is (to control) anger/ to take revenge.
- The person carrying the burden is the angry person.

<i>Source:</i>	<i>Target:</i>
A burden is heavy to carry.	a) Anger is difficult to control. b) Wrongs must be avenged.
Weak people cannot carry burdens.	Fools vent their anger easily.

Version 2:

- The burden is the effect of anger.
- The person carrying the burden is the object of anger.

<i>Source:</i>	<i>Target:</i>
A burden is heavy to carry.	The effects of anger are serious.
One can get hurt from carrying too heavy a burden.	Too intense anger can cause severe injuries to the victim.

4.2.8 Anger is a Flood

The Hebrew Bible abounds in expressions that provide us with a rather complete image of the meaning that water had for the ancient Israelites (Raymond 1958:55). Because of its importance for life in general, it served as a very common source domain for a broad spectrum of metaphors:

¹⁴⁹ See 4.2.9.1.

¹⁵⁰ Instead of its usual meaning, “to support, lean on,” סָמַךְ appears to have the meaning “to lean on aggressively, attack,” as in Ezek 24:2 (Tate 1990:397).

¹⁵¹ Assuming the pi. perf. from עָנָה II “bow down, afflict,” with the suffix of the first colon, עָלַי, “on me” (Tate 1990:397).

¹⁵² Also see 4.2.8.1.

L'eau, l'eau présente, l'eau à portée de main, l'eau naissante dans les sources ou les torrents, l'eau qui ranime un paysage par sa lumière ou son bruit représente la vie. Il n'est donc pas étonnant que, plus encore que la pluie, l'eau sous ses formes diverses, dans sa puissance comme dans sa fluidité, ait été en Palestine l'objet de comparaisons et d'images multiples comme elle ... (Raymond 1958:54).

One of the most important sources of figurative speech from the domain of water in the Hebrew Bible is the torrent. Moses told Israel that the Promised Land would be “a land of streams of water and fountains” (ארץ נחלי מים עינת) (Deut 8:7). Raymond (1958:66-7) explains that this expression primarily concerns the numerous torrents that flow through Palestine, since those streams that have their origin in perennial springs are few and of little significance. In fact, most watercourses in Palestine are torrents that flow strongly in winter and are dry in summer (Raymond 1958:67).

To better understand the metaphoric use of torrents in the Hebrew Bible, we need to consider their nature more closely. They were unexpected white waters that could violently sweep along everything in its way:

The inhabitants of Palestine had special opportunity – lacking in Mesopotamia and Egypt – to experience the destructive power of the proud floods of Chaos: the numerous wadis can in the space of a single hour become engorged with water. The rain itself often falls somewhere in the mountains far out in the desert. The waters gather in the dry beds; then suddenly, perhaps even under a fair sky, the flood appears in a place remote from the area of precipitation and carries off with it both man and beast (Keel 1997:73).

This miraculous flood of waters as a sudden terrifying agent of death serves as an ideal candidate for one of the elements in the petrifying advance of God in the theophany (cf. Isa 30:28; Nah 1:8). As such, it also serves as an image for the wrath of God, since theophany is inextricably linked to the concept of anger (Jeremias 1965:1). This should not be surprising, since the nature of a torrent is indeed comparable to that of anger. Clinical psychologists commonly describe ire as an intense emotion of relatively short duration (Izard 1977:331). Not surprisingly, a proverb in the Hebrew Bible likens the expression of anger, metonymically presented as strife, with devastating, fast-flowing waters:

(261) פוטר מים ראשית מדרן ולפני התגלע הריב נטוש

pwtr mym r'syt mdwn wlpny htgl' hryb ntws

V: burst through (qal pt sg, m) N: water/s N: beginning (cs) N: quarrel C: and P: before V: break out (hitp pf 3rd sg, m) N: strife (def) V: abandon (qal imp sg, m).

“The beginning of strife is like waters breaking through; therefore abandon anger before it breaks

out” (Prov 17:14).¹⁵³

Many commentators take the root פטר “to send forth, bring out” (Lange 1869:162) to imply the making of a rift in the bank of a reservoir (cf. NIV “breaching a dam”; see also Lange 1869:162; Deane 1950:333; Lawson 1980:265-6; Ross 1991:1018 and Murphy 1998:130). These were common in ancient Israel because of the rarity of perennial springs in Palestine (Deane 1950:333). Lawson (1980:265) colourfully explains the resulting image:

When a breach is made in the bank that confines water, the water seizes the opportunity, widens the breach more and more, pours itself forth in mighty currents, and gathering new force continually, it soon becomes altogether irresistible, breaks through every obstacle in its way, and sweeps along everything that meets it, with a violence which cannot be controlled.

This image is quite compatible with that of wadi bursting through the ravines killing everything in its way. The association of water with an irresistible power of destruction made an even bigger impression on the ancient Israelite mind than its power to give life:

Etant donné l’importance de l’eau en Palestine, on peut s’attendre à rencontrer dans nos textes de fréquentes allusions à la fertilité qu’elle apporte. Celles-ci sont certes assez nombreuses, mais, chose étonnante, ce qui, bien avant cet aspect là a impressionné les habitants, c’est le mouvement, la force et la violence de l’eau, en même temps que le danger qu’elle fait courir; l’image est alors empruntée à la vision des crues irrésistibles des wadi ou des fleuves, voire au souvenir du Déluge (Raymond 1958:108).

As recurrent short-lived forces of destruction, these torrents also serve as an ideal figure of speech for the personality that has difficulty managing anger (Raymond 1958:108). Such a description is applied to Ruben in Genesis 49. Along with some LXX, Syrian and Targum versions of Genesis 49:4, פחזת should be emended to the verb of the same root in the second person singular (*BHS*). The stem in cognate Aramaic means, “to boil up, over” (Davidson 1967:623):

(262) פחזת כמים

pḥzt kmym

V: be rash (qal pf, 2nd sg, m) P: like N: water/s

“You are rash like waters” (Gen 49:4).¹⁵⁴

One of the characteristics of torrents that made an impression on the ancient Israelite mind, was its instability

¹⁵³ Also see 4.2.1.1.

¹⁵⁴ Notice the *double entendre* created by the reference to ‘frothing’ (cf. 4.1.7).

and fleeting nature:

À un moment donné le torrent est en crue; peu après il est couvert de glace; ensuite il se remet à couler puis disparaît totalement sous l'effet de la chaleur (Raymond 1958:108).

This feature is also attested in metaphorical descriptions of anger, where its transitory nature is emphasised. Job describes the torrents in vivid terms to detail the offence of his friends in Job 6:15-18 (cf. v 27). The description clearly focuses on the aspect of instability of wadi. The course of these torrents was highly irregular and often changed from time to time (Raymond 1958:67). The verb עבר “disappear” (Holladay 1971:263) in Job 6:15 brings this idea to the fore. Thus, anger expressed in violence is not only short-lived, but also unstable (Raymond 1958:108):

(263) אחי בגדו כמו נחל כאפיק נחלים יעברו

'hy bgdw kmw nhl k'pyq nhlym y'brw.

N: brothers + pron suffix (1st sg) V: cover (Strong 1961:19) (qal pf 3rd pl m) P: like N: torrent P: like N: channel (cs) N: floods V: disappear (qal impf 3rd pl, m).

“My brothers are deceitful as a flood, like beds of torrents they disappear” (Job 6:15).

However, the focus of the FLOOD metaphor is annihilation. It has already been mentioned that torrents are a more productive source of metaphoric transfer than rain (see above). The sudden flooding caused by these fast-moving waters horrified people living in ancient Israel:

Bien plus encore que la sécheresse annuelle qui tarissait la plupart des torrents, leurs crues subites, leur violence incoercible ont frappé l'imagination des hommes de l'Ancien Testament (Raymond 1958 :74).

The focus on obliteration is clearly evidenced by the multitude of Biblical Hebrew expressions describing the violence of these waters (cf. Gen 9:11; Jer 46:8; Ps 69:2, 16; Job 9:23; 22:11; etc). They testify to the fact that the fear of floods figured prominently in the ancient Israelite mind, and was a very productive source for metaphoric transfer:

Nous ne pouvons nous cacher l'importance de ces crues dans la vie et la pensée des Israélites, car la langue hébraïque elle-même nous en donne des indications évidentes. En effet, nous avons environ dix-neuf verbes différents qui décrivent la violence des eaux, ou la montée de leur niveau, et une douzaine de substantifs ou d'expressions substantivales qui expriment les mêmes idées, ainsi que les effets produits par les inondations (Raymond 1958:74).

In Psalm 66:12, the danger associated with water is placed next to fire, one of the most commonly used and

elaborated metaphors for anger in the Hebrew Bible:¹⁵⁵

(264) באנו באש ובמים

b'nw b's' wbmym.

V: went (qal, pf, 1st pl) P: in N: fire C: and N: water/s.

“We went through fire and waters” (Ps 66:12).

Dying by drowning was the worst death imaginable to the ancient Israelites (Raymond 1958:75). Water (מים) entering the throat (נפש) serves as a common symbol for panic and anxiety (cf. 2 Sam 22:5; Isa 8:8; Ps 69:3, 16). Unfortunately, this metaphor is sometimes obscured by translations that interpret נפש with “life” (so KJV; etc.) instead of “throat”:

Or, il est incontestable que, en akkadien, par une métonymie toute naturelle, le mot *napištu* a désigné l'organe par excellence d'où sort le souffle vital, le canal de la respiration, à savoir la gorge, et plus spécialement la partie visible de la gorge, le cou (Dhorme 1963:18).

This primary meaning of the word provides the key to the concept underlying the common Hebrew expression נפש עד מים (cf. Ps 69:2; Isa 30:28; Jon 2:6; etc.):

Quand Jonas s'écrie נפש עד מים (2:6), il ne veut pas dire “les eaux m'ont entouré jusqu'à m'ôter la vie” (*Segond*, etc. ...), mais “les eaux m'ont environné jusqu'à la gorge”, comme nous disons: avoir de l'eau jusqu'au cou (Dhorme 1963:19).

This expression is not limited to Jonah's narrow experience in the waters of the Mediterranean. It came to be utilised as a common figure for anxiety and fear. The words of the suppliant in Psalm 69:2 will suffice to illustrate the terror associated with this idea:

(265) הושיעני אלהים כי באו מים עד נפש

hwšy'ny 'lhyim ky b'w mym 'd npš.

V: save (hi imp, m) + pron suffix (1st sg) PN: Elohim/God C: because V: come (qal pf 3rd pl, m) N: water/s P: unto N: throat.

“Save me God, for the waters rise up to my throat” (Ps 69:2).

Again we are confronted with the close connection between fear and anger in the thought of the ancient Israelites. Although נפש עד מים can be regarded as an idiomatic expression indicating panic, it also clearly functions as a metaphor for divine wrath. In the cultic theophany in Isaiah 30:28 it is YHWH's anger (רעף) that rises up to the neck. Unfortunately, many scholars have failed to deduce meaning from this figurative

¹⁵⁵ See 4.2.2.

expression. Rawlinson (1950b:439) has labelled the metaphor “laboured and incongruous.” Watts (1985:403) has found the use of נחל ambiguous in this verse. Kruger (2000b:155-62) has suggested that the expression is inspired by the ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER metaphor indicating the rising of the fluid with the increase of intensity. Accordingly, the “breath” is said to “rise up to the neck.”

However, this locution is immediately followed by the infinitive construct of נפה “to wave, swing back and forth” (BDB, 631; cf. Watts 1985:403). Thus, we clearly have to do with the destructive power of a flood as an image of anger, which “sweeps those who try to cross it away” (Rawlinson 1950b:439). Accordingly, נחל שוטף עד צוואר can be regarded as a semantic equivalent of במים עד נפש, indicating the danger that the floodwaters pose to the throat of the ancient Israelite, as the seat of life and vitality (Dhorme 1963:18):

(266) ורוחו כנחל שוטף עד צוואר יחצה

wrwḥw knḥl šwṭp ‘d šw’r yḥšh.

C: and (consec) N: breath + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: like N: wadi V: violent (qal pt, sg, m)¹⁵⁶ P: unto N: neck V: reach to (qal impf 3rd sg, m).

“And his anger, like a violent torrent, reach unto the neck” (Isa 30:28).

The conceptualisation of anger as a flood in the theophany of Isaiah 30:27-33 is further strengthened by the inclusion of זרם “flood,” which is related to the verb of the same root: “to gush (as water), carry away, as with a flood” (Strong 1961:36) in v 30. Grogan (1986:199) points out that the image of a flood in these verses is probably related to the portrait of the great Euphrates overflowing as described in Chapter 8:7-8 where it is said that it passes even through Judah (cf. DELUGE below).

In yet another theophany, the flood serves as a warning against the enemies of YHWH of the power of his wrath (cf. Jeremias 1965:125). Although he is kind to those who trust in him (Nah 1:7), he is a terrible avenger to those who disobey him. The terror associated with this flood is illustrated by its juxtaposition with “darkness.” This parallel becomes more intelligible when one considers that the ancient Israelites thought of the dead as being covered by an infernal ocean. Death is like a deep hole, not only underneath the earth, but also underneath the waters. To die is to find oneself in a cistern (Raymond 1958:212):

(267) ובשטף עבר כלה יעשה בקמיו¹⁵⁷ ואיביו ירדה חשך

wbšṭp ‘br klh y‘šh bqmyw w’ybyw yrdp ḥšk.

C: but P: in + N: violent stream V: overflowing (qal pt sg, m) N: annihilation V: make (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: in + VN: uprising (qal pt sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and N: enemies + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: pursue (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: darkness.

“But in a violent, overflowing torrent he will bring annihilation in his anger, and his enemies will be

¹⁵⁶ For this reading of שטף see Raymond (1958:76).

¹⁵⁷ See BHS.

pursued by darkness” (Nah 1:8).

In Job 22:11, the torrent as metaphor for divine anger and punishment appears in parallel to “darkness” covering the object of wrath:

(268) או חשך לא תראה ושפעת מים הכסך

’w ḥšk l’ tr’h w šp’t mym tsk.

C: or N: darkness Neg particle: not V: see (qal impf 2nd sg, m) C: and N: flood (cs) N: water/s V: cover (pi impf 3rd sg, f) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).

“Or darkness that you cannot see and a flood of waters cover you” (Job 22:11).

On close investigation, FLOOD is a very common metaphor for anger in the Hebrew Bible. In Proverbs 27:4 we even encounter the construct שטף אף “the violent flood of wrath” (cf. Raymond 1958:76). Lange (1869:229) correctly remarks that this genitive relation can be interpreted as a combination of predicate and subject, “anger is a flood.” Hence we have the preposition: ANGER IS A FLOOD. Standing in parallel to words commonly used to denote violent anger, such as חמה, אף and קנאה, the aspect of demolition again predominates. Commenting on Proverbs 27:4, Deane (1950:515) says that anger is “the bursting forth of passion which, like a flood, carries all before it”:

(269) אכזריות חמה ושטף אף ומי יעמד לפני קנאה

’kzrywt ḥmh wšṭp ’p wmy y’md lpny qn’h.

N: cruelty (indef) N: froth (indef) C: and (conj) N: flood (indef) N: nose (indef) C: but [and] (consec) Interr pronoun: who V: stand (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: before N: fervour.

“Wrath is cruel and anger is outrageous; but who can stand before fervour?” (Prov 27:4).¹⁵⁸

In Psalm 38:5 the verb עבר, “to pass over” is utilised to create the image of a flood overpowering a victim. Commentators agree that this phrase creates an image of forceful waters (Rawlinson 1950a:298; VanGemeren 1991:307). The link with anger is also firmly established through a listing of three words for anger in v 2 and the presence of two other metaphors for anger in the same passage, namely, ANGER IS POISON, and ANGER IS A BURDEN.¹⁵⁹ In the phrase quoted below, “iniquities” metonymically stand for the anger and judgement associated with disobedience to the law (cause for effect, cf. v 2; Gen 4:13):

(270) כי עונתי עברו ראשי כמשא כבד יכבדו ממני

ky ’wnty ’brw r’sy kmś’ kbd ykbdw mmny.

C: because N: punishment (pl, f) + pron suffix (1st sg) V: go over (qal pf, 3rd pl, f) N: head + pron suffix (1st sg) P: as N: burden A: heavy V: be heavy (qal impf 3rd pl) P: from + pron suffix (1st sg).

¹⁵⁸ Also see 4.1.14.

¹⁵⁹ See 4.2.9 and 4.2.7 respectively.

“For my iniquities have gone over my head, like a heavy burden they are too heavy for me” (Ps 38:5).¹⁶⁰

The root עברה is again used in Hosea 5:10 to depict anger in terms of an overflowing flood. The verb שפך is normally used with אף and חמה as direct objects conveying the image of foam exuding from the face of an angry individual.¹⁶¹ The expression in this verse, however, may be motivated by the image of the violent torrents of a Palestinian wadi (Raymond 1958:109):

(271) עליהם אשפוך כמים עברתי

'lyhm 'špwk kmym 'brty.

P: on + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) V: pour (qal impf 1st sg) P: like N: water/s (def) N: overflowing + pron suffix (1st sg).

“I will pour my anger on them like waters” (Hos 5:10).¹⁶²

The image of a torrent makes visible divine anger against a malevolent individual in Job 24:18 (Raymond 1958:109). The expression על פני מים simply indicates the surface of the waters, that is to be contrasted with the invisible waters (Dhorme 1963:50-1):

(272) קל הוא על פני מים

ql hw' 'l pny mym.

A: swift Pronoun: he P: on N: face (cs) N: waters.

“He is swift, [as] the surface of the waters” (Job 24:18).

Reference has already been made above to Hosea 10:7, where we encounter the phrase, כקצף על פני מים, “like foam on the face of the water” (cf. Cohen 1979:25). This expression stands in the context of divine judgement on Israel. By implication, the king of Samaria will drown and so die the most horrific death imaginable (cf. Raymond 1958:184). The mention of קצף may very well evoke a *double entendre*, for, as we have seen, this root is commonly used to denote foam at the mouth as a metonymy for anger:¹⁶³

(273) נדמה שמרון מלכה כקצף על פני מים

ndmh šmrwn mlkh kqsp 'l pny mym.

V: be silent (ni pf 3rd sg, m) N: Samaria N: king + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) P: like P: on N: face (cs) N: waters.

¹⁶⁰ Also see 4.

¹⁶¹ See 4.1.10.

¹⁶² Also see 4.2.1.

¹⁶³ See 4.1.8.

“The king of Samaria is quiet as foam on the surface of the waters” (Hos 10:7).¹⁶⁴

Hosea 10:7 is not the only reference where קצף is mentioned in the context of the ANGER IS A FLOOD metaphor. In Isaiah 54:8, the root שצף, a variant for שטף, “violent inundation” (Raymond 1958:76) stands in parallel with this root for anger (Raymond 1958:109):

(274) בשצף קצף הסתרתי פני רגע ממך

bššp qšp hstrty pny rg‘ mmk.

P: in N: violent inundation N: foam V: hide (hi pf 1st sg) N: face + pron suffix (1st sg) N: while P: from + pron suffix (2nd sg, f).

“With a flood of anger I hid my face from you for a short while” (Isa 54:8).

In Isaiah 59:19, the “breath” (רוח) of YHWH, which is also commonly used in the context of anger, is compared to a “fleet river” (נהר צר; cf. Raymond 1958:109) that chases the enemy away. The ancient Israelites understood that floods were something irresistible that destroyed and swept away everything in its way, as it did in the blink of an eye with the troops of Sisera (Judg 5:21; cf. Raymond 1958:75):

(275) כי יבוא כנהר צר רוח יהוה נססה בו

ky ybw‘ knhr šr rwḥ yhwḥ nssh bw.

C: because V: come (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: like + N: river (def) A: narrow N: breath (cs) PN: Yahweh V: drive onward (pol pf 3rd sg, f) P: in + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“For the anger of YHWH comes like a fast-flowing river and drives him onward” (Isa 59:19).

It is not without significance that drowning waters were conceptualised as a monster of chaos in the ancient Near East (cf. Allen 1983:162-3). In Psalm 124:4-5 the anger of an opponent is described in terms of a threatening flood. Some scholars have pointed out that the image of the chaos monster is evoked by the use of the verb בלע I, “to swallow” (Holladay 1971:41). Although this mythological beast is usually associated with the sea, these few verses seem to draw a link with the Palestinian wadi (נחלה). The repetitive reference to the floodwaters (המים “the flood,” נחלה “the torrent,” הזידונים “the raging waters,” NIV) may reinforce the notion of its speed and power.

Analogous to the characterisation of anger as a flood in the theophany in Isaiah 30:28, the threatening danger of the flood to the essence of life is again emphasised through the restatement of עבר על נפשנו “going over our throats.” The menace of the waters attacking the organ of breathing is obvious:

La racine commune aux langues sémitiques *nafas* ou *nafaš* a le sens de “souffle” ou de “respiration”. C’est par la respiration que le corps vivant atteste sa vitalité. Mourir, c’est

¹⁶⁴ Also see 4.1.10.

cesser de respirer (Dhorme 1963:18).

As usual, the image created serves as an excellent image for brutal anger (Allen 1983:162-3):

(276) אזי חיים בלעונו בחרות אפם בנו אזי המים שטפונו נחלה עבר על נפשנו אזי עבר על נפשנו המים
הזידונים

*'zy ḥyym bl'wnw bḥrwt 'pm bnw 'zy hmym šṭpwnw nḥlh 'br 'l npšnw 'zy
'br 'l npšnw hmym hzydwnym.*

C: then A: alive (pl) V: swallow (qal pf 3rd pl) + pron suffix (1st pl) P: in V: be hot (qal inf cs) N: nose + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: with + pron suffix (1st pl). C: then N: waters (def) V: wash away (qal pf 3rd pl) + pron suffix (1st pl) N: wadi V: go over (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: over N: neck + pron suffix (1st pl). C: then V: go over (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: over N: neck + pron suffix (1st pl) N: waters (def) A: raging.

“Then they would have swallowed us alive, so furious was their anger against us. Then the waters would have overwhelmed us, the torrent would have gone above our necks, then it would have gone above our necks – those raging waters” (Ps 124:3-5; translation by Allen 1983:162).

In Isaiah 10:26 the same figure of speech stands next to another metaphor for anger, namely ANGER IS POISON.¹⁶⁵ The vehicle is בזהר, a root which, according to Strong (1961:62), originally meant “to be liquid, to flow easily.” This connotation, in the context of anger, evidently calls to mind the violent movement of a Palestinian torrent:

(277) כי הנני מקים את הכשדים הגוי המר והנמהר
ky hnny mqym 't hkśdym hgwy hmr whnmhr.

C: because Particle of focus: behold V: raise up (hi pt sg, m) Nota accusativi + N: Chaldeans N: nation A: bitter/poisonous C: and A: impetuous (ni pt 3rd sg, m).

“For behold, I raise up the Chaldeans, the ruthless and impetuous nation” (Hab 1:6).

The use of the FLOOD metaphor outside of the domain of anger substantiates its focus on total destruction. In Daniel 11:40 it serves as a figure for the devastating feat of an invading army:

(278) ובא בארצות ושטף ועבר
wb' b'ršwt wšṭp w'br.

C: and V: come (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: in N: countries (def) C: and V: flood (qal pf 3rd sg, m) C: and V: go over (qal pf 3rd sg, m).

“And he came to the countries, flooded and [violently] went through them” (Dan 11:40).

¹⁶⁵ See 4.2.9.

From what was stated above, it may be concluded that the torrent, as perilous fast-flowing water, serves as a very effective metaphor for anger. When used of divine anger, this metaphor emphasises God's irresistible strength and swift punishment of anyone who dares to resist his will. It therefore serves equally well as a metaphor for the force, power and violence associated with human anger (cf. Prov 17:14).

When one considers the focus and the scope of the FLOOD metaphor, it is not surprising that the aesthetic appreciation of water seems to be totally absent in the Hebrew Bible (cf. Raymond 1958:116). When not used as a figure for anger, it symbolises the overpowering might of invading enemies (Hillers 1964:70-1):

(279) מצרים כיאר יעלה וכנהרות יתגעשו מים ויאמר אעלה אכסה ארץ אבידה עיר וישבי בה
mšrym ky'r y'lh wknhrwt ytg'sw mym wy'mr 'lh 'ksh 'rṣ 'bydh 'yr wyšby bh.

PN: Egypt P: like N: flood V: go up (qal impf 3rd sg, m) C: and P: like N: rivers V: move (hitp impf 3rd pl, m) N: waters C: and V: say (qal impf 3rd sg, m) V: rise up (qal impf 1st sg) V: cover (pi impf 1st sg) N: earth V: destroy (hi coh sg) N: city C: and N: inhabitants (cs) P: in + pron suffix (3rd sg, f).

“Egypt rises up like a flood and his waters are moved like the rivers; and he says: ‘I will go up and cover the earth; I will destroy the city and the inhabitants thereof’” (Jer 46:8).

The metaphor can best be summarised as follows:

- The torrent is anger.
- The people drowned by the flood are the objects of anger.

<i>Source:</i>	<i>Target:</i>
A torrent is ruinous.	Anger is violent.
Torrents advance quickly and unexpectedly.	Anger can break out quickly and unexpectedly.
Torrents don't last for long.	Anger quickly subsides.
All life is defenceless against a torrent.	Nobody can resist the force of anger.
Floods often drown people.	Anger often leads to death.

4.2.8.1 Other Related Metaphors

In view of the fact that the Hebrew Bible is primarily a product of ancient Israel, it is understandable that the TORRENT metaphor, which is motivated by the Palestinian wadis, dominates with respect to the figurative use of water. However, we also encounter several expressions that are better explained in terms of the Mesopotamian deluge or the sea. Although the focus of these metaphors is the same, the conceptual frameworks that they represent seem to be slightly different.

As can be expected, the metaphors for anger that were motivated by the deluge reflect conceptions that are based on the nature of this phenomenon (cf. Raymond 1958:77-8). Interestingly, the deluge is sometimes described in Palestinian terms (Job 22:16; cf. Raymond 1958:77). However, its existence in this geographical region is totally unimaginable (Raymond 1958:77-8).¹⁶⁶ The few remaining examples of ANGER IS A DELUGE in the Hebrew Bible need only briefly be mentioned.

The Story of the Flood in the Bible has inspired many a Sunday school lesson. Even in the sophisticated Western civilisation it has acquired mythic nature. One would never expect the story to be one of fierce divine violence. Indeed, the focus of the stories in the Sunday school classroom is the love, grace and salvation of God who decided to save a handful. He was so merciful that Noah had time to preach and pray, probably after the rains of winter had already started to fall, for the lost souls of those who continued to disregard the word of YHWH. This stands in stark contrast with the swiftness and unexpectedness of divine judgement so characteristic of the ANGER IS A TORRENT metaphor discussed above.

The reason for the significant divergence in the conceptualisation of anger expressed in these two metaphors is evident. The nature of the deluge, which was primarily associated with Mesopotamia in the time of the Hebrew Bible, differs significantly from the Palestinian wadi. The deluge corresponds to the flood of the Euphrates in winter and to the winter rains (Raymond 1958:78):

Il y eut conjonction en un pays plat d'une pluie torrentielle de longue durée *et* d'une montée exceptionnellement forte du fleuve, sur une vaste étendue. Pour le Cananéen, une inondation restait toujours quelque chose de relativement local à cause de la nature même du pays, montagneux, cloisonné par des chaînes de collines, donc très différent des plaines babyloniennes. Par ailleurs, là où le Mésopotamien eut l'impression que l'eau venait à la fois d'en haut *et* d'en bas, le Cananéen, lui, ne pouvait imaginer spontanément un bouleversement dû à l'éclatement des sources d'en bas, ce qui est caractéristique dans le cas du récit du Déluge (Raymond 1958:78).

Given this, it becomes intelligible why there were no references to violent white waters in the Story of Noah and the Flood (Gen 7). The words used to describe the intimidating waters, גבר, “swell, rise” (Holladay 1971:55) and רבה, “become great” (Holladay 1971:330) focus on the volume of the waters, not their violent movement (Gen 7:17-18; Raymond 1958:78).

(280) ויהי המבול ארבעים יום על הארץ וירבו המים וישאו את התבה ותרם מעל הארץ ויגברו
 המים וירבו מאד על הארץ ותלך התבה על פני המים
wyhy hmbwl 'rb'ym ywm 'l h'rs wyrbw hnym wys'w 't htbh wtrm m'l h'rs

¹⁶⁶ For an example of how the environment affects the adaptation of metaphor, see Dirvin (1994:11-2).

wygbw hmy m wyrbw m'd 'l h'rš wtlk htbh 'l pny hmy m.

C: and (consec) + V: be (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: deluge A: forty N: day P: on N: earth C: and (consec) V: become great (qal impf 3rd pl) N: water/s (def) C: and V: lift up [rose up] (qal impf 3rd pl) Nota accusativi N: ark (f, def) C: and (consec) V: rise up (qal impf 3rd sg, f) P: from + P: on N: earth (def) C: and (consec) V: rise (qal impf 3rd pl) N: water/s (def) C: and V: become great (qal impf 3rd pl) Adv: very P: on N: earth (def) C: and (consec) V: go (qal impf 3rd sg, f) N: ark (f, def) P: on N: face (cs) N: water/s (def).

“And the deluge was on the earth for forty days, and the waters increased and lifted the ark up and rose up from the face of the earth. The waters rose and attained great volumes, and the ark started to float” (Gen 7:17-18).

Similarly, the descriptive verb, הָיָה, “to be,” that we find in Genesis 7:6, 10 and 17 is static. In the above verses, the ark is described as being lifted, not swept away, as it would be in the equivalent Palestinian metaphor, ANGER IS A TORRENT. Further, the water covers (כִּסָּה) the earth. It doesn’t run as in Palestine (Raymond 1958:78).

The scarcity of metaphoric expressions for anger in the Hebrew Bible that were motivated by the image of a deluge is not unanticipated. The slow increase of hostile waters is hardly comparable to the nature of anger, which is commonly described as a very intense, short-lived emotion (cf. Izard 1977:329-34). That is why most translations wrongly interpret the description of divine anger in Genesis 6:6 as an indication of grief (so KJV, etc). Although the heart is rarely associated with anger in the Hebrew Bible, this verse, in accordance with its Mesopotamian origin, draws a clear link between the heart and anger (cf. Dhorme 1963:118-9):

(281) וַיִּנְחַם יְהוָה כִּי עָשָׂה אֱת הָאָדָם בְּאֶרֶץ וַיִּתְעַצֵּב אֱלֹהִים לְבוֹ

wynḥm yhwḥ ky ‘šh ’t h’dm b’rš wyt‘šb ’l lbw.

C: and V: breathe strongly (Strong 1961:77) PN: YHWH C: because V: make (qal pf 3rd sg, m) Nota accusativi N: man (def) P: on N: earth (def) C: and V: cut oneself (hitp 3rd sg, m) P: to N: heart + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“And YHWH was wroth because he made man on the earth and he became furious” (Gen 6:6).¹⁶⁷

Images for divine anger inspired by Egyptian floods also prove to be much more comparable to the ANGER IS A DELUGE metaphor of Mesopotamian origin than to the Palestinian ANGER IS A TORRENT. The image is that of rising waters:

(282) וַאֲדַנִּי יְהוָה הַצְבָּאוֹת הַנוֹגַע בְּאֶרֶץ וַתִּמּוֹג ... וְעִלְתָּה כִּי־אֵר כְּלָה וְשָׁקַעָה כִּי־אֵר מִצְרַיִם

w’dny yhwḥ ḥšb’wt hnwg‘ b’rš wtmwg ... w’lth ky’r klh wšq’h ky’r mšrym.

¹⁶⁷ Also see 4.1.2.

C: and PN: Adonai PN: YHWH (cs) N: hosts (def) V: smite (qal pt sg, m) N: land C: and V: melt (qal impf 3rd sg, f) ... C: and V: rise (qal pf 3rd sg, f) P: like N: flood Indef pronoun: all + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) C: and V: sink down (qal pf 3rd sg, f) P: like N: flood (cs) PN: Egypt.

“And Adonai, YHWH of the hosts will smite the land, and it will melt ... and all of it will rise like a flood, and it will be overflowed as by the flood of Egypt” (Am 9:5).¹⁶⁸

Although the focus of the ANGER IS A DELUGE metaphor is also annihilation and destruction (cf. Gen 6:17), its relation to the ideal cognitive model of anger in ancient Israel is much less pronounced. The incompatibility of the nature of the Mesopotamian deluge and the predominant experiential concomitants of anger may have contributed to the dissociation of divine anger and feeling. The ANGER IS A DELUGE metaphor is one of the only figures for anger in the Hebrew Bible that is reconcilable with the concept of divine anger as a justifiable act of retribution devoid of passionate feeling (see Chapter 2). An anger that is likened to a deluge that rises slowly may indeed be considered impassable. However, it needs to be stated that this metaphor was foreign to ancient Israel and probably lost its impetus and disappeared over time. In fact, the figure of a deluge for anger is limited to the story of Noah and the flood in the Hebrew Bible. The term for deluge, *מבול*, and its variant, *מי המבול*, are mere technical terms in the Hebrew Bible and their use is restricted to the catastrophic event of Genesis 6 and 7 (Raymond 1958:78). Other references to the Mesopotamian deluge as a figure for anger are usually adapted to fit the ecological background of ancient Palestine. For example, the flooding of the Euphrates as described in Isaiah 8:7-8 shows similarities with the ANGER IS A TORRENT metaphor described above. The focal point is the violent movement of the water rather than its volume and constant rising:

(283) ולכן הנה אדני מעלה עליהם את מי הנהר העצומים והרבים את מלך אשור ואת כל כבודו ועלה
 על כל אפיקיו והלך על כל גדותיו וחלף ביהודה שטף ועבר עד צואר יגיע
*wlkn hnh ' dny m'lh 'lyhm't my hnhr h'swmyw whrbym w'lh 'l kl 'pyqyw
 whlk 'l kl gdwtiw whlp byhwdh štp w'br 'd šw'r ygy'.*

C: and C: therefore Particle of focus: look PN: Adonai/lord V: make go up (hi pt sg, m) P: over + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) Nota accusativi N: water/s (cs) N: river (def) A: mighty C: and A: great Nota accusativi N: king (cs) N: Assur C: and Nota accusativi A: all N: weight + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and V: go up (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: over A: all N: stream-channels + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and V: go (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: over A: all N: river-banks + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and V: pass through P: in N: Judah V: flood (qal pf 3rd sg, m) C: and V: pass over P: to N: neck V: touch (hi impf 3rd sg, m).

“Therefore, behold, Adonai will make the waters go up over them; the mighty and great river – the king of Assyria and all his power. He will go over all his stream-channels and overflow his river-

¹⁶⁸ Also see 4.1.11.

banks, passing through Judah and reaching up to the neck” (Isa 8:7-8).

Apart from this, the use of שָׁכַךְ “to go down, abate” (Holladay 1971:369) with reference to anger in Esther 2:1 and 7:10 may also be metaphoric. The verb is used in Genesis 8:1 to image the drop in water levels after the deluge that destroyed the objects of divine wrath:

(284) אַחַר הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה כַּשֶּׁךְ¹⁶⁹ חַמַּת הַמֶּלֶךְ

’ḥr hdbrym h’lh kšk ḥmt hmlk.

P: after N: thing (pl) Demonstr pronoun: these P: as V: go down, abate (qal inf cs) N: anger (cs) N: king (def).

“After these things, as the anger of the king abated ...” (Esth 2:1; ZK, see also 7:10).¹⁷⁰

The metaphor can be summarised as follows:

- The deluge is anger.
- The people drowned by the flood are the objects of anger.
- The drop in water levels after the deluge is anger subsiding.

<i>Source:</i>	<i>Target:</i>
A deluge is disastrous.	Anger can be dangerous.
A deluge slowly but consistently builds up force.	Anger sometimes slowly builds up until it eventually gets out of control.
A deluge last for months.	Anger can last long.
A deluge is one of the most feared perils of life (in ancient Mesopotamia).	Divine anger is terrifying.

THE SEA

The concept of the sea in the mind of the ancient Israelite is as vast as the ocean itself (Raymond 1958:163). For long, the sea remained something profoundly alien and unknown to the ancient Israelite, since they were not sailors by nature (Raymond 1958:164). Unlike their conceptions regarding floods, which were based on experience, their ideas of the sea were chiefly based on the fear for the unknown (Raymond 1958:163-4). The hiatus between the life of the ancient Israelite and the life of the sea can be attributed to the fact that they were a people who had come out from the steppes into the arable land and maintained strong ties with their past (Raymond 1958:163; Keel 1997:74). Furthermore, they had no major harbour at their disposal, and grievous disasters at sea were not uncommon due to the flimsy construction of ships (Keel 1997:74).

This said, there are remarkable similarities in the application of the torrent and the sea as source

¹⁶⁹ See Footnote 91.

¹⁷⁰ Also see 4.2.1.1.

domains for metaphoric transfer. Just like the flood, the sea served as symbol for the enemy, danger and death (Raymond 1958:180). There is at least one v where the ocean, due to its power as an irresistible element, serves as a figure for divine anger (Raymond 1958:180). Psalm 88:8 and 18 put the rage (חמה) of God in close parallel with the waters and its hammering waves (משברים):

(285) עלי סמכה חמתך וכל משברריך עניה

'ly smkh hmtk wkl mšbryk 'nyt.

P: on + pron suffix (1st sg) V: throw itself (qal pf 3rd sg, f)¹⁷¹ N: foam [rage] + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and A: all P: with N: waves + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) V: overpower (pi pf 2nd sg, m).¹⁷²

“Your anger attacks me, you have afflicted me with all your waves” (Ps 88:8).¹⁷³

In v 18, the metaphor is used in conjunction with the figures of foaming at the mouth and poison.

(286) עלי עברו חרוניך בעותיך צמתחוני סבוני כמים כל היום הקיפו עלי יחד

'ly 'brw hrwnyk b'wtyk šmtwtynsbwny kmym kl hywm hqypw 'ly yhr.

P: over + pron suffix (1st sg) V: go over (qal pf 3rd pl) N: anger (pl) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) N: terrors + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) V: silence (pilp pf 3rd pl) + pron suffix (1st sg) V: surround (qal pf 3rd pl) + pron suffix (1st sg) P: like N: water/s A: all N: day (def) V: encircle (hi pf 3rd pl) P: on + pron suffix (1st sg) Adv: together.

“Your anger covered me, your terrors silenced me. They surrounded me all day long, together they encircled me” (Ps 88:18).

Much the same as the TORRENT and the DELUGE metaphors, the SEA metaphor does not limit itself to anger as a target domain. In analogy to the above-mentioned metaphors, its scope includes the target of powerful invading enemies. Once more the focus is the movement of the waves that overpowers helpless victims:

(287) הנני עליך צר והעליתי עליך גוים רבים כהעלות הים לגליו

hnni 'lyk šr wh'lyty 'lyk gwym rbyim kh'ltw hym lglyw.

Particle of focus: behold P: against + pron suffix (2nd pl, m) PN: Tyre C: and (consec) V: bring up (hi pf 1st sg) P: against + pron suffix (2nd pl, m) N: nations A: many P: as V: bring up (hi inf cs) N: sea (def) P: to N: waves + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“Behold, I am against you, Tyre; and I will rise many nations up against you, as the sea rises up its waves” (Ezek 26:3).

(288) עלה על בבל הים בהמון גליו נכסתה

'lh 'l bbl hym bmwn glyw nksth.

¹⁷¹ See Footnote 153.

¹⁷² See Footnote 151.

¹⁷³ Also see 4.2.7.

V: go up (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: against PN: Babylon N: the sea P: with N: agitation (cs) N: waves + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: be covered (ni pf 3rd sg, f).

“The sea rises up against Babylon; she is covered with its agitated waves” (Jer 51:42).

The conceptual link between the TORRENT, DELUGE and SEA metaphors is incontrovertible. The association is evidenced not only by the shared scope, but also in the joint focus. All three metaphors emphasise the danger of moving waters to the essence of life. They threaten to cover the throat and thereby violently take away life. Of these three metaphors, the ANGER IS A TORRENT metaphor dominates and even seems to have influenced the development of the other two metaphors in the Hebrew Bible. The ANGER IS THE SEA metaphor is slightly more specific in that the threatening waters are usually identified as waves:

- The sea is anger.
- The waves of the sea are the outbursts of anger
- The people drowned by the waves are the objects of anger.

<i>Source:</i>	<i>Target:</i>
The sea is dangerous and much feared.	Anger is very dangerous.
The force of the sea is irresistible.	The force of anger is irresistible.
The waves of the sea threaten to overpower and drown victims.	Anger outbursts can kill victims.

Any consideration of the SEA metaphor would be incomplete without reference to the ancient Near Eastern myth of the battle between some divinity and the sea monster. In the theophany of Nahum 1, the rivers (נהרות) are mentioned with the sea (ים) as YHWH’s opponent. This suggests an influence of the Ugaritic version of the myth, where both ים and נהר are understood as the conquered enemies of Baal (Jeremias 1965:93). Ugaritic texts also name the rivers (נהרים) in parallel to the depths as abode of El (Jeremias 1965:93). Hence, נהרות/נהרים should be understood as the prehistoric sources of the sea that were conquered before creation, according to the Babylonian version of the myth (Jeremias 1965:92-3).

V 2 puts this mythological theme in the context of YHWH’s advent in anger (Jeremias 1965:32). He is pictured as an avenger that does not tolerate injustice. The hymn functions as a psalm praising the power of YHWH’s anger that brought the formidable Assyria to its knees (Jeremias 1965:5; Klopfenstein 1997:35):

(289) גוער בים ויבשהו וכל הנהרות החריב

gw‘r bym wybšhw wkl hnhrwt hḥryb.

V: subdue (qal pt sg, m) P: in N: sea C: and V: dry up (qal [hi? cf. BHS] pf 3rd sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and A: all N: rivers (sources) V: dry up (hi pf 3rd sg, m).

“He subdues the sea and dries it up. He parches all the sources” (Nah 1:4a).

This aspect of divine anger is clearly of more import for theology than for an understanding of the

phenomenology of anger as an emotion. Klopfenstein (1997:33-43) has shown that the verb that is most commonly used in the context of this myth, גער, “to subdue,” (*anherrschen*), is often used in parallel with other words for anger, such as חמה (Isa 51:20), קצף (Isa 54:9) and אף (Ps 18:16).¹⁷⁴ The primary use of גער may therefore be to indicate the power of God’s anger in subduing the mythological forces of chaos, such as ׀ (Nah 1:4) and רהב (Job 26:11-12) (Klopfenstein 1997:43).

4.2.9 Anger is Poison

It has been noted above that foam at the mouth was commonly used in the Hebrew Bible to metonymically indicate anger.¹⁷⁵ This use probably derived from the perception of epileptic attacks as some extreme form of anger (Gruber 1980:540). Significantly, this foam forming at the mouth of angry individuals was considered poisonous in the ancient world:

The popular view of epilepsy as “contagious” goes back ... to Antiquity, when people used to spit before an epileptic and refused to eat and drink from the same dishes with him. The demon driven out of the epileptic boy by Jesus was also called an “unclean spirit” in the Gospel. “Unclean” in the meaning of the cult usually indicated an object whose presence or touch might prove disastrous (Temkin 1994:114-5).

This belief continued into the Middle Ages, where people were advised to avoid epileptics at all costs if they valued their lives (Temkin 1994:115). As a consequence of this principle, epileptics in the ancient Near East tried to avoid publicity of their attacks where possible (Wilson 1967:202).

It may not be without implication that one of the Classical Hebrew words for “foam,” indicating anger, also has the meaning “poison.” Cohen (1979:25) has shown that Hebrew חמה and its Akkadian etymological counterpart *imtu* share the meanings “foam, poison, wrath.” This adds force to the depictions of angry divinities spilling foam from their mouths. In analogy to the Akkadian god Nergal who pours foam on his victims as a form of judgement (Gruber 1980:537), YHWH of the Hebrew Bible punishes his opponents in a similar way:

(290) וכלה אפי והנחותי חמתי במ והנחמתי וידעו כי אני יהוה דברתי בקנאתי בכלותי חמתי במ
*wkllh 'py whnḥwty ḥmty bm whnḥmty wyd'w ky 'ny yhwh dbrty bqn'ty
 bklwty ḥmty bm.*

C: and V: waste away (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: nose + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and V: lower (hi pf 1st sg)
 N: anger (lit. poisonous foam) + pron suffix (1st sg) P: with + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) C: and V:

¹⁷⁴ See 4.1.10.

¹⁷⁵ See 4.1.10.

scheme revenge (hitp pf 1st sg) C: and V: know (qal pf 3rd pl) C: that Pronoun: I PN: YHWH V: speak (pi pf 1st sg) P: in N: zeal + pron suffix (1st sg) P: in V: complete (pi inf cs) + pron suffix (1st sg) N: wrath (lit. poisonous foam) + pron suffix (1st sg) P: with + pron suffix (3rd pl, m).

“My nose will waste away and my poisonous foam will rest on them; I will be avenged and they will know that I, YHWH have spoken in my zeal by spending my anger on them” (Ezek 5:13).

In Ezekiel 20:13, the verb כָּלָה, which usually has חַמָּה or אֵשׁ as object (cf. Ezek 5:13; 20:8; 20:21; etc.), is used to indicate the disastrous effect of contact with the foam when it is used with the meaning “consume” with regards to the objects of wrath:

(291) וְאָמַר לְשֹׁפֵךְ חַמְתִּי עֲלֵיהֶם בַּמִּדְבָּר לְכַלּוֹתָם

w’mr lšpk ḥmty ‘lyhm bmdbr lklwtm.

C: and V: say, think (qal impf 1st sg) P: to V: pour (qal inf cs) N: wrath (lit. poisonous foam) + pron suffix (1st sg) P: on + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: in N: desert P: to V: finish (pi inf cs) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m).

“Then I thought I would pour out my poisonous foam on them in the wilderness to annihilate them” (Ezek 20:13; cf. Block 1997; 633).

The conceptualisation of the foam exuding from the mouth of angry persons as poison may also have led to the belief that epilepsy was caused by poison. This explanation was favoured from very early on. Aristotle attributed epileptic attacks to evaporations from food (Temkin 1994:56). The Epicurean philosopher, Lucretius, argued that a sharp poison caused the disease, after which it returned to its frame (Temkin 1994:56). Based on this, medieval physicians developed a theory of vapours. According to this theory, vapours rose to the head from a very poisonous, horrible liquid in the body, thus causing epilepsy (Temkin 1994:129). Renaissance physicians also accepted this theory of poisonous vapours (Temkin 1994:198-9). In the Enlightenment irritating agents as a cause for the disease started to be questioned (Temkin 1994:214). However, modern medicine confirmed the link between poisoning and epilepsy (Temkin 1994:284).

Poisonous substances in the body may also have been conceptualised as the cause for epilepsy as intense anger in the ancient Near East. The Ethiopian etymological counterpart of חַמָּה means “bile” (Köhler & Baumgartner 1958:309). In the Hebrew Bible, too, one of the words for bile, שֶׁרָא, is used to denote the poison of asps (Deut 32:33; Job 20:16). The conceptual link between poisonous bile and epileptic attacks in the Hebrew Bible is further attested to by the fact that another word for bile, מִרְרָה, is generally used in the same way as חַמָּה (Cohen 1971:703). This is also demonstrated by the Akkadian lexical equation *imtum* “poison” = *martum* “gall,” where *martum* is the Akkadian etymological and semantic equivalent of Hebrew מִרְרָה (Cohen 1971:703). In addition, the etymology of the Biblical Hebrew word for bile, מִרְרָה, includes the meanings “poison, venom” (Cohen 1971:703). The belief that anger and epilepsy was caused by

poisonous bile explains the use of מרה and מרר with the sense, “to embitter, provoke to anger” (Davidson 1967:514-5, 517):

(292) וימרו על ים

wymrw 'l ym.

C: and V: embitter (hi impf 3rd pl, m). P: on N: sea.

“And they provoked him to anger by the sea” (Ps 106:7).

The use of מררה and its related roots in connection with anger should be considered in view of the etymology, “gall, poison.” In parallel to other cultures in the ancient and modern world, the ancient Israelites thought of anger as caused by poisonous bile rising to the head and spilling through the mouth in the form of spittle. This seems to be the only plausible explanation for the use of the Biblical Hebrew expression for anger, מר נפש “poison/bitterness of throat.” It suggests that the ancient Israelites associated strong anger with a poisonous substance in the body that rose to the throat in the event of provocation. Several examples where the expression denotes anger deserve quotation:

(293) אחה ידעת את אביך ואת אנשיו כי גברים המה מרי נפש המה כדב שכול בשדה

'th yd't 't 'byk w't 'nšyw ky gbrym hmh w'mry npš hmh kdb škwl bśdh.

Pronoun: you V: know (qal pf 2nd sg, m) Nota accusativi N: father + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and Nota accusativi N: men + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: for N: mighty (men) Pronoun: they A: bitter (pl, cs) N: throat Pronoun: they P: like N: bear A: bereaved P: in N: field.

“You know your father and his men: For they are mighty men and they are angry like a she-bear robbed of her cubs in the field” (2 Sam 17:8).¹⁷⁶

(294) ויתקבצו אליו כל איש ... מר נפש

wytqbšw 'lyw kl 'yš ... mr npš.

C: and V: gather (hitp impf 3rd pl, m) P: to + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) Indef pronoun: all N: men ... A: bitter (cs) N: throat.

“And everyone that was angry gathered with him” (1 Sam 22:2).

(295) פן יפגעו בכם אנשים מרי נפש ואספתה נפשך

pn ypg'w bkm 'nšym mry npš w'spt npšk.

C: lest V: pursue (qal impf 3rd pl, m) P: with + pron suffix (2nd pl, m) N: men A: bitter (pl, cs) N: throat C: and V: loose (qal pf 2nd sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) N: throat + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).

“Lest angry men attack you and you lose your life” (Judg 18:25).

¹⁷⁶ Also see 4.2.11.

(296) אדברה בצר רוחי אשיחה במר נפשי

'dbrh bšr rwḥy 'šyḥh bmr npšy.

V: speak (qal coh sg) P: in N: tightness (cs) N: breath + pron suffix (1st sg) V: complain (qal coh sg)
P: in A: bitterness (cs) N: throat.

“I will speak in my anger; I will complain in my indignation” (Job 7:11).

(297) אמרו העם לסקלו כי מרה נפש כל העם

'mrw h'm lsqllw ky mrh npš kl h'm.

V: speak (qal pf 3rd pl) N: people (def) P: to V: stone (qal inf cs) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: because
A: bitter/ poisonous N: throat (cs) A: all N: people (def).

“The people spoke of stoning him for they were all angry” (1 Sam 30:6).

Finally, Elisha interprets the gesture of contempt by a woman whom he has disappointed as an expression of anger in 2 Kings 4:27 by using the expression *נפשה מרה לה* “her throat is bitter to her”:

(298) הרפה לה כי נפשה מרה לה

hrph lh ky npšh mrh lh.

V: leave alone (hi imp, m) P: to + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) C: because N: throat + pron suffix (3rd sg, f)
A: poisonous (f) P: to + pron suffix (3rd sg, f).

“Leave her alone, for she is angry” (2 Kgs 4:27).

The combination *מר נפש* is also commonly used for physical and emotional distress (1 Sam 1:10; 2 Kgs 4:27; Isa 38:16; Ezek 27:31; Prov 14:10; Job 3:2; 10:1; 11:25; 27:3; 31:6). Care should be taken to distinguish between *מר נפש* when used of anger and *מר נפש* as used in the context of anguish since these emotions have different underlying conceptual frameworks. When used of distress, *נפש*, in parallel to the eyes (*עיני*), is sometimes said to waste away (*כלה*) (Lev 26:16; Ps 119:81-82). Correspondingly, it can be poured out (*שפך*) in the form of tears (1 Sam 1:15; Ps 42:5; Lam 2:12, 19; etc.) (cf. Collins 1971:18-38; 185-97). However, in the case of anger, it is usually the nose (*אף*) that pines away (*כלה*) and results in the pouring forth (*שפך*) of foam (*חמה*) (Ezek 5:13; 7:8; 20:8, 21). Thus, while *מר נפש* in the context of distress can be accompanied by crying (Ezek 27:31), it probably refers to agitation when used of anger. There are no instances in the Hebrew Bible where *מר נפש* is explicitly linked with foaming at the mouth as indication of anger, but both figures are clearly used to indicate intense, brutal anger. By contrast, *מר נפש* as used of suffering may be associated with a related metaphor, where the focus falls on poison administered to victims as a means of punishment (see below).

The use of *מר נפש* with reference to anger also provides an interpretational framework for the word *מר* when indicating fury. Although *נפש* is not always mentioned, the underlying concept seems to be the

same: poisonous gall causes agitation that expresses itself in anger. The following three examples will serve to illustrate the use of מר when denoting anger.

In Ezekiel 3:14, מר stands in parallel to חמה, which, as we have seen, denotes foam at the mouth as metonymic indication of anger as epilepsy. Further, Ezekiel's self-testimony that he was "taken away by the spirit" implies a state of prophetic trance that can easily be coupled with epilepsy. Temkin (1994:148-61) argues that a close link between prophesying and epilepsy has always existed in the ancient world. According to him (Temkin 1994:148):

Propheying was the real touchstone between the natural disease, epilepsy, and the involvement of supernatural powers.

In view of this, the anger associated with Ezekiel's prophetic trance seems more explicable:

(299) ורחה נשאחני ותקחני ואלך מר בחמת רוחי

wrwḥ nś'tny wtqḥny w'lk mr bḥmt rwḥy.

C: and N: spirit V: lift up (qal pf 3rd sg, f) + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and (consec) V: take (qal impf 3rd sg, f) + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and (consec) V: go (qal impf 1st sg) A: bitter/poisonous P: in N: froth (def [cs]) N: breath + pron suffix (1st sg).

"And the spirit lifted me up and took hold of me. Then I went bitter in the froth of my breath" (Ezek 3:14).

In Habakkuk 1:6, מר is used together with the FLOOD metaphor to characterise the violence of the Chaldeans:

(300) כי הנני מקים את הכשדים הגוי המר והנמהר

ky hnny mqym 't hkśdym hgwy hmr whnmhr.

C: because Particle of focus: behold V: raise up (hi pt sg, m) Nota accusativi + N: Chaldeans N: nation A: bitter/poisonous C: and A: impetuous (ni pt sg, m).

"For behold, I raise up the Chaldeans, the ruthless and impetuous nation" (Hab 1:6).

Finally, Naomi expressed her anger with YHWH for the grief he has caused by using this root:

(301) כי מר לי מאד מכם כי יצאה בי יד יהוה

ky mr ly m'd mkm ky yš'h by yd yhwh.

C: because A: poisonous P: to + pron suffix (1st sg) Adv: exceedingly P: from + pron suffix (2nd pl) C: because V: go out (qal impf 3rd sg, f) P: against + pron suffix (1st sg) N: hand (cs) PN: YHWH.

"For I am very angry for your sake that the hand of YHWH is against me" (Ruth 1:13).

A root that is commonly neglected in studies on the Hebrew conceptualisation of anger is מרר. This verb in the hitpalp form means, "become furious" (Holladay 1971:216). However, the KJV rendering, "to be moved

with choler” seems to come closer to the primary meaning of the root, since it is obviously related to מררה “poison, venom, gall” (Cohen 1971:703). The verb in this form occurs twice in Daniel:

(302) וראיתיו מגיע אצל האיל ויתמרמר אליו ויך את האיל

wr'ytyw mgy' 'sl h'yl wytmrmr 'lyw wyk 't h'yl.

C: and V: see (qal pf 1st sg) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: reach (hi pt sg, m) P: close N: ram (def) C: and (consec) V: moved to choler (hitpalp impf 3rd sg, m) P: to + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and (consec) V: strike (qal impf 3rd sg, m) Nota accusativi + N: ram (def).

“And I saw him reaching close to the ram and he was moved to choler against him and he smote the ram” (Dan 8:7).

(303) ויתמרמר מלך הנגב ויצא ונלחם עמו

wytmrmr mlk hngb wys' wnlhm 'mw.

C: and V: moved with choler (hitpalp impf 3rd sg, m) N: king (cs) N: south [Egypt] C: and V: go out (qal impf 3rd sg, m) C: and V: do battle with (ni pf 3rd sg, m) P: with + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“And the king of the South will be moved with choler and go out to battle with him” (Dan 11:11).

The use of מרר to denote anger is not limited to the hitpalp form. The hi form, as it occurs in Exodus 23:21, seems to have the meaning, “provoke to anger”:

(304) השמר מפניו ושמע בקלו אל תמר בו

hšmr mpnyw wšm' bqlw 'l tmr bw.

V: be careful (ni imp, m) P: from + P: before + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and V: listen (qal imp, m) P: with N: voice + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) Neg particle V: provoke to anger (hi impf 2nd sg, m) P: with + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“Be careful of him, obey his orders and don't provoke him to anger” (Ex 23:21).

Up to this point, the metaphor ANGER IS POISON essentially centred on the manifestation of anger in the angry subject. The emotion was conceptualised as having been caused by some poison (מר) in the life substance (נפש) that caused agitation. A hot, poisonous foam (חמה, קצף, זעם, אף, חרון אף and אש עברתי and אש) probably resulting from the wasting away of the nose (אף), filled (מלא) the subject and resulted in it being spilled forth (שפך, נתך). Being poisonous, this foam could be used as a means of punishment.

The ontological correspondences can be summarised as follows:

- A person with poison in his throat is very angry (epileptic?).
- Poisonous froth exuding from the mouth of an epileptic is anger.

Here follows a brief outline of the epistemological correspondences:

<i>Source:</i>	<i>Target:</i>
----------------	----------------

Poison/epilepsy leads to intense bodily agitation.	Anger leads to intense bodily agitation and heat.
The foam from the mouth of an epileptic is poisonous.	The froth from the mouth of an angry person is poisonous.

4.2.9.1 Other Related Metaphors

The following two related metaphors highlight the effect that poison can have on the victims of divine anger.

ANGER IS A CUP OF POISON

In a study on the etymology of the root *חמה*, Driver (1958:133) has concluded that it could not always mean “(hot) anger.” Realising that the word often seems to denote a liquid, Driver (1958:133-5) identified three verses where the word should rather be rendered “fiery wine.” In Isaiah 27:4 YHWH declares that he has no *חמה* in him (*חמה אין לי*). Driver (1958:133) regards this as a complaint on the part of YHWH, lamenting the fact that despite his tending his vineyard, it hasn’t produced anything to make wine of (verses 2-3). However, most commentators take this expression to indicate that YHWH is no longer angry at the vineyard (cf. Lange 1878:293; Rawlinson 1950b:434; Watts 1985:347; Grogan 1986:171).

In Habakkuk 2:15, *חמה* is clearly conceptualised as a drink that renders the subject defenceless against sexual abuse:

(305) *הוי משקה רעהו מסף חמתך ואף שכר למען הביט על מעוריהם*

hwy mšqh r’hw msp ḥmtk w’p škr lm’n hbyṭ ‘l m’wryhm.

Interj: woe V: give a drink to (hi pt sg, m) N: neighbour + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: from N: cup (cs) N: wrath (lit. poison) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and Particle of focus: also V: make s.one drunk (pi inf cs) P: in order to V: look at (hi inf cs) P: on N: nakedness + pron suffix (3rd pl, m).

“Woe unto you who make your neighbours drink, pouring out your fiery wine and making them drunk in order to gaze on their nakedness” (Hab 2:15).

Analogously, *חמה* seems to be implemented in a bribe that involves a luxurious table laden with rich foods in Job 36:16-18. Again, the meaning, “fiery wine” seems to fit the context well. Driver (1958:134) translates v 18 as follows:

(306) *כי חמה פן יסיתך בספק ורב כפר אל יטך*

ky ḥmh pn ysytk bspq wrb kpr ‘l ytk.

C: because N: fiery wine P: lest V: incite (hi impf 3rd sg, m) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) P: in N: abundance C: and A: great N: bribe Neg particle V: mislead (hi impf 3rd sg, m) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).

“(Beware) lest fiery wine in plenty incite thee and let not much bribery deflect thee” (Job 36:18; Driver 1958:134).

Driver (1958:133) regards this proposed rendering of the root as the best fit in view of the fact that it is probably derived from חָם, “to be hot.” Johnson (1973:380) expresses the logic behind this interpretation:

An und für sich ist es leicht zu verständlich dass körperliche Hitze sowohl durch Zorn als auch ... Wein hervorgerufen wird.

However, Brongers (1969:177-92) has warned against attempts to equate חָמָה with wine. He (Brongers 1969:189) declares that scholars who assume glamorous meals as a *Sitz im Leben* for the “cup of wrath” (כּוֹס הַחֲמָה) are mistaken. Rather, the key to a most feasible interpretation of these references is consciousness of the fact that they are metaphoric in nature (Brongers 1969:189). חָמָה is much more than mere “fiery wine.” It is a metaphor for divine wrath that is administered to victims as a form of punishment.

Apart from Habakkuk 2:16, Jeremiah 25:15-16 is widely regarded as the oldest reference to the cup of wrath (Brongers 1969:177). The author clearly does not take the figure from banquet imagery. The hitpolel הַלֵּל III, which describes the effect of חָמָה means to become mad or act insane (Brongers 1969:178) (cf. 1 Sam 21:14; Jer 50:38; 51:7):

(307) קח את כוס היין החמה הזאת מידי והשקיתה אתו את כל הגוים אשר אנכי שלח אותך אליהם
ושתו והתגעשו והתהללו

*qh 't kws hyyn hḥmh hz't mtdy whšqyth 'tw 't kl hgwym 'šr 'nky šlh 'wtk
'lyhm wštww whtg'šw whthllw.*

V: take (qal imp, m) Nota accusativi N: cup (cs) N: wine (def) N: wrath (def) Pronoun: this P: from
N: hand + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and V: give to drink (hi imp, m) Nota accusativi + pron suffix (3rd
sg, m) P: to Indef pronoun: all N: nations Rel pronoun: that Pronoun: I V: send (qal pt sg, m) Nota
accusativi + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) P: to + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) C: and V: drink (qal pf 3rd pl) C:
and V: shake (hitp pf 3rd pl) C: and V: go mad (hitp pf 3rd pl).

“Take from my hand this cup of wine of wrath, and make all the nations to whom I send you drink it. They shall drink and stagger and go out of their minds” (Jer 25:15-16; NRSV).

Even Psalm 75:9, which has seduced many scholars into assuming a banquet as *Sitz im Leben* for the cup of wrath, should be treated with great care. The text reads as follows:

(308) כי כוס ביד יהוה ויין חמר מלא מסך ויגר מזה אך שמריה ימצו ישתו כל רשעי ארץ
*ky kws byd yhwḥ wyyn ḥmr ml' msk wygr mzh 'k šmryk ymšw yštw kl rš'y
'rṣ.*

C: because N: cup P: in N: hand (cs) PN: YHWH C: and N: wine V: boil over (qal pf 3rd sg, m) V: be full (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: mixture C: and V: pour out (hi impf 3rd sg) P: from Pronoun: this Particle of emphasis: surely N: dregs + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) V: drain (qal impf 3rd pl, m) Indef pronoun: all N: wicked (cs) N: earth.

“For in the hand of YHWH there is a cup with foaming wine, well mixed; he will pour a drink from it, and all the depraved of the earth shall drain it down to the dregs” (Ps 75:9).

Much of the terminology in this verse is taken from ancient viticulture. For example, חמר means, “foaming, fermenting” (Köhler & Baumgartner 1958:312). שומר refers to “lees, dregs of wine out of which still clear wine is gained by a filter (זקק)” (Köhler & Baumgartner 1958:994). This means that the wine was probably matured. Further, מלא מסך implies that the wine was generously spiced (Brongers 1969:178). However, all this vocabulary figures in the context of judgement, which implies that the reference to wine is meant as a figure of speech, as in all the other references to the cup of wrath (Brongers 1969:178; cf. Smothers 1995:277-9). In Isaiah 51:21 it is even emphasised that those who drank from the cup of YHWH did not become drunk from wine:

(309) לכן שמעי נא זאת עניה ושכרת ולא מיינ כה אמר אדניך יהוה ואלהיך ... הגה לקחתי מידך את כוס התרעלה את קבעת כוס חמתי לא תוסיפי לשתותה עוד
lkn šm'y n' z't 'nyh wškr't wl' myyn kh 'mr ' dnyk yhw'h w'lhyk ... hnh lqhty mydk 't kws htr'lh 'tqb't kws ħmty l' twsypy lštwth 'wd.

C: therefore V: hear (qal imp, f) Particle of emphasis Pronoun: this A: afflicted (f) C: and A: drunk (f) C: and Neg particle P: from N: wine Adv: thus V: say (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: lord + pron suffix (2nd sg, f) PN: YHWH C: and N: god + pron suffix (2nd sg, f) ... Particle of focus: behold V: take (qal pf 1st sg) P: from N: hand + pron suffix (2nd sg, f) Nota accusativi N: cup (cs) N: trembling Nota accusativi N: goblet (cs) N: cup (cs) N: wrath (lit. poison) + pron suffix (1st sg) Neg particle V: go on (hi impf 2nd sg, f) P: to V: drink (qal inf cs) + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) Adv: still.

“Therefore hear this, you afflicted one, drunk but not with wine. Thus says your Lord YHWH, your God ...: Behold, I have taken out of your hand the cup of trembling, the goblet of the cup of poison. You will not drink it again” (Isa 51:21-22).

The חמה with which the cup is filled is similar to wine in that it also seems to be a fluid (Brongers 1969:179). However, it does not seem to have the gladdening effect usually associated with wine. Further, it is always intended for objects of anger against whom harm is intended:

(310) יראו עיניו כידרו ומחמת שדי ישתה
yr'w 'ynw kydw wmħmt šdy yšth.

V: see (qal juss pl, m) N: eyes + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: destruction + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C:

and P: from N: wrath (lit. poison, cs) PN: Shaddai/Almighty V: drink (qal impf 3rd sg, m).

“Let their own eyes see their destruction, and let them drink of the wrath of the Almighty” (Job 21:20; NRSV).

In some cases the effect of YHWH’s drink on his enemies is comparable to drunkenness. Moab becomes laughingstock by stumbling in his own vomit. In Isaiah 19:14 it is not the wine itself that causes the drunkenness, but the perverse spirit that YHWH mixes into it. In the ancient Mediterranean spirits often served as messengers for gods bringing about illness, death and destruction (Tromp 1969:160-5):

(311) השכירוהו כי על יהוה הגדיל וספק מואב בקיאו והיה לשחק גם הוא

hškyrhw ky ‘l yhw hgdyl wspq mw’b bqy’w whyh lšḥq gm hw’.

V: make s.one drunken (hi imp, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: because P: against PN: YHWH V: make oneself great (hi pf 3rd sg, m) C: and V: wallow (qal pf 3rd sg, m) PN: Moab P: in N: vomit + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and V: be (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: to VN: laugh (qal inf cs) Particle of focus: also Pronoun: he.

“Make him drunk, because he made himself great against YHWH; let Moab wallow in his vomit; he too shall become a laughingstock” (Jer 48:26).

(312) יהוה מסך בקרבה רוח עועים והתעו את מצרים בכל מעשהו כהתעות שכור בקיאו

yhw msk bqrhb rwh ‘w’ym wht’w ‘t msrym bkl m’shw kht’wt škwr bqy’w.

PN: YHWH V: mix (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: in N: midst + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) N: spirit (cs, f) N: perversities C: and V: make stagger (hi pf 3rd pl) Nota accusativi PN: Egypt P: in Indef pronoun: all V: do (hi pt pl, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: as V: stagger (hi inf cs) A: drunk (m) P: in N: vomit + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“And YHWH has mingled a perverse spirit in the midst thereof, and it caused Egypt to err in every work thereof as a drunk man staggers in his vomit” (Isa 19:14).

According to Ezekiel 23:32-33, the drink not only leads to drunkenness, but also to sorrow (גון), horror (שמה) and desolation (שממה):

(313) כה אמר אדני יהוה כוס אחותך תשתי העמקה והרחבה תהיה לצחק וללעג מרבה להכיל שכרון ויגון תמלאי כוס שמה ושממה כוס אחותך שמרון

kh ‘mr ‘ dny yhw kws ‘ ḥwtk tšty h’mqh whrhbb thyh lšḥq wll’g mrbh lhkyl škrwn wygwn tml’y kws šmh wšmmh kws ‘ ḥwtk šmrwn.

Adv: thus V: say (qal pf 3rd sg, m) PN: Adonai/lord PN: YHWH N: cup (cs) N: sister + pron suffix (2nd sg, f) V: drink (qal impf 2nd sg, f) A: deep C: and A: large V: become (qal impf 2nd sg, f) P: to VN: laugh (qal inf cs) C: and P: to N: derision N: abundance P: to V: contain (hi inf cs) N: drunkenness C: and N: sorrow V: be filled (ni impf 2nd sg, f) N: cup (cs) N: ruin C: and N:

devastation N: cup (cs) N: sister + pron suffix (2nd sg, f) PN: Samaria.

“Thus says Adonai YHWH: You will drink your sister’s cup, deep and wide; you will be scorned and ridiculed, it holds so much. You will be filled with drunkenness and distress. A cup of dismay and devastation is the cup of your sister Samaria” (Ezek 23:32-33).

The effect of madness as expressed by the hitpolel הלל III has already been alluded to. In Jeremiah 51:7, Babylon becomes a metaphor of the cup that YHWH gave to the whole world, leading to their insanity:

(314) כוס זהב בבל ביד יהוה משכרת כל הארץ מיינה שתו גוים על כן יתהללו גוים

kws zhb bbl byd yhw h mškrť kl h'rš myynh štw gwym 'l kn ythllw gwym.

N: cup (cs) N: gold PN: Babylon P: in N: hand (cs) PN: YHWH V: make drunken (pi pt sg, f) Indef pronoun: all N: earth (def) P: from N: wine + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) V: drink (qal pf 3rd pl) N: nations C: therefore N: go mad (hitp impf 3rd pl, m) N: nations.

“Babylon is a golden cup in YHWH’s hand, making all the earth drunken. The nations drank of her wine, and therefore went mad” (Jer 51:7).

The effect of this liquid is again vividly described in Isaiah 51:17-22. In v 17 the symptom of shaking (רעל) is suggested. “The cup of reeling” (כוס התרעלה) that occurs here and in v 22 seems to be a synonym for כוס החמה. The root רעל “to stagger” (Holladay 1971:343) corresponds to the Aramaic רעל “to shake, quiver.” As a parallel to כוס החמה, כוס התרעלה, כוס metonymically points to the effect of the cup of wrath, namely shivering:

(315) התעוררי הרעוררי קומי ירושלם אשר שתית מיד יהוה את כוס חמתו את קבעת כוס התרעלה
שתית מצית

*ht'wrry ht'wrry qwmy yrwšlym 'šr štyt myd yhw h 't kws ħmtw 't qb't kws
htr'lh štyt mšyt.*

V: awake (hitpol imp, f) V: awake (hitpol imp, f) V: stand (qal imp, f) PN: Jerusalem Rel pronoun: that V: drink (qal pf 2nd sg, f) P: from N: hand PN: YHWH Nota accusativi N: cup (cs) N: wrath (lit. poison) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) Nota accusativi N: goblet (cs) N: cup N: trembling V: drink (qal pf 2nd sg, f) V: suck out (qal pf 2nd sg, f).

“Awake, awake, stand up Jerusalem, you who have drunk from the hand of YHWH the cup of his poison, you drained out and drank the goblet of the cup of trembling” (Isa 51:17).

A further effect of חמה is complete loss of strength and loss of consciousness (עלף). The victim of the cup of poison is compared to an antelope caught in a net in Isaiah 51:20:

(316) בניך עלפו שכבו בראש כל חוצות כתוא מכמר המלאים חמת יהוה

bnyk 'lpw škbw br'š kl ħwšwt ktw' mkmr hml'ym ħmt yhw h.

N: sons + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) V: faint (qal pf 3rd pl) V: lie down (qal pf 3rd pl) P: in N: head (cs)
 Indef pronoun: all N: streets P: like N: antelope N: net N: (those) full of N: wrath (f, cs, lit. foam)
 PN: YHWH.

“Your sons have fainted; they lie at the head of every street, like an antelope caught in a net – they are filled with the fury of YHWH” (Isa 51:20).¹⁷⁷

In Zechariah 12:2 YHWH makes Jerusalem a cup of trembling for all the neighbouring peoples. Here, כֶּסֶל “basin, bowl” (Köhler & Baumgartner 1958:663) is used as an equivalent for כוס “cup” (Brongers 1969:178):

(317) הנה אנכי שם את ירושלים סף רעל לכל העמים סביב

hnh 'nky śm 't yrwšlym sp r'l lkl h'mym sbyb.

Particle of focus: behold Pronoun: I V: place (qal pt sg, m) Nota accusativi PN: Jerusalem N: cup (cs) N: trembling P: to Indef pronoun: all N: nations Adv: about.

“See, I am about to make Jerusalem a cup of reeling for all the surrounding peoples” (Zech 12:2; NRSV).

In the verses discussed so far, the castigation implied by the cup of wrath seems to be slight. In most cases, the outcome appears to be nothing more than temporary folly effected by a strong drink. However, there are several instances where victims of the cup of wrath suffer brutal consequences. Obadiah 1:16 seems to imply that drinking from the cup leads to death (Brongers 1969:180):

(318) כי כאשר שתיתם על הר קדשי ישחו כל הגוים תמיד ושחו ולעו והיו כלוא היו

ky k'sr štytm 'l hr qdšy yštw kl hgwym tmyd wštw wl'w whyw klw' hyw.

C: because P: as V: drink (qal pf 2nd pl, m) P: on N: mountain A: holy + pron suffix (1st sg) V: drink (qal impf 3rd pl) Indef pronoun: all N: nations Adv: constantly C: and V: drink (qal pf 3rd pl) C: and V: swallow down (qal pf 3rd pl) C: and V: become (qal pf 3rd pl) P: as Neg particle V: be (qal pf 3rd pl).

“For as you have drunk on my holy mountain, all the nations drink continually; they will drink and gulp down, and will be as though they had never been” (Obad 1:16).

YHWH's invitation to his enemies in Jeremiah 25:27 is comparable to the foregoing verse (Craigie *et al.* 1991:372). It also seems to lead to death, and co-occurs with the metaphor of the sword, which is commonly used as a symbol for war related slaughtering. Brongers (1969:180) recognises that ingestion in this verse is a metaphor for the total obliteration of YHWH's enemies. This is further accentuated when the metaphor of drunkenness is changed to that of military defeat (Craigie *et al.* 1991:372):

¹⁷⁷ Also see 4.2.1.

(319) שתו ושכרו וקיו ונפלו ולא תקומו מפני החרב אשר אנכי שלח ביניכם

štw wškrw wqyw wnplw wl' tqwmw mpny hhrb 'šr 'nky šlh bynykm.

V: drink (qal imp) C: and V: get drunk (qal imp) C: and V: vomit (qal imp) C: and V: fall (qal imp) C: and Neg particle V: rise up (qal impf 2nd pl) P: because of N: sword (def) C: that Pronoun: I V: send (qal pt sg, m) P: among + pron suffix (2nd pl, m).

“Drink, get drunk and vomit, fall and rise no more, because of the sword that I am sending among you” (Jer 25:27; NRSV).

In the same way, YHWH promises his enemies in Jeremiah 51:39 that he will make them drunk so they will never wake up again. The attached metaphor, “I will bring them down like lambs to the slaughter” in v 40 gives testimony that extermination is meant by the figure (Keown *et al.* 1995:371):

(320) בחמם אשית את משתייהם והשכרתים למען יעלזו וישנו עולם שנת ולא יקיצו נאם יהוה אורידם

ככרים לטבוח כאילים עם עתודים

bḥmm 'šyt 't mštyhm whškrty m lm'n y'lwz wysnw šnt 'wlm wl' yqyšw n'm yhw h 'wrydm kkrym lṭbwḥ k'ylym 'm 'twdym.

P: when V: be hot (qal inf cs) V: place (hi impf 1st sg) Nota accusativi N: drink + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) C: and V: make drunk (hi pf 1st sg) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) C: that V: be joyful (qal impf 3rd pl, m) C: and V: sleep (qal pf 3rd pl) Adv: always N: sleep C: and Neg particle V: wake (hi impf 3rd pl, m) N: declaration (cs) PN: YHWH V: bring down (hi impf 1st sg) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: as N: lambs P: to V: slaughter (qal inf cs) P: as N: rams P: with N: he-goats.

“When they are inflamed, I will set out their drink and make them drunk, until they become happy and then sleep an endless sleep and never wake, says YHWH. I will bring them down like lambs to the slaughter, like rams and goats” (Jer 51:39-40).

Jeremiah 49:12-13 also clearly links the cup of wrath with ruthless punishment. The consumer becomes an object of terror and derision:

(321) הנה אשר אין משפטם לשחתות הכוס שתו ואתה הוא נקה תנקה לא תנקה כי שתה תשתה כי

בי נשבעתי נאם יהוה כי לשמה לחרפה לחרב ולקללה תהיה בצרה וכל עריה תהינה לחרבות

עולם

hnh 'šr 'yn mšpṭm lšwt hkws štw yštw w'th hw' nqh tnqh l' tnqh ky šth tšth ky by nšb'ty n'm yhw h ky lšmh lḥrph lḥrb wlqllh thyh bšrh wkl 'ryh tyynh lḥrbwt 'wlm.

Particle of focus: behold Pronoun: (those) who Existential particle: there be not N: judgement + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: to V: drink (qal inf cs) N: cup V: drink (qal inf abs) V: drink (qal impf 3rd pl, m) C: and Pronoun: you Pronoun: it V: remain unpunished (qal inf abs) V: remain unpunished

(ni impf 2nd sg, m) Neg particle V: remain unpunished (ni impf 2nd sg, m) C: because V: drink (qal inf abs) V: drink (qal impf 2nd sg, m) C: because P: in + pron suffix (1st sg) V: swear (ni pf 1st sg) N: declaration (cs) PN: YHWH C: that P: to N: desolation P: to N: disgrace P: to N: waste C: and P: to N: curse V: become (qal impf 2nd sg, m) PN: Bozrah C: and Indef pronoun: all N: cities + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) V: become (qal impf 3rd pl, f) P: to N: waste (pl) N: eternity.

“Look, if those who do not merit to drink the cup still have to drink it, shall you be the one to go unpunished? You shall not go with impunity; you must drink it. For by myself I have avowed, says YHWH, that Bozrah shall become an object of dismay and derision, a waste, and an object of cursing; and all her towns shall be lasting wastes” (Jer 49:12-13).

Again, in the passage of the filled wine-jars (Jer 13:12-14), consumption goes along with devastating results (Brongers 1969:180):

(322) הנני ממלא את כל ישבי הארץ הזאת ואת המלכים הישבים לדוד על כסאו ואת הכהנים ואת הנביאים ואת כל ישבי ירושלים שכרון ונפצתים איש אל אחיו והאבות והבנים יחדו נאם יהוה לא אחמול ולא אחוס ולא ארחם מהשחיתם

hnnny mml' 't kl yšby h'rš hz't w't hmlkym hyšbym ldwd 'l ks'w w't hkhnym w't hnby'ym w't kl yšby yrwšlym škrwn wnpšty m 'yš 'l 'hyw wh'bwt whbnym yḥdw n'm yhwh l' 'hmwl wl' 'hws wl' 'rhm mhšhytm.

Particle of focus: behold V: fill (pi pt sg, m) Nota accusativi Indef pronoun: all VN: inhabitant (qal pt pl, m, cs) N: earth (def) Demonstr pronoun: this C: and Nota accusativi N: kings VN: inhabitant (qal pt pl, m) P: to PN: David P: on N: throne + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and Nota accusativi N: priests C: and Nota accusativi N: prophets C: and Indef pronoun: VN: inhabitant (qal pt pl, m, cs) PN: Jerusalem N: drunkenness C: and V: smash (pi pf 1st sg) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) N: man P: against N: brother + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and N: fathers C: and N: sons P: with each other N: declaration (cs) PN: YHWH Neg particle V: have compassion (qal impf 1st sg) C: and Neg particle V: have mercy (qal impf 1st sg) C: and Neg particle V: have pity (pi impf 1st sg) P: from V: destroy (hi inf cs) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m).

“I am about to fill all the population of this land – the kings who sit on David’s throne, the priests, the prophets, and all the residents of Jerusalem – with drunkenness. And I will dash them one against another, parents and children together, says YHWH. I will not pity or spare or have sympathy when I wipe them out” (Jer 13:13-14).

In the texts listed above, wine seems to have lost its nature as a valued drink that is to be enjoyed. It becomes a pure metaphor for harm. This may seem to be a contradiction, but it all becomes intelligible when one considers that in most examples referred to above, wine was mixed with חמה. The meaning of חמה, “venom, poison” is well attested in the Hebrew Bible (Holladay 1971:108). It has already been demonstrated that the

root often denoted poisonous foam at the mouth of angry individuals. Gruber (1980:522-3) lists the following two examples where חמה refers to the venom of snakes:

(323) חמת תנינם יינם וראש פתנים אכזר

ḥmt tnynm yynm wr'š ptnym 'kzr.

N: poison (f, cs) N: serpents N: wine + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) C: poison (cs) N: snakes A: fierce.

“Their wine is serpents’ venom and the fierce poison of snakes” (Deut 32:33; translation by Gruber 1980:522).

(324) חמת למו כדמות חמת נחש כמו פתן חדש יאטם אזנו אשר לא ישמע לקול מלחשים חובר חברים

מחכם

ḥmt lmw kdmwt ḥmt mḥš kmw ptn ḥrš y'tm 'zrw 'šr l' yšm' lqwl mlḥšym ḥwbr ḥbrym mḥkm.

N: poison P: to + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: like P: like N: poison (cs) N: snake P: like N: serpent A: deaf V: stop (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: ear + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) Rel pronoun: who Neg particle V: hear (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: to N: voice P: from N: charmers VN: caster (qal pt sg, m) N: spells V: instructed (pu pt sg, m).

“They have venom like a snake’s venom, like that of a deaf serpent who closes his ear so that he does not hear the voice of the charmers, of the skilled caster of spells” (Ps 58:5-6; translation by Gruber 1980:523).

There are also instances where חמה denotes poison that people are made to drink as a means of execution (Gruber 1980:526-9). Gruber (1980:526) regards the reference to the cup of חמה in Job 21:20 as indicating poison as a mode of capital punishment. Hosea 7:5 indicates that poisoning was used in ancient Israel as a means of executing political rivals (Gruber 1980:526). Some scholars have interpreted יום מלכנו, lit. “on the day of our king” as referring to a day of festivities celebrating the crowning or the birthday of the king (cf. Jeremias 1983:95), which would suit the questionable presumption that the cup of wrath is to be understood against the backdrop of banquet imagery (Brongers 1969:186-7; cf. Smothers 1995:276). Further, the combination חמת מיין, which is normally rendered, “heat of wine,” should rather be translated “poison instead of wine” (Gruber 1980:527):

(325) יום מלכנו החלו שרים חמת מיין

ywm mlknw ḥḥlw śrym ḥmt myyn.

N: day (cs) N: king + pron suffix (1st pl) V: make sick (hi pf 3rd pl) N: princes N: poison P: instead of N: wine.

“By day the princes intoxicated our king with poison instead of wine” (Hos 7:5; translation by Gruber 1980:526-7).

Brongers (1969:190-1) provides another piece of evidence that suggests that כוס החמה should be understood as a cup of poison indicating divine wrath metaphorically (cf. McKane 1980:474-92). There are several texts where YHWH's anger is depicted in terms of the forced consumption of poisonous food and drink (Deut 29:17; Jer 9:14; 23:15; Amos 6:12; Lam 3:19; Cant 3:9). In these texts wormwood (לענה) and gall (ראש II)¹⁷⁸ are commonly mentioned as poisonous substances used by the deity. As in the case of כוס החמה, these references are clearly meant as figures of speech, as is evidenced by its co-occurrence with the metaphor of the sword in Jeremiah 9:14-15:

(326) לכן כה אמר יהוה צבאות אלהי ישראל הנני מאכילם את העם הזה לענה והשקיתים מי ראש
והפצותים בגוים אשר לא ידעו המה ואבותם ושלחתי אחריהם את החרב עד כלותי אותם
lkn kh 'mr yhwh šb'wt 'lhy ysr'l hnny m'kylm 't h'm hzh l'nh whšqytym
my r's whpšwtym bgwym 'šr l' yd'w hmh w'bwtm wšlḥty 'hryhm 't hḥrb 'd
klwty 'wtm.

C: therefore Adv: thus V: say (qal pf 3rd sg, m) PN: YHWH N: hosts N: god (cs) PN: Israel Particle of focus: behold V: feed (hi pt sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) Nota accusativi N: people Pronoun: this N: wormwood C: and V: give to drink (hi pf 1st sg) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) N: water (cs) N: poison C: and V: disperse (hi pf 1st sg) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: in N: nations Rel pronoun Neg particle V: know (qal impf 3rd pl) Pronoun: they C: and N: fathers + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) C: and V: send (pi pf 1st sg) P: after + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) Nota accusativi N: sword P: unto V: destroy (pi inf cs) + pron suffix (1st sg) Nota accusativi + pron suffix (3rd pl, m).

“Therefore thus says YHWH of hosts, the God of Israel: I am feeding this people with wormwood, and giving them venomous water to drink. I will disperse them among nations that neither they nor their ancestors have known; and I will send the sword after them, until I have consumed them” (Jer 9:14-15).

In Jeremiah 23:15 the same expression is used as a symbol for the sentence of false prophets:

(327) לכן כה אמר יהוה צבאות על הנבאים הנני מאכיל אותם לענה והשקיתים מי ראש כי מאת נביאי
ירושלם יצאה חנפה לכל הארץ
lkn kh 'mr yhwh šb'wt 'l hnb'ym hnny m'kyl 'wtm l'nh whšqytym my r's ky
m't nby'y yrwšlym yš'h ḥnp lkl h'rš.

C: therefore Adv: thus V: say (qal pf 3rd sg, m) PN: YHWH N: hosts P: over N: prophets Particle of focus: behold V: make eat (hi pt sg, m) Nota accusativi + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) N: wormwood C: and V: make drink (hi pf 1st sg) N: water (cs) N: poison C: because P: from P: with N: prophets (cs)

¹⁷⁸ Strong (1961:106) argues that the poisonous plant commonly referred to as ראש may be the poppy plant due to its conspicuous head. The root also means “serpent’s venom” (Deut 32:33; Job 21:16) (Holladay 1971:329).

PN: Jerusalem V: go out (qal pf 3rd sg, f) N: impiety P: to Indef pronoun: all N: earth (def).

“Therefore thus says YHWH of hosts regarding the prophets: ‘I am going to make them eat wormwood, and give them poisoned water to drink; for from the prophets of Jerusalem ungodliness has spread all through the land’” (Jer 23:15).

There can be no doubt that these expressions are intended as metaphors for judgement (Craigie *et al.* 1991:370). Lamentations 3:19 also equates the combination with affliction and misery:

(328) זכר עניי ומרודי לענה וראש

zkr 'nyy wmrwdy l'nh wr'sh.

V: remember (qal imp, m) N: affliction + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and N: misery + pron suffix (1st sg)

N: wormwood C: and N: poison (lit. “gall”).

“Remember mine affliction and my misery, the wormwood and the gall” (Lam 3:19; NKJV).

This parallel metaphor clearly supports the interpretation of כוס החמה as a cup of poison, which was presented to objects of divine wrath as a sentence (Brongers 1969:191). Brongers (1969:190) argues that it was thus understood even in the earliest texts where the cup of wrath was mentioned in the Hebrew Bible (Hab 2:15; Jer 25:15).

Brongers (1969:188) further investigates the possibility that a parallel to this Biblical Hebrew metaphor existed in the art of ancient Assyria. On the renowned black obelisk of Salmanasser III (859-824), the king is depicted as standing erect with Jehu of Israel at his feet. In his right hand the king is holding a cup and his left hand is gripping a sword. However, Brongers (1969:189) concludes that there is not conclusive evidence that the cup is meant for Jehu. Therefore the depiction cannot be identified as a certain parallel to the metaphor as found in the Hebrew Bible. It is not clear if the portrayal of a goddess holding two cups in her hands on a dedicatory cup of Gudea can be related directly to the use of this metaphor in the Hebrew Bible (Smothers 1995:278).

Although the metaphor of the cup of poison is a very late prophetic figure of speech, it had a profound impact on the subsequent conceptualisation of the wrath of God (Smothers 1995:278-9). It consistently grew in popularity and even found its way into the New Testament, where it acquired the meaning of pain and affliction (Mark 10:38; Matt 26:42; John 18:11). In the Hebrew Bible, however, the cup is inextricably linked with divine wrath. It makes the godly fury tangible through its association with the most horrific symptoms, such as trembling, loss of consciousness, insanity, and even death. The cup of poison also provides the conceptual background for several texts where wine and drunkenness figure as metaphors for divine wrath without any specific reference to the cup itself:

(329) כי מגפן סדם גפנם ומשדמת עמרה ענבמו ענבי רוש אשכלת מררת למו חמת תנינם יינם וראש
פתנים אכור

*ky mgpn sdm gpm wšdmt 'mrh 'nbmw 'nby rwš 'šk lt mrrt lmw ḥmt
tnym ynm wr'š ptnym 'kzr.*

C: because P: from N: grapevine N: Sodom N: grapevine + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) C: and P: from N: (cultivated) fields (cs) N: Gomorrah N: grapes + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: grapes (cs) N: poison (lit. gall) N: clusters of grapes A: poisonous P: to + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: poison (cs) N: serpents N: wine + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) C: and N: poison (gall, cs) N: asps.

“For their vines are from the vines of Sodom and from the fields of Gomorrah. Their grapes are grapes of poison and clusters of grapes are poison to them. Their wine is venom of serpents and poison of asps” (Deut 32:32-33).

(330) השביעני במרורים הרוני לענה

hšby'ny bmrwrym hrwny l'nh.

V: fill (hi pf 3rd sg, m) + pron suffix (1st sg) P: with N: poisonous grapes V: give to drink (hi pf 3rd sg, m) + pron suffix (1st sg) N: wormwood.

“He has filled me with poisonous grapes, he has given me wormwood to drink” (Lam 3:15).

(331) בשיר לא ישחו יין ימר שכר לשתיו

bšyr l' yštw yyn ymr škr lštyw.

P: with N: song Neg particle V: drink (qal impf 3rd pl) N: wine V: be poisonous (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: drink P: to V: drink (qal pt pl, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“They will not sip wine with a song; the alcoholic drink will be poisonous to those who imbibe it” (Isa 24:9).

(332) ראש פתנים יינק תהרגהו לשון אפעה

r'š ptnym yynq thrghw lšwn 'p'h.

N: gall (cs) N: asps V: suck (qal pf 3rd sg, m) V: slay (qal impf 3rd sg, f) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: tongue (cs) N: snake.

“He will suck the gall of asps, the tongue of the snake will slay him” (Job 20:16).

(333) ואחריתה מרה כלענה

w'ḥryth mrh kl'nh.

C: but N: end + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) A: poisonous (f) P: as N: wormwood.

“But her end is poisonous as wormwood” (Prov 6:4).

The CUP OF POISON metaphor clearly focuses on the effect of divine anger on the victim rather than on the phenomenology of the emotion itself. This is in keeping with the scope of the POISON metaphor, which includes the target concept of affliction:

(334) כל שעריה שוממין כהניה נאנחים בתולתיה נוגת והיא מר לה

kl š'ryh šwmmyn khnyh n'nhym btltyh nwgwt why' mr lh.

A: all N: gates + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) A: deserted N: priests + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) V: groan (ni pt pl, m) N: virgins + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) V: afflicted (ni pt pl, f) C: and Pronoun: she A: poisonous P: to + pron suffix (3rd sg, f).

“All her gates are deserted and her priests groan; her virgins are afflicted and she is poisoned” (Lam 1:4).

(335) וימררו את חייהם בעבדה קשה

wymrrw 't hyyhm b'bdh qšh.

C: and V: poison (qal pf 3rd pl) Nota accusativi N: life + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: with N: labour A: hard.

“And they poisoned their lives with hard labour” (Ex 1:14).

The possible conceptual relation with the ANGER IS A HOT WIND metaphor has already been pointed out. In Psalm 11:6 the hot easterly wind (רוח) is identified as the lot (lit. the “cup,” כוס) of the object of anger. The reference to the cup may not be accidental. The root which is used in this v as an adjective for the wind, זלעפה “violent heat” (Davidson 1967:239), is also used in Psalm 119:53 to indicate the [bodily] heat of anger. This suggests that the ancient Israelites may have conceptualised the sultry air as poison, which is commonly associated with abnormal levels of bodily heat and respiratory difficulties:

(336) ימטר על רשעים גחלי אש וגפרית ורוח זלעפות מנת כוסם

ymtr 'l rš'ym phym 'š wgpryt wrwh zl'pwt mnt kwsn.

V: make rain fall (hi impf 3rd sg, m) P: on N: evil N: coals (cs) N: fire C: and N: sulphur C: and N: wind (cs) N: glow N: portion (cs) N: cup pron suffix (3rd pl, m).

“On the wicked he will rain glowing lava and brimstone, and a burning hot wind is the portion of their cup” (Ps 11:6).¹⁷⁹

The metaphor can be recapitulated as follows:

- The poison is anger.
- The person administering poison to the victim is the angry person.
- The individual to whom the poison is applied is the object of anger.
- Taking the poison away is ceasing to be angry.

<i>Source:</i>	<i>Target:</i>
Poison is harmful and can be fatal.	Anger is injurious and could kill.

¹⁷⁹ Also see 4.2.2.6 and 4.2.3.

ANGER IS POISON ARROWS

The figurative use of arrows as a metaphor for divine intervention is very common in the Hebrew Bible. Analogous to the cup of wrath in the New Testament, divine arrows are often interpreted as a metaphor for pain and suffering by modern day theologians (cf. Fontaine 1984:243-8). Most commentators, however, interpret them as an indication of pestilence and disease (Habel 1985:145; Merrill 1994:419; Tigay 1996:309; etc.).

Although the root רשף “flame, pestilence” (Holladay 1971:347) rarely occurs as a personification of a deity in the Hebrew Bible (Tigay 1996:309), the figurative use of divine arrows are usually associated with the deity of the same name that was widely revered in ancient Syria-Palestine in the second and first millennia BCE. This god bore the epithet Reshef the Archer (Clines 1989:171), and has been found to be comparable to the prominent Baal of the Canaanite pantheon (Conrad 1971:182) and Apollo in the Greek period (Keel 1997:221). Reshef is also regarded as the Canaanite equivalent to the Egyptian Seth and the Mesopotamian Nergal, whose characters are often misconstrued as gods of chaos and the netherworld (Tate 1990:283; Conrad 1971:160-7).

Scholars often wrongly present Reshef, as also Seth and Nergal, as some antisocial deity that creates chaos by causing pestilence and evil (Conrad 1971:176). What is often overlooked, however, is that Seth himself was a fighter of chaos (Conrad 1971:166) and that Nergal functioned as the highest god of several cities, but especially Kutha (Conrad 1971:160). As such, he was responsible for fertility, the well-being and protection of the city and the safeguarding of justice (Conrad 1971:160-1). Similarly, Reshef was not a secondary god of plague and the underworld, but a high god of various localities, mostly in the south of Syria-Palestine in the second millennium BCE (Conrad 1971:182). He was an important god of weather, fertility and war. At certain places, such as Bethshean, he replaces Baal, with whom he also shares many functions as the highest god of the pantheon, and so represents the type of the “highest god” (Conrad 1971:183). He was also associated with Apollo, whose arrows caused plagues (Habel 1985:145). When Reshef did send illness and death through his arrows, it was to maintain the order of the cosmos by eliminating enemies and punishing disobedience (Conrad 1971:182).

In the Hebrew Bible, however, the רשף etymology is associated with threatening dangers, such as “thunderbolt, fire, flame, pestilence, fever” (Conrad 1971:158). This etymology is probably a result of the militant ancient Israelite religious beliefs that tried to eliminate any non-jahwistic elements by reducing them to demonic evil. In one of the few places in the Hebrew Bible where רשף occurs as a personification, his sons (בני רשף) are associated with distress (עמל):

(337) כי אדם לעמל יולד ובני רשף יגביהו עוף

ky 'dm l'ml ywld wbny ršp ygbyhw 'wp.

C: because N: man P: to N: trouble V: be born (pu pf 3rd sg, m) C: and N: sons (cs) PN: Reshef V: make high (hi impf 3rd pl, m) V: fly (qal inf cs).

“Surely man is born unto trouble, but the sons of Reshef fly high” (Job 5:7).

The ancient theophany of Habakkuk 3 depicts Reshef as a servant of YHWH, who advances in ominous power to save his own (Keel 1997:219-20). He is mentioned alongside Deber, a demon associated with pestilence and the underworld (Tromp 1969:162-3):

(338) לפניו ילך דבר ויצא רשף לרגליו

lpnyw ylk dbr wys' ršp lrglyw

P: before + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: walk (qal impf 3rd sg, m) PN: Deber C: and V: go forth (qal impf 3rd sg, m) PN: Reshef P: at N: feet + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“Deber walked before him and Reshef went forth at his feet” (Hab 3:5).

Conrad (1971:163) argues that the fever-related illnesses that are commonly associated with Nergal and Reshef should be seen as secondary effects of the wars with which they were associated, since war in the ancient Near East were often followed by pestilence. For example, the land surrounding Bethshean, with which Reshef is closely associated, is an ideal breeding ground for malaria when the arable land is left unattended for some time (Conrad 1971:176). This may be why the arrow metaphor sometimes co-occurs with images of pestilence in the Hebrew Bible. In Deuteronomy 32 the attack by an enemy (v 21) is to be followed by the natural consequences of war: famine, disease, and wild animals overrunning devastated territory (Tigay 1996:308):

(339) אספה עלימו רעות חצי אכלה במ מזי רעב ולחמי רשף וקטב מרירי וכן בהמת אשלה במ עם

חמת זחלי עפר

*'sph 'lymw r'wt ḥsy 'klh bm mzy r'b wlḥmy ršp wqṭb mryry wšn bmwt 'šlh
bm 'm ḥmt zḥly 'pr.*

V: heap (hi impf 1st sg) P: on + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) N: evil N: arrows V: finish (pi impf 1st sg) P: in + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) A: exhausted (pl, cs) N: hunger C: and V: consumed (qal pt pass pl, m) N: pestilence (lit. Reshef) C: and N: destruction (cs) A: poisonous C: and N: tooth N: beasts V: send (pi impf 1st sg) P: in + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: with N: poison (cs) N: serpents (cs) N: dust.

“I will sweep misfortunes on them, use up My arrows on them: wasting famine, ravaging plague, deadly pestilence, and fanged beasts will I let loose against them, with venomous creepers in dust” (Deut 32:23-24; translation by Tigay 1996:308-9).

In Psalm 7:12-14 the metaphor stands alongside the metaphor of the sword, commonly associated with war:

(340) חרבו ילמוש קשתו דרך ויכוננה ולו הכין כלי מות חציו לדלקים יפעל

ḥrbw yltwš qštw drk wykwnnh wlv hkyn kly mwt ḥšyw ldlqym yp'l.

N: sword + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: sharpen (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: bow V: bend (qal pf 3rd sg, m) C: and V: prepare (pol impf 3rd sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) C: and P: for + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: prepare (hi pf 3rd sg, m) N: weapons (cs) N: death N: arrows + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: to V: persecute (qal pt pl, m) V: make (qal impf 3rd sg, m).

“He will sharpen his sword. He has bent his bow and made it ready. He also has prepared the instruments of death for himself; he directed his arrows against the persecutors” (Ps 7:13-14).

Above all, arrows are a metaphor for divine anger in the Hebrew Bible. They serve as a powerful figure for the devastating judgement of those who infuriated God. In Psalm 78:48-49 these arrows are equated with the shattering plagues that was the lot of Egypt. Tate (1990:283) points out that רשפים (v 48) which is usually translated as “thunderbolts” (so KJV, NIV), is probably derived from Canaanite/Phoenician רשק חץ “fiery arrow,” thus denoting arrows of pestilential disease:

(341) ויסגר לברד בעירם ומקניהם לרשפים ישלח במ חרון אפו עברה וזעם וצרה משלחת מלאכי

רעים

wysgr lbrd b'yrn wmqnyhm lršpym yšlh bm ḥrwn 'pw 'brh wz'm wšrh mšlḥt ml'ky r'ym.

V: deliver (hi impf 3rd sg, m) P: to N: hail N: cattle + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) C: and N: livestock + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: to N: fiery arrows V: send (pi impf 3rd sg, m) P: in + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) N: burning (cs) N: nose + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: outpouring¹⁸⁰ C: and N: wrath (lit. foam) C: and N: affliction P: by V: send (qal inf cs) N: messengers (cs) N: evil.

“He gave over their cattle to the hail and their livestock to fiery arrows. He sent them the heat of his face, outpouring and foam; and affliction, by discharging evil angels” (Ps 78:48,49).

רשפים also occurs with the meaning “fiery arrows” in Psalm 76:4:

(342) שמה שבר רשפי קשת מגן וחרב ומלחמה

šmh šbr ršpy qšt mgn wḥrb wmlḥmh.

Loc: there V: break (pi pf 3rd sg, m) N: fiery arrows (cs) N: bow N: shield C: and N: sword C: and N: war.

“There he broke the fiery arrows of the bow, the shield and the sword, the weapons of war (Ps 76:4).

As gods of the underworld, Reshef and Nergal commanded the allegiance of demons (Clines 1989:171). In

¹⁸⁰ See Footnote 51.

Psalm 78:49 they are called “bad angels” (מלאכי רעים). These demonic powers should be regarded as the executors of the wrath of the divinity by working as destroyers in the plagues he sends (Kraus 1989:129). They are often personified by means of Hebrew roots denoting fear. In Job 6:4 and Psalm 88:17 they are called the “terrors” (בעותים) from the root בעה “terrify” (Holladay 1971:45). In Psalm 91:5 the root פחד “tremble (in terror)” is employed to personify the demon accompanying the deadly arrows (Holladay 1971:290):

(343) לא תירא מפחד לילה מחץ יעוף יומם מדבר באפל יהלך מקטב ישוד צהרים

l' tyr' mḫd lyh mḫṣ y'wp ywmm mḏbr b'pl yhlk mqtḅ yšwd šhrym.

Neg particle V: fear (qal impf 2nd sg, m) P: from N: terror (cs) N: night P: from N: arrow V: fly (qal impf 3rd sg, m) Adv: by day P: from N: pestilence P: in N: darkness V: go (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: from N: plague V: devastate (qal impf 3rd sg, m) Adv: noon.

“You will not fear the terror of night, nor the arrow that flies by day, nor the pestilence that stalks in the darkness, nor the plague that destroys at midday” (Ps 91:5-6; NIV).

The messengers of Death (מלאכי מות) that are brought in relation with the anger (חמה) of a king in Proverbs 16:14 should also be understood as demons effectuating illnesses (Tromp 1969:162-5):

(344) חמת מלך מלאכי מות

ḥmt mlk ml'ky mwt.

N: rage (cs) N: king N: messengers (cs) PN: Moth/Death.

“The rage of a king is the messengers of Death” (Prov 16:14).¹⁸¹

The psalmist interprets the illness caused by YHWH’s arrows as a punishment for his sins in Psalm 38:2-3. Some scholars contend that the illness described may be leprosy (cf. Kraus 1988:412). However, the symptoms, which include open wounds, burning loins, numbness, congestion, a ‘growling heart,’ palpitations and blindness, may be too wide ranging to be associated with one disease (Craigie 1983:304):

(345) יהוה אל בקצפך תוכיחני ובחמתך תיסרני כי חציד נחתו בי ... אין מתם מפני זעמך אין שלום

בעצמי מפני חטאתי

yhwh 'l bqṣpk twkyḥny wbḥmtk tysrny ky ḥṣyk nḥtw by ... 'yn mtwm bšry mpny z'mk 'yn šlwm b'šmy mpny ḥt'ty.

PN: YHWH Neg particle P: in N: anger (lit. foam) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) V: rebuke (hi impf 2nd sg, m) + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and P: in N: wrath (lit. foam) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) V: punish (pi impf 2nd sg, m) + pron suffix (1st sg) C: because N: poison arrows + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) V: bring

¹⁸¹ Also see 4.2.11.

down (pi pf 3rd pl)¹⁸² P: in + pron suffix (1st sg) ... Existential particle: there be not N: wholesomeness P: because of N: wrath (lit. foam) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) Existential particle: there be not N: health P: in N: bones + pron suffix (1st sg) P: because of N: sin + pron suffix (1st sg). “YHWH, do not rebuke me in your anger, do not punish me in your wrath. For your poison arrows bring me down ... there is no soundness in my body because of your foaming anger, there is no health in my bones because of my sin” (Ps 38:2-4).¹⁸³

In practically all the texts discussed so far the terminology for anger is that of the metaphor, ANGER IS POISON. Words indicating foaming at the face abound. םזע occurs in Psalms 7:12; 38:4; 78:49, חמה and קצף in Psalms 38:2; עברה and אף in Psalm 78:49. Elsewhere the metaphor is accompanied by strong images of heat. In Deuteronomy 32 it is immediately preceded by the metaphor ANGER IS FIRE. In Psalm 120:4 the arrows of God (cf. Rawlinson 1950a:179; Allen 1983:146) are mentioned along with the especially powerful coals of the broom tree as a metaphor for anger (Fuhs 1975:463). Fuhs (1975:465) points out that it is the aspect of continuing heat that dominates when coals are used as a figure for divine wrath. In this case they probably suggest the sustained heat caused by poisoning (cf. Hartley 1988:132), since ancient Near Eastern mythology holds that the demonic arrows sent by deities carried poison (Kraus 1988:411).

(346) מה יתן לך ומה יסיף לך לשון רמיה חצי גבור שנונים עם גחלי רחמים
mh ytn lk wmh ysyp lk lšwn rmyh ḥṣy gbwr šnwnym ‘m gḥly rtmym.
 Interr pronoun: what V: give (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: to + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and Interr particle: what V: add (hi impf 3rd sg, m)¹⁸⁴ P: to + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) N: tongue A: deceitful N: arrows (cs) N: strong V: sharpened (qal pt pass pl, m) P: with N: coals (cs) N: broom trees.
 “What shall be given to you and what more shall be done to you, deceitful tongue? Sharpened arrows of the strong with coals of the broom trees” (Ps 120:3-4).¹⁸⁵

The ANGER IS POISON metaphor for divine irascibility was probably motivated by the common use of poison arrows as a weapon of war in the ancient Near East (Rawlinson 1950:108; Gruber 1980:525-6; Hartley 1988:132). There is clear evidence in the Hebrew Bible that the ancient Israelites were aware of this practice. However, references to POISON ARROWS mostly function as metaphors for anger on the part of the archer and affliction on the part of the victim:

(347) וימררהו ורבו וישטמהו בעלי חצים
wymrrhw wrbw wyštmhw b‘ly ḥṣym.
 C: and V: poison (qal impf 3rd pl, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and V: shoot (qal pf 3rd pl) C: and

¹⁸² See Footnote 146.

¹⁸³ Also see 4.2.7.

¹⁸⁴ יסף hi functions as an adverb in oath-formulas. See Holladay (1971:137).

¹⁸⁵ Also see 4.2.2.6.

V: hate (qal impf 3rd pl, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: lords (cs) N: arrows.

“And the archers shot and poisoned him; they hated him” (Gen 49:23).

In Job 6:4, the perception that God’s arrows carry poison is unmistakably brought to the fore. Job understood his own suffering as proceeding from attacks and persecutions that God directed against him in his anger (Lange 1874:346; Smick 1988:900). These attacks were conceptualised as poison arrows, of which he was the target:

(348) כִּי חֲצֵי שְׂדֵי עֲמֹדֵי אֲשֶׁר חִמְחַם שָׁתָה רוּחִי בְּעוֹתֵי אֱלֹהִים יַעֲרֹכְנֵנִי

ky ḥṣy šdy ‘mdy ’šr ḥmtm šth rwḥy b’wty ’lwh y’rkwny.

C: because N: arrows (cs) PN: Shaddai/Almighty P: in + pron suffix (1st sg) Rel pronoun: that N: poison + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) V: drink (qal pt sg, m) N: spirit (lit. breath) + pron suffix (1st sg) N: terrors (cs) PN: Eloah V: form up against (qal impf 3rd pl, m) + pron suffix (1st sg).

“For the arrows of Shaddai are in me, my spirit drinks in their poison. Eloah’s terrors are marshalled against me” (Job 6:4, ZK).

Shaddai (שְׂדֵי) the Archer (cf. Job 16:13) in this v is effectively Reshef (Clines 1989:171). Again there is reference to the demons who apply his wrath, the “terrors” (בְּעוֹתֵימָם). Clines (1989:171) aptly summarises the concept underlying the metaphor of poison arrows as presented in this verse:

His life-force or vitality (רוּחִי) has been enfeebled by drinking in the venom of God’s bitterness against him, and he feels himself beleaguered by the terrifying hostility of God.

The words of Naomi in Ruth 1:20 reflect a similar conceptual background, even though there is no specific reference to poison arrows. The subject is again Shaddai, and he has poisoned (בָּרַר) her. An identical expression is found in Job 27:2:

(349) כִּי הִמַּר שְׂדֵי לִי מְאֹד

ky hmr šdy ly m’d.

C: because V: poison (hi pf 3rd sg, m) PN: Shaddai/Almighty P: to + pron suffix (1st sg) Adv: very much.

“For Shaddai has poisoned me very much” (Ruth 1:20).

(350) וְשְׂדֵי הִמַּר נַפְשִׁי

wšdy hmr npšy.

C: and PN: Shaddai/Almighty V: poison (hi pf 3rd sg, m) N: throat + pron suffix (1st sg).

“And Shaddai poisoned my throat” (Job 27:2).

Poison arrows (בָּרַר דָּבַר מָר; cf. Tate 1990:131; Dahood 1986:104) as metaphor for anger is not limited to

deities. In Psalm 64:4 it is used as a figure for the antagonism of the psalmist's adversaries:

(351) אשר שנגנו כחרב לשונם דרכו חצם דבר מר
'šr šnnw kḥrb lšwnm drkw ḥšm dbr mr.

Rel pronoun: who V: sharpen (qal impf 3rd pl) P: like N: sword N: tongue + (3rd pl, m) V: string (qal pf 3rd pl) N: arrows + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) N: word/substance A: bitter.

“[They] who sharpen their tongue like a sword, who string (their bows) for arrows – their angry words” (Ps 64:4).¹⁸⁶

In response, God shoots arrows at them (Ps 64:8). The root used for their wounds, מכה, also means “plague” (Holladay 1971:194):

(352) וירם אלהים חץ פתאום היו מכוחם וכשילוהו עלימו לשונם יתגדרו כל ראה במ
wyrm 'lhym ḥṣ pt'wm hyw mkwtm wykšylwhw 'lymw lšwnm ytnddw kl r'h
bm.

C: and V: shoot (hi impf 3rd sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) N: god N: arrow Adv: suddenly V: become (qal pf 3rd pl) N: wounds + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) C: and V: make fall (hi impf 3rd pl, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: on + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: tongue + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) V: flee (hitp impf 3rd pl, m) Indef pronoun: all VN: beholder (qal pt sg, m) P: in + pron suffix (3rd pl, m).

“But God will shoot them with an arrow; suddenly they will be wounded” (Ps 64:8).

Comparable to the above image is Job 16:13. Being hit by the arrows of adversaries also results in the victim's gall (מררה) being poured out. This is again reminiscent of the metonymy of FOAM AT THE MOUTH. However, in this case, the foaming stands for a symptom of poisoning rather than anger as a violent epileptic attack:

(353) יסבו עלי רביו יפלה כליותי ולא יחמול ישפך לארץ מררתי
ysbw 'ly rbyw yplḥ klywty wl' yḥmwly yšpk l'rṣ mrrty.

V: surround (qal impf 3rd pl) P: on + pron suffix (1st sg) N: archers + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: split open (pi impf 3rd sg, m) N: kidneys + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and Neg particle V: feel compassion (qal impf 3rd sg, m) V: pour out (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: to N: ground N: gall + pron suffix (1st sg).

“His archers surround me; mercilessly they split open my kidneys. My gall spills on the ground” (Job 16:13).

The lightning (ברק) that enters the body of a victim in Job 20:25 also seems to fit in neatly in the conceptual framework of the ANGER IS POISON ARROWS metaphor. In keeping with Reshef imagery, the wounded is surrounded by fever-causing demons (אזמים; cf. Keel 1997:78-80) that threaten his life. In addition, the

¹⁸⁶ Also see 4.2.11.

statement that YHWH sends (שלח) his poisonous froth (חרון אף) to the victim of wrath (v 23) adds to the image of fever causing arrows. The verb שלח in this context evokes the image of demons of illnesses that were sometimes sent by gods as instruments of wrath (cf. Tromp 1969:163). The two texts read as follows:

(354) ישלח בו חרון אפו וימטר עלימו

yšlh bw ḥrwn 'pw wymṭr 'lymw.

V: send (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: in + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: burning (froth?) N: face (lit. nose) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and N: rain (hi impf 3rd sg, m) P: on + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“He sends his poisonous anger to him, and rains it on him” (Job 20:23).

(355) שלף ויצא מגוה וברק ממרחו יהלך עליו אמים

šlp wyš' mgwh wbrq mmrṭw yhlk 'lyw 'mym.

V: draw (qal pf 3rd sg, m) C: and V: come out (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: from N: body C: and N: lightning P: from N: gall + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: go (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: on + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: terrors.

“Lightning is drawn from his body and comes out of his gall. Terrors are upon him” (Job 20:25).

The ANGER IS POISON ARROWS metaphor focuses on the suffering of the victim of anger. Being struck by an arrow or being poisoned leads to intense physical discomfort often localised in internal organs, such as the heart and kidneys (Ps 73:21). In Lamentations 3:12-13 it is the kidneys that are the target of YHWH's poison arrows:

(356) דרך קשתו ויצבני כמטרא לחץ הביא בכליותי בני אשפתו

drk qštw wyšybnny kmṭr' lḥš hby' bklywty bny 'šptw.

V: draw (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: bow + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and V: set up (hi impf 3rd sg, m) + pron suffix (1st sg) P: as N: target P: for N: arrow V: bring (hi pf 3rd sg, m) P: in N: kidneys + pron suffix (1st sg) N: sons (cs) N: quiver + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“He drew his bow and set me up as a target for the arrow. He sent his arrows in my kidneys” (Lam 3:12-13).

However, it needs to be emphasised that the primary sense of Hebrew לב is the internal invisible part of the human body as opposed to the face (פנים) as the visible part (Dhorme 1963:109-10). The same can be said of the kidneys (Dhorme 1963:131). Thus, when these two organs are mentioned side by side, the author did not necessarily intend a sharp biological distinction between the two. Naturally, the bitterness caused by the reins being hit can be felt in the heart, too (Dhorme 1963:131):

(357) כי יתחמץ לבבי וכליותי אשתונן

ky yṭmš lbby wklywty 'štwnn.

C: because V: turn bitter (hi impf 3rd sg, m) N: heart + pron suffix (1st sg, m) C: and N: kidneys + pron suffix (1st sg) V: sharply stabbed¹⁸⁷ (hitpolel impf 1st sg).

“For my heart turned bitter and I was hit in my reins” (Ps 73:21).

Unsurprisingly, pain caused by poisoning, which is often localised in the heart, can also be associated with the stomach (Dhorme 1963:133):

(358) זאח רעהך כי מר כי נגע עד לבך מעי מעי אחללה¹⁸⁸ קירות לבי

z't r'tk ky mr ky ngc 'd lbk m'y m'y 'hllh qyrwt lby.

Demonstr pronoun: this (sg, f) N: destruction (sg, f) + pron suffix (2nd sg, f) C: because A: bitter C: because V: hurt (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: to N: heart + pron suffix (2nd sg, f) N: bowels + pron suffix (1st sg) N: bowels + pron suffix (1st sg) V: wounded (pol coh sg) N: walls (cs) N: heart + pron suffix (1st sg).

“This is your own wickedness that is so bitter, for he has pierced your heart. My bowels, my bowels, I am wounded!” (Jer 4:18-19).

In summary, the following correspondencies can be outlined:

- The poison arrow is anger.
- The archer is the angry person.
- The victim is the object of anger.

<i>Source:</i>	<i>Target:</i>
Poison arrows are dangerous.	Anger leads to severe injury.
God uses poison arrows against disobedient people.	Anger is punishment.

4.2.10 Anger is an Opponent (in a Struggle)

It has already been noted that a negative attitude towards human anger is advanced in the Hebrew Bible. This is especially true of the wisdom literature, which judges anger to be extremely negative (Prov 27:4) and links it with jealousy (Prov 6:34) (Schunck 1977:1034). Accordingly, Proverbs 22:24 even warns against having any contact with an angry person (Schunck 1977:1034). This criticism of anger corresponds with the dismissive approach to the same emotion in English (Kövecses 1990:61):

All in all, anger is understood in our cultural model as a negative emotion. It produces undesirable physiological reactions, leads to an inability to function normally, and is dangerous to others.

¹⁸⁷ Cf. Isa 5:28 where the verb שָׁנַן “to sharpen” (Holladay 1971:379) has an arrow as object.

¹⁸⁸ MT reads the highly unlikely אֲחִילֵּה. Cf. also Althann (1985:19-28) and Craigie, Kelley & Drinkard (1991:78).

Therefore, it is not surprising that we find evidence for the figure, ANGER IS AN OPPONENT in the Hebrew Bible (Kruger 2000:190). As in English, this metaphor focuses on the issue of control (Kövecses 1990:62):

(359) טוב ארך אפים מנבור ומשל ברוחו מלכד עיר

twb 'rk 'pym mgbwr wmsl brwhw mlkd 'yr.

Adv: better N: long (cs) N: nostrils P (comparative): than N: warrior C: and VN: master (qal pt sg, m) P: in N: anger (lit. breath) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: (comparative): than VN: conqueror (qal pt sg, m) N: city.

“He that controls¹⁸⁹ his anger is stronger than a warrior, a man who masters his ire¹⁹⁰ than one who takes a city” (Prov 16:32).¹⁹¹

The following correspondences have been identified by Kövecses (1990:61) for the English version of the metaphor:

- The opponent is anger
- Winning is controlling anger
- Losing is having anger control you
- Surrender is allowing anger to take control of you
- The pool of resources needed for winning is the energy needed to control anger

4.2.11 Anger is a Dangerous Animal

The metaphor, ANGER IS A DANGEROUS ANIMAL also addresses itself to the issue of emotion control, but its main focus in English is the potential danger to others (Kövecses 1990:62). In this metaphor, losing control over one’s anger is equivalent to a dangerous animal getting loose (Kövecses 1990:62).¹⁹² In the Hebrew Bible as well, the metaphor is quite successful in emphasizing the danger associated with anger.

The conceptual link between anger and dangerous animals in the ancient Near East was strongly inspired by the presence of lions in this region (cf. Watts 1985:65). There are several words in Classical Hebrew designating “lion,” some of which are used only in poetical contexts. This testifies to the impact that lions had on the imagination of Palestinians. The colloquial for lion was אַרְיֵה, and was used of the African lion. לְבִיא, “lion/lioness” (Davidson 1967:406) distinguished the Asiatic lion from Persia. The term כַּפִּיר, “young lion,” which is also often encountered in metaphoric descriptions of anger, indicated a lion old enough to hunt. The other terms, לֵישׁ and שׂוּזַל, are only poetic designations (Watts 1985:65; McComiskey 1992:217).

¹⁸⁹ See Footnote 22.

¹⁹⁰ See Footnote 23.

¹⁹¹ Also see 4.1.2.

¹⁹² Also see 4.2.2.6.

The innovative use of lion imagery to denote anger is also present in theophany. In the first couplet of the archetypical theophany in Amos 1:2, YHWH is portrayed as “roaring” (שׁאג) and therefore metaphorically compared to a lion (Stuart 1987:300). Niehaus (1992:338) indicates that this root signifies the kind of roaring that a lion does when it is about to attack, as opposed to נהם “to growl” (Davidson 1967:538). It therefore functions as a good alternative to the usual “to come” (בוא) which usually indicates YHWH’s approach in the theophany (Jeremias 1965:8-10, 13).

The verb שׁאג functions as a parallel to the נתן קולו “he gives his voice” in the second couplet, which commonly signifies thunder in the Hebrew Bible, as well as in the Ugaritic Baal theophanies and in the Akkadian Adad (= Baal) theophanies (Jeremias 1965:79-80; Niehaus 1992:338). McComiskey (1985:281) indicates that שׁאג does not always have the meaning “to roar.” In this text too, שׁאג should be taken as concretely indicating thunder (Jeremias 1965:13). However, its value as a metaphor, albeit conventional, picturing an angry god in his onset, should not be underestimated:

(360) יהוה מציון ישאג ומירושלם יתן קולו ואבלו נאות הרעים ויבש ראש הכרמל
yhwh msywn ys’g wmyrwšlym ytn qwlw w’blw n’wt hr’ym wybš r’s hkrml.
 PN: YHWH P: from PN: Zion V: roar (qal impf 3rd sg, m) C: P: from PN: Jerusalem V: give (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: voice + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and V: mourn (qal pf 3rd pl) N: pastures (cs)
 VN: shepherd (qal pt pl, m, def) C: and V: wither (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: top (cs) PN: Carmel.
 “YHWH roars from Zion and thunders from Jerusalem; the pastures of the shepherds dry up, and the top of Carmel withers” (Am 1:2).¹⁹³

Royal anger (זעף מלך) is depicted as something to be feared in Proverbs 19:12, where it is compared to the growling (נהם) of a lion (Murphy 1998:43-4):

(361) נהם ככפיר זעף מלך
nhm kkpyr z’p mlk.
 N: roar P: like N: lion N: rage (cs) N: king.
 “A king’s rage is like the roar of a lion” (Prov 19:12; NIV).

The ancient Israelites experienced the roar of a lion as terrifying. It often precluded danger and death (Deane 1950:369). In a parallel saying, the “terror of a king” (אימת מלך) is likened to the growling of a lion (Prov 20:2). Commentators agree that this terror refers to “the terror which a king causes when his anger is rising” (Deane 1950:383; cf. NIV; Lange 1869:177; Murphy 1998:148-9).

The use of the term חטא in Prov 20:2, which is often translated with “sin” (so KJV; cf. Holladay 1971:100), has proven difficult for commentators (cf. Lawson 1980:321). Although scholars have suggested

¹⁹³ Also see 4.2.3.

various solutions based on supposed meanings of this term, they mostly arrive at the same conclusion, namely, that the phrase, חוֹטֵא נִפְשׁוֹ, points to the danger of death as a result of provoking the king to anger (cf. McKane 1970:543-4; Plöger 1984: 229-30; Murphy 1998:149):

(362) נָהַם כַּכְּפִיר אֵימַת מֶלֶךְ מִתְעַבְּרוּ חוֹטֵא נִפְשׁוֹ

nhm kkp̄yr 'ymt mlk mt'brw ḥwṭ' npšw.

N: roar P: like N: lion N: terror (f, cs) N: king VN: make angry (hitp pt pl, m) V: feel the lack (qal pt sg, m) N: throat + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“The terror of a king is like the roaring of a lion. He who provokes him to anger endangers his own life” (Prov 20:2).¹⁹⁴

In language comparable with theophany, YHWH is also depicted as a lion (אַרְיֵה) going up (עָלָה) from the Jordan to hunt in Jeremiah 49:19-20 (cf. 50:44-45):

(363) הִנֵּה כְּאַרְיֵה יַעֲלֶה מִגְּאוֹן הַיַּרְדֵּן אֵל נֹה אֵיטָן כִּי אֲרַגְעָה אֲרוּצִים מֵעֲלִיָּה

hnh k'ryh y'lh mg'wn hyrdn 'l nwh 'ytn ky 'rg'h 'rwšm m'lyh.

Particle of focus: behold P: like N: lion V: go up (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: from N: forest (cs) PN: Jordan P: to N: pasture A: well watered (lit. ever flowing) C: so V: make suddenly (hi coh sg) V: run (hi impf 1st sg) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: from + pron suffix (3rd sg, f).

“Behold, like a lion goes up from the jungle of the Jordan to the pasture well watered, so I will in a moment run away her sucklings” (Jer 50:44; translation by Keown, Scalise & Smothers 1995:327).

In Hosea 5:14 we encounter the poetic fixed pair “lion” (שַׁחַל) and “young lion” (כַּפִּיר) as a metaphor for divine anger (עֲבָרָה), referred to in v 10 (Stuart 1987:105):

(364) כִּי אֲנֹכִי כְּשַׁחַל לְאַפְרַיִם וְכַכְּפִיר לְבֵית יִהוּדָה אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲטַרְףֶּנּוּ וְאֵלֶּךְ אֲשָׂא וְאֵין מְצִיל

ky 'nky kšḥl l'p̄rym wkkp̄yr lbyṭ yhwḏh 'ny 'ny 'trp w'lk 'ś' w'yn mšyl.

C: because Pronoun: I P: like N: lion P: to PN: Ephraim C: and P: like N: lion P: to PN: Judah Pronoun: I (emphasis) V: tear (qal impf 1st sg) C: and V: go (qal impf 1st sg) V: carry off (qal impf 1st sg) C: and Existential particle: there be not VN: rescue (hi pt sg, m).

“For I will be like a lion to Ephraim, like a great lion to Judah. I will tear them to pieces and go away; I will carry them off, with no one to rescue them” (Hos 5:14; NIV).

In Amos 1:11, the root טַרַף “to tear,” is used to depict anger as a violent animal ripping up its prey. Kruger (2000:190) observes that the verb usually has a lion as subject (Deut 33:20; Ezek 19:3, 6; Mic 5:7; Ps 17:12; etc.):

¹⁹⁴ Also see 4.2.1.3.

(365) ויטרף לעד אפר

wytrp l'ed 'pw.

C: and V: tear (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: to N: perpetuity N: anger + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“And his anger tore unceasingly” (Am 1:11).

Anger is also said “to tear in pieces” (טרף, Holladay 1971:125) in Job 16:9:

(366) אפר טרף וישטמני חרק עלי בשניו צרי ילוש עיניו לי

'pw trp wyštmy hrq 'ly bšnyw šry yltwš 'nyw ly.

N: anger (lit. nose) V: tear (qal pf 3rd sg, m) C: and V: hate (qal impf 3rd sg, m) + pron suffix (1st sg)

V: gnash (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: on + pron suffix (1st sg) P: with N: teeth + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: adversary + pron suffix (1st sg) V: sharpen (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: eyes + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: to + pron suffix (1st sg).

His anger tears, and he who hates me gnashes on me with his teeth. My enemy looks daggers at me (Job 16:9; ZK; cf. Kruger 2000:190).¹⁹⁵

The characteristic lacerating (טרף) of the throat (נפש) of his victim in a lion's attack is also metaphorically brought into relation with anger in Psalm 7:3:¹⁹⁶

(367) פן ישרף כאריה נפשי

pn ytrp k'ryh npšy.

C: lest V: tear (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: like N: lion N: throat + pron suffix (1st sg).

“Lest he tears my throat like a lion” (Ps 7:3).

Although the ferocity of a lion serves as an ideal picture for the violence and danger of anger, the brutal force of bears seems to be an even more suitable image for this feared emotion in the Hebrew Bible. While bears were absent from the flat river valleys of Mesopotamia and Egypt, they were commonly encountered in Syria-Palestine. The ferocity of the Syrian bear was well known to the Egyptians, as is evidenced by illustrations (Keel 1997:89). The epic savageness of this wild animal is attested to by the account of a bear that swiftly killed 42 children who mocked Elisha in 2 Kings 2:24. It is therefore not surprising to find that a she-bear bereaved of her cubs is used to figure rage (lit. “bitterness of throat,” מרי נפש) in 2 Samuel 17:8.¹⁹⁷ This image may be stronger than the lion metaphor, since even those with courage like a lion (lit. “heart of a lion,” כלב האריה) will melt with fear (v 10).¹⁹⁸

(368) אתה ידעת את אביך ואת אנשיו כי גברים המה מרי נפש המה כרב שכול בשדה

¹⁹⁵ Also see 4.1.5.

¹⁹⁶ This violence of the psalmist's enemies is an act of anger (עברה) in v 7.

¹⁹⁷ Anderson (1989:210) renders מרי נפש, “furious,” and Youngblood (1992:1010), “fierce.” Cf. Johnson (1964:11).

¹⁹⁸ Some suggest the existence of a riddle in Classical Hebrew: “What is worse to meet than a bear?” (cf. Deane 1950:333).

'th yd't 't 'byk w't 'nšyw ky gbrym hmh wmry npš hmh kdb škwl bšdh.

Pronoun: you V: know (qal pf 2nd sg, m) Nota accusativi N: father + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and
Nota accusativi N: men + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: for N: mighty (men) Pronoun: they A: bitter (pl,
cs) N: throat Pronoun: they P: like N: bear A: bereaved P: in N: field.

“You know your father and his men: For they are mighty men and they are bitter in the throat like a
she-bear robbed of her cubs in the field” (2 Sam 17:8).¹⁹⁹

It has already been pointed out that the wisdom literature associates the inability to control anger with
foolishness.²⁰⁰ Proverbs 17:12 seems to indicate that the anger of a fool is even worse than a she-bear robbed
of her cubs:

(369) פגוש דב שכול באיש ואל כסיל באולתו

pgwš kb škwl b'yš w'l ksyl b'wltw.

V: meet (qal inf cs) N: bear A: bereaved P: with N: man C: and Neg particle N: fool P: in N:
foolishness + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“Better to meet a bear robbed of her cubs than a fool in his folly” (Prov 17:12; NIV).

Some commentators take “foolishness” (אולת) to indicate wickedness, which can be harmful (cf. Ross
1991:1017; Murphy 1998:130). Hence, they find the proverb ironic and even humorous (cf. Murphy
1998:130). However, the clear link that the wisdom literature establishes between anger and folly supports
the translation of אולת with “fury” (cf. Lange 1869:162; Deane 1950:333). This rendering is substantiated by
the fact that the bear metaphor is exclusively used to denote fierce anger. Lawson (1980:264) correctly
associates the anger of a fool, as described here by means of bear imagery, with a total loss of self-control (cf.
4.2.4 above). He interprets the *bon mot* thus:

This animal [she-bear] in its greatest fury is not so dangerous as a fool in the heat of
passion. A bear in its rage makes no distinction between those who have robbed her and
others, but falls upon anyone she sees and tears him in pieces; and yet you may by proper
means escape from her, or secure yourself from her violence. But a fool in his folly will
neither be reduced to reason by just reproofs, nor soothed by the mildest language (Lawson
1980:264).

Sometimes the simile of a bear and a lion combines to typify violent anger:

(370) דב ארב הוא לי אריה במסתרים דרכי סורר ויפשחני שמני שמם

db 'rb hw' ly 'ryh bmstry m drky swrr wypšḥny šmny šm.

¹⁹⁹ Also sec 4.2.9.

²⁰⁰ See 4.2.7.

N: bear V: lurk (qal pt sg, m) Pronoun: he P: to + pron suffix (1st sg) N: lion P: in N: hiding places
 N: roads + pron suffix (1st sg) V: make depart C: and V: tear in pieces (pi impf 3rd sg, m) + pron
 suffix (1st sg) V: place (qal pf 3rd sg, m) + pron suffix (1st sg) A: desolate.

“Like a bear lying in wait, like a lion in hiding, he dragged me from the path and mangled me and left me without help” (Lam 3:10-11; NIV).

Stuart (1987:204) points out that the attack of wild animals was a common curse motif in ancient Near Eastern covenant sanctions. This was also the case with the Sinai covenant (cf. Lev 26:22; Deut 32:24 etc.):

In these references the lion is described most often, though a variety of animals from bees to wolves are also mentioned as animal agents symbolic of divine wrath.

In Hosea 13:7-8, the leopard (נמר) stands next to the usual lion (שחל) and bear (ב). As the bear and the lion, the leopard was native to Palestine and known for its relentless manner of killing (Wood 1985:221):

(371) ואהי להם כמו שחל כנמר על דרך אשר אפגשם כרב שכול ואקרע סגור לבם ואכלם שם
 כלביא חית השדה תבקעם

*w'hy lhm kmw šhl knmr 'l drk 'šwr 'pg šm kdb škwł w'qr' sgwr lhm w'klm
 šm klby' hyt hśdh tbq'm.*

C: and V: become (qal impf 1st sg) P: to + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: like N: lion P: like N: leopard P:
 on N: road V: lie in wait (qal impf 1st sg) V: attack (qal impf 1st sg) P: like N: bear A: robbed C: and
 V: rend (qal impf 1st sg) N: enclosure (cs) N: heart + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) C: eat (qal impf 1st sg) +
 pron suffix (3rd pl, m) Loc: there P: like N: lion N: beast (cs) N: field V: rip open (pi impf 3rd sg, f)
 + pron suffix (3rd pl, m).

“I will become to them like a lion; like a leopard by the road I will lie in wait. I will attack²⁰¹ them
 like a bear bereaved of her cubs,²⁰² I will rip open their intestines.²⁰³ There will I devour them like a
 lion: the beasts of the field²⁰⁴ will tear them” (Hos 13:7-8).

Hosea’s reference to wild animals differs from the covenant sanctions in Leviticus (cf. 26:22 below), where
 beasts are named as instruments of destruction (McComiskey 1992:217). Here the mention of a she-bear
 robbed of her whelps functions as an intense image of destructive rage (Stuart 1987:204).

In Psalm 124:3 the anger of the enemy is compared to something that “swallows” (בלע) its victim
 “alive” (ח). This verb is used of a lion in Psalm 7:3 and of the big fish that swallowed Jonah alive (Jon 1:17).

²⁰¹ For this translation of פגש, “to meet” (Holladay 1971:288), see Stuart (1987:199).

²⁰² Lit. “bereaved” (שכול). The object, “her cubs,” is evident (McComiskey 1992:217).

²⁰³ סגור לבם, “enclosure of the heart” is too precise and clinical for Hosea’s strong image (McComiskey 1992:217), hence
 “intestines,” (cf. Stuart 1987:199).

²⁰⁴ The “beasts of the field” refers to the lion and the leopard as opposed to the bear (Wood 1985:220-1).

Several commentators contend that a mythological monster is implied by the use of בלע in this verse, especially since there is reference to floodwaters in the following two verses (Allen 1983: 162):

(372) אוי חיים בלענו בחרות אפם בנו

'zy hyym bl'wnw bħrwt 'pm bnw.

C: then A: alive V: swallow (qal pf 3rd pl) + pron suffix (1st pl) P: in V: burn (qal inf cs) N: anger (lit. nose) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: with + pron suffix (3rd pl, m).

“Then they would have swallowed us alive when they got angry with us” (Ps 124:3).

The same verb is used of YHWH’s anger in Psalm 21:10:

(373) תשיחמו כתנור אש לעת פניך יהוה באפו יבלעם ותאכלם אש

tšytmw ktnwr 'š l't pnyk yhw h b'pw ybl'm wt'klm 'š.

V: make (hi impf 2nd sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: like N: oven (cs) N: fire P: in N: time (cs) N: face + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) PN: YHWH P: in N: wrath + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: swallow (pi impf 3rd sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) C: and V: consume (qal impf 3rd sg, f) + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) N: fire.

“You will make them like an oven of fire when you appear. YHWH will swallow them in his anger and the fire will consume them” (Ps 21:10).²⁰⁵

The image of a devouring animal can also be conveyed by the verb אכל, “to eat” (Holladay 1971:14) (cf. Ezek 36:13):

(374) ואכל אהם באפי

w'kl 'tm b'py.

C: and V: eat (qal pf 1st sg) Nota accusativi + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: in N: anger + pron suffix (1st sg).

“Therefore I consumed them in my anger” (Ezek 43:8).

In Isaiah 48:9 the root חטם, which in Late Hebrew denoted a muzzle (Davidson 1967:255; cf. Kruger 2000:190), is used to picture anger control:

(375) למען שמי אאריך אפי ותהלתי אחטם לך

lm'n šmy 'ryk 'py wthlty 'h tm lk.

P: for the sake of N: name + pron suffix (1st sg) V: lengthen (hi impf 1st sg) N: nose + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and N: renown + pron suffix (1st sg) V: restrain oneself (qal impf 1st sg) P: for + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).

²⁰⁵ Also see 4.2.2.2.

“For my name’s sake I will calm down my anger,²⁰⁶ for the sake of my praise I will hold it back from you” (Isa 48:9).

Similarly, the root כָּפַח, which is used figuratively with the meaning “to tame” (Strong 1961:57), is employed in Proverbs 21:14 as a metaphor for anger being appeased:

- (376) מתן בסתר יכפה אף ושחד בחק חמה עזה
mtn bstr ykph ’p wšhd bḥq ḥmh ‘zh.
 N: gift P: in N: secret V: tame (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: anger C: and N: present P: in N: cloak N: wrath A: strong.

“A gift in secret appeases anger, and a reward in the cloak strong wrath” (Prov 21:14).

The root עוֹר III, “to stir up” (Holladay 1971:268), is contrasted with restraining anger in Psalm 78:38. Kruger (2000:190) points out that the same root is used to indicate the “arousal” of a crocodile in Job 41:2:

- (377) והרבה להשיב אפו ולא יעיר כל חמתו
whrbh lhšyb ’pw wl’ y’yr kl ḥmtw.
 C: and V: increase (hi pf 3rd sg, m) P: to V: turn (hi inf cs) N: anger + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and Neg particle V: raise (hi impf 3rd sg, m) Pronoun: all N: wrath + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“Many times he restrained his wrath and did not stir up his anger” (Ps 78:38; translation by Kruger 2000:190).

In Isaiah 37:29 we find clear evidence of the entailment: TAMING THE ANIMAL IS CALMING DOWN THE ANGER:

- (378) יען החרגוך אלי ושאנך עלה באזני ושמתי חחי באפך ומתגני בשפתיך והשבתיך בדרך אשר באת
 בה
y’n htrgzk ’ly wš’nnk ’lh b’zny wśmty ḥḥy b’pk wmtgy bśptyk whšybytk bdrk ’šr b’t bh.

C: because VN: rage (hitp inf cs) + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) P: to + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and N: tumult + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) V: go up (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: in N: ears + pron suffix (1st sg) C: and V: put (qal pf 1st sg) N: hook + pron suffix (1st sg) P: in N: nose + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and N: bridle P: in N: lips + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and V: turn back (hi pf 1st sg, m) P: in N: road Rel pronoun: that V: come (qal pf 2nd sg, m) P: in + pron suffix (3rd sg, f).

“Because your rage against me and your tumult has come up into my ears, therefore I will put my hook in your nose and my bridle in your lips, and I will take you back the way you have come” (Isa 37:29).

²⁰⁶ See 4.1.2.

In order to appropriately interpret the ANGER IS A DANGEROUS ANIMAL metaphor, we need to consider the scope of the DANGEROUS ANIMAL figure in the Hebrew Bible. The aspect of danger with regard to the lion, bear and viper hardly needs to be emphasised. These animals all share the potential to imperil a man's life, and indeed, they repeatedly did so (Keel 1997:87-8). In a brilliant portrayal of the darkness (i.e. danger to life; cf. Tromp 1969:142) coupled with the Day of YHWH, the prophet artfully employs the metaphor of a DANGEROUS ANIMAL in Amos 5:19:

(379) כאשר ינוס איש מפני הארי ופגעו הדב ובא הבית וסמך ידו על הקיר ונשכו הנחש
*k'sr ynws 'yš mpny h'ry wpg'w hdb wb' hbyt wsmk ydw 'l hqyr wnškw
 hnḥš.*

C: as V: escape (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: man (indef) P: from N: lion (def) C: and (consec) V: encounter (qal pf 3rd sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: bear (def) C: and (consec) V: come (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: home C: and (consec) V: lean (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: hand + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: against N: wall (def) C: and (consec) V: bite (qal pf 3rd sg, m) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: snake (def).

“As when a man escapes from a lion to be encountered by a bear. He *flees* [to the safety of his] home, leans against the wall and a snake bites him” (Amos 5:19).

A very important notion of the DANGEROUS ANIMAL metaphor that can easily be overlooked, is its relationship with death and the underworld. From the earliest times, demons have been portrayed with leonine features (Keel 1997:85). Not surprisingly, lions and serpents have often been associated with death in the Hebrew Bible (Tromp 1969:164). In analogy to the Ugaritic Leviathan and serpents and dragons in ancient Near Eastern mythology, the lion represents destruction and death:

(380) על שחל ופתן תדרך תרמס כפיר ותנין
'l šḥl wptn tdrk trms kpyr wtnyn.

P: on N: lion-cub C: and N: cobra V: tread (qal impf 2nd sg, m) V: trample (qal impf 2nd sg, m) N: young lion C: and N: sea monster (def).

“You will tread on the lion-cub and cobra; you will trample the young lion and the sea monster” (Ps 91:13).

The fact that the scope of the DANGEROUS ANIMAL metaphor includes death and the underworld may be of import for the conceptualisation of anger in the Hebrew Bible. Indeed, Proverbs 16:14 brings the ire of a king in direct relation with Moth, the king of the Underworld, and his demons (Tromp 1969:160-2):

(381) חמת מלך מלאכי מות
ḥmt mlk ml'ky mwt.

N: rage (cs) N: king N: messengers (cs) PN: Moth.

“The rage of a king is the messengers of Death” (Prov 16:14).²⁰⁷

This conceptual link between dangerous animals and supernatural beings as workers of evil also provides the backdrop for the interpretation of references to beasts in treaty curses (cf. Hillers 1964:54-6). Devouring animals are listed together with several other metaphors for divine anger in Lamentations 3 to portray the curses that befall those who disregard the covenant of YHWH (see the listing of v 10 above). This type of curse is found in Leviticus 26:22:

(382) והשלחתי בכם את חית השדה ושכלה אתכם והכריתה את בהמתכם והמעטיה אתכם ונשמו
דרכיכם

*whšlḥty bkm 't ḥyt ḥsdh wšklh 'tkm whkryth 't bmtkm whm'yth 'tkm
wnšmw drkykm.*

C: and (consec) V: send (hi pf 1st sg) P: with + pron suffix (2nd pl, m) Nota accusativi N: animal (f, cs) N: field (def) C: and V: bereave of children (pi pf 3rd sg, f) Nota accusativi + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and V: root out (hi pf 3rd sg, f) Nota accusativi N: cattle + pron suffix (2nd pl, m) C: and V: make the number few (hi pf 3rd sg, f) Nota accusativi + pron suffix (2nd pl, m) C: and V: be made deserted (ni pf 3rd pl) N: roads + pron suffix (2nd pl, m).

“And I will send the beast of the field against you. You will be bereaved of children and it will root out your cattle and make your number few. Your roads will be deserted” (Lev 26:22).

In addition to being symbols of danger and the underworld, the DANGEROUS ANIMAL figure also commonly stands for an enemy. This is especially true with regard to the metaphoric use of the lion as source (Hillers 1964:56). However, this aspect is often overshadowed by the notion of malevolence. Psalm 10:9 deserves quotation as an illustration of this use:

(383) יארב במסתר כאריה בסכה יארב לחטוף עני
y'rb bmstr k'ryh bskh y'rb lḥṭwp 'ny.

V: lie in ambush (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: in N: hiding place (def) P: as N: lion (indef) P: in N: thicket
V: lie in ambush (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: to V: seize (qal inf cs) N: poor.

“He lies in ambush in a hiding place, as a lion lies in ambush in a thicket, to seize the poor” (Ps 10:9).

The evil of the iniquitous in the above animal comparison is underscored by the fact that the godless do not want to rob the complainant of his goods, or any other quality; he wants to rob the poor of his life, and that alone (Keel 1997:88).

A close investigation of the scope of the DANGEROUS ANIMAL metaphor revealed that this figure in the

²⁰⁷ Also see 4.2.9.1.

Hebrew Bible is more detailed with regard to conceptual content than its English counterpart. Where the English version focuses on the aspect of danger in the event of loss of control, anger is closely linked with evil and the demonic in the Biblical Hebrew account of the same metaphor. By way of summary, the ontological and epistemological correspondences can be summarised as follows:

- The dangerous animal is anger.
- The victim of the animal is the object of anger.

<i>Source:</i>	<i>Target:</i>
Dangerous animals are violent.	Anger is violent.
Dangerous animals sometimes swallow their preys alive.	Anger sometimes leads to swift destruction.
Dangerous animals are easily provoked.	Anger is easily stirred up.
Dangerous animals are demonic.	Anger is demonic.

Another parallel, which is closely tied to the metonymy, AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOUR STANDS FOR ANGER, can be added to the list of ontological correspondences (Kövecses 1990:63-4):

- The aggressive behaviour of the dangerous animal is angry behaviour

Kövecses (1990:63-4) points out that this correlation can be seen as “a combination of metaphor and metonymy, in which the aggressive behaviour metaphorically corresponds to angry behaviour, which in turn metonymically stands for anger.” This is especially true of aggressive verbal behaviour indicated by words, such as *snap*, *growl* and *snarl* in English (Kövecses 1990:64). In the Hebrew Bible, aggressive verbal behaviour is sometimes likened to the bite of an adder, metonymically indicated by its sharp tongue in Psalm 140:4:

(384) שִׁנְנוּ לְשׁוֹנָם כְּמוֹ נַחֵשׁ חִמָּת עֲכָשׁוּב תַּחַת שִׁפְתֵימוֹ

šnnw lšwnm kmw nḥš ḥmt ‘kšwb tḥt šptymw.

V: sharpen (qal pf 3rd pl) N: tongue + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) P: like N: serpent N: poison (cs) N: adder P: under N: lips + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“They have sharpened their tongues like a serpent; adders’ poison is under their lips” (Ps 140:4; KJV).

However, the metonymy, AGGRESSIVE VERBAL BEHAVIOUR STANDS FOR ANGER is not limited to the domain of animal behaviour (Kövecses 1990:64). The metaphoric use of the sharp tongue of a snake to indicate violent behaviour in the Hebrew Bible probably motivated the use of the sword (חֶרֶב) to the same effect. Hence, we have a double metaphor: the sword is a metaphor for a sharp tongue, which, in its turn, is used as a figure for violent verbal behaviour:

(385) יֵשׁ בֹּטָה כַּמְדַּקְרוֹת חֶרֶב וּלְשׁוֹן חֲכָמִים מֵרֶפֶא

yš bwṯh kmdqrwt ḥrb wlšwn ḥkmyṯ mrp’.

Existential particle: there be VN: talk rashly (qal pt sg, m) P: like N: wounds (cs) N: sword C: but N: tongue (cs) N: wise (pl) N: medicine.

“There are those who speak rashly²⁰⁸ like the stabbings of a sword, but the tongue of the wise is health” (Prov 12:18).

(386) הנה יביעון בפיהם הרבות בשפתותיהם
hnh yby‘wn bpyhm ḥrbwt bšptwtyhm.

Particle of focus: behold V: gush forth (hi impf 3rd pl) P: in N: mouth + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) N: swords P: in N: lips + pron suffix (3rd pl, m).

“Behold, they overflow in their mouth, swords are in their lips” (Ps 59:8).

In Psalm 64:4, the figure of an arrow is used alongside that of the sword to typify a sharp tongue. “Their arrows” (חצם) are used as a metonymy for “their bows” (קשתם), which is the implied object of the verb דרך “to string” (Tate 1990:130-1; Davidson 1967:154):

(387) אשר שננו כחרב לשונם דרכו חצם דבר מר
’ šr šnnw kḥrb lšwnm drkw ḥšm dbr mr.

Rel pronoun: who V: sharpen (qal impf 3rd pl) P: like N: sword N: tongue + (3rd pl, m) V: string (qal pf 3rd pl) N: arrows + pron suffix (3rd pl, m) N: word A: bitter.

“[They] who sharpen their tongue like a sword, who string (their bows) for arrows – their angry words” (Ps 64:4).²⁰⁹

Other texts emphasise the damage that verbal aggression can cause:

(388) מרפא לשון עץ חיים וסלף בה שבר ברוח
mrp’ lšwn ‘š ḥyyim wslp bh šbr brwḥ.

A: healthy N: tongue N: tree A: living C: but N: viciousness P: in + pron suffix (3rd sg, f) N: bruise P: in N: spirit (lit. breath).

“A wholesome tongue is a tree of life, but viciousness in it is a bruise in the spirit” (Prov 15:4).

(389) מות וחיים ביד לשון
mwt wḥyyim byd lšwn.

N: death C: and N: life P: in N: hand (cs) N: tongue.

“Death and life are in the power of the tongue” (Prov 18:21; KJV).

Other forms of aggressive behaviour can also stand metonymically for anger. In English, aggressive visual behaviour is commonly used to this effect, which is not surprising, since it is one of the most visible

²⁰⁸ For במה, “to talk rashly,” see Davidson (1967:78)

²⁰⁹ Also see 4.2.9.1.

symptoms of anger. We have already pointed to the frown, which seems to be fixed in a hard stare toward the object of anger, as an innate expression of anger (cf. Izard 1977:330). The following metonymic expressions in English are clearly motivated by this facial feature of an angry subject (Kövecses 1990:64):

- She was *looking daggers* at me.
- He *gave me a dirty look*.
- *If looks could kill*, ...
- He was *glowering* at me.

In Job 16:9, the metonymy, AGGRESSIVE VISUAL BEHAVIOUR STANDS FOR ANGER, clearly forms part of the metaphor ANGER IS A DANGEROUS ANIMAL (cf. Kövecses 1990:64):

(390) אָפוּ טרף וישטמני חרק עלי בשניו צרי ילמוש עיניו לי

'pw trp wyštṁny ḥrq 'ly bšnyw šry yltwš 'ynyw ly.

N: anger (lit. nose) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: tear (qal pf 3rd sg, m) C: and V: hate (qal impf 3rd sg, m) + pron suffix (1st sg) V: gnash (qal pf 3rd sg, m) P: on + pron suffix (1st sg) P: with N: teeth + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: adversary + pron suffix (1st sg) V: sharpen (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: eyes + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) P: to + pron suffix (1st sg).

“His anger tears, and he who hates me gnashes on me with his teeth. My enemy looks daggers at me” (Job 16:9; ZK; cf. Kruger 2000:190).²¹⁰

4.2.12 The Cause of Anger is Trespassing

Kövecses (1990:65) records several expressions in English that are indicative of the figure, CAUSING ANGER IS TRESPASSING:

You're beginning to *get to* me.

This is where I *draw the line*!

Don't *step on my toes*!

Most studies on anger in the Hebrew Bible emphasise that the emotion is mostly a justified reaction to excessive provocation (see Chapter 2). Although this understanding of anger is largely motivated by theological considerations, there are also linguistic elements pointing to the existence of the concept, CAUSING ANGER IS TRESPASSING, in the Hebrew Bible.

Johnson (1973:380-1) states that the root כעס, “anger,” usually denotes a feeling that is provoked through unfair treatment (cf. Lohfink 1984:299):

(391) אֵל הַכַּעַס אֲשֶׁר הַכַּעַסַּת

'l hk's 'šr hk'st.

²¹⁰ Also see 4.1.5.

P: to N: anger Rel pronoun: that V: provoke to anger (hi impf 2nd sg, m).

“... for the anger you have provoked me to” (1 Kgs 21:22).

Lohfink (1984:301) notes that כעס *hi* often occurs in the infinitive following expressions indicating how anger was provoked:

כעס *hiph* ist in der Mehrzahl der Fälle als Infinitiv mit vorangestelltem ל an die jeweils vorauslaufende Aussage angeschlossen. Diese Verbindung ist mindestens konsekutiv. Doch wird man ... fragen dürfen, ob sie nicht sogar final gemeint ist: Israel hat mit Absicht JHWH zum Zorn gereizt.

(392) לעשות הרע בעיני יהוה להכעיס

l'šwt hr' b'yny yhwh lhk'ys.

P: to V: do (qal inf cs) N: evil P: in N: eyes (cs) PN: YHWH P: to V: provoke to anger (hi inf cs).

“He did much wrong in the eyes of YHWH, irritating him to anger” (2 Kgs 21:6).

4.3 MINOR UNRELATED METAPHORS FOR ANGER

Kövecses (1990:66) points to two metaphors that have a very large scope that are also commonly used in comprehending and speaking about anger. They are EXISTENCE IS PRESENCE and EMOTIONS ARE BOUNDED SPACES. When applied to anger, these categories yield the following metaphors (cf. Kruger 2000:191):

4.3.1 Anger is Presence

Kövecses (1990:66) observes that “existence is commonly understood in terms of physical presence. You are typically aware of something’s presence if it is nearby and you can see it. This is the basis of the metaphor.” There are several typical expressions in the Hebrew Bible that are illustrative of this trope (Kruger 2000:191):

(393) עד שוב אף אחיך ממך

'd šwb 'p 'hyk mmk.

P: until V: return (qal inf cs) N: anger (lit. nose) N: brother + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) P: from + pron suffix (2nd sg, m).

“Until the anger of your brother *turned away* from you” (Gen 27:45; translation by Kruger 2000:191).

(394) לא שב אפו ועוד ידו נטויה

l' šb 'pw w'wd ydw nṭwyh.

Neg particle V: turn back (qal pf 3rd sg, m) N: anger + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) C: and Adv: still N: hand (f) + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) V: stretch out (qal pt pass, sg, f).

“His anger hasn’t turned away and his hand is still stretched out” (Isa 9:16, cf. 10:4).

(395) מענה רך ישיב חמה

m‘nh rk yšyb ḥmh.

N: answer A: tender V: turn away (hi impf 3rd sg, m) N: wrath.

“A soft answer *turns* anger *away*”(Prov 15:1).

(396) חרון אף יהוה עליכם

ḥrwn ‘p yhwh ‘lykm.

N: burning (cs) N: face (lit. nose) PN: YHWH P: on + pron suffix (2nd pl, m).

“The anger of YHWH is *upon* you” (2 Chr 28:11; translation by Kruger 2000:191).

(397) לך עמי בא בחדריך וסגר דלתוך בערך חבי כמעט רגע עד יעבור זעם כי הגה יהוה יצא
ממקומו

*lk ‘my b’ bḥdryk wsgr dltyk²¹¹ b‘dk ḥby km‘t rg‘ ‘d y‘bwr z‘m ky hnh
yhwh yš’ mmqmw.*

V: walk (qal imp sg, m) N: people + pron suffix (1st sg) V: go (qal imp sg, m) P: in N: rooms + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) C: and V: close (qal imp sg, m) N: doors + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) P: behind + pron suffix (2nd sg, m) V: hide (qal imp sg, m) P: as A: a little N: moment P: until V: pass (qal impf 3rd sg, m) N: foam C: because Particle of focus: behold PN: YHWH V: go out (qal pt sg, m) P: from N: place + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“Come, my people, enter into your rooms and shut your doors; hide yourself for a little while until the foaming has ceased. For behold, YHWH comes out of his dwelling” (Isa 26:20-21).²¹²

4.3.2 Anger is Bounded Space

This metaphor is logically connected with the category EXISTENCE IS PRESENCE. Kövecses (1990:66) explains that “in the case of emotions, existence is often conceived of as location in a bounded space. Here the emotion is the bounded space and it exists when the person is in that space.” Kruger (2000:191) lists the following illustrations of this metaphor in the Hebrew Bible:

(398) ויצא מפס פרעה בחרי אף

wyš’ m‘m pr‘h bḥry ‘p.

²¹¹ See BHS.

²¹² Also see 4.1.10.

C: and V: go out (qal impf 3rd sg, m) P: from PN: Pharaoh P: in N: burning (cs) N: nose.

“And he went out from Pharaoh in hot anger” (Ex 11:8; translation by Kruger 2000:191).

(399) וַיָּקָם יְהוֹנָתָן מֵעַם הַשֻּׁלְחָן בַּחֲרֵי אֵף

wyqm yhwntn m‘m hšlhñ bhry ‘p.

C: and V: rise (qal impf 3rd sg, m) PN: Jonathan P: from N: table (def) P: in N: burning (cs) N: nose.

“And Jonathan rose from the table in anger” (1 Sam 20:34).²¹³

(400) כִּי רָגַע בְּאַפּוֹ חַיִּים בְּרִצּוֹנוֹ

ky rg‘ b’pw hyym bršwnw.

C: because N: moment P: in N: anger + pron suffix (3rd sg, m) N: life P: in N: favour + pron suffix (3rd sg, m).

“For it is only a moment in his anger, life in his favour” (Ps 30:6; translation by Kruger 2000:191).

4.4 THE SYSTEMATICITY OF METAPHOR

In the foregoing study several source domains have been analysed that were used by the ancient Israelites to characterise the single target domain of anger. While it is not surprising that a whole range of source concepts were used to target anger (cf. Kövecses 2000:79), the fact that these combine to present an integrated view of anger does indeed make an impression. What is even more surprising is that different metaphors of which the relation is not always directly perceptible are sometimes put in parallel.

A favourite combination of early Biblical authors, to take an example, was the figures of foam and fire (cf. Lam 4:11, Nah 1:6; Jer 7:20; 21:12; Ezek 21:36). At first glance this grouping may seem unnatural since these two images appear to have little in common. On closer investigation, however, we find that they are compound figures, made up of primitives, some of which they share (cf. Grady, Taub & Morgan 1996:177-88). The metonymy ANGER IS FROTH AT THE MOUTH can be regarded as a primitive of the concept ANGER IS AN EPILEPTIC SEIZURE. Frothing would therefore only be one of many symptoms associated with the emotion, the most important of which is ANGER IS HEAT. The ANGER IS FIRE metaphor, as we have seen, is a compound also including the primitive, ANGER IS HEAT. This, of course, makes the alliance of the FROTHING metonymy and the FIRE metaphor only natural. In fact, rather than competing or contradicting each other, they complement each other.

One more example will serve to illustrate the systematicity of anger metaphor in the Hebrew Bible. The juxtaposition of the FLOOD and POISON metaphors are far too common to be ignored (Isa 54:8; Hos 10:7; Hab 1:6, etc). The close relation between the metonymy FROTHING IS ANGER and ANGER IS POISON has

²¹³ Also see 4.1.7.

already been illustrated. The ancient Israelites regarded anger and epileptic seizures as caused by poisonous bile being secreted by the gall bladder.²¹⁴ This led to several symptoms, including violent, insane behaviour and frothing at the mouth. The metaphor ANGER IS POISON therefore includes the primitive ANGER IS A FLUID. The latter also makes up the ANGER IS A FLOOD metaphor, which explains the compatibility of these two metaphors.

In conclusion it can be observed that the bodily basis of metaphor is of extreme importance to the coherence of the metaphor system as regards the conceptualisation of emotion in the Hebrew Bible, as also in any language. This does not imply, however, that bodily symptoms determine metaphor to its finest detail. They are culturally interpreted in accordance with the accepted value systems, humoral theories and concepts about magic and spirits (Matsuki 1995:137-8; Geeraerts & Grondelaers 1995:153-79). These concepts and beliefs as they regard the ancient Israelite perception of anger can best be summarised by means of a conceptual model that incorporates notions reflected in the conceptual metaphors and metonymies discussed above.

²¹⁴ See 4.1.10.

CHAPTER 5

A CONCEPTUAL MODEL FOR ANGER IN THE HEBREW BIBLE

The metaphors and metonymies discussed above converge to form a certain prototypical cognitive model for anger. Although it is not the only model for anger that can be identified from material from the Hebrew Bible (see Chapter 2), the one presented here focuses on linguistic expressions regardless of the theological intent of the authors. It can therefore be regarded as the dominant ancient Israelite ‘folk’ model for anger. This model has a temporal dimension, and can best be regarded as a prototype scenario with stages that follow on each other (Kövecses 1990:67).

Stage 1: Offending event

Some offence displeases S. The wrongdoing can be classified as intentional. This causes anger in S.

Stage 2: Anger

The anger process is initiated, which causes several physical symptoms in S. These include bodily heat, quickened breathing, frowning, glaring eyes, gnashing of teeth, internal pressure, redness in the face, agitation, internal agitation and frothing at the mouth. If S is wise, he will control his anger.

Stage 3: Attempt at control

S attempts to control his anger (this stage is rarely encountered in depictions of anger in the Hebrew Bible. It is mostly limited to wisdom literature as the ideal).

Stage 4: Loss of control

If the intensity of anger is too great for S to control it, he loses control. This leads to some voluntary expression of anger, including striking with the fist, clapping of hands and stamping with the feet.

Stage 5: Retribution

Anger is often accompanied by some act of retribution. This usually consists of violent, uncontrolled behaviour, aimed at harming the object of wrath. Although images of fire, the hot easterly wind, earthquakes, storms, clouds, torrents, poison and dangerous animals are mostly used to typify the destructive force of divine anger, they also sometimes figure as representations of human violence. These acts of retribution usually satisfy the impulse to strike out, and the intensity of anger drops to zero.

The above prototype scenario shows that expressions that indicate anger in the Hebrew Bible are no random selection of terms. Rather they are structured to form an elaborate cognitive model that is implicit in the semantics of Classical Hebrew. In addition, the conceptual metaphors for anger in the Hebrew Bible are motivated by these metonymies to a very large extent. To name but one example, the ANGER IS A HOT WIND metaphor is most probably motivated by the conceptual metonymy SNORTING IS ANGER. The prototype scenario, therefore, presents us with a working conceptual model that illustrates how the various metaphors are related to one another, and how they function together to characterise a single target concept, in this case, anger.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

After this vast tour of the horizon it seems almost impossible to summarise all the findings regarding the ancient Israelite conceptions of anger in a few lines. This theme has proven to be encyclopaedic in proportion, more detailed than has been anticipated. A whole world has opened before us: bodily functions, humoral theories, theories about magic and spirits, meteorology, cosmology and cultural aspects as interpreted by the ancient Israelite. In view of the breadth of knowledge that we have gained, one of the conclusions that seem most imperative regards the theory of Classical Hebrew and language in general.

One can only lament the dominance of the Autonomic View of language that guided most of the research on anger in the Hebrew Bible. The belief that language existed in separation of bodily existence misguided scholars into searching for the ‘meaning’ of Classical Hebrew terms that would allow them to define an anger equally separable from bodily existence as the mind itself. This was of absolute consequence, of course, if the philosophical presupposition of divine impassibility was to be maintained. The result, as we have seen, was decontextualised meanings of anger terms that would be comparable to English terminology, such as “anger” and “wrath.” The metaphoric use of the Hebrew language had been replaced by ‘literal’ meanings separable from the thought, being and environment of the ancient Israelite.

By way of summary, let us consider the figurative use of some terms for anger, including those traditionally thought to cover the domain of anger (אף, זעם, זעף, חמה, חרה, כעס, עבר, קצף, רגז, רוח; cf. Johnson 1973:379-81; Kruger 2000:182). This list is by no means exhaustive, but has the potential to illustrate the close relation between Classical Hebrew and the being of the ancient Israelite, including his environment and culture.

1. אף “nose,” רוח “breath” and נחם “breathe strongly.” The nose (or the “nostrils,” אפיים), to the ancient Israelite, was above all the organ of respiration (Dhorme 1963:80). The common use of this word in the context of anger can very easily be explained in view of the symptom of heavy breathing of angry persons. This interpretation is confirmed by several parallel expressions, including the application of the related verb אָנַף “to breathe through the nose, snort” (Davidson 1967:36), as metonymies for anger. The figure expressed by the locution ארך אפיים “length of nostrils,” where “nostrils” figure as a metonymy for “breath” (cf. ארך רוח, Prov 14:29) also testifies to the impression that angry snorting made on the ancient

Israelite mind. Naturally, we can group the words רוּחַ “breath” and נַחֵם “heavy breathing” as figures for anger with these.

2. חָרָה “burn,” חָמַם “to be or grow warm.” The physiological motivation of the combination חָרָה אֵף “the nose burns” needs little comment, since the experience of bodily heat in the face/neck area is probably a universal phenomenon. The few instances where חָרָה is used without אֵף an image of bodily heat is also implied, although not restricted to the face. When חָמַם has the heart as subject, it indicates internal heat as metonymy for anger.
3. חִמָּה, זַעַם and קִצְף “foam.” The parallel use of these three terms in the context of anger makes a clear distinction unnecessary. Together they constitute one of the most elaborate concepts of anger in the Hebrew Bible through their relation with the understanding of anger in terms of an epileptic seizure with frothing as one of the most distinguishable symptoms. The concept ANGER IS AN EPILEPTIC SEIZURE is a very powerful mental picture for anger, since it was associated with violent, uncontrolled behaviour in the thought of the ancient Israelite. There is a high probability that the ancient Israelites, as most ancient Mediterranean people, regarded epilepsy as an abnormal state caused by poisonous bile. This impression would explain the use of the root מָרַר “to be bitter” (cf. מָרַרָה “poison, gall”), as well as מָרַר נֶפֶשׁ “bitterness of throat” to indicate strong anger.

The foam exuding from the mouth of an epileptic was perceived to be poisonous as well, which gives impetus to the recurrent ancient Near Eastern theme of a divinity pouring his foam on victims of his wrath. The relation with the winged daemon, Pazuzu, who manifested himself in dust-clouds of “The Poison,” the hot, oppressive wind that blows from the Arabian Desert bearing all kinds of sickness in its train, is too obvious to be ignored. The foam that YHWH spills on his victims use up (כָּלָה) their life-fluids through fever and dehydration, just as affliction causes the subject to spill his vital liquids through tears.

Closely related to this figure is that of poison arrows, commonly attributed to the ancient Near Eastern divinity known as Reshef (cf. רֶשֶׁף “pestilence”). He also commanded the allegiance of demons that caused burning diseases, which further testifies to the fact that the ancient Israelites interpreted fever as having been caused by divine wrath. This fact partially explains the many instances where divine wrath is said to burn like fire (אֵשׁ). In analogy to other cultures living in hot climates, the humoral theory of the ancient Israelites classed dehydration and heat as negative states.

4. עֲבַרָה “overflow.” The fact that עֲבַרָה is sometimes used in parallel with words indicating frothing at the mouth suggests that it can also be regarded as a medium of the same concept. Further, it also serves as an agent for the notion that the expression of anger is like a hot fluid

boiling over the sides of a container. Yet another idea that might be elicited by the use of this word in the context of anger is the potential danger of an erupting volcano. This is especially likely in view of the fact that the earliest conceptions of YHWH were most probably influenced by volcanic phenomena (cf. Keel 1997:217-8).

5. רָעַף, “to be agitated,” כָּעַס, “to be irritated, provoked,” רָגַז “shake.” As all the terms for anger listed so far, these also have a clear bodily basis. Research has shown that the emotion of anger is characterised by very high levels of arousal and a strong impulse to strike out. The fact that רָגַז is sometimes used of the trembling of mountains, also in the context of anger, further supports the notion that the ancient Israelites originally interpreted dangerous natural phenomena as an expression of divine anger (cf. Jeremias 1965:1).

These terms, although very expressive and detailed with regard to ancient Israelite ideas of anger, do not exhaust the concepts of ire in the Hebrew Bible. This study has shown that there are countless ways in which everyday words, such as יָד “hand,” קוֹל “voice” and אֵשׁ “fire,” to name but a few, can be used as figures for anger. However, the conceptual content manifest in the few terms listed above powerfully demonstrates the embodiment of the anger metaphor in the Hebrew Bible. We can safely conclude that much of the conceptual framework of the ancient Israelite had been motivated by bodily sensations commonly associated with the emotion of anger. These may have inspired the use of certain related source domains from the environment. The snorting metonymy, for example, may have encouraged the use of the wind as metaphor for anger. Similarly, the experience of bodily heat may have motivated the metaphor ANGER IS FIRE. Although likely, however, this cannot be presented as a fact beyond reasonable doubt.

Another finding that needs to be emphasised is that the physiology of anger can in no way account for all the conceptual content regarding anger in Classical Hebrew. The ancient Israelites systematically interpreted bodily processes in terms of the culturally agreed upon humoral theories as well as common beliefs regarding magic and spirits. The same can be said about the role of environmental factors and natural phenomena. Although these often served as source domains for metaphoric transfer in the depiction of anger they were generally viewed as manifestations of the divine.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aalders, G C 1948. *Het Boek de Prediker* (Commentaar op het Oude Testament) Kampen: J H Kok.
- Alexander, W L 1950. *Deuteronomy* (The Pulpit Commentary 3). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Allen, L C 1983. *Psalms 101-150* (Word Biblical Commentary 21). Waco, Texas: Word Books.
- Allen, L C 1990. *Ezekiel 20-4* (Word Biblical Commentary 29). Dallas, Texas: Word Books.
- Allen, L C 1994. *Ezekiel 1-19* (Word Biblical Commentary 28). Dallas, Texas: Word Books.
- Albertz, R & Westermann, C 1997. ןׁׁׁ, in: Jenni, E & Westermann, C (eds) *TLOT*, 1202-20.
- Aloysia, M 1946. The God of Wrath? *CBQ*, 8, 406-15.
- Althann, R 1985. The Oracles of Jeremiah in Northwest Semitic Research. *Scriptura*, 16, 19-28.
- Anderson, A A 1989. *2 Samuel* (Word Biblical Commentary 11). Dallas, Texas: Word Books.
- Aristotle [1964] *ΠΕΡΙ ΨΥΧΗΣ*. With an English Translation by W S Hett. London: William Heinemann.
- Augustine, A [1955]. *De Civitate Dei. Libri 11-22*. Turnholti: Typographi Brepols Editores Pontificii.
- Balentine, S E 1989. Prayers for Justice in the Old Testament: Theodicy and Theology. *CBQ*, 51, 597-616.
- Baloian, B 1997. Anger, in: Van Gemeren, W A (Ed.). *NIDOTTE* 4, 377-85.
- Baloian, B 1992. *Anger in the Old Testament*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Banks, W P & Thompson, S C 1996. The Mental Image of the Human Body: Implications of Physiological Mental Models of our Understanding of Health and Illness, in: Mio, J S & Katz, A N (eds), *Metaphor: Implications and Applications*, 99-126. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Barcelona, A 2000. The Cognitive Theory of Metaphor and Metonymy, in Barcelona, A (Ed.), *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads. A Cognitive Perspective*, 1-28. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Becker, J 1965. *Gottesfurcht im Alten Testament* (Analecta Biblica 25). Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- Ben-Chorin, S 1986. *Was ist der Mensch? Anthropologie des Judentums*. Tübingen: J C B Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Bettenson, H 1972. *Augustine: Concerning the City of God against the Pagans. A New Translation by Henry Bettenson with an Introduction by David Knowles*. Middlesex: Penguin.
- Bergen, R D 1996. *1, 2 Samuel* (The New American Commentary 7). Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Blenkinsopp, J 2000. *Isaiah 1-39* (The Anchor Bible). New York: Doubleday.
- Block, D I 1997. *The Book of Ezekiel. Chapters 1-24* (The New International Commentary on the Old Testament). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Boegner, A 1878. *Colère de Dieu*, in: Lichtenberger, F (Ed.), *Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses*, 3:248-50. Paris: Librairie Sandoz et Fischbacher.
- Boehmer, J 1926. Zorn. *ZAW* 44, 320-2.

- Boers, F 1999. When a Bodily Source Domain Becomes Prominent: The Joy of Counting Metaphors in the Socio-Economic Domain, in Gibbs, R W & Steen, G J (eds). *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*, 47-56. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing.
- Borret, M 1967. *Origène: Contre Celse I. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Marcel Borret*. Paris: Les éditions du Cerf.
- Botha, J E 1996. Exploring Gesture and Nonverbal Communication in the Bible and the Ancient World: Some Initial Observations. *Neotestamentica* 30/1, 1-19.
- Botterweck, G J, Freedman, D N & Lundbom, J R 1986. $\eta\eta\eta$, in: Botterweck, G J & Ringgren, H (eds) 1986. *TDOT V*:171-6.
- Bremmer, J 1991. Walking, Standing, and Sitting in Ancient Greek Culture, in: Bremmer, J & Roodenburg (eds) *A Cultural History of Gesture*, 15-35. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Briggs, J L 1998[1970]. Never in Anger: Portrait of an Eskimo Family, in: Jenkins, J M, Oatley, K & Stein, N L (eds). *Human Emotions: A Reader*, 45-54. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Brody L R & Hall J A 1993. Gender and Emotion, in Lewis, M & Haviland, J (eds). *Handbook of Emotions*, 447-60. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Brongers, H A 1969. Der Zornesbecher. *OTS* 15, 177-92.
- Brotzman, E R 1988. Man and the Meaning of שָׂנֵא . *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 145/580, 400-9.
- Brueggemann, W 1998. *Isaiah 1-39* (Westminster Bible Companion). Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Brüning, C 1998. "Lobet den Herrn, ihr Seeungeheuer und all ihr Tiefen!" Seeungeheuer in der Bibel. *ZAW*, 110/2, 250-5.
- Büchsel, F 1965. $\theta\upsilon\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$, in: Kittel, G & Friedrich, G (eds). *TDNT III*. 167-72.
- Buzzell, S S 1995. Proverbs 25-26, in: Zuck, R B (Ed.). *Learning from the Sages. Selected Studies on the Book of Proverbs*, 333-8. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books.
- Caplice, S J 1974. An Apotropaion Against Fungus. *JNES*, 33/3, 345-49.
- Cassirer, E 1925. *Sprache und Mythos. Ein Beitrag zum Problem der Götternamen*. Leipzig: B G Teubner.
- Cassirer, E 1961[1953]. *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms. Volume One: Language*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Cazelles, H 1955. À propos d'une phrase de H H Rowley, *Supplements to VT*, 3:26-32. Leiden: E J Brill.
- Cheyne, T K 1950. *Jeremiah: Exposition* (The Pulpit Commentary 11). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Chilton, C W 1971. *Diogenes of Oenoanda. The Fragments*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clines, D J A 1974. The Tree of Knowledge and the Law of YHWH (Psalm 19). *VT*, 24, 8-14.
- Clines, D J A 1989. *Job 1-20* (Word Biblical Commentary 17). Dallas, Texas: Word Books.
- Cohen, H R 1971. Poison. *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 13, 702-4.
- Cohen, H R 1979. *Biblical Hapax Legomena in the Light of Akkadian and Ugaritic* (SBL Dissertation Series

- 37). Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press.
- Collins, T 1971. The Physiology of Tears in the Old Testament: Part 1. *CBQ* 33, 18-38.
- Collins, T 1971. The Physiology of Tears in the Old Testament: Part 2. *CBQ* 33, 185-97.
- Conrad, D 1971. Der Gott Reschef. *ZAW* 83, 157-83.
- Craigie, P C 1983. *Psalms 1-50* (Word Biblical Commentary 19). Waco, Texas: Word Books.
- Craigie, P C, Kelley, P H & Drinkard, J F 1991. *Jeremiah 1-25* (Word Biblical Commentary 26). Dallas, Texas: Word Books.
- Creel, R E 1986. *Divine Impassibility: An Essay in Philosophical Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dahood, M S J 1986[1968]. *Psalms 51-100* (The Anchor Bible 17). Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company.
- Darwin, C 1981[1874]. L'expression des émotions chez l'homme et les animaux, in: Rimé, B & Scherer, K R (eds), *Textes de base en psychologie: Les Emotions*, 169-81. Neuchâtel, Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé.
- Darwin, C 1904[1874]. *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*. London: John Murray.
- Darwin, C 1998[1874]. *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*, in: Jenkins, J M, Oatley, K & Stein, N L (eds), *Human Emotions: A Reader*, 13-20. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Davitz, J R & Mattis, S 1964. The Communication of Emotional Meaning by Metaphor, in: Davitz, J R (Ed.), *The Communication of Emotional Meaning*, 157-76. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Davidson, B 1967[1959]. *Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons Ltd.
- De Labriolle, P 1950. Apatheia. *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, 1, 484-7.
- Deane, W J 1950. *Proverbs* (The Pulpit Commentary 9). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Deane, W J 1950a. *Ecclesiastes* (The Pulpit Commentary 9). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Deane, W J 1950b. *Nahum* (The Pulpit Commentary 14). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Delitzsch, F 1975. *Isaiah 37-66* (Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes 7). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Derousseaux, L 1970. *La crainte de Dieu dans l'Ancien Testament*. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf.
- Derrett, J D M 1995. The Evil Eye in the New Testament, in: Esler, P F (Ed.), *Modelling Early Christianity*, 65-72. London: Routledge.
- Dhorme, E 1963[1923]. *L'emploi métaphorique des noms de parties du corps en hébreu et en akkadien*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Dietrich, W 1976. Rache. Erwägungen zu einem alttestamentlichen Thema. *EvT* 36, 450-72.
- Dirvin, R 1994. *Metaphor and Nation: Metaphors Afrikaners Live By* (Duisburger Arbeiten zur Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft 22). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Douglas, M 1975. *Implicit Meanings: Essays in Anthropology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Driver, G R 1958. On חַמַּד "Hot Anger, Fury" and also "Fiery Wine." *ThZ* 14, 133-5.

- Eaton, M A 1994. Suffering and Sin: Ecclesiastes 7:1-8:1, in: Zuck, R B (Ed.), *Reflecting with Solomon: Selected Studies on the Book of Ecclesiastes*, 291-9. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books.
- Edelstein, L & Kidd, I G 1972. *Posidonius. I. The Fragments*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Edelstein, L 1967. Posidonius. *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 6, 413-4.
- Edwards, D C 1999. *Motivation and Emotion: Evolutionary, Physiological, Cognitive, and Social Influences*. London: Sage Publications.
- Eichrodt, W 1961. *Theology of the Old Testament*, 1:259-69. London: S C M Press Ltd.
- Ekman, P & Friesen, W V 1981. The Repertoire of Nonverbal Behaviour: Categories, Origins, Usage, and Coding, in: Sebeok, T A & Umiker-Sebeok, J (eds), *Nonverbal Communication, Interaction, and Gesture*, 57-105. The Hague: Mouton Publishers.
- Ellsworth, P C 1975. Direct Gaze as a Social Stimulus: The Example of Aggression, in: Pliner, Krames & Alloway (eds), *Advances in the Study of Communication and Affect. Volume 2: Nonverbal Communication of Aggression*, 53-75. New York: Plenum Press.
- Ellsworth, P C 1994. William James and Emotion: Is a Century of Fame Worth a Century of Misunderstanding? *Psychological Review*, 101/2, 222-9.
- Ellsworth, P C & Scherer, K R (in press). Appraisal Processes in Emotion, in: Davidson, R J, Goldsmith, H & Scherer, K R (eds), *Handbook of Affective Sciences*, 1-64. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Emanatian, M 1999. Congruence by Degree. On the Relation between Metaphor & Cultural Models, in: Gibbs, R W & Steen, G J (eds), *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*, 205-17. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing.
- Emerton, J A 1976. The Translation of Psalm 64:4. *JTS* 27, 391-2.
- Eppstein, V 1968. The Day of YHWH in Jeremiah 4:23-28. *JBL*, 87:93-7.
- Faessler, M 1997. Tel un souffle brûlant, in: Pacht, P (Ed.) *La colère: Instrument des puissants, arme des faibles*. Collection morales/23, 91-108. Paris: Editions Autrement.
- Farr, F K 1952. Anger, in: Orr, J (Ed.), *ISBE*, 135.
- Feinberg, C L 1986. *Jeremiah* (The Expositor's Bible Commentary 6) Grand Rapids, Michigan: Regency.
- Fontaine, C R 1984. Arrows of the Almighty (Job 6:4): Perspectives on Pain. *Anglican Theological Review* 66, 243-8.
- Frazier, J G 1934. *The Fear of the Dead in Primitive Religion*. London: MacMillan and Co.
- Frijda, N H 1989. Les théories des émotions: Un bilan, in: Rimé, B & Scherer, K R (eds) 1989. *Textes de base en psychologie: Les émotions*, 21-66. Neuchâtel, Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé.
- Füglister, N 1970. Gott der Rache? In: Sartory, T (Ed.), *Entdeckungen im Alten Testament*, 117-33. München: Sartory.
- Fuhs, H F 1975. 𐤇𐤏𐤂, in: Botterweck, G J & Ringgren, H (eds). *TDOT* II, 461-5.
- Fuhs, H F 1990. 𐤏𐤇, in: Botterweck, G J & Ringgren, H (eds). *TDOT* VI, 290-315.

- Geeraerts, D & Grondelaers, S 1995. Looking Back at Anger: Cultural Traditions and Metaphorical Patterns, in: Taylor, J R & MacLaury, R (eds), *Language and the Cognitive Construal of the World*, 181-96. Berlin: Mouton.
- Glen, D R 1994. Mankind's Ignorance: Ecclesiastes 8:1-10:1, in: Zuck, R B (Ed.), *Reflecting with Solomon: Selected Studies on the Book of Ecclesiastes*, 321-9. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books.
- Gordon, R P 1986. *1 & 2 Samuel. A Commentary*. Exeter: Paternoster Press.
- Grady, J, Taub, S & Morgan, P 1996. Primitive and Compound Metaphors, in Goldberg, A E (eds), *Conceptual Structure, Discourse, and Language*, 177-88. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Green, O H 1999. *The Emotions. A Philosophical Theory*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Grether, O & Fichtner, J 1967. ὀργή, in: Kittel, G & Friedrich, G (eds). *TDNT V*, 392-412.
- Grogan, G W 1986. *Isaiah* (The Expositor's Bible Commentary 6). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing.
- Gruber, M I 1978. The Tragedy of Cain and Abel: A Case of Depression. *JQR*, 69:89-97.
- Gruber, M I 1980. *Aspects of Nonverbal Communication in the Ancient Near East*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
- Habel, N C 1985. *The Book of Job. A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Hallie, P P 1967. Stoicism. *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 6, 19-22.
- Hamilton, V P 1990. *The Book of Genesis. Chapters 1-17*. Eerdmans Company.
- Hamp, V 1974. זַעַם, in: Botterweck, G J & Ringgren, H (eds). *TDOT I*, 423-8.
- Haney, H M 1960. *The Wrath of God in the Former Prophets*. New York: Vintage Press.
- Hanson, R P C 1946-7. The Wrath of God. *The Expository Times*, 58, 216-8.
- Hartley, J E 1988. *The Book of Job*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Company.
- Heise, D R 1992. Affect Control Theory and Impression Formation: Emotion, in: Borgatta E F & Borgatta, M L (eds). *Encyclopedia of Sociology*, 1:15-7. New York: MacMillan Publishing.
- Herion, G A 1992. Wrath of God. *Anchor Bible Dictionary VI*, 989-96
- Heschel, A J 1975[1962]. *The Prophets. Part II*. New York: Harper Colophon Books.
- Hillers, D R 1964. *Treaty-curses and the Old Testament Prophets*. *Biblica et Orientalia 16*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- Holladay, W L 1971. *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Houston, J M 1986. Earthquake, in: *NBD*, 293-4.
- Hubbard, D A 1995. Words of Agur: Proverbs 30:1-33, in: Zuck, R B (Ed.), *Learning from the Sages. Selected Studies on the Book of Proverbs*, 361-374. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books.
- Hummel, H D 1957. Enclitic Mem in Early Northwest Semitic. *JBL* 76, 85-107.
- Izard, C E 1975. Patterns of Emotions and Emotion Communication in "Hostility" and "Agression," in:

- Pliner, Krames & Alloway (eds). *Advances in the Study of Communication and Affect. Volume 2: Nonverbal Communication of Aggression*, 77-101. New York: Plenum Press.
- Izard, C E 1977. *Human Emotions*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Jackendoff, R 1992. *Languages of the Mind: Essays on Mental Representation*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- James, W 1890[1998]. *The Principles of Psychology*, reprinted in Jenkins, J M; Oatley, K & Stein, L (eds). *Human Emotions: A Reader*, 21-9. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Janzen, W 1972. *Mourning Cry and Woe Oracle*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Jeremias, J 1965. *Theophanie: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentliche Gattung* (WMANT 10). Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Jeremias, J 1983. *Der Prophet Hosea* (Das Alte Testament Deutsch 24/1). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Johnson, A R 1949[1964]. *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Johnson, E 1973. אָנַף, אָנַף (אָנַף, אָנַף, אָנַף, אָנַף, אָנַף), in: Botterweck, G J & Ringgren, H (eds), *TWAT I*, 378-89.
- Kaiser, O 1973. *Der Prophet Jesaja. Kapitel 13-39* (Das Alte Testament Deutsch 18). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Keel, O 1997. *The Symbolism of the Biblical World: Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms*. Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Keil, C F & Delitzsch, F 1973. *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon* (Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Keltner D & Haidt, J 1999. Social Functions of Emotion at Four Levels of Analysis. *Cognition and Emotion*, 13/5, 505-21.
- Kendon, A 1981. Introduction: Current Issues in the Study of 'Nonverbal Communication', in: Sebeok, T A & Umiker-Sebeok, J (eds), *Nonverbal Communication, Interaction, and Gesture*, 1-53. The Hague: Mouton Publishers.
- Keown, G L, Scalise, P J & Smothers, T G 1995. *Jeremiah 26-52* (Word Biblical Commentary 27). Dallas, Texas: Word Books.
- Kidd, I G 1999. *Posidonius. III. The Translation of the Fragments*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Kilpatrick, T B 1908. Anger, in: Hastings, J 1908. *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, 1, 475-82. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Klopfenstein, M A 1972. *Scham und Schande nach dem Alten Testament. Eine begriffsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu den hebräischen Wurzeln בּוֹשׁ, כּלָם and חָפַר*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.
- Klopfenstein, M A 1997. Wenn der Schöpfer die Chaosmächte "anherrscht" (גֵּעַר) und so das Leben schützt.

- Zu einem wenig beachteten Aspekt des Zorns Gottes im Alten Testament. *ThZ* 53/1/2:33-43.
- Köhler, L & Baumgartner, W 1958. *Lexicon in veteris testamenti libros*. Leiden: E J Brill.
- Köhler, L 1966[1935]. *Theologie des Alten Testaments*. Tübingen: J C B Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Köhler, L 1953. *Der hebräische Mensch*. Tübingen: J C B Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Kövecses, Z 1990. *Emotion Concepts*. New York: Springer Verlag.
- Kövecses, Z 1995. Language and emotion concepts, in: Russell, J A; Fernández-Dols, J-M; Manstead, A S R & Wellenkamp, J C (eds), *Everyday Conceptions of Emotion: An Introduction to the Psychology, Anthropology and Linguistics of Emotion*, 3-15. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kövecses, Z 1995a. Metaphor and the Folk Understanding of Anger, in: Russell, J A; Fernández-Dols, J-M; Manstead, A S R & Wellenkamp, J C (eds), *Everyday Conceptions of Emotion: An Introduction to the Psychology, Anthropology and Linguistics of Emotion*, 49-71. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kövecses, Z 1995b. Anger: Its Language, Conceptualisation, and Physiology in the Light of Cross-Cultural Evidence, in: Taylor, J R & MacLaury, R (eds), *Language and the Cognitive Construal of the World*, 181-96. Berlin: Mouton.
- Kövecses, Z 1999. Metaphor. Does it Constitute or Reflect Cultural Models? In: Gibbs, R W & Steen, G J (eds), *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*, 167-188. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing.
- Kövecses, Z 2000. The Scope of Metaphor, in Barcelona, A (Ed.) 2000. *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads. A Cognitive Perspective*, 79-92. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kövecses, Z 2002. *Metaphor. A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Z & Palmer, G B 1999. Language and Emotion Concepts. What Experientialists and Social Constructionists Have in Common, in: Palmer, G B & Occhi, D J (eds), *Languages of Sentiment. Cultural Constructions of Emotional Substrates*, 237-58. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kraemer, J L 1966. שָׁקַע רָרוּחַ: A Proposed Solution for an Unexplained Hapax. *JNES* 25, 125-9.
- Kraus, H-J 1988. *Psalms 1-59. A Commentary* (translated by Oswald, H C). Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House.
- Kraus, H-J 1989. *Psalms 60-150. A Commentary* (translated by Oswald, H C). Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House.
- Kruger, P A 1994. Nonverbal Communication and Symbolic Gestures in the Psalms. *The Bible Translator*. 45/2, 213-22.
- Kruger, P A 1998. "Nonverbal Communication" in the Hebrew Bible: A Few Comments. *JNSL* 24/1, 141-64.
- Kruger, P A 2000. A Cognitive Interpretation of the Emotion of Anger in the Hebrew Bible. *JNSL* 26/1, 181-93.
- Kruger, P A 2000a. Sosiologiese en antropologiese insigte en die studie van die Hebreuse Bybel: 'n

Bestekopname. *HTS* 56/1, 137-73.

- Kruger, P A 2001. A Cognitive Interpretation of the Emotion of Fear in the Hebrew Bible. *JNSL* 27/2, 77-89.
- Kutsch, E 1965. "Trauerbräuche" und "Selbstminderungsriten" im Alten Testament. *Theologische Studien* 78, 25-42.
- Labourt, J (1949). *Jérôme: Lettres. Tome 1. Texte établi et traduit par Jérôme Labourt*. Paris: Société d'édition "Les belles lettres."
- Lakoff, G 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G & Johnson, M 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G & Kövecses, Z 1987. The Cognitive Model of Anger Inherent in American English, in: Holland, D & Quinn, N (eds), *Cultural models in language and thought*, 195-221. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lang, F 1968. πῦρ, πυρώω, πυρόσις, πύριμος, πυρρός, in: Kittel, G & Friedrich, G (eds), *TDNT*, 928-52.
- Lange, J P 1869. *Proverbs; Song of Solomon* (Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Lange, J P 1871. *Jeremiah; Lamentations* (Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Lange, J P 1872. *Psalms* (Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Lange, J P 1874. *Job* (Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Lange, J P 1876. *Ezekiel, Daniel* (Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Lange, J P 1878. *Isaiah* (Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Lange, J P 1879. *Deuteronomy* (Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Latvus, K 1998. *God, Anger and Ideology. The Anger of God in Joshua and Judges in Relation to Deuteronomy and the Priestly Writings* (JSOTSS 279). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Lauha, A 1978. *Kohelet* (Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament 19). Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Lauha, R 1983. *Psychophysischer Sprachgebrauch im Alten Testament*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- Lawson, G 1980. *Commentary on Proverbs*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications.
- Lawson-Tancred, H 1986. *Aristotle. De Anima (On the Soul)*. Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- Lazarus, R S 1984. Thoughts on the Relations Between Emotion and Cognition, in: Scherer, K R & Ekman, P (eds), *Approaches to Emotion*, 247-56. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lazarus, R S 1991[1998]. Emotion and Adaptation, in: Jenkins, J M, Oatley, K & Stein, N L (eds), *Human*

- Emotions: A Reader*, 38-44. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- LeDoux J E 1994. Emotion, Memory and the Brain. *Scientific American* 270, 38.
- Leezenberg, M 2001. *Contexts of Metaphor*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Lemerise, E A & Dodge, K A 1993. The Development of Anger and Hostile Interactions, in: Lewis, M & Haviland, J M (eds), *Handbook of Emotions*, 537-46. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Levenson, R W 1999. The Intrapersonal Functions of Emotion. *Cognition and Emotion*, 13/5, 481-504.
- Levy, R I 1984. Emotion, Knowing, and Culture, in: Shweder, R A & LeVine, R A (eds) 1984. *Culture Theory. Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion*, 214-37. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lohfink, N 1984. חַמַּד, in: Botterweck, G J & Ringgren, H (eds), *TWAT VI*, 297-302.
- Longman, T 1993. *Nahum* (An Exegetical and Expository Commentary: The Minor Prophets 2). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books.
- Lutz, C A 1988. *Unnatural Emotions: Everyday Sentiments on a Micronesian Atoll and their Challenge to Western Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Malina, B J 1993. *The New Testament World. Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press.
- Marshall, G 1998. Emotion, Sociology of, in: Marshall, G (Ed.) 1998. *A Dictionary of Sociology*, 190. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mathews, K A 1996. *Genesis 1-11* (The New American Commentary 1A). Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Matsuki, K 1995. Metaphors of anger in Japanese, in: Taylor, J R & MacLaury, R (eds), *Language and the Cognitive Construal of the World*, 137-51. Berlin: Mouton.
- Matsumoto, D 1994. *People. Psychology from a Cultural Perspective*. California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Matsumoto, D 1996. *Culture and Psychology*. California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- McCarthy, D J 1974. The Wrath of YHWH and the Structural Unity of the Deuteronomistic History, in: Crenshaw J L & Willis J T (eds) 1974. *Essays in Old Testament Ethics*, 97-110. New York: Ktav Publishing House.
- McComiskey, T E 1985. *Amos* (The Expositor's Bible Commentary 7). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing.
- McComiskey, T E 1992. *Amos* (An Exegetical and Expository Commentary: The Minor Prophets 1). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books.
- McComiskey, T E (Ed.) 1992. *An Exegetical and Expository Commentary: The Minor Prophets*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books.
- McKane W 1970. *Proverbs. A New Approach* (The Old Testament Library). London: S C M Press Ltd.
- McKane, W 1980. Poison, Trial by Ordeal and the Cup of Wrath. *VT* 30, 474-92.

- Merrill, E H 1994. *Deuteronomy* (The New American Commentary 4). Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Mesquita, B & Frijda, N H 1992. Cultural Variations in Emotions: A Review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112/2, 179-204.
- Moran, W L 1963. The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy. *CBQ* 25, 77-87.
- Morris, L 1952. The Wrath of God. *The Expository Times*, 63/5, 142-5.
- Muffs, Y 1992. *Love & Joy. Law, Language and Religion in Ancient Israel*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Murphy, R E 1992. *Ecclesiastes* (Word Biblical Commentary 23A). Dallas, Texas: Word Books.
- Murphy, R E 1998. *Proverbs* (Word Biblical Commentary 22). Nashville: Thomas Nelson.
- Niehaus, J 1992. *Hosea* (An Exegetical and Expository Commentary: The Minor Prophets 1). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books.
- Nogales, P D 1999. *Metaphorically Speaking*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- North, R 1995. Did the Ancient Israelites Have a Heart? *BR*, 11/1, 33.
- Noth, M 1966. *The Old Testament World*. London: Adam & Charles Black.
- Oatley, K & Johnson-Laird, P N 1987. Towards a Cognitive Theory of Emotions. *Cognition and Emotion* 1/1, 29-50.
- Orr, J (Ed.) 1952. *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Oswalt, J N 1986. *The Book of Isaiah. Chapters 1-39* (The New International Commentary on the Old Testament). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Otto, R 1908[1959]. *The Idea of the Holy*. Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- Parrot, W G 1995. Emotional Experience, in: Manstead, A S R & Hewstone, M (eds), *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social Psychology*, 198-203. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Parrot, W G 1999. Function of Emotion: Introduction. *Cognition and Emotion*, 13/5, 465-6.
- Pearson, A C 1973. *The Fragments of Zeno and Cleanthes with Introduction and Explanatory Notes*. New York: Arno Press.
- Pedersen, J 1926 (1959). *Israel, its Life and Culture. I-II*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Peels, H G L 1992. *The Vengeance of God. The Meaning of the Root ׀׀ and the Function of the ׀׀-Texts in the Context of Divine Revelation in the Old Testament*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Persson, G 1990. *Meanings, Models and Metaphors. A Study in Lexical Semantics in English*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Pfeiffer, E 1965. Die Gottesfurcht im Buche Kohelet, in: Reventlow, H G (Ed.) 1965. *Gottes Wort und Gottes Land*, 133-58. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Plöger, O 1984. *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia)* (Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament 17). Neukirchen-

Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

- Podella, T 1997. Reinheit. Altes Testament. *TRE* 28, 477-83.
- Rawlinson, G 1950. *Job* (The Pulpit Commentary 7). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Rawlinson, G 1950a. *Psalms* (The Pulpit Commentary 8). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Rawlinson, G 1950b. *Isaiah* (The Pulpit Commentary 10). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Raymond, P 1958. *L'Eau, sa vie et sa signification dans L'Ancien Testament* (SVT 6). Leiden: E J Brill.
- Reinelt, H 1982. Zorn, in: Haag, H (Ed.) 1982. *Bibel-Lexikon, 1934-5*. Zürich: Benziger Verlag.
- Ringgren, H 1963. Einige Schilderungen des göttlichen Zorns, in: Würtwein, E & Kaiser, O (eds), *Tradition und Situation*, 107-13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Robinson, H W 1925. Hebrew Psychology, in: Peake, A S (Ed.), *The People and the Book*, 353-82. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ross, A P 1991. *Proverbs* (The Expositor's Bible Commentary 5). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Rousseau, A 1985. *Irénée de Lyon. Contre les hérésies. Dénonciation et réfutation de la gnose au nom du menteur. Traduction française par Adelin Rousseau*. Paris: Les éditions du Cerf.
- Russell, J A 1983. Pancultural Aspects of the Human Conceptual Organisation of Emotions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45/6, 1281-8.
- Sapir, E 1967[1921]. *Le langage: introduction à l'étude de la parole*. Paris: Payot.
- Sarles, H 1975. Language and Communication – II: The View from '74, in: Pliner, Krames & Alloway (eds), *Advances in the Study of Communication and Affect. Volume 2: Nonverbal Communication of Aggression*, 1-19. New York: Plenum Press.
- Sauer, G 1997. פֶּחַח, in: Jenni, E & Westermann, C (eds), *TLOT I*, 166-9.
- Sauer, G 1997a. הַחַח, in: Jenni, E & Westermann, C (eds), *TLOT I*, 435-6.
- Sauer, G 1997b. הַחַח, in: Jenni, E & Westermann, C (eds), *TLOT II*, 472-4.
- Schachter, S & Singer, J E 1962. Cognitive, Social, and Physiological Determinants of Emotional State. *Psychological Review* 69/5, 379-399.
- Scharbert, J 1955. *Der Schmerz im Alten Testament*. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag.
- Scheepers, J H 1960. *Die Gees van God en die Gees van die Mens in die Ou Testament*. Kampen: J H Kok.
- Scherer, K R 1984. On the Nature and Function of Emotion: A Component Process Approach, in: Scherer, K R & Ekman, P (eds), *Approaches to Emotion*, 293-317. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Scherer, K R 1993. Studying the Emotion-Antecedent Appraisal Process: An Expert System Approach. *Cognition and Emotion*, 7/3-4, 325-355.
- Scherer, K R 1999. Universality of Emotional Expression, in: Levinson, D; Ponzetti, J & Jorgenson, P (eds), *Encyclopedia of Human Emotions*, 669-74. New York: Macmillan.
- Scherer, K R 1999a. Cross-cultural patterns, in: Levinson, D; Ponzetti, J & Jorgenson, P (eds), *Encyclopedia of Human Emotions*, 147-56. New York: Macmillan.

- Scherer, K R 2000. Emotion, in: Hewstone, M & Stroebe, W (eds), *Introduction to Social Psychology*. Third Edition, 151-91. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Scherer, K R, Bänziger, T, Grandjean, D, Meylan, S & Wranik-Odehnal 2000. *La Psychologie de l'Emotion*. Genève: FAPSE, Université de Genève.
- Scherer, K R 2001. The Nature and Study of Appraisal: A Review of the Issues, in: Scherer, K R, Schorr, A & Johnstone, T (eds), *Appraisal processes in emotion: Theory, Methods, Research*, 369-91. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schmidt, W 1964. Anthropologische Begriffe im Alten Testament. *EvTh* 24/7, 374-90.
- Schroer S & Staubli T 1998. *Die Körpersymbolik der Bibel*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Schunk, K-D 1977. אַרְוֶה, in: Botterweck, G J & Ringgren, H (eds). *TWAT*, II: 1031-36.
- Shaw, G 1974. *Song of Love. Exposition of the Song of Solomon*. Arkansas: Handmaidens.
- Shweder, R A 1984. A Colloquy of Culture Theorists, in: Shweder R A & Levine R A (eds), *Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion*, 1-24. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Simpson, J W 1952[1988]. *Wrath*, in: Orr (Ed.), *ISBE* 4, 1134-5. Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Sittl, C 1970[1890]. *Die Gebärden der Griechen und Römer*. Hildesheim, New York: Georg Olms Verlag.
- Skinner, J 1994. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Smick, E B 1988. *Job* (The Expositor's Bible Commentary 4). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing.
- Smith, M S 1998. The Heart and Innards in Israelite Emotional Expressions: Notes from Anthropology and Psychobiology. *JBL* 117/3, 427-436.
- Smith, W R 1923. *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*. London: A & C Black Ltd.
- Smothers, T G 1995. Excursus: The Cup of Wrath, in: Keown, G L, Scalise, P J & Smothers, T G (eds), *Jeremiah 26-52* (Word Biblical Commentary 27), 277-9. Dallas, Texas: Word Books.
- Soggin, J A 1997. *Das Buch Genesis: Kommentar*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Spence, H D M & Excel, J S (eds) 1950. *The Pulpit Commentary*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Spieckermann, H 1989. Dies Irae: Der Alttestamentliche Befund und seine Vorgeschichte. *VT* 39/2, 194-208.
- Spiro, M E 1984. Some Reflections on Cultural Determinism and Relativism with Special Reference to Emotion and Reason, in: Shweder, R A & LeVine, R A (eds), *Culture Theory. Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion*, 324-347. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Steen, G 1999. From Linguistic to Conceptual Metaphor in Five Steps, in Gibbs, R W & Steen, G J (eds), *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*, 57-77. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing.
- Stöger, A 1970. Wrath, in: Bauer, J B (Ed.), *Bauer Encyclopedia of Biblical Theology* 3, 1006-11.
- Strong, J 1961. Hebrew and Chaldee Dictionary Accompanying the Exhaustive Concordance, in: Strong, J *The Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Struthers, G B 1997. אַרְוֶה, in: Van Gemeren, W A (Ed.), *NIDOTTE* 1, 462-5.

- Stuart, D 1987. *Hosea-Jonah* (Word Biblical Commentary 31). Waco, Texas: Word Books.
- Talos, C H 2002. Pourquoi tant de violence, in: Aeschlimann, J-C (Ed.), *Coopération*. 8/20 février 2002, 7-9.
- Tasker, R V G 1980. Wrath, in: Douglas, J D (Ed.), *The Illustrated Bible Dictionary* 3, 1657. Sydney: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Tate, M E 1990. *Psalms 51-100* (Word Biblical Commentary 20). Dallas, Texas: Word Books.
- Taylor, J R 1989. *Linguistic Categorization: Prototypes in Linguistic Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Temkin, O 1971[1994]. *The Falling Sickness: A History of Epilepsy from the Greeks to the Beginnings of Modern Neurology*. Baltimore & London: John Hopkins University Press.
- Tigay, J H 1996. *Deuteronomy* (The JPS Torah Commentary). Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society.
- Thomas, K 1991. Introduction, in: Bremmer, J & Roodenburg (eds), *A Cultural History of Gesture*, 1-14. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Thompson, J A 1977. Israel's "Lovers." *VT* 27/4, 475-81.
- Tromp, N J 1969. *Primitive Conceptions of Death and the Nether World in the Old Testament*. *Biblica et Orientalia* 21. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- Van Andel, J 1909. *Salomo's Hooglied*. Kampen: J H Kok.
- Van der Leeuw, G 1933[1977]. *Phänomenologie der Religion*. Tübingen: J C B Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Van Leeuwen, C 1978. *Hosea* (De Prediking van het Oude Testament). Nijkerk: Callenbach.
- Van Pelt, M V & Kaiser, W C 1997. לֵב, in: VanGemeren (Ed.), *NIDOTTE* 2:527-33.
- VanGemeren, W A 1991. *Psalms* (The Expositor's Bible Commentary 5). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing.
- VanGemeren, W A (Ed.) 1997. *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Vanoni, 1993. לֵב, in: Botterweck, G J & Ringgren, H (eds), *TWAT*, 326-30.
- Vögtle, A 1965. Zorn. *LTK* 10, 1403-4.
- Völker, W 1952. *Der Wahre Gnostiker nach Clemens Alexandrinus*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Von Harnack, A 1985. *Marcion. Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Von Humboldt, W 1968[1836]. *Über die Sprache des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts*. Bonn: F Dümmler.
- Von Meyenfeldt, F H 1950. *Het Hart (לֵב, לֵב) in het Oude Testament*. Leiden: EJ Brill.
- Vorwahl, H 1932. *Die Gebärdensprache im Alten Testament*. Berlin: Emil Ebering.
- Wallbott, H G & Scherer, K R 1988. How Universal and Specific is Emotional Experience? Evidence from 27 Countries on Five Continents, in: Scherer, K R (Ed.), *Facets of Emotion. Recent Research*, 31-56.
- Watts, J D W 1985. *Isaiah 1-33* (Word Biblical Commentary 24). Waco, Texas: Word Books.

- Watts, J D W 1987. *Isaiah 34-66* (Word Biblical Commentary 25). Waco, Texas: Word Books.
- Weill, J 1926. Le sense de שָׁמַיִם dans Prov 23:7a. *ZAW* 44, 62-3.
- Wenham, G J 1981. The Theology of Unclean Food. *EQ* 53, 6-15.
- Wenham, G J 1983. Why Does Sexual Intercourse Defile (Lev 15:18). *ZAW* 95, 432-4.
- Wenham, G J 1987. *Genesis 1-15* (Word Biblical Commentary 1). Waco, Texas: Word Books.
- Wenham, G J 1994. *Genesis 16-50* (Word Biblical Commentary 2). Waco, Texas: Word Books.
- Westermann, C 1981. Der Begriff des Zornes Gottes in der Prophetie, in: Jeremias, J & Perlitt, L (eds), *Die Botschaft und die Boten*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Whorf, B L 1962[1956]. *Language, Thought, and Reality. Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf. Edited with Introduction by J B Carroll*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Wierzbicka, A 1995. Everyday Conceptions of Emotions: A Semantic Perspective, in: Russell, J A; Fernández-Dols, J-M; Manstead, A S R & Wellenkamp, J C (eds), *Everyday Conceptions of Emotion: An Introduction to the Psychology, Anthropology and Linguistics of Emotion*, 49-71. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Wiggins, S A 1999. Tempestuous Wind doing YHWH's Will: Perceptions of the Wind in the Psalms. *SJOT*, 13/1, 3-23.
- Wiklander, 1977. שָׁמַיִם, in: Botterweck, G J & Ringgren, H (eds), *TWAT*, 621-6.
- Wilken, R L 1987. Marcion. *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, 9, 194-5. New York: MacMillan Publishing.
- Wildberger, H 1982. *Jesaja 28-39* (Bibischer Kommentar Altes Testament 10/3). Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Williamson, H G M 1985. *Ezra, Nehemiah* (Word Biblical Commentary 16). Waco Texas: Word Books.
- Wilson, J V K 1967. Organic Diseases of Ancient Mesopotamia, in: Brothwell, D R & Sandison, A T (eds), *Diseases in Antiquity: A Survey of the Diseases, Injuries, and Surgery of Early Populations*, 191-208. Springfield, Illinois: C C Thomas.
- Wolff, H W 1969. Zur Thematik der elohistischen Fragmente im Pentateuch. *EvTh* 29, 59-72.
- Wolff, H W 1973. *Anthropologie des Alten Testaments*. München: Kaiser Verlag.
- Wood, L J 1985. *Hosea* (The Expositor's Bible Commentary 7). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing.
- Wright, D P 1987. The Disposal of Impurity. Elimination Rites in the Bible and in Hittite and Mesopotamian Literature. *SBL Dissertation Series*, 101.
- Youngblood, R F 1992. *1, 2 Samuel* (The Expositor's Bible Commentary 3). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing.