

20 and 23, instead of "the wife of David"⁸⁹. In this way the central theme of the second part of I Samuel, to wit, the contrast between Saul and David, is resumed – Michal taking over the role of Saul.

Finally the conflict between the two spouses results in a complete rupture between David and Michal. She will not become the mother of David's heir: another heir is needed. In this way the rejection of Saul and his house, announced in I Samuel xiii and xv is completed, and the subsequent theme, that of David's succession, is introduced.

The literary style of the author when he intertwines three different themes (the Ark/Temple theme, the replacement theme and the succession theme) into one narrative, is eminently skilful. The earlier story featuring the Ark is also excellently written. In particular, the contrast between the despondency of ch. iv and the comedy of ch. v achieves a fine effect. The author succeeds in presenting a profound theological message through a compelling story that combines dramatic scenes with comic relief.

⁸⁹ See I Sam. xix 11 where the latter designation does occur in a context where Michal opposes her father in favour of her husband.

PSALM LXXX: FORM OF EXPRESSION AND FORM OF CONTENTS

BY

N.J. TROMP

Utrecht

TEXT

- 2 Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel,
thou who leadest Joseph like a flock!
Thou who art enthroned upon the cherubim, shine forth
- 3 before Ephraim and Benjamin and Menasseh!
Stir up thy might
and come to save us!
- 4 Restore us, O God;
let thy face shine and we shall be saved!
- 5 O LORD God of hosts,
how long wilt thou be angry
with thy people's prayer?
- 6 Thou hast fed them with the bread of tears,
and given them tears to drink in full measure.
- 7 Thou dost make us the scorn of our neighbours;
and our enemies laugh among themselves.
- 8 Restore us, O God of hosts;
let thy face shine and we shall be saved!
- 9 Thou didst bring a vine out of Egypt:
thou didst drive out the nations and plant it.
- 10 Thou didst clear the ground for it;
and thou didst cause it to take deep root and to fill the land.
- 11 The mountains were covered with its shade;
the mighty ceders with its branches;
- 12 it sent out its branches to the sea,
and its shoots to the River.
- 13 Why then hast thou broken down its walls,
so that all who pass along the way pluck its fruit?
- 14 The boar from the forest ravages it,
and all that move in the field feed on it.

- 15 Turn again, O God of hosts!
 Look down from heaven, and see;
 have regard for this vine,
 16 this stock which thy right hand has planted,
 and the son that thou madest strong for thyself.
 17 They have burnt it with fire, they have cut it down;
 may they perish at the rebuke of thy countenance!
 19 Then we will never turn back from thee;
 give us life, and we will call on thy name!
 20 Restore us, O LORD God of hosts!
 Let thy face shine and we will be saved!
 (RSV and KJ)

“Semioticians stick to their guns; but that is a poor strategy for attracting people”, a colleague confided to me. That is: time and again semioticians start enunciating their theory and its terminology, as if their readers are stubborn ignoramuses. And in reproducing their analyses they hold on to their models and jargon, suggesting that a new and intricate presentation of seasoned and straightforward ideas is the secret of their trade. My colleague’s advice meant: write the results of your analyses down in a way others can understand. That will enable them to compare the output of the semiotic approach to the one of current methods.

I will put that advice into practice here, be it with some hesitation. For firstly a well-known impasse looms ahead. If we offer a new interpretation, we will be confronted with the reproach of pretending to be superior to our predecessors; as if a similar reproach was not addressed to established methods when they emerged. If we present current views in a new terminology, we may be upbraided of making simple truths complicated. As if from a scholarly point of view it is not only the results that count, but at least also the systematic and verifiable way to reach them. Which implies indeed that elements of a semiotic approach have been cultivated *avant la lettre*.

Because of standing by the theories of A.J. GREIMAS, the main stream of the Paris school did not develop adequate models for analysing literary texts by allowing for the vital link between the form of the expression and the form of the content. The expression was hardly studied systematically in view of its relations with deeper levels of texts with their syntactical and semantic components. J. GENINASCA has taken this task in hand, with remarkable results. I will make use of this approach here in a somewhat haphazard way¹.

¹ According to S. LEVIN (*Linguistic Structures in Poetry*, The Hague 1973⁴) coupling, which is a model of the special unity of structure as to content and expression in poetry, is present when

II. THE FORM OF THE EXPRESSION

The application of GENINASCA’s model to biblical poetry entails some problems. First of all it starts from a poetic tradition in which prosodic laws are well established. And knowledge of them enables the analyst to determine positional equivalences which put us on the track of semantic equivalences. As to the phonological aspect one is familiar with certain rules pertaining to assonance in the broad sense of the word. In this way we can discover differences which are semantically suggestive and stimulate further research in that direction. It need not be argued here that in the biblical field research is still in its infancy, although pioneer studies were published in the last few years. As to my knowledge no analysis focusing on the connection between the form of the expression and of the content in Old Testament poetry is extant, we must be content to scout the field and ask some relevant questions here.

1. Strophic structure and vs. 15

What role is played by vs. 15 in Psalm lxxx? It is congenial to the refrain because of the double divine name (as in vs. 8), of the use of the root *šûb* in the imperative and of a parallel imperative which is semantically related to the one appearing in the refrain (“look down and see”; “let your face shine upon us”). As the psalm does not strike up with it, the burden does not mark the beginning of the strophes, but their conclusion. If we take vs. 15 as a variation on the refrain, the architecture of Ps. lxxx looks this way:

str. 1: vv. 2-4; str. 2: vv. 5-8; str. 3: vv. 9-15; str. 4: vv. 16-20.

two elements in a text converge: as to the content, when in two instances equivalence of its substance (semantics) goes together with equivalence of its form (comparable syntagmatic position); as to the expression, when twice equivalence of its substance (phonology) is combined with equivalence of its form (position on the metrical axis, i.e. metrical position). GENINASCA (1971) enlarges this principle in maintaining that a similar convergence possesses heuristic value as soon as we are dealing with equivalences both as to the form of the expression and of the contents, in other words, when an equivalent metrical position goes together with an equivalent syntagmatic one. Then the regularity of the expression’s form arouses expectations which the enun- tiator may effectively disturb by deviating from the set pattern, in that way putting the reader on the track of semantical transformations. Each relation of content and expression may result in a homology, i.e. “a rigorous formulation of reasoning based by analogy”; the homology manifests the isomorphism of the relations existing between two places on both levels (see A.J. GREIMAS and J. COURTÈS, *Semiotics and Language, An Analytical Dictionary*, Bloomington 1982, pp. 144f.).

Selected bibliography: J. GENINASCA, *Analyse structurale des Chimères de Nerval*, Neuchâtel 1971, Introduction; *idem*, “Découpage conventionnel et signification”, in A.J. GREIMAS, *Essais de sémiotique poétique*, Paris 1972, pp. 45-61; *idem*, “Pour une sémiotique littéraire”, in: *Actes sémiotiques, Documents* (Paris), IX, 83, 1987, pp. 7-24.

The results of exegetical research will not be mentioned here completely; see H.J. KRAUS, *Psalmen 60-150* (BK XV/2), Neukirchen 1978⁵, pp. 717-725; G. RAVASI, *Il libro dei Salmi II*, Bologna 1983, pp. 671-689; on Ps. 80, see N.J. TROMP, “La métaphore engloutie. Le langage métaphorique du Psaume 80”, *Sémiotique et Bible* 47 (sept. 1987), pp. 30-41.

The quantitative relations between the strophes merit further consideration: we expect to find some regularity in them, based on the laws of Hebrew poetry. In establishing the exact structure of the lines, however, we are facing uncertainties.

In vv. 2-3 MT reads two tricola, followed by a bicolon in vs. 4; in view of its length, vs. 5 also must be taken as a tricolon, although MT does not do so. In vv. 15-16 the situation is unclear: if we maintain vs. 16.2, the verses count 5 cola, i.e. two bicola followed by a monocolon, or a bicolon with a tricolon. The result is as follows:

- str. 1: 2 tricola, 1 bicolon (BHK: 4 bicola);
- str. 2: 1 tricolon, 3 bicola;
- str. 3: 7 bicola;
- str. 4: 1 tricolon, 4 bicola.

This looks rather chaotic: there is an apparent lack of regularity. We find no basic structure which may be deviated from in a significant way. An alternative solution consists in considering vs. 15 not to be a varied refrain. Merely counting the cola on the basis of a regular 3 + 3 meter, and making no decision as to the division in lines, we find this structure:

- str. 1 (A1): vv. 2-4 (8 cola); str. 2 (A2): vv. 5-8 (9 cola);
- str. 3 (B1): vv. 9-14 (12 cola); str. 4 (B2): vv. 15-20 (13 cola)².

2. *The relations between the strophes*

Accepting the Masoretic division in vv. 5 and 15, and elsewhere following BHS, we obtain two groups of strophes, A and B, on the basis of the number of cola. Both comprise two strophes, the second of which is marked by the first line being a tricolon, suggesting the boundary between the two strophes of the same group. The coherence of A1-A2 and of B1-B2 is reinforced by these groups of strophes, rather than the individual ones, being concluded by the refrain.

Starting from this structure we can characterise its components syntactically in this way:

- A1 is a supplication (a direct manipulation);
- A2 is a reproach about the present situation (dysphoric sanction);
- B1 is a description of the past, debouching into a reproach about the present;
- B2 is a supplication (a direct and indirect manipulation).

² As to the strophic division authors do disagree. The proposed structure resembles the one presented by A. ROEFER, "The End of Psalm 80", *Tarbiz* 29 (1959), pp. 113-124.

So we find a syntactical conformity, i.e. an equivalence as to the form of the content, which runs parallel with a positional equivalence of limit and non-limit strophes:

$$A1:A2 = B2:B1 = \text{manipulation:sanction.}$$

This discourse as a totality is bordered by the element which is essential in the enuntiators' narrative programme. They realise a performance which consists in enunciating a discourse that intends to act upon God. The performance they induce God to carry out is manifested in the refrain as making his face shine, an effect of which will be the transformation of the enuntiators: "and we will be saved".

It might be straining the evidence to maintain that, because vs. 15 is not the conclusion of B1 but the beginning of B2, the reader must feel deprived of the expected refrain after B1, the absence of which would underline that the situation is judged beyond hope, beyond supplication. What we may say, however, is this. As far as being a refrain, vs. 15 drastically changed, it turns up late (after 12 cola only, not after 8 or 9, as before), and is not a monolithic utterance as in vv. 4 and 8, but is intertwined with the fabric of B2. I will return to this point.

This infraction of an established pattern constitutes a deviation in the form of the expression which arouses the expectation that something similar will be true for the form of the content also.

The relation between A2 and B1 appears to be climactic: in A2 the lament is predominating, but it results in an entreaty (vs. 8), while in B1 the lament carries more weight because of the internal contrast between past (blessing: 9-12) and present (curse: 13f.), and by the absence of the refrain, which is expected after a strophe of this size, and whose wording is familiar by now.

This is not the only difference between A2 and B1, making the repetition of the dysphoric sanction significant. One notices that in A2 the damaging actions are reproduced in the form of rather neutral observations, whereas they are introduced by the interrogative "wherefore?" in B1, a question as to God's motive for action. This question which seems to prevail upon God to react, suggests there is not any answer to it; and in fact no answer is forthcoming, as it is not manifested in the text. Moreover, there is a diversity between A2 and B1 as to the acting subject. In A2 (6-7) God himself is the acting subject in three sentences: he realises personally a dysphoric programme or he enables the adversary to do so; in vs. 7.2 only the enemy himself is directly active. In B1 (13f.) this proportion is reversed: one action is ascribed to God, three actions are put down to human agents directly. Which is a serious condition: after all God is the shepherd and the "planter" of his people: he can be appealed to. From human adversaries no compassion can be expected.

Given a free hand they will finish off their victim (17.1). It seems in fact that they are allowed to give rein to their fury, because God turns away from his people. This may explain why this strophe is not concluded by the familiar refrain and more specifically, why its supplication, when alluded to, has “turn back” instead of “restore us”, the heart of the matter being God’s aversion from his people.

God’s performance is represented as a process in so far as A2 manifests an inchoative aspect of his activity (wrath) and his performance is expressed in durative verbal forms (6f). In B1, too, there is an inchoative aspect (the breaching of the walls), while the others’ activities are manifested as iterative by the verbal forms (*yiqtol*). Moreover, there is an element of repetition in the three syntagmata consisting in three lexemes each: pass-by/road/plucks; boar/wood/ravages; wild beast/field/devours. The terminative aspect, the complete destruction, must be near; it is suggested by 17.1 (burnt) and 19.2 (give us life). The supplication for a saving intervention, however, shows this suggestion to be a rhetorical overstatement.

As to the relation between A1 and B2, they are similar as they are marked by the manipulation. A1 is the opening part of the discourse, as nothing precedes it. B2 not only concludes the psalm, it also constitutes a reprisal of A1 and a sequel to A2 and B1. In order to be significant, the repetition of A1 in B2 must be different from A1 itself. The example of the refrain indeed shows how subtle the difference may be: in this case there is only a slight change as to the form of the expression. The main difference must derive from its position related to the section it concludes and to the development of the manipulative process.

Sections A1 and B2 contain four imperatives each:

- A1: give ear; shine forth; stir up; come;
- B2: turn; look down; see; visit.

The implied position of the addressee is different in the two cases:

- A1: God is invisible (non-paraître + être);
- B2: God is totally absent (non-paraître + non-être);
- A1: God is actively, although dysphorically, committed;
- B2: He is willingly neutral, letting matters take their course;
- A1: God is related to his people;
- B2: God has broken relations with his people.

The sanction of God’s programme is more bitter in A2 than in B1. This explains why the manipulation is more intensive in B2 than in A1; in A1 we find four imperatives, in B2 also four, which are reinforced this time by the addition of three, more indirect manipulations: “may they perish”, “let thy hand be”, “give us life” (Hebrew: *yiqtol*). Moreover, B2 is concluded by the two

imperatives of the refrain (20), which constitutes an inclusion of a kind with vs. 15 (*l’hym šb’wt, šûb*). There is a hidden manipulation in vs. 17.2, which means: “make your face menacing so that they perish”, a direct contrast with “make your face shine, so that we will be saved”. The verb *paq*, “to make an active appearance”, is specified towards the adversary and towards the enuntiators. The latter express the wish that God’s hand may protectively rest upon their representative, in order that he may live; the former may participate in the menacing face of God in order that they may perish. Up till now God’s obfuscated face is the cause of Israel’s plight.

In A1 the manipulation rather intends the transformation of God: he is to listen, to appear, to come into action; in B2 the transformation in the humans is predominating (17-19). Both rationally and emotionally this is explained by the contribution of A2 and B1. There is some reason, consequently, to maintain that the relation between A1 and B2 is a climactic one, as is true for A2 and B1, *ergo* for A and B. This is affirmed by the refrain, which finds its strongest form in vs. 20 (three divine titles)³. For the first time the tetragrammaton appears in the refrain here; interpreted as “the one who is actively present”, it is semantically related to the verb *paq*. It may very well have an optative meaning in this case⁴, in other words: the Lord is called upon to verify his name YHWH and to show his presence by his saving intervention. In this sense vs. 20 constitutes an inclusion with vs. 15 and the culminating final chord of the psalm. The supplication proceeds from “return” to “make us return” (15.20): a climax which summarises the object of the supplication. And unexpectedly the latter entreaty obtains a double charge. Verse 19 namely runs: “We will not turn back from you”, a promise which may be understood as an implicit confession of guilt. Therefore “make us return” will also have a moral meaning. For that reason God’s wrath is not as unaccountable as vs. 13 suggests, and not as indefinitely lasting as vs. 15 seems to imply. In order to reinforce the supplication the present plight is presented more dramatically than conditions justify. The luminous face is a token of grace and forgiveness, while the obfuscated face expresses a just wrath and punishment.

Further we notice a change of metaphors. The vine is skilfully converted into a “sprout”, which not only individualises the vine, but also tends towards a lexicalised metaphor (such as *nēšer*) for a human being. Thus the appearance of the “son” is prepared⁵.

Everything goes to show that the manipulation of B2 is a radical transformation of the one in A1, a fact which is brought about by the intervention

³ Compare F. DELITZSCH, *Die Psalmen*, Leipzig 1894⁵, p. 535 and KRAUS, *op. cit.*, pp. 718f.

⁴ See P. JOÛON, *Grammaire de l’hébreu biblique*, Rome 1947², par. 79e4.

⁵ It is unlikely that Hebrew *bēn* means “twig” here, as proposed by D. HILL, “Son of Man in Ps. 80 v. 17”, *NT* 15 (1973), pp. 261-269: p. 263, n. 2. For vv. 15 and 17, see also B. McNEIL, *NTS* 26 (1979-80), pp. 419-421.

of the preceding sections A2 and B1. In this way B2 is the climax of the discourse.

Consequently there is a relation of homology between limit and non-limit strophes, A1 and B2 being in a limit position in the poem, and A2 and B1 in a non-limit position. An observation on the meter may consolidate this hypothesis: it is remarkable that A2 and B2 each count one more colon than A1 and B1, a fact which marks the limits between the quantitatively equal groups of strophes (A and B). The impression that A1 and B2 belong more together than A1 and B2 finds a counterpoise in the datum that the first lines of A2 and B2 seem to be tricola. (In vs. 5 it is semantically evident that the sentence constitutes one line; in vs. 15 I follow MT in placing the four imperatives within one line.) In this way the distance between A1 and A2, between B1 and B2 is enlarged, and the one between A2 and B2 diminished.

II. THE FORM OF THE CONTENT

Israel, Joseph, Ephraim, Benjamin and Menasseh

As L. JACQUET notes, only northern tribes are mentioned here: there is no talk of Judah, Jerusalem or Temple⁶.

The LXX title *hypèr toû 'Assuriou* suggests that these translators connected the psalm with some Assyrian invasion of the Northern Kingdom. Of course the descriptions of the current plight (6f., 13f. and 17) and the entreaties (4.8 etc.) play a role in this. JACQUET lists at least eight proposals as to the date of the text's origin, ranging from Achab's time to the Maccabean period. As to the place of origin (Shilo or Jerusalem) the discussion centres around the title *YHWH sb'wt*⁷.

This debate is characteristic for the historico-critical method, its procedure, its interests and its claims. Some critical remarks must be made here, however. On the one hand every standpoint as to date and place of origin remains uncertain in this case. On the other the psalm is no more nor less than a particular and subjective way of digesting objective circumstances. That is why even an intimate knowledge of the latter does not constitute the decisive key towards its meaning and sense. Moreover, although his perspective remains an historical one, JACQUET is right in stating: "Reste que, dans la suite, les Juifs durent réutiliser le Psaume, quitte à l'adapter lors des désastres qui survinrent . . ." ⁸. The essential question pertains to the meaning of the text rather than to its application (reference).

Starting from the personal names Israel, Joseph, Ephraim, Benjamin and

⁶ L. JACQUET, *Les Psaumes et le coeur de l'homme* II, Gembloux 1977, p. 566.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 566f.; O. EISSFELDT, "Psalm 80", in *KS* III, Tübingen 1966, pp. 221-232.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 567.

and Menasseh, we ask what they contribute to the meaning of the text.

The genealogical relation between them is the following: Israel represents the first generation, Joseph and Benjamin the second, Ephraim and Menasseh the third. In this view the position of Benjamin is curious: this member of the second generation is put on one level with representatives of the third and is enclosed by them. This creates a distance between the two couples of brothers, between Joseph and Benjamin, between Ephraim and Menasseh. Which is the thematic importance of this literary fact? Are we dealing with individuals or with tribes, co-existing entities or with successive generations? We can ascertain that in biblical narratives the persons mentioned have or are brothers, and that in each case the relation between them is upset. Israel obtains the rights of the first-born from Esau; to his father Benjamin replaces the lost Joseph (Gen. xlii 38); Menasseh is subordinated to Ephraim (Gen. xlvi 22). The strange trio Ephraim – Benjamin – Menasseh might show that genealogical priority, based on birth, is of no consequence here. Two generations are called in one breath, as if they were contemporaries, and the youngest is put in the first place, to be followed by the junior of two brothers, who again obtained priority. First a certain simultaneity is suggested as to Israel and Joseph, this because of their parallel position, then Ephraim, Benjamin and Menasseh are put on line with each other. In fact some simultaneity between all of them is presented as self-evident: because God is the shepherd of the first, he is to take care of the last. In other words: the genealogical dissimultaneity is undone. We will see that this motif is coupled with another inversion, through which an individual represents a collectivity. We wonder whether a similar phenomenon returns somewhere in the psalm. It would seem that we come across an analogous situation in the allegory of the vine. We are reminded of the vicissitudes of Israel *cum suis*: the vine is a simple plant among the peoples in Egypt; by the grace of YHWH it grows in a way to surpass peoples and countries. But at present it is reduced to near-nothingness (13f.; 17.1). The solitary plant became a forest ("vom Weinstock zum Weinberg", KRAUS writes), just as the patriarchs of vv. 2f. became tribes/collectivities; but now the history of grace has turned into an history of rejection: the vineyard has been reduced to a plant, a mere sprout (*kannā*), a lonely son. This poor remnant of a mighty people remains the man of God's right hand, the son of man, once made strong by God (cf. 9-12). But this very state of inferiority is a reason for God's intervention, which favours the downtrodden above those that burn them, the younger above the older. YHWH puts down the mighty, he exalts the lowly. The solitary representative of the people is the object of God's grace, he is the king sitting at God's right hand, "is per quem dextera tua nos salvare volet"⁹.

⁹ F. ZORELL, *Lexicon Hebraicum*, Rome 1964, p. 314B.

The king is as much an individual as the patriarchs of vv. 2f. are individuals. He is the incarnation of the people, and in him past history, exemplified by the patriarchs, should repeat itself. The exceptional stylistic position of Benjamin in vs. 3 is revealed to be a privileged position by the allusions to it in vv. 16.2 and 18.1. Apparently the praying people wants to identify itself particularly with Benjamin.

Whatever this particular interpretation is worth, it shows the approach of semiotics. The problem of the proper names is not broached as an isolated detail, to be unriddled as such from without, but as part of the discourse. To be sure, we start from an hypothesis, taken from other discourses, but it is only accepted as valid when its tenability is tested on the basis of the concrete text as a whole. Knowledge of the cultural universe of the psalm is therefore presupposed, but it is not automatically applied to the object under discussion, but tested on it. Which is done by checking whether the themes of the inversion of genealogical priority in favour of the younger and of the conversion of the individual into a collectivity recur in the text. Besides, the remarkable literary position of Benjamin in vs. 3 points to vv. 15f., where the infraction of the regular form of the expression marks a decisive transformation in the relation between the enuntiator and God, namely the identification with Benjamin, the one who is entitled to God's saving intervention, because he has got into low water. In this way the "text-immanent" approach of semiotics may be understood and put in perspective¹⁰.

III. CONCLUSION

We now return to the conclusion arrived at in part I, and examine closely its relation to the findings of part II. The analysis of part I showed that there is a homological relation of this kind: A1:A2 = B2:B1 = limit:non-limit = manipulation:sanction = reinstatement:demolition = life:death.

This looks rather like an abstract wording of the figurative isotopy than of the thematic one. In other words, it resumes the general situation the psalm refers to, which is the condition of misfortune and the people's reaction to it. Against this background the thematic isotopy is projected, i.e. the transformation of a people that considered itself superior to others because of being a mighty power, into a people that acknowledges its inferiority and entrusts itself to the grace of God. The figurative isotopy can be found in kindred

¹⁰ The semiotic approach analyses its object in its final shape and aims at discovering and verifying its significance from the structure of its content; literary criticism rather intends to explain the present state of the text by tracing the history of its growth into its final shape. An eloquent example of the latter is the study by W. BEYERLIN, "Schichten im 80. Psalm" in H. BALZ and S. SHULZ (eds.), *Das Wort und die Wörter* (Festschrift G. FRIEDRICH), Stuttgart 1973, pp. 9-24.

Psalms, those of public lament and entreaty. It is the result of a generic approach to these texts, which is characteristic for form-criticism. The thematic isotopy, the specific angle under which it is illuminated, is proper to the individual psalm, the one under discussion. The latter was arrived at in part II. History is illustrated in our Psalm as a series of precedents creating an obligation as to the present plight. Through the course of history YHWH has established a pattern of behaviour: he created a tradition of intervening out of mere grace in favour of the inferior and the powerless. The very distressing conditions of God's powerless people are the trump played by the enuntiators; now they can effectively appeal to the precedents of history. In this way a disadvantage is turned into an advantage; weakness has become strength (II Cor. xii 9).

We can conclude by specifying the homology: A1:A2 = B2:B1 = limit:non-limit = future:present = manipulation:sanction = restoration:demolition = action out of grace:action out of wrath = preference for the inferior:slight of the superior. In this reasoning, guilt does not fit; that is why it is acknowledged indirectly and as an afterthought: "We will never turn back from you!"¹¹.

¹¹ The author wants to acknowledge the stimulating criticisms made by his fellow-members of SEMANET, Dr. G. Lukken, Drs. J. Maas and Drs. P. de Maat.