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# How the System Works

This document describes the methods used to generate scholarly commentary on the Psalms through a staged analytical workflow. The system works in five distinct stages, each building on the previous one to create comprehensive commentary that meets academic standards.

**Stage 1: Macro Analysis**

Establishes the big picture. The system identifies the psalm’s genre (such as lament, praise, or wisdom), develops a central theological thesis, and creates a structural outline. This stage draws on a predefined analytical framework and reference materials to understand the psalm’s place within the broader biblical tradition.

**Stage 2: Micro Analysis**

Examines each verse in detail. The system looks for linguistic features, sound patterns, figurative language, and potential translation issues. It also generates specific research requests for words or concepts that need deeper investigation. This stage includes phonetic transcriptions of the Hebrew text to ensure accurate sound analysis.

**Stage 3: Research Assembly**

Gathers all the requested materials. Specialized librarian components retrieve dictionary definitions, concordance evidence, figurative language examples, and traditional commentaries. This stage operates automatically without using language models, ensuring consistent and comprehensive data collection.

**Stage 4: Synthesis Writing**

Combines everything into coherent commentary. The system drafts an introductory essay (800–1200 words) and detailed verse-by-verse commentary (150–400 words per verse), integrating all the research materials into a unified scholarly narrative.

**Stage 5: Editorial Review**

Ensures publication quality. The system checks for factual accuracy (especially phonetic claims), verifies that all technical terms are defined, and ensures the writing is accessible to educated readers while maintaining scholarly rigor.

# Sources Available to the Commentary System

The system has access to a comprehensive collection of scholarly resources:

## Textual Sources

* Complete Hebrew text with all diacritical marks preserved
* English translation for accessibility
* Septuagint (LXX) Greek text for comparison
* Phonetic transcriptions using reconstructed Biblical Hebrew pronunciation

## Lexical Resources

* Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew Dictionary (BDB)
* Klein Hebrew Dictionary
* Comprehensive Hebrew concordance with morphological variations

## Figurative Language Database

* Custom database covering all Psalms and the Pentateuch
* 5,000+ figurative language instances with vehicle, tenor, and hierarchical tags
* Metaphor families (e.g., protection: shield/rock/fortress; guidance: light/lamp/path)
* Frequency statistics and usage patterns across biblical texts

## Traditional Commentaries

* Rashi (11th century)
* Ibn Ezra (12th century)
* Radak (13th century)
* Metzudat David (17th century)
* Malbim (19th century)
* Meiri (13th century)

## Comparative Materials

* Ugaritic parallels from ancient Near Eastern literature
* Analytical framework for psalm interpretation
* Psalm function database with genre characteristics

# Detailed Examples of System Analysis

## Example 1: Sibilant Alliteration in Psalm 1

The system’s analysis of Psalm 1 demonstrates how phonetic transcriptions prevent common errors. In the opening verses, the system identifies specific sibilant sounds (ש, ס, צ) rather than making vague claims about “sibilant alliteration.”

For instance, in verse 1, the sequence “אשרי האיש אשר לא הלך” contains the sibilant ש in אשרי and אשר, while verse 2’s “כי אם בתורת יהוה” includes the ש in יהוה. The system maps these sounds precisely across the poetic lines, showing how they create acoustic patterns that reinforce the psalm’s structure.

Rather than asserting that sibilants “create a sense of movement,” the system documents exactly which sounds appear where and explains their rhetorical function within the specific poetic context.

## Example 2: The Cultivated Tree in Psalm 1:3

The system’s analysis of the tree metaphor in Psalm 1:3 illustrates how cross-textual comparison leads to specific insights. The Hebrew phrase “עץ שתול על־פלגי מים” (“tree planted by streams of water”) uses the verb שתול (planted), which specifically means transplanted or cultivated, not naturally occurring.

The system then searches its figurative language database and finds parallel uses of this verb in agricultural contexts throughout the Pentateuch and Psalms. For example, in Psalm 92:13-15, the same verb appears in connection with palm trees and cedars in the temple courts, suggesting intentional cultivation rather than natural growth. Jeremiah 17:8 uses similar imagery but with different vocabulary, contrasting naturally occurring and intentionally planted vegetation.

The system’s database reveals that שתול appears 12 times in the Hebrew Bible, always in contexts of deliberate agricultural practice. This evidence leads the system to conclude that the tree in Psalm 1 represents not just any tree, but specifically a cultivated tree placed by irrigation channels — an image of intentional spiritual development rather than accidental growth.

# How the System Ensures Quality

The system uses multiple safeguards to ensure accuracy and scholarly rigor. Phonetic transcriptions prevent common errors like confusing hard “p” sounds with soft “f” sounds or mixing up different Hebrew letters. The concordance searches use four levels of normalization to handle the complexities of Hebrew diacritics and word forms.

The figurative language database provides specific, traceable examples rather than vague claims about “common biblical imagery.” Traditional commentaries are presented as historical witnesses rather than unquestioned authorities.

The system is designed to be conservative in its claims, always pointing to specific evidence. When discussing sound patterns, it references exact phonetic sequences. When analyzing metaphors, it grounds claims in lexical data and cross-references.

The result is commentary that explains its reasoning and allows readers to evaluate each step of the analysis.

This approach produces commentary that meets academic standards while remaining accessible to educated readers. The system doesn’t replace human scholarship but provides a tool that can process more information than any individual scholar could reasonably handle — ensuring comprehensive analysis while maintaining the critical thinking and evidence-based reasoning that characterize good biblical scholarship.