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This is indeed an interesting and thorough piece of work. The author gives us a general introduction to the relation of Hebrew to other Semitic Languages, as well as to his method of linguistic approach which is done according to the principles of modern linguistics. It is to be welcomed that we have in this grammar a thorough application of the results of modern linguistics. The author goes on to describe the phenomena of Hebrew grammar with excellent knowledge of the more important results of modern research in this field of study. In some instances a too simple usage of certain forms is proposed. I do not think it is adequate to describe the usage of the infinitive absolute with the verb as emphasis, certainty and duration (cf. pp. 74, 80). In some cases it cannot be proved. Some scholars would also question the meanings ascribed to D and H. But the author's attempt is a great advancement on what is still used in some other grammars. It should have been profitable to include with the pe-yodverbs those that have / as second consonant with a tendency to assimilate. One wonders whether the students of München have a better grounding in general grammar than ours, but this grammar would be too advanced for our beginners. All in all this grammar is to be welcomed by all who are interested in teaching Hebrew Grammar. It is a thorough study, written with good knowledge of modern tendencies (cf. e.g. p. 77 where a good case is made out for G passive, punctuated by the Massoretes as D passive). It can be recommended without reservations.

F.C.F.


Two volumes of the very interesting grammar of Richter have been published. The author has taken good advantage of the methods of modern linguistics. He seems to rely especially on the work of modern linguists like e.g. De Saussure, Bloomfield, Zellig Harris, Gleason, Lyons and Hjelmslev. The result is an interesting approach which sometimes deviates from other approaches. We want to refer here to Richter’s contention in connection with the word group, approached from the morphosyntactical angle (II, 5ff.). This has produced important results. A few observations can be made: I am becoming more aware of the fact that poetic Hebrew grammar and especially the older poetry must be approached on its own. (Cf. JNSL 6 (1978), 9–18). There seems to be some difference between the grammar of poetry and that of prose. This would give a different view to the usage of the verb as discussed by the author (I, 139ff.). It is also important to discuss the viewpoint of P. Kustar on the verb more fully than the one reference to his work 0, 140). Another important study on the Hebrew verb is omitted, viz. that of J. Hoftijzer (Verbale Vragen, 1974). But Richter calls his work Grundlagen and as he has stated it in II, 3, it is not his intention to discuss all the examples. In spite of this, scholarship is much indebted to him for the first general Hebrew grammar to be written with the aid of modern linguistics. It is an amazing piece of research.

F.C.F.


In this dissertation the author has studied from a variety of approaches the problems in connection with the Elijah narratives. All the different methods at the disposal of the modern scholar are used, viz. literary criticism, form criticism, tradition criticism and redaction criticism. The result is an excellent study in which the outer surface is removed and the inner historical kernel displayed. It seems to be the ultimate purpose of this study to discover the religious traits and the historical basis of the narratives. Important is one of the results of this study, viz. that the narrator and the traditionalists did not
restrict the historical reality to historical events, but also brought existential experiences into play (p. 341). In modern studies on the traditions of the Old Testament this fact is strongly emphasized (cf. H. Gese in *Tradition and Theology in the Old Testament*, 1977, 301 ff.). The author’s view, contrary to the contention of certain modern scholars, that the raising of the son by Elijah is not subordinate to that of Elishah, but an independent tradition, can be endorsed (cf. 188 ff. and 329). But I think that the attempt of the author to minimize the conflict between Baal and the Lord in certain Elijah narratives (pp. 334–335), cannot be upheld. To my mind this conflict lies in the background of both the drought narrative and raising of the son in 1 Ki. 17 (cf. my forthcoming article in *ZA W*). The role of this conflict is, thus, important for a better understanding of the narratives in 1 Ki. 17–18.

We have in this study a thorough application of all the modern methods for the study of Old Testament narratives. If one has doubts about the applicability or the value of some of these methods, the results would be different from those of the author. We want to congratulate the author on a thorough investigation and with an excellent bibliography. Everyone who wants to study the Elijah narratives, must use this study.

F. C. F.

**MICHAEL HELTZER, The Rural Community in Ancient Ugaritic, 1976. Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden.**

We are indebted to the author for this important sociological study of ancient Ugarit. His study is based on the texts and their interpretation. He has, understandingly, made use of both the alphabetic and Akkadian cuneiform texts. The results of his study are very interesting and takes us a step forward in understanding the social stratification at Ugarit. It is always a risk to compare institutions of Ugarit with those of the Old Testament. It would have been, however, profitable to compare certain results of this study with the Old Testament. This could have enriched this book. The author has also explained in various ways difficult terms in the texts. It is to be expected that some terms still evade explanation and are a serious challenge to further research. One of the terms which gave problems to the author, is jkl from kly (p. 40) for which we have given an explanation elsewhere in this journal. The author is well versed in modern studies in connection with Ugarit. An amazing amount of scholarly opinion is worked into this book. We want to draw the attention to one omission, viz. in connection with maswatu-wood (p. 46). Anton Jirku has pointed out that Ugaritic mswn must probably be connected to maswatu which gives an excellent explanation for 1 Keret 124ff. (cf. Jirku, *JNSL* 3 (1974), 34). There could be some difference of opinion about some of the author’s interpretations. It is, however, an excellent study and could be strongly recommended.

F. C. F.


There is quite a revival of research on the Book of Lamentations. The author’s study is intended to explain problems in connection with the text, but is much more than only a textual critical study in which the Masoretic Text is evaluated against the ancient versions, especially LXX and Peshitta. It is also a philological study of problematic terms in Lamentations. The author, in the footsteps of Albrektson, tries to make sense out of the Masoretic Text as far as possible. This modern tendency is to be welcomed. Although the author is quite aware of the aid of Ugaritic to explain some of the problems (e.g. k as intensifying particle p. 20), he is not willing to follow Dahood in most of his proposals which alter the meaning of the text significantly. His criticism of Dahood’s views in most cases is valid, e.g. on 5:18 (p. 70). We have here a careful analysis of the more problematic terms in light of the textual tradition which is of great value for further research.

F. C. F.

**GARY A. TUTTLE (ED.), Biblical and Near Eastern Studies. Essays in honor of William**

The "Festschrift" which was at one stage almost solely a German enterprise, has now made its impact on many other countries. These studies in honour of Prof. LaSor on his sixty fifth birthday, testify of the high regards held for LaSor by his friends and former students. This publication is divided into three sections, viz. New Testament Studies, Old Testament Studies and Ancient Near Eastern Studies. It is impossible to give here a full account of every of the twenty two contributions, some by scholars of international repute. We just want to draw the attention to some of the authors, e.g. F. F. Bruce, Jean Carmignac, Brevard S. Childs, Cyrus H. Gordon (with two articles), Meredith G. Kline, Robert B. Lauren, Marvin H. Pope (who gives an interesting explanation of the old crux of Ex. 7:19 from Ugaritic), D. J. Wiseman (who offers criticism against the views of T. L. Thompson and J. van Seters that people did not live in tents during Middle Bronze Age), Barry J. Beitzel, Frederic Wm Bush (with a study on certain suffixes of Hurrian), A. R. Millard, Bruce Zuckerman and an interesting study of the editor, Garry A. Tuttle, on case vowels on masculine singular nouns in construct in Ugarit. These studies do not conform to a general theme, but reflect the interest of the various authors. LaSor himself is a versatile scholar who has made in different fields of study important contributions (cf. the personal tribute of David Allan Hubbard, pp. 1 ff.). It is, thus, fitting to honour him with such a wide variety of articles. We want to congratulate Prof. LaSor with these studies in his honour. Quite a few new insights are offered which make it worthwhile to study this book.

F.C.F.


The author is wellknown for his important articles on the Ancient Near East, e.g. in JANES. This Akkadian grammar is to be welcomed. In the first place there is not really a satisfactory grammar in Akkadian at the moment for beginners. One can use the grammar of Ungnad-Matous, but it is too advanced in many instances. This work of Marcus complies with a long standing need. In the second place it is written according to the inductive method by using certain Akkadian texts to explain the grammar, a method introduced many years ago for Biblical Hebrew by Harper and recently used by Sawyer. This method is also not totally satisfactory, because in the texts advance material as well as material for beginners is used side by side. A beginner will, thus, encounter certain material which will only be explained to him later on. On the other hand, the beginner is immediately introduced to the text and not to artificial sentences created by the grammarian. The text creates in the beginner a feeling for the literature he is going to study. In the third place the author immediately introduces the beginner to cuneiform writing. This is very important. The usual process to teach Akkadian grammar through transcription is not to be recommended. The student must from the beginning be introduced to certain basic signs in order to master in a more advanced stage the syllabary of special periods. The author starts his grammar with the classical period of Akkadian from the Code of Hammurapi and advances to the Late Assyrian period with the Annals of Sennacherib at the end of the grammar. This grammar is thoroughly tested with students and the evidence is that it works. It can, thus, be heartily recommended.

F.C.F.


The author regards the latest methods of research on the Pentateuch inadequate. He specially refers to the atomistic approach in which small minutiae is discussed with disregard of the whole. Another method he criticises, is what he calls geneticism, a method that works back to the origin of traditions (G. von Rad and M. Noth). Clines opts for a more positive approach which takes the text as it stands, a kind of holistic approach (pp. 10ff.). It is a pity that Clines could not have taken notice of the study of H. Gese (cf. D. A. Knight (ed.), Tradition and Theology in the Old Testament, 1977,
301 ff.) because it has probably been published after the study of Clines is concluded. Gese is also of opinion that the text as it stands, is important and from this he develops his view of an approach of totality. Clines then proceeds to a discussion of the central theme of the Pentateuch which is the promise in which the relationship between the Lord and his people plays an important rôle, although a slightly different view of Gen. 1–11 is taken. Clines shows how his view can fit into the documentary hypothesis. Later on in his study it seems, however, that he accepts for his general theme a Sitz im Leben during the exile (pp. 97 ff.). From his discussion is clear that he approaches the Pentateuch as literature, cf. e.g. his useful discussion of the story as literary type. The impression is created that not much of the historical reliability can be abstracted from these stories. The promise is then connected to the principle of hope and special reference is made to studies of Bloch and Moltmann.

Although we have here an interesting approach, many questions remain unexplained. It is not clear whether Clines accepts Noth’s view of a Deuteronomistic Historical Work or not. On p. 96 he refers to this work, but an acceptance of this would mean that Deuteronomy cannot be included in his discussion. The position is not clear. His view that we must work from the text as it stands, is quite acceptable, but I think it is our duty to trace the development of the tradition back to its origin. Promise and hope existed indeed in the time of the exile, but this is also true of many other situations in the history of Israel. Must we accept that these other life situations are not important? It is perfectly correct to move away from an earlier tendency, especially applied by H. Gunkel, to take as authentic the original tradition in its pure form. On the other hand, we must be cautious to accept the final redaction as absolute and to disregard the whole history of the development of the tradition. The whole process from the original form up to its final form is important (cf. the cogent arguments of Gese in his article). But, on tradition and its development many views can prevail. Clines gives us his view and this is worthwhile studying.

F.C.F.


The wellknown book of G. R. Driver has been published in 1956. This second edition of John Gibson is not a kind of reprint with a few new observations, but is to a large extent totally different from the first edition. This is to be expected, because between 1956 and 1978 many Ugaritic texts have been published and a constant stream of scholarly work has appeared. It was indeed high time to restudy the Ugaritic texts as interpreted by Driver. Gibson is so well versed in Ugaritic studies that quite a fresh approach is the result. He takes the latest research into consideration and carefully weighs it against Driver’s earlier interpretation. The impression one receives, is that Gibson has moved in many instances away from Driver’s tendency to overemphasize the use of Arabic to explain Ugaritic. Driver has done useful work and scholarship is much indebted to him. Some of his proposals are, however, no longer acceptable. This is not the place to go into all the particulars of philology and the interpretation of the texts. Gibson’s attempt is to be welcomed for its sober and superb approach to sometimes untranslatable texts. The general organisation of the material is done on the same lines as the original edition. It is a pity that the translation is accompanied by only a few explanatory remarks in footnotes, but fuller explanations could have expanded the work with many pages, making it very expensive. Another improvement on Driver’s edition is that the numbering of texts is done according to Herdner’s edition of the texts. The author has also supplied us with an appendix of recently discovered mythological texts, but in this case no translation is given. The useful glossary is improved according to new insights in the meaning of Ugaritic terms. This up-to-date book of Gibson can be heartily recommended and is indispensable for further research.

F.C.F.


It is amazing how popular Zephaniah has become in modern studies. In quick suc-
cession we have the philological commentary of Sabottka (1972), the literary study of Kapelrud (1975) and now this exhaustive study of Irsigler of over 500 pages—and that only on Zeph. 1:1–2:3! These three scholars have approached Zephaniah differently: Sabottka of the Dahood-school form a strong philological angle in which Ugaritic plays an important rôle; Kapelrud from the Scandinavian school with emphasis on the cult and Irsigler of the Richter-school with emphasis on the literary structure. Everyone of these scholars has made an important contribution to the advancement of knowledge in connection with Zephaniah. Irsigler starts out with a study on the text and lexicography (cf. his good discussion of ḏlg on pp. 43–45); he continues his study with literary criticism according to the model of Wolfgang Richter in which special attention is given to the doublet, the inner tension and the parallel texts. A careful analysis is also given of divergencies and the unity of every small literary unit. The relation of the units is also studied. This is followed by Form Criticism in which the form on the surface, the syntax, the lexemes, ornamental character and inner form etc. are discussed. The result is gratifying. Every phrase is carefully weighed against similar phraseology in the Old Testament. From the smallest unit the whole structure of the larger unit is built out.

On the day of the Lord important conclusions are made. We want to draw the attention to one important insight, viz. the relationship of the day of the Lord to Ps. 110 (pp. 352 ff.). His explanation of the universal tendency in the book as an eschatological day for the whole world is also acceptable, especially his view that this is brought in in post-exilic times when this kind of message was meaningful. A later re-edition is, thus, not less important than the earlier traditions. Also gratifying is the author’s exhaustive bibliography and his clever application of this material on his study. It is, indeed, to be welcomed that South African scholars figure prominently in his bibliography. This excellent study can be recommended and we are looking forward to the next delivery.


In the series of the University of München under direction of Prof. Wolfgang Richter two studies on Jonah have appeared, one written by Hagia Witzenrath and the other by Gottfried Vanoni. It is interesting to compare these two books. Witzenrath calls her study “eine literaturwissenschaftliche Untersuchung” and Vanoni his “Literatur- und formkritische Untersuchung”. Witzenrath follows mainly the principles of this kind of study laid down by Richter. We have already referred to certain of these principles in our discussion of the work of Irsigler on Zephaniah. The tendency to study the main actors in the Jonah-story in nominal and verbal descriptions is very interesting (pp. 49 ff.). Although a clear distinction is not always given of the semantic field in which action took place, Witzenrath has sometimes indicated it (e.g. pp. 51 f.). Another interesting feature of this book is the study of place and time indications (pp. 59 ff.). She then writes about the fiction of the Book of Jonah by emphasizing various traits, e.g. the fish carrying Jonah, the geographical chiffre use which is made of Tarshish and Nineve. The function of geographical places is also carefully studied. The result is that the Book of Jonah is regarded as an excellent piece of literary art built around the “Aussage” (pp. 95 ff.). It is to be welcomed that a method is applied which grows out of what is actually said in the book itself. From the smallest unit and its relation to other units up to the larger composite unit the composition is described. From a literary point of view this is valuable. This book can heartily be recommended for further study.


This study was done under the inspiration of Prof. Dr. P. Clemens Thomas of the University of Vienna. It is clear that it follows in many respects the principles of “Literaturwissenschaft” worked out by Wolfgang Richter. Some of the things we have said of
the study of Witzenrath can also be applied to this study. And yet there are some differences. To my mind Vanoni has worked out the rôle of the Lord and Jonah more elaborately than Witzenrath (pp. 122 ff.), especially the reference to the initiative and contra initiative of the dramatis personae is illuminating. His study of specific elements (geprügte Elemente) is interesting because of their comparison with similar kinds of elements in other parts of the Old Testament. The result is that some of these elements can be regarded as direct citations from other parts of the Old Testament, and others have a literary relationship (p. 142). The author refers also to the relationship between e.g. Jonah and Gen. 4:1–16; Gen. 6; Ex. 14; Ex. 32; 1 Ki. 19; Jer. 36; Ezek. 27–28; Joel 2:12–17 and Neh. 8. Of interest is that Vanoni comes to the same conclusion as Witzenrath, viz. that the main purpose of the Book of Jonah is not the action, but the “Aussage” (p. 149). It is, thus, important that both Vanoni and Witzenrath, although they have sometimes followed a different course, have reached the same conclusion. This illustrates the value of this kind of method. This work can also heartily be recommended for further study.

F.C.F.


In a careful study all the sources with personal names are utilised. The names are listed alphabetically and furnished with a short discussion. It is clear from the literature used that nothing has escaped the attention of the authors. It starts from pre-exilic times and is carried through to Mishnaic and Talmudic times, an amazing piece of work. In chapter 2 etymology is discussed and a classification is given of the roots. It is compared with cognate names in the Old Testament. The following chapters deal with names in Neo-Babylonian and Persian times, in the Hellenistic Period and the Talmudic Period. One of the important conclusions is: “We have a large number of typically Hebrew personal names in the Jewish sources from later periods, which as yet have not been attested in the pre-exilic period.” In Excursus I an important discussion is given of personal names in Ezra and Nehemiah in comparison with names in epigraphical material.

This is a very useful work for everybody studying names, who is confronted with names in Biblical books without all the different sources at his disposal and who has it now neatly put together. It can heartily be recommended.

F.C.F.


The subtitle is “Eine formkritische Untersuchung zu Dan. 8 und 10–12”. We have already referred to the method employed, in the discussion of other books in this series. Hasslberger’s study takes him 451 pages to discuss Dan. 8 and 10–12, four chapters of the Book of Daniel! It is, thus, an exhaustive discussion of the grammar and function of terms as well as the style. The author explains why only these chapters are selected for his study. Dan. 7 in Aramaic creates some problems for a comparison with the other chapters in Hebrew. This illustrates, thus, one of the shortcomings of the author’s method. Dan. 9 is omitted because it does not fit in the horizon of Dan. 8, 10–12. It would take a long discussion to refer to all the small detail of the author’s study. We want to refer to a few interesting points: On p. 28 he discusses the verb r’y in its combination with ḫazôn. On p. 72 the function of this combination is studied. It stands at the beginning of a unit. He refers also to its function in Dan. 2:1; 7:1 and 10:1. The result is that this combination reflects an independent and restricted theme. This is an example of the small detail of the author’s discussion. The author gives a full discussion of the numbers in these chapters and the different solutions for the problem (pp. 385 ff.). There is no satisfactory solution and the author does not attempt a new solution. He refers, however, to the possibility that the numbers were inserted as a gloss at
later times when certain expectations were not met. One should always be cautious with this kind of solution, because it is an easy way out to get rid of the problem. In his discussion of the *Sitz im Leben* the author regards as the purpose of Dan. 10–12 to denote the end of the last king and, thus, salvation for Israel. It is clear that the author of Dan. 8, 10–12 wanted to encourage people in grave distress to hope on their salvation. It is also clear that this author was influenced by the prophetic writings of the Old Testament (p. 400). From this we can gather that Hasslberger in discussing the *Sitz im Leben*, is cautious not to connect it to a definite historical situation.

It can be strongly recommended.

F.C.F.


We have reviewed the first part of this study in *JNSL* 6 (1978), 87. The work is now complete with the second volume running up to 391 pages, all in all with the first volume 551 pages on three chapters of Jeremiah! And this is only a discussion of literary criticism (Literaturwissenschaft). With the review of the book of Irsgler on Zephaniah we have expressed our admiration for this kind of feat. Everything is built out from the text in which the smallest detail does not escape the attention of the author. It is, however, difficult reading. All these studies are useful, but it is not the whole story. The next step should be to discover the message of the chapters. The Old Testament is not only a literary piece of work, but it is strongly connected to the message of the Lord to peoples of certain times. If an exposition of the message should be included, the work will become so expanded that it will be very difficult to use. We should, thus, look for a shorter and more simple approach to make these kinds of studies efficient. We want to draw the attention to a few features of Seidl’s study: In an exhaustive study the author discusses the phrase ʾšp(yhwh) (ʾr)ʾx. All the different nuances of this expression are noted as used in the different genres of Old Testament literature. A diachronic study of its usage is also given (pp. 73ff.) and a development of the usage registered (pp. 81ff.). The result is that the origin of this expression is connected to an apologetical conflict with polytheism in the environment of Israel. Later on the expression became static in the liturgy. In the third phase it is an introductory formula (pp. 82–83). The surmise of the author is that the connections between these three chapters have only been laid later on by an editor. Another result of his study is that the different units of Jer. 27 and 28 were written by different authors, etc. It is, thus, a careful study, logically executed and full of important particulars. It can be heartily recommended.

F.C.F.