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This book by Bodi, at present working in the Department of Old Testament at the University of Neuchatel, represents a remodeled and expanded version of his PhD dissertation, Terminological and Thematic Comparisons Between the Book of Ezekiel and Akkadian Literature with Special Reference to the Poem of Erra (Union Theological Seminary, New York, NY, 1987).

The contention of his research is twofold:

* the themes and motifs of the Book of Ezekiel lose their point unless they are interpreted in the light of their contemporary literature, religious beliefs and practices - with the focus on the Poem of Erra;

* there is the likelihood that in the formulation of certain themes and motifs of the Book of Ezekiel its author or redactor knew or emulated the Akkadian literary masterpiece, the Poem of Erra.

In the light of the impossibility of conducting exegesis without presuppositions, Bodi states his basic assumptions as follows:

* the Book of Ezekiel should be studied as a work of particular literary artistry;

* there exists an inter-connectedness of themes, motifs and expressions among the literatures of the ancient Near East and the Old Testament is part of this broad cultural and literary continuum;

* the Book of Ezekiel was originally composed in a Babylonian environment;

* without sharing a dogmatic belief in the supremacy of the Masoretic text, the research makes use of the Book of Ezekiel in its final form.

In short, it all boils down to the following working hypothesis: "the existence of a definite relationship between expressions, themes and motifs in the Book of Ezekiel and the Poem of Erra" (pp 22-3). This relationship is best illustrated by twelve features shared by both works and these points of contact are discussed in descending degree of probability, divided into two main categories.

The first category consists of four features which, in the Old Testament, appear uniquely in the Book of Ezekiel and are also present in the Poem of Erra:

* corresponding verbs for "to show contempt/treat with despite";

* etymologically related nouns for "amber";

* the motif of the seven executioners in Ezekiel 9 and the divine seven in Erra;

* The common motif of the preservation from the flood.

The second category comprises eight features found in antecedent Old Testament traditions but used in such a way to suggest some influence by the Poem of Erra:

* terms meaning "din" or "noise", which also have a metaphorical meaning hybris;
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* corresponding verbs for “to throw a net”;
* a common theme: “the absence of the divinity from its shrine”;
* the motif of the navel of the earth (Jerusalem and Babylon);
* the song of the sword;
* the role of the watchman and intercessor;
* the remnant and restoration motifs;
* the recognition formula in Ezekiel and the statement of recognition in Erra.

Bodi also perceives two major differences between the Weltanschauung in the Book of Ezekiel and in the Poem of Erra: on the one hand, the Poem of Erra is strictly polytheistic, whilst a radical demand for monolatry dominates the Book of Ezekiel; on the other hand, the Poem of Erra reflects magical practices as being effective by virtue of performance and by contrast the Book of Ezekiel contains no magical device which can manipulate the furor of Yahweh.

The detailed analysis of the twelve features common to both the Book of Ezekiel and the Poem of Erra contributes to a better understanding of Old Testament prophetic tradition and of Akkadian literature. Bodi’s research shows the heuristic potential and the inevitable limitations of the comparative study of ancient Near Eastern literature.

H.L. Bosman
Dept. of Old Testament
University of Stellenbosch
STELLENBOSCH 7600
South Africa


In this book Floss offers a reworked paper from 1986 incorporating also the preparatory detail analyses. His investigation of 2 Sam 5:6-9 was largely stimulated by a part of the dissertation of Christa Schäfer-Lichtenberger, Stadt und Eidgenossenschaft im Alten Testament (BZAW 156) 1983. It was originally meant to focus on the aims and results of the conquest of the city, but already in the paper Floss had changed the subtitle to indicate the focus on the report itself. His point of departure is the classic hypothesis of Albrecht Alt that David had his private army capture Jerusalem so that he could use it as a central and neutral capital for the combined realm, took its crown as his third and renamed Jerusalem the city of David.

As to method he follows Alt’s dictum that one should work with the text from a literary point of view before attempting a historical evaluation. From his initial analyses of 2 Sam 5:6-9 and 1 Chr 11:4-8 he concludes that the latter is secondary and unreliable. The rest of his study is then based on 2 Sam 5:6-9 only. True to the Richter approach he provides the text in transcription and analysed according to its syntactical structure. He then distinguishes between complete and incomplete information up to the sentence level, as well
as on the text level. On the sentence level he regards (his sentence 8b) as incomplete, agreeing on this point with Schäfer-Lichtenberger, and rejecting the view of Gross that it is a pendens construction. Next he discusses Schäfer-Lichtenberger’s solution to the problems of 2 Sam 5:6-9 and especially her interpretation of as a change of ownership. His study of and its direct objects leads him to the conclusion that where the direct object is a lexeme indicating locality, the verb refers to military capture with or without fighting. There follows a redaction critical discussion of the function of the report within its context, and a discussion of the references to Jerusalem in Jos 15:63, Jdg 1:21 and 1 Sam 17:54, after which he summarises the results of his study.

Floss proposes the following view: The expression implied in or missing from sentence 8b is not as Schäfer-Lichtenberger suggested, but rather by the use of which David wanted to protect the lives of the Jebusites. The inversion of the sequence in which the blind and lame are mentioned seeks to express inverse proportionality. There is no connection between the conquest report and the various references to the lame and blind, although the latter are related amongst themselves. It is therefore likely that only one person added to the original report. The is not Jerusalem, and the city does not come into the story at all. The placing of 2 Sam 5:6-9 in its present position does not derive from DtrH, but from a later redactor who put it there because of the naming of Jerusalem in 5:5. Both DtrH and his source did not know a conquest report as we have it. The city of Jerusalem had long been in Israelite hands already. The redactor made use of a separate tradition concerning the capture of to glorify David. David’s own intention was not to gain a central and neutral capital, but merely to find a place where the ark could stay finally. This view, Floss points out, was already stated by W.E. Barnes in 1914, but has not found its way into the recent historiography of the period.

One could raise some questions in response to Floss. In his discussion of the references to Jerusalem in Joshua, Judges and 1 Samuel he does not refer to Jdg 19:10-12, where Jerusalem is identified with Jebus, and is called , and described as . Assuming Floss has an explanation why this text should not be taken at face value, one would have expected him to spell it out, because as it stands it claims to be relevant. Concerning the information which Floss regards as incomplete, specifically the possible relations of (his sentence 8b) to 8c, a fuller discussion would have been more satisfactory. This also applies to the expression (cf. p.39), the word , and the growth of the text to its present form. After all, we must assume that the text made some sense to those who created and transmitted it.

The book has the typical appearance of the by now well-known series, both outside and inside. The six rather conspicuous typing errors noticed (pp. 23, 34, 35, 35n.88, 49, 55n.126) should not prevent one from enjoying the carefully researched and well written book and from learning much in the process.

In this thought provoking book, Koenig engages in a fresh interpretation of a number of enigmatic passages in Deutero-Isaiah. Throughout his analysis, he is concerned to demonstrate that the modern preoccupation with coherence has often obscured the interpretative processes which were at work in the shaping of the Biblical text. In this respect he pays particular attention to the hermeneutical processes which can be identified in various textual traditions.

In the first passage under consideration, namely Isaiah 40:6-8, Koenig points to the textual evidence for both a longer reading as contained in the Massoretic text (MT), but also a shorter reading (without v 7) as contained in 1 Q ISa (Qa), and also possibly in pre-original versions of the Septuagint. The significance of the shorter text is that it contains a pointer to the history of interpretation by highlighting one of the two functions which the MT text assumed, namely an oracle which depicts the imminent demise of Babylon (vv 6,8).

In his second analysis, Koenig turns to the interpretation of Isaiah 40:1-26. The whole passage of Isaiah 40:12-26 is understood as a polemic against the claims which were made for the Babylonian gods in the Table of Destinies during the annual New Year feast. A crucial aspect of this proposal turns on the interpretation of verse 13b as a reference to Cyrus as the object of God’s decree. A variety of textual witnesses, including Qa and Qb (I Q ISb), the translation of Symachus and the Massoretic Ketib of Isaiah 46:11, are induced in support of this reading. In my opinion, Koenig effectively demonstrates that textual witnesses, as sources for understanding the hermeneutical processes which were at work in Jewish communities, lend plausibility to a reading which has been discounted by most exeges.

As for Isaiah 40:1-11, the recognition that the passage is dominated by the description of the theophany in verses 3-5, provides the basis for understanding the integral relationship between 40:1-11 and 40:12-26. The contention that the passages are held together by the structural elements of the theophany, provides a very plausible thesis which opens the text to new and suggestive interpretative possibilities.

In his third and most expansive essay, Koenig addresses problems surrounding the interpretation of the fourth servant poem in Isaiah 52:7-53:12. The first part of analysis which concentrates on Isaiah 53:10-13, departs the novel hypothesis concerning the identification of servant as the institution of the exilic synagogue.

According to Koenig, this proposal is able to explain a number of enigmatic characteristics pertaining to the description of the servant. Thus the use of the terminology of the cult to portray the servant as a sacrificial victim (the term *asham* in 53:10) can be related to the historical circumstances which pertained in the exilic period. As representatives of the golah the members of the synagogue fulfilled an expiatory role with respect to both the Babylonian authorities, and those who had remained behind in Judah. The institutional clarification also explains how the work of the servant can be logically depicted as extending beyond the exile, to include the establishment of an aristocratic sacerdotal authority which will enjoy both internal and external recognition.
With regard to Is 52:13-15, Koenig addresses two major problems. In both cases his argument amounts to the retention of the lectio difficilior of the MT, and a rejection of the attempts at textual emendation—which are based on various textual witnesses.

Firstly, the term mishat in the MT of 52:14a is interpreted on the principle of homonymy, according to which it enjoys the double connotation of 'disfigured' and 'anointed'. Koenig proceeds to demonstrate that the textual witnesses confirm the priority of the MT reading by providing readings in which both inherent meanings of the MT homonymy are employed. This fact serves as a caveat that modern exegesis should not try to resolve the text's interpretative difficulties by making an exclusive choice for one particular reading.

Secondly, Koenig discusses the semantic problems connected to the use of the technical cultic term for 'sprinkling' (yazeh) in 52:15. Once again, a painstaking evaluation of the hermeneutical considerations which were at stake in the various textual witnesses, leads to the conclusion that the reading of the MT, which is also preserved in Qa, should be maintained. The reason for the specific semantic usage in Isaiah 52:15 is sought in the establishment of a typological connection between the ritual practices of the cult and the activity of the servant in the exilic situation.

Throughout the analysis of the fourth servant poem, the reader can only be impressed by the painstaking and rigorous nature of Koenig's analysis. His proposals for new approaches to old cruces interpretum are based on a careful assessment of all the available evidence, whether of a philological or historical nature, and present insights of which the ensuing debate will certainly have to take cognizance.

In his final essay, Koenig contends that the motif of the liberation of captives from prison allowed the oracles of Isaiah 42:5-9 and 49:8-9a, which originally described the liberative activity of Cyrus, to be reinterpreted as a depiction of the servant's role in freeing the nations from the obscurity of polytheism. Once again, therefore, Koenig's argument amounts to a plea that modern exegesis should modify their notions of coherence in order to be sympathetic to the polivalency of the text.

In closing, I recommend this book as a valuable discussion of the treatment of textual witnesses that pertain to the analysis of Deutero-Isaiah. On a broader scale, however, it addresses the more encompassing methodological issue concerning the criteria which inform modern exegesis in their analysis of Biblical texts. As such, it should be read by all who are concerned to engage in a more sympathetic appraisal of the hermeneutic processes which were at work in ancient Jewish communities.

M.J. Oosthuizen
Dept. of Biblical Studies
University of Port Elizabeth
PORT ELIZABETH 6001
South Africa

*****
This publication is concerned with the preliminary reports on ASOR-sponsored excavations covering the following:

  The multidisciplinary approach followed at Tell Halif resulted in a report that covers a wide range of subjects such as the excavations, stratigraphy, ancient economy, human ecology, botanical remains and animal exploitation. Although the main aim of this expedition was to research the Bronze Age settlements, the information gained covers aspects dating from the Chalcolithic to the Modern Arab period.

  The primary objectives of the fourth and final season of Phase I at Khirbet Iskander were to clarify previous work and to unravel some stratigraphical problems before publishing the final report. The expedition’s hypothesis that permanent sedentary adaptation in the Early Bronze IV and villages and towns of urban EB II-III periods was a viable alternative lifestyle was vindicated by the results of this campaign.

  The aim of this project was to survey and excavate Tell el-‘Umeiri and the region within a 5 km radius around the tell. In 1987 attention was focussed on the growth and decline of the economy, society, and agriculture from the Early Bronze Age to modern times.

  The activities of the fourth season focused on the Lejjûn fortress and the conclusion of the survey of the limes region. The aim of this project is to examine the historical evolution of the Roman frontier east of the Dead Sea between the late third and mid-sixth centuries.
  The fourth season of this project yielded useful additional information on this subject. The headquarters building, barracks, and fortifications of the legionary fortress of el-Lejjûn were further exposed and several other areas were opened. A kitchen in the headquarters provided interesting artifacts and information on the military diet while the survey yielded a total of 500 sites.
  This report is accompanied by appendices containing catalogues and discussions of coins and faunal remains recovered during the 1987 excavations.

* The Sardis Campaign of 1986.
  The purpose of the 1986 campaign was to excavate, conserve and examine the finds from earlier seasons. Efforts were concentrated in two sectors:
The huge earthwork from archaic times against the west face of Colossal Lydian Structure in sector MMS. The aims in this sector were to clarify the design of the west face and frontage of Colossal Lydian Structure and to expose more of the Lydian habitation zone near the east side of the Structure.

At sector ByzFort the aims of the 1986 season were to obtain evidence for the date of a Roman mosaic paving discovered in 1984 and to clarify Roman and Archaic occupation deposits that had been partly excavated on the spur summit in 1985. The segment of the Archaic terrace facade that was exposed by erosion was also examined. The excavators also tried to determine whether the monumental Lydian construction had existed on the spur summit.

The information disclosed in these reports is important to every scholar concerned with archaeology, history and other related fields of study. Unfortunately the accessibility to the information submitted here is limited. The reason for this is perhaps the fact that the meaning as well as the consequences of the results are not adequately discussed. The information should be communicated in such a way that it is also accessible to scholars outside the brotherhood of archaeologists.

In spite of the negative remarks above, the reports presented in this publication are nevertheless of consequence and scholars should take notice of it.

D.N. Pienaar
Dept. of Biblical Studies
University of the Orange Free State
BLOEMFONTEIN 9301
South Africa

*****


This book is the author’s dissertation, in the completion of which he was guided in turn by W. Richter, H. Irsigler and T. Seidl. After its acceptance in the winter semester of 1987/8 by the Catholic Theological Faculty in Munich he added some references to newer literature as well as to older commentaries.

H.-D. Hoffmann and H. Spieckermann came to contrastive conclusions concerning the literary unity of 2 Kings 22-23. This contrast and Lohfink’s subsequent call for a purely synchronic study of these chapters provided a stimulus for Tagliacarne’s approach, which he describes as a “postmodern” exegesis. In the past most studies of 2 Kings 22-23 have been diachronic in nature. The new approach takes as point of departure the insight that the text at some stage began to be transmitted in a form identical with or similar to its present form, because it was regarded to be meaningful. His aim then is to describe the present form of the text, to say how it is structured and how it functions.

Tagliacarne mentions three considerations to support this approach: Firstly, the non-unity of a literary complex can only be considered when its global functioning proves to be untenable, and the functioning should be judged in terms of text immanent indicators, and not be questioned on the basis of criteria which are at home in a different cultural
circle. Secondly, literary critical studies depart from the axiom that unevenness, tensions and contradictions should be removed from the text to arrive at a coherent text, but this axiom is at odds with the reality of literary production. Thirdly, the study of a text aims at deciphering its code, first as to the language and then as to indicators which constitute the “reading program”, putting the question of its historical reference in brackets.

For this method Tagliacarne chooses the MT as basis, and then describes his method. If what has so far been described sounds rather unlike the Richter school, the reader will nevertheless find that for the rest the book is very much like that of other students of Richter. He places strong emphasis on the theoretical basis of his study, transcribes the whole text (in a transcription representing morphology, not pronunciation), segments it into sentences and spells out the criteria for the establishing of each sentence boundary, analyses the sentences, distinguishes sections, and identifies structural markers.

The main part (namely chapter 4, i.e. pp. 45-332) of his book is taken up by his description of the text, of which he first spells out the aims, namely (1) to check the syntactical analysis, (2) to identify important elements which make possible the interpretation on a narrative or semiotic level, and (3) to find the immanent reading program. Next he expounds the steps in the process. These focus on the morphosyntactic description of the sentences, the relationship between the sentences, and the results for the semantics of the text. A brief paragraph (pp. 50-51) notes the limits of the work done in the chapter, which concludes with three pages of summary observations. A significant one among these is appears somewhat hidden in foot-note 744: “Without excluding the possibility that single expansions are to be explained diachronically, the tendency in exegesis to explain all expansions in this fragmentary way is unfounded as far as literary science is concerned” (his emphases, my translation).

The next chapter focuses on the intratextual relations, or the outer form of the text. Here he groups the various sections into sequences. He concludes that 22:3 - 23:3 and 23:4-24 are each other’s parallel counterparts, and that the text 22:3-23:24 is to be regarded as a structure planned and composed according to definite models. He also finds formal indicators that emphasise the parallel structure.

Chapter 6 deals with diachronic and synchronic intertextual relations of 2 Kings 22-23 to other Old Testament texts. These are discussed and presented in tabular form, and lead him to the conclusion inter alia that the “finding” of the book of the law in 22:8 is historically to be viewed with utter scepticism, seeing that it is text immanently explainable and that it is the prerequisite for Josiah’s reaction.

In his concluding chapter Tagliacarne establishes that the deeds of Josiah are not presented chronologically, but serve a literary or theological scheme. To express the oppositions and structures in the text he makes use of a model developed by Greimas.

Tagliacarne has studied an important part of the Old Testament text. He has combined the strong theoretical basis of the Richter school with a synchronic approach focusing on the Masoretic text. This has enabled him to give us an interpretation which is less speculative than many in the field and which makes a valuable contribution.

W.T.W. Cloete
Dept. of Semitics
University of the Western Cape
BELLVILLE 7530
South Africa