

Journal for the Evangelical Study of the Old Testament

JESOT is published bi-annually online at www.jesot.org and in print
by Wipf and Stock Publishers.
199 West 8th Avenue, Suite 3, Eugene, OR 97401, USA

ISBN 978-1-7252-6256-0

© 2020 by Wipf and Stock Publishers

JESOT is an international, peer-reviewed journal devoted to the academic and evangelical study of the Old Testament. The journal seeks to publish current academic research in the areas of ancient Near Eastern backgrounds, Dead Sea Scrolls, Rabbinics, Linguistics, Septuagint, Research Methodology, Literary Analysis, Exegesis, Text Criticism, and Theology as they pertain only to the Old Testament. The journal seeks to provide a venue for high-level scholarship on the Old Testament from an evangelical standpoint. The journal is not affiliated with any particular academic institution, and with an international editorial board, online format, and multi-language submissions, *JESOT* seeks to cultivate Old Testament scholarship in the evangelical global community.

JESOT is indexed in *Old Testament Abstracts*, *Christian Periodical Index*, The Ancient World Online (AWOL), and EBSCO databases

Journal for the Evangelical Study of the Old Testament

Executive Editor

STEPHEN J. ANDREWS
(Midwestern Baptist Theological
Seminary, USA)

Editor

RUSSELL L. MEEK
(Ohio Theological Institute, USA)

Book Review Editor

ANDREW M. KING
(Midwestern Baptist Theological
Seminary, USA)

RON HAYDON
(Wheaton College, USA)

Journal correspondence and manuscript submissions should be directed to rmeeek@ohiotheological.org. Instructions for authors can be found at <https://wipfandstock.com/catalog/journal/view/id/7/>.

Books for review and review correspondence should be directed to Andrew King at aking@mbts.edu.

All ordering and subscription inquiries should be sent to Orders@wipfandstock.com.

Editorial Board

T. DESMOND ALEXANDER (Union
Theological College, Queens University,
Ireland)

GEORGE ATHAS (Moore College,
Australia)

ELLIS R. BROTZMAN (Emeritus, Tyndale
Theological Seminary, The Netherlands)

HÉLÈNE DALLAIRE (Denver Seminary,
USA)

MATTHEW EMERSON (Oklahoma Baptist
University, USA)

JOHN F. EVANS (Nairobi Evangelical
Graduate School of Theology, Kenya)

CHRISTOPHER J. FRESCH (Bible College of
South Australia, Australia)

KYLE GREENWOOD (Colorado Christian
University, USA)

JOHN HOBBS (University of Wisconsin –
Oshkosh, USA)

JENS BRUUN KOFOED (Fjellhaug
International University College, Denmark)

KENNETH A. MATHEWS (Beeson Divinity
School, Samford University, USA)

MICHELLE KNIGHT (Trinity Evangelical
Divinity School, USA)

SUNG JIN PARK (Midwestern Baptist
Theological Seminary, USA)

CRISTIAN RATA (Torch Trinity Graduate
University, South Korea)

MAX ROGLAND (Erskine Theological
Seminary, USA)

RODRIGO FRANKLIN DE SOUSA (Faculté
Jean Calvin, France)

LENA-SOFIA TIEMEYER (University of
Aberdeen, Scotland)

DANIEL TIMMER (Faculté de théologie
évangélique, Canada)

COLIN TOFFELMIRE (Ambrose University,
Canada)

Covenant Sin in Nahum

GREGORY D. COOK

Independent Scholar
kimngreg97@aol.com

Generations of Nahum scholars have accepted the view that the prophecy does not address Judah's sin. These scholars proceed to debate whether this silence is a defect of the book. This article contends with the consensus. Nahum does not explicitly mention Judah's sin, but the whole book is set in the context of Judah's adulterous covenant with Assyria. The second verse uses three poetic devices—allusion, repetition, and wordplay—to establish the events of Nahum as a continuing chapter in YHWH's restoration of his people. The first two words of Nah 1:2 allude to Joshua's prophecy (24:19) that YHWH's wrath would break forth when Israel consorted with foreign gods. Next, Nahum uses a three-fold repetition to emphasize YHWH's vengeful nature. Finally, the Hebrew word בעל uses wordplay to mark YHWH as a jealous husband and Judah as an idolatrous people. Through subtlety, this master poet/prophet linked YHWH's affliction of Judah (Nah 1:12) and his destruction of Nineveh to Assyria's seduction of YHWH's adulterous people.

KEYWORDS: *Nahum 1:2, Covenant, Joshua 24:19, Allusion, Hebrew Poetry*

Nahum may be the least-studied, least-taught book in the canon.¹ While this claim is difficult to quantify, it is also difficult to contradict. If there

1. See Duane L. Christensen, *Nahum: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 24F (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009) 17–25. According to Christensen, “Among the church Fathers, the book is cited infrequently: by Tertullian (twice), Clement of Alexandria (once), Eusebius (eight times), Epiphanius (ca. 315–403; five times), Cyril (twice), Hippolytus Romanus (ca. 170–ca. 236; twice), Melito of Sardis (once), and John Chrysostom (twice). Jerome presents a spiritual interpretation in which the book speaks of the certain destruction of those who oppose God and reject the church” (Christensen, *Nahum*, 18). Elizabeth R. Achtemeier observes that Nahum

are books in the Bible that have received less attention, their number is few. The underlying reasons that church, synagogue, and academy have deemphasized this Minor Prophet include the terse poetry, confusing language, and violent imagery in the vision. This article addresses a long-held view that has also contributed to the prophecy's neglect: the belief that Nahum does not address the sin of YHWH's covenant people.

The most famous proponent of this view was J. M. P. Smith, who in 1911 used this claim as evidence of Nahum's inferiority: "The contrast between the message of Nahum and that of Jeremiah, his contemporary, is striking. . . . Instead of grieving over the sin of Judah and striving with might and main to warn her of the error of her ways that she herself, might turn and live, Nahum was apparently content to lead her in a jubilant celebration of the approaching death of Assyria."² Many commentators interact with Smith and grant that Nahum does not discuss Judah's sin.³ Once granted, the discussion usually focuses on whether or not Smith drew the proper conclusion.⁴ Julia O'Brien, for

"has been almost totally ignored in the modern church. No lectionary reading is taken from it and no hymn suggests its words, other than the one line from William Cowper's poem set to music in 'God Moves in a Mysterious Way.' ('He plants his footsteps in the sea and rides upon the storm,' cf. Nahum 1:3c.)" (*Nahum—Malachi*, IBC [Louisville: John Knox, 1986], 5). Aron Pinker makes a similar observation regarding Nahum's role in the synagogue. "It is interesting to note that no lectionary reading has been taken from the Book of Nahum, as if implying that it does not have anything ethical or theological to offer of the same caliber as the other prophets" ("Nahum's Theological Perspectives," *JBQ* 32 [2004]: 148). According to James D. Nogalski, "Nahum is not a prominent figure in rabbinic tradition" (*The Book of the Twelve: Micah—Malachi*, Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary [Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2011], 601).

2. J. M. P. Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Micah, Zephaniah, and Nahum*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark/New York: Scribner, 1911), 281.

3. For example, Simon J. De Vries: "Here is a strange book—one filled with fierce denunciations of Judah's enemy but strikingly wanting in many elements commonly ascribed to the Hebrew prophets, most particularly in any declaration of Judah's sin as seen in the light of covenant obligations" ("Acrostic of Nahum in the Jerusalem Liturgy," *VT* 16 [1966]: 476). Because of the perceived lack of criticism against Judah, some commentators, such as Giuseppe Bernini, consider Nahum a nationalistic prophet (*Osea, Michea, Naum, Abacuc*, Nuovissima Versione della Bibbia dai Testi Originali 30 [Milan: Edizioni San Paolo, 1997], 361; 366).

4. An example of how scholars reorient the discussion is seen in Joseph L. Mihelic: "The chief criticism of the man Nahum is centered on the fact that in his savage joy over the prostrate foe, he does not condemn the sins of his own people. Yet, granting that

instance, makes the perceptive point that scholars who share Smith's opinion do not explain "why the call for the brutal destruction of one's own people is morally superior to the call for the brutal destruction of the enemy or the call for the brutal destruction of them both. J. M. P. Smith's preference for Jeremiah over Nahum, for example, focuses only on Jeremiah's laments while ignoring Jeremiah's insistence that Judah must be punished."⁵ This article challenges that consensus. Nahum does address Judah's sin. In fact, it begins by doing so.

While Nahum does not emphasize Judah's sin, Nah 1:2 sets the events of the book in the context of Judah's adulterous covenant with Assyria. The verse does this by using three poetic devices common in Hebrew poetry and common to Nahum: allusion, repetition, and wordplay.⁶ The verse begins by alluding to a warning against Israel forsaking YHWH for foreign gods. Then, the phrase נקם יהוה ("YHWH avenges") occurs three times in the next eight words. Finally, the phrase that interrupts this rare repetition plays on the word בעל ("lord," "master," "husband," or "Ba'al") to refer to YHWH as a jealous husband. Together, these three aspects of Nah 1:2 introduce the prophecy as a declaration of vengeance against the nation that seduced YHWH's adulterous people.

JOSHUA 24:19

In Hebrew, Nah 1:2 reads, אל קנוא ונקם יהוה ונקם יהוה ובעל חמה נקם יהוה, לצריו ונוטר הוא לאיביו ("YHWH is a jealous and avenging God. YHWH takes vengeance and is a husband of wrath. YHWH takes vengeance

this is a valid criticism of the prophet, still the question arises, when is one justified in voicing criticism of the evil of another individual or nation?" ("The Concept of God in the Book of Nahum," *Int* 2 [1948]: 199).

5. Julia M. O'Brien, *Nahum*, 2nd ed. (Readings; London: Sheffield Academic, 2009), 107. Later in her book O'Brien writes, "Nahum never gives any hints as to the nature of Judah's sin or what changed attitudes or behaviors now invite a turn in Yahweh's favor" (*ibid.*, 134). While not all commentators make this statement, I have found no denial of it.

6. Oswald T. Allis wrote an excellent article, which is still frequently cited, reviewing Nahum's use of poetic devices: "Nahum, Nineveh, Elkosh," *EvQ* 27 (1955): 67–80. See also Richard D. Patterson and Michael E. Travers, "Nahum: Poet Laureate of the Minor Prophets," *JETS* 33 (1990): 437–444.

against his adversaries and he keeps wrath for his enemies”).⁷ The first two words deserve particular attention. While Nahum uses the tetragrammaton (יהוה) thirteen times, only here does the more generic title (אל) for God occur.⁸ The second word of verse 2 is an alternate form of “jealous.” The more common root קנא appears forty times in the OT, but apart from Nah 1:2, קנא is unique to Josh 24:19.

This variant form occurs as Joshua warns “the people, ‘You are not able to serve YHWH, for he is a holy God. He is a jealous God [אל-קנא]; he will not suffer your transgressions and sins.’” The “blunt character” of these words from Joshua comes in response to the people of Israel swearing that they will serve YHWH.⁹ As Gordon McConville and Stephen Williams note, “If we expected Joshua to welcome this, his response is astonishing, with its fierce assertion that they ‘are not able to serve the Lord.’”¹⁰ The covenant united a jealous God who would not tolerate adultery with a people who could not remain faithful.¹¹

7. All translations are mine.

8. The uniqueness of the term in Nahum is often noted by commentators and various theories are given for Nahum’s deviation. For instance, Ralph L. Smith opines, “אל is used only here in Nahum and may indicate that the hymn is from an independent source” (*Micah–Malachi*, WBC 32 [Waco, TX: Word, 1984], 73). The partial acrostic found in Nah 1:2–8 has consumed far more scholarly ink in the last century than any other issue in Nahum studies. Often it is assumed that Nahum used אל instead of יהוה because he needed an א for the acrostic.

9. William T. Koopmans, *Joshua 24 as Poetic Narrative* (Sheffield: JSOT, 2010), 132.

10. J. Gordon McConville and Stephen N. Williams, *Joshua*, Two Horizons Old Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 90.

11. Bernini, Bernard Renaud, and Carl E. Armerding do recognize the covenantal nature of the book. None argues that Nahum addresses Judah’s sin, though Armerding may be hinting at it. Bernini roots the judgment against Assyria in the context of Assyria’s oppression of YHWH’s covenant people (*Nahum*, 361). Renaud likewise interprets Nahum as a statement of YHWH’s jealousy without linking it to spiritual adultery (“La Composition du Livre de Nahum: Une Proposition,” *ZAW* 99 (1987): 217–18. Armerding correctly observes that “The adjective ‘jealous’ is used solely of God, primarily in his self-revelation at Sinai (Exod 25:5; 34:14). Against the covenantal background it denotes the Lord’s deep, indeed, fiercely protective commitment to his people and his exclusive claim to obedience and reciprocal commitment (cf. Deut 4:24; 5:9). Where this relationship of mutual commitment is threatened, either by Israel’s unfaithfulness or by foreign oppression, the inevitable expressions of such jealousy are ‘vengeance’ and ‘wrath,’ directed to restoring that relationship” (“Nahum,” in *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, ed. Frank E. Gaebelain [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985], 7:461).

Joshua's speech continues in the next verse: "If you leave YHWH and serve foreign gods, then he will turn and do evil to you and destroy you after doing good to you."

The uncharacteristic use of *לֹא* in Nahum and the absence of *קָנָה* in any other Old Testament text suggests that Nahum begins by alluding to the only other occurrence of this phrase. While not conclusive in itself, "Shared language that is rare or distinctive suggests a stronger connection than does language that is widely used."¹² The prophets were "subtle and artful interpreters of their times and cultures, they wove into their words countless allusions to the literary texts and the sociohistorical 'texts' of their worlds."¹³ As Robert Alter shows, "purposeful literary allusions" are "a pointed activation of one text by another, conveying a connection in difference or a difference in connection through some conspicuous similarity in phrasing, in motif, or in narrative situation."¹⁴ Though scholarly literature has not discussed this allusion, Nah 1:2 pointedly activates Josh 24:19 through a conspicuous similarity in phrasing and narrative situation. If it is presupposed that Nahum is unconcerned with Judah's sin, the correspondence between Nahum and Joshua would seem insignificant and coincidental. The verse in Joshua indicts Israel as incapable of spiritual faithfulness—a theme seemingly of minor importance amongst Oracles against the Nations texts.

The assertion of allusion depends upon the book of Joshua pre-dating Nahum and also Nahum's audience being able to recognize the allusion. Fixing a date for Nahum does not prove difficult. In 663 bc the Assyrians did what seemed impossible and sacked Thebes. The prophet refers to this as a past event in Nah 3:8–10. Likewise, the book prophesies that Nineveh will meet a similar, yet more brutal, demise—and this occurred in 612 bc. In light of these markers, "hardly anybody

12. Jeffery M. Leonard, "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case," *JBL* 127 (2008): 251.

13. Christopher B. Hays, "Echoes of the Ancient Near East? Intertextuality and the Comparative Study of the Old Testament," in *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays*, ed. J. Ross Wagner, C. Kavin Rowe, and A. Katherine Grieb (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 21.

14. Robert Alter, *The World of Biblical Literature* (New York: Basic, 1992), 110–11.

doubts that the book of Nahum or part of it has to be dated” within this fifty-one year period.¹⁵

The question of Joshua’s dating does not enjoy the same consensus: “Experts are divided about few books in the OT as they are about the book of Joshua. Both date and the authorship (editing) of the book are subjects of continuing controversy.”¹⁶ Those who favor a late date for Joshua will therefore deem the correspondence between Joshua and Nahum of no significance. For those who believe that Josh 24 faithfully records Joshua’s words, there will be no problem in accepting that Nahum and his contemporaries were familiar with it.¹⁷ This article agrees with those who believe that Josh 24 significantly predates Nahum.

The next question is whether an additional τ provides sufficient cause to anchor one prophecy in the context of another. Literature dedicated to allusions in Hebrew poetry suggests that it is since ancient societies proved superior to modern ones in attention to detail.

Again and again, a revelation of a shift in attitude, perspective, or situation is introduced through the alternation of a single word, the deletion of a phrase, the addition of a word, a switch in the order of items, as statements are repeated; it is a technique with a power and subtlety that could have worked only on an audience accustomed to retain minute textual details as it listened and thus to recognize the small but crucial changes introduced in repetition. A listener who could in this way detect close recurrence and difference within the frame of a single episode might reasonably have been expected to pick up a good many verbal echoes and situational correspondences between far-flung episodes.¹⁸

Although Alter emphasizes oral transmission, the identification of Nahum as a “book” (1:1) marks the prophecy as a literary text. As Alter goes on to say, such allusions occur frequently in “biblical poetry, which often depends on a minute phrasal recall of earlier poems and

15. Klaas Spronk, *Nahum*, HCOT (Kampen, The Netherlands: Kok Pharos, 1997), 12. Also Michael Weigl, “Current Research on the Book of Nahum: Exegetical Methodologies in Turmoil?” *CurBS* 9 (2001): 82.

16. Marten H. Woudstra, *The Book of Joshua*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 5.

17. Woudstra discusses various theories and defends an early date in *Joshua*, 9–16.

18. Alter, *World*, 113. Also see Jean Koenig, “L’allusion Inexpliquée au Roseau et à la Mèche, Isaïe 42:3,” *VT* 18 (1968): 159.

narrative texts.¹⁹ The universal acclaim of Nahum as an extraordinary poet places such subtlety well within his abilities.

Fortunately for this argument, even though an ancient audience would have been capable of recognizing the significance of Nahum's ו, it is not essential that they did. All of the occurrences of either אֵל קָנָא or אֵל קָנָא in the OT support the article's hypothesis. The more common form of the phrase is only found in Exod 20:5; 34:14; Deut 4:24; 5:9; 6:15. As with Josh 24:19, each passage also refers to YHWH's jealous desire for faithful worship. Like Josh 24:19, each prophesies that YHWH's wrath will come against his people when they forsake him for foreign gods.

Nahum opened his prophecy with a phrase that occurs in only six places. Each passage is a foundational OT text. Each text uses the strongest possible terms to condemn worship of other gods. Each promises YHWH's wrath against his people should they commit this sin. In the case of Josh 24:19, such a covenant—with the accompanying wrath—is declared inevitable. The allusion in Nahum activates each text. It shows that the "affliction" (Nah 1:12) that Judah endured from Assyrian chariots came as the judgment of an angry and jealous God.

YHWH AVENGES

It is well known that Hebrew intensifies a word or phrase through repetition. It is also well known that a threefold repetition indicates extreme emphasis—but occurs rarely. The statement וְנָקַם יְהוָה נֶקֶם יְהוָה וְנָקַם יְהוָה is therefore striking. A more extreme declaration of YHWH's vengeance is hardly possible. All commentators recognize this. At issue is the motive for the vengeance. There is no debate that the Neo-Assyrian Empire committed atrocities. Usually though, Assyrian cruelty is deemed sufficient reason for the invective of the prophet. Nahum points to a more grievous offense. YHWH intended to avenge his honor against the nation who superseded his mandate and seduced his promiscuous people.

Nahum contributes a chapter to a larger story. In recent decades scholars have made important progress in examining the Minor Prophets as a unified whole. Numerous ancient sources refer to the Twelve

19. Alter, *World*, 128.

as one book.²⁰ The overarching unity has implications for interpretation and is relevant here. Hosea begins the book of the Twelve with judgment meted out by YHWH against his covenant people for their spiritual adultery. As noted by Smith, the prophets gave the majority of their attention to the sins of Israel and Judah. Nahum, however, shows that once YHWH has thoroughly chastised his people, he will avenge himself on his rival (Nah 1:12–14).

For this reason, recognizing the allusion to Josh 24:19; Exod 20:5; 34:14; Deut 4:24; 5:9; 6:15 proves important to proper interpretation. The allusion sets the context for the words that follow. Nahum acknowledges the faithlessness that has gone before. The prophecy establishes that YHWH has punished Judah. The threefold declaration of vengeance, therefore, refers back to this adultery as well as forward to the coming desecration of Nineveh. YHWH avenges himself on his wayward bride—and also upon those who seduced her.

בעל

The above explanation adds a dimension to the wordplay evident in the phrase *ובעל חמה*. “Wordplay is based on *lexical ambiguity* which is simply a way of saying that words can be polyvalent (i.e., have multiple meanings).”²¹ Such wordplay is a “dominant feature of Hebrew poetry.”²²

The word *בעל* may be used to mean “master,” “lord,” or “husband,” or it could name the god Ba‘al. The duality has received much comment. Kevin Cathcart’s work comparing Nah 1:2–8 and Canaanite myth has been particularly helpful. He makes a strong case that “the language of this theophany of Yahweh is borrowed to a large extent from

20. Ancient evidence from scribes, Second Temple literature, the Talmud, the New Testament, Josephus, and the early church attest to the unity of the Twelve. Unfortunately, these sources give no commentary on the nature of this unity. Marvin A. Sweeney provides an excellent overview of the topic in *The Twelve Prophets*, Berit Olam (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2000), 1:xv–xxxix.

21. Wilfred G. E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 2nd. ed., JSOTSup 26 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1986), 237; italics original.

22. Lynell Zogbo and Ernst R. Wendland, *Hebrew Poetry in the Bible: A Guide for Understanding and Translating*, Helps for Translators (New York: United Bible Societies, 2000), 40.

the Canaanite descriptions of the theophany of the storm god Ba'al."²³ As Laurel Lanner points out, "Scholars have been finding 'pagan' or mythological allusions . . . in the book of Nahum, for centuries."²⁴

What seemingly has not entered into the scholarly discussion is the possibility that בעל חמה describes YHWH as a jealous and avenging husband of wrath.²⁵ The presupposition that Nahum does not address Judah's sin precludes such an interpretation; yet the recognition that the phrase comes within the context of YHWH's all-encompassing judgment for Judah's adultery makes the interpretation likely. As Gerlinde Baumann points out, through the study of the prophets "a kind of 'story' of the wife of YHWH can be reconstructed."²⁶ According to Nah 1:2, Nahum is part of that story.

CONCLUSION

Traditionally, scholars have viewed Nahum as a statement of YHWH's judgment against Assyria—and a more general assertion that YHWH will hold violent nations accountable for their sins. Some scholars have linked this judgment to Assyria's crimes against YHWH's covenant people. No commentary I am aware of, however, has noted that Nahum begins with an allusion to Josh 24:19. This article has presented evidence for this allusion and argued that its rhetorical effect sets the entire

23. Kevin J. Cathcart, "The Divine Warrior and the War of Yahweh in Nahum," in *Biblical Studies in Contemporary Thought*, ed. Miriam Ward (Somerville, MA: Greeno, Hadden & Co., 1975), 69–70.

24. Laurel Lanner, "Who Will Lament Her?": *The Feminine and Fantastic in the Book of Nahum*, LHOTS 434 (New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 17.

25. While my research has not been exhaustive, I have written a dissertation and a number of articles on Nahum. Throughout, I have searched for any scholar who read Nahum as YHWH exercising vengeance as a wronged husband but have found none.

26. Gerlinde Baumann, "Prophetic Objections to YHWH as the Violent Husband of Israel: Reinterpretations of the Prophetic Marriage Metaphor in Second Isaiah (Isaiah 40–55)," in *Prophets and Daniel*, ed. Athalya Brenner, FCB Second Series 8 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 558. Similarly, Renita Weems: "[T]he earliest days of God and Israel's relationship were cast as a period of courtship; the covenant in the wilderness became a marriage; Israel's idolatry was interpreted as betrayal and adultery; Israel's estrangement was divorce; and the reunion of God and Israel was reconciliation" (*Battered Love: Marriage, Sex and Violence in the Hebrew Prophets* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1995], 26).

vision in the context of Judah's adulterous covenant with Assyria. Additional poetic devices in Nah 1:2—repetition and wordplay—support this theory. The verse makes a threefold assertion of YHWH's vengeful character. It interrupts the repetition to name YHWH as a "husband of wrath"—using the Hebrew word *בעל*. While some scholars have correctly identified this as a polemic against Canaanite religion, none have discussed how the word contributes to the idea of YHWH as a wronged husband bent on avenging his honor against those who seduced his beloved. The cumulative effect of the poetic devices in Nah 1:2 is to identify the past judgment against Judah and the coming judgment against Nineveh as YHWH's response to Judah's spiritual adultery with Assyria.

The Identity of him who is like a Son of Man in Daniel 7:13–14

PIETER DE VRIES

Free University of Amsterdam
dspdevries@solcon.nl

The identity of “the one who is like a son of man” is still a matter of disagreement between Old Testament scholars. First, we have the question whether we must understand this expression corporately or individually. When we are sure that it refers to an individual, what is the identity of this individual? I give arguments for the divine identity of “the one who is like a son of man” using analysis of the structure of the book of Daniel both to support this view and to show that we find the same individual not only in Dan 7 but also in Dan 1–6 and Dan 8–12.

KEYWORDS: *Son of man, Daniel, Visions of Ezekiel*

INTRODUCTION

My purpose in this article is to show that the central place of Dan 7 within the book of Daniel is one of the clues to the identity of “the one who is like a son of man” (כְּבֶרֶךְ אֱנוֹשׁ). In identifying the character and identity of the one who is like a son of man,” I will first search for clues in Dan 7. Having done that, I will draw attention to all the relevant texts both in the first and second halves of Daniel, and their backgrounds.

My thesis is that both in Dan 1–6 and 8–12 we find angelic beings who must be identified with “the one who is like a son of man.” The status of angelic beings whom we find in Dan 8–12, who can be identified with “the one like the son of man,” strengthens the viewpoint that the “one like a son of man” is far elevated above all other angelic

and heavenly beings and shares in the identity of the Ancient of Days/YHWH.

THE CENTRAL PLACE OF DANIEL 7 IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

Daniel 7 forms the centerpiece of the book of Daniel. It is the conclusion the Aramaic section of the first half of Daniel. Equally, although written in Aramaic, it can be seen as the introduction to the second part written in Hebrew.¹ The language division does not mirror the broad two literary types the book exhibits, namely six court narratives (Dan 1–6) and four visions (Dan 7–12). Daniel 1–6 contains accounts of the experiences of Daniel and his friends Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah under the Babylonian rulers Nebuchadnezzar (605–562 BCE) and

1. Several explanations have been offered for the linguistic phenomenon that Daniel is partly written in Aramaic (Dan 2:4b–7:28) and partly in Hebrew (Dan 1:1–2:4a; 8:1–12:17). A common explanation given is that the book of Daniel comprises Aramaic traditions about Daniel that were bundled together over a lengthy period and that this bundle was expanded with an introduction in Hebrew and in the second half with visions in Hebrew composed during the Maccabean Revolt between 167 and 164 BCE. John J. Collins, *Daniel: With an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature* (FOTL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), 20ff.; idem, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1993), 4. This explanation presupposes a late dating of Daniel as a whole. A major objection to this explanation is that it conflicts with the dates given in the book of Daniel itself. H. H. Rowley (*The Relevance of Apocalyptic: A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to the Revelation* [2nd ed., London: Lutterworth Press, 1947], 37ff.) thought that the Aramaic traditions were destined for a more general public and the visions in Hebrew for a select group. I think that the explanation of Otto Plöger (*Das Buch Daniel* [Gütersloh: Mohn, 1965], 1ff.) is more satisfying: that the Aramaic chapters, written as they were in the lingua franca of that era, describe events at the court in Babylon and visions of the superpowers. They show us that the God of Israel reigns over the whole world. This is also the view of Joyce G. Baldwin, *Daniel: An Introduction and Commentary* (Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1978), 29–30. She states that the part of the book of interest to non-Jews is related in the international language: Dan 2–7 contains a message for the Gentile nations. Several scholars think that Dan 1:1–2:4a was originally written in Aramaic and later translated in Hebrew. This translation is dated to the second century. J. C. Lebram, *Das Buch Daniel* (Zürcher Bibelkommentar; Zürich: Theologisches Verlag, 1984), 21–22; Paul L. Redditt, *Daniel* (NCBC; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 19; Reinhard G. Kratz, “The Visions of Daniel,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition & Reception. Volume One* (ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 92. I would say that the introduction to the court narratives, with its focus on the nations, was written in or translated into Hebrew in order to stress that the message of these narratives is ultimately a message of consolation to Israel.

Belshazzar (553/550–539 BCE) as well as under the Persian emperor Cyrus the Great (538–530 BCE). Daniel 7–12 contains four visions that are internally dated to the years of the then reigning king. Daniel 7 is dated in the first year of Belshazzar, Dan 8 in the third year of Belshazzar, Dan 9 in the first year of Darius the Mede, and Dan 10–12 in the third year of Cyrus.

The four visions reflect the genre that is designated as apocalyptic, which is the most perplexing anomaly in seeking an answer to this problem. On the basis of its language, Dan 7 belongs to the first part of the book, but based on form, to the second. We must not exaggerate the distinction between the court narratives and the apocalyptic visions. In particular, the dream of Nebuchadnezzar recorded in Dan 2 has apocalyptic features, and the visions recorded in Dan 7–12 have the content of that dream as their basis.

The Hebrew visions in Dan 8–12 deal specifically with the future of Israel as the covenant people of God. The change of language reflects the collision of the earthly powers and the kingdom of God which manifests itself in Israel and in history as God's people.² That Dan 7 is written in Aramaic must be seen as an interlocking device between the two halves of the book. Written in Aramaic, it is not only the end of the first part but more especially an introduction to the second part written in Hebrew.³

Daniel 7 can be seen as the first supplement to the court narratives. Chronologically, as well as topically, it looks further back than Dan 6. Nebuchadnezzar's hubris in Dan 4 and Belshazzar's sacrilege in Dan 5 are seen in Dan 7 as becoming standard practice and are even surpassed by the empire and its emperor represented by fourth beast. Daniel 7 was, from the outset, composed with the content of Dan 1–6 in mind. Daniel 1–6 and 7 relate to one another as text and commentary, although Dan 7 dates from an earlier time than Dan 5.⁴

Daniel 8–12 form the second supplement. In the court narratives Daniel is able to interpret dreams and decipher the writing on the wall. Daniel is here spoken of in the third person. In Dan 7–12 Daniel becomes a recipient of visions that he does not understand. For

2. Aage Bentzen, *Daniel* (HAT, Erste Reihe, 2nd rev. ed.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1953), 9.

3. Collins, *Daniel*, 30. I do not follow Collins in his view of the date of Daniel but in this respect I agree with him.

4. Kratz, "The Visions of Daniel," 91, 95, 97.

their meaning he is dependent on an interpreting angel. In these visions Daniel speaks in the first person.⁵

Daniel 7:27 tells us that the kingdom and dominion shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High. After a final remark in Aramaic, the text continues in Hebrew. The visions written in Hebrew in Dan 8–12 can be seen as an outworking of the way God will free his people from oppression and give it the kingdom and dominion. The central place of Dan 7 within the book as a whole is beyond dispute. A chiasm is widely recognized in Dan 2–7:⁶

- A ch. 2 The dream of Nebuchadnezzar: four empires and God’s future kingdom
- B The friends of Daniel tried by fire and delivered (ch. 3)
- C Nebuchadnezzar warned, chastised, and delivered (ch. 4)
- C’ Belshazzar warned, defiant, and deposed (ch. 5)
- B’ Daniel tried in the lions’ den and delivered (ch. 6)
- A’ The vision of Daniel: four empires and the everlasting kingdom of him who is like a son of man (ch. 7)

It is possible to detect a second chiasm in Dan 7–12:

- A The destiny of the world is revealed to Daniel, with its final outcome being the everlasting kingdom of him who is like a son of man (ch. 7)
- B Daniel’s vision of the triumph and end of the empire of Alexander the Great and its explanation by Gabriel (ch. 8)
- B’ Daniel’s prayer for the end of his people’s exile and the answer to his prayer by Gabriel (ch. 9)
- A’ A celestial figure reveals to Daniel what will happen to his people at the end of history (ch. 10–12)

That Dan 7 comes the end of the first chiasmus and the introduction of the second is another indication of its central place and significance in the book. It is self-evident that the one who is like a son of man is, other than the Ancient of Days, the central character in Dan 7 and, in

5. Kratz, “The Visions of Daniel,” 91.

6. Joyce G. Baldwin, “Theology of Daniel,” *NIDOTTE* 4:499–505.

view of the central place of Dan 7, also the central character in the book of Daniel as a whole.

IS THE ONE WHO IS LIKE A SON OF MAN TO BE UNDERSTOOD
AS A CORPORATE OR AS AN INDIVIDUAL PERSONALITY?

The first question that should be asked in relation to one who is like is a son of man is whether we have to do with a corporate or an individual personality. In the first option, the one who is like a son of man is simply a symbol for the saints of the Most High God. Those who support this view point to the fact that in Dan 7:1–14 we find the vision and in Dan 7:15–27 the explanation of the vision. The character of him who is like a son of man thus represents, they argue, the oppressed remnant in Israel that will be purified by oppression and that will receive glory and honor from the God of Israel, the Most High God.⁷

Nevertheless, I am convinced that in the text of Daniel there are indications that point in another direction. The fact that the everlasting kingdom is given to the saints of the Most High God does not exclude the possibility that this people can have a king.⁸ I point to the fact that the four beasts whose dominion precedes the dominion of him who is like a son of man represent not only four kingdoms but also four kings (Dan 7:3–8, 17). In the same way he who is like a son of man can be seen an individual with a representative function. Another argument

7. J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, (ICC Edinburgh: Clark, 1927), 317ff.; E. W. Heaton, *The Book of Daniel* (London: SCM, 1956) 183; L. F. Hartman and A. A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel* (AB 23; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978), 218–219; André Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel* (trans. David Pellauer; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1979), 126, 146; J. Ton, *Suffering, Martyrdom, and Rewards in Heaven* (Wheaton: The Romanian Missionary Society, 2000), 21–37. See for a good oversight of the different views: Maurice Casey, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* (London: SPCK, 1993), 7–50. Casey himself thinks both a symbolic and angelic interpretation are possible. According to J. W. Wesselius (“Gedachten over de oorspronkelijke betekenis van de ‘menszoon,’” in *Messianisme en eindtijdverwachting bij joden en christenen* [ed. G. C. den Hertog and S. Schoon, Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 2006], 37–46), the figure of him who is like a son of man in Dan 7:13 is deliberately ambiguous and the author intended it from the outset to be a figure applicable both to the oppressed remnant of Israel and to a future savior of theirs.

8. C.F. Keil, *Biblical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (1869; trans. and rev. M. G. Easton; repr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 234–236.

is that elsewhere in Daniel only the simplex שָׁנִי can have a corporate meaning (Dan 3:10; 5:7; 6:8). In Dan 7:14 we read not of שָׁנִי but of קְבֵר אֱנִי .⁹

But if the one who is like a son of man is an individual, what then is his identity? I would first and foremost suggest that he is a kingly representative of the saints of the Most High God. His identity must be understood against the background of the preexilic and exilic expectation of the appearance of a Davidic messianic figure. The vision of Dan 7 treats this Davidic son of man as a member of the heavenly court. What is his status in the heavenly court? I will present arguments that he is not just an angelic or heavenly being but has a divinely status. There is no clear definition of the term “divine” or “divine status” on which there is a consensus among Old Testament scholars. What I want to argue is that he status surpasses the status of all other angelic beings and/or member of heavenly court.¹⁰

HE WHO CAN BE CHARACTERIZED AS ONE LIKE A SON OF MAN
IS THE KINGLY, DAVIDIC REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SAINTS OF
THE MOST HIGH GOD

It is true that Dan 7:13 lays more stress on the task than on the identity of him who is like a son of man.¹¹ This figure judges and has dominion. As such, both functions can be attributed both to an individual person and to a collective or college consisting of more than one person. Although in Dan 7:13 the accent falls on the task of him who is like a son of man, this does not mean that his identity is not a matter of interest. The content of Dan 7 is closely related to the content of those psalms that speak of the struggle between YHWH and the powers that resist him (cf. Ps. 26; 93).

Even more important is the portrait of an ideal Davidic king which we find in several parts of the Old Testament. This portrait developed from the promise to David that throne of his kingdom would established

9. Klaus Koch, “Der “Menschensohn” in Daniel,” *ZAW* 19 (2007): 370ff. According to Koch, he who is like a son of man is an individual with a representative function.

10. Compare to/with Markus Zehnder, “Why the Danielic “Son of Man” is a Divine Being,” *BBR* 24 (2014): 334ff.

11. John E. Goldingay, *Daniel* (WBC 30; Dallas: Word, 1989), 172.

for ever (2 Sam 7:13). The insistence on kingship (the setting of the thrones, the exercise of judgment, and the granting of universal dominion) are all indications that the messianic expectation of a coming ideal Davidic king form the background of Dan 7. Especially Pss 2 and 110 are important in this context. These psalms show the Davidic king enthroned alongside YHWH.¹²

There are a number of topical relations between Dan 7 and Pss 2 and 110. Both of these psalms speak of the decree of God concerning the installation of the king of the house of David to rule over his enemies. Under this Davidic king the raging of the enemies will be in vain: he will triumph over them. These descriptions surpass the historic reality of the Davidic kings under the Old Testament dispensation: they are ultimately prophecies of the coming ideal king.

The giving of the kingdom, dominion, and glory in the heavenly court to the one like a son of man in Dan 7:13–14 corresponds to YHWH's decree to set his anointed as king to rule the nations in Ps 2 and to YHWH's oath in Ps 110 that the son of David will, as priest after the order of Melchizedek, sit at his right hand and execute judgment on the nations.

In Ps 2 YHWH calls the king of Zion "my son."¹³ To this king is promised dominion over all the nations: he will possess the ends of the earth. The king of Zion represents his people, and in his person the rule of YHWH over the people finds its expression.¹⁴ The relationship between the one who is like a son of man and the Ancient of Days in Dan 7 has a correspondence with the relationship between the Davidic king who is called "son" by YHWH and YHWH himself.

In Dan 7:9, we read that thrones were placed and the Ancient of Days took his seat. The Ancient of Days is, of course, a designation for God. The Ancient of Days occupies one of them, but there is obviously at least one other throne left. The text does not explicitly state that there

12. André Lacocque, "Allusions to Creation in Daniel 7," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception, Volume 1*, 126.

13. The fact that Ps. 2:12 uses the Aramaic word בֶּר for "son" rather than the Hebrew word בֶּן makes it canonically easier to see a relationship between Ps 2 and Dan 7. Because Dan 7 is written in Aramaic, this cannot be presented as a linguistic argument for the relationship between Ps 2 and Dan 7.

14. Goldingay, *Daniel*, 149.

are only two thrones that are occupied, nor does it say that the one who is like a son of man in fact takes his seat on one of the thrones.

Since we read in Dan 7:14 that to him who is like a son of man is given dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him, the only reasonable explanation is that there is not only a throne in heaven for the Ancient of Days but also a second one for him who is like a son of man. The throne for him who is like a son of man should be connected with the fact that he, together with the Ancient of Days, executes the eschatological judgment (Dan 7:26).¹⁵ This concept fits not only with Ps 110:1 but also with how Ps 45:6 addresses the Davidic king: “Your throne, O God, is for ever and ever.” In Ps 45 the king’s throne is closely associated with God’s throne.¹⁶ If we are right that the one like a son of man occupies a throne alongside the Ancient of Days, the association is even closer in Dan 7, because the throne of the one like a son of man is located not on earth but in heaven.

In Dan 7:13 we read that he who is like a son of man comes with the clouds of heaven to the Ancient of Days. Although not stated explicitly, we must presuppose that he is coming to occupy his throne. For in Dan 7:14 we hear about the dominion, glory, and kingdom given to him. Taken together with Ps 110 as background, this interpretation is even more firmly grounded.¹⁷

Beside Pss 2 and 110, one can also point to Ps 89 as a background to Dan 7.¹⁸ Like Pss 2 and 110, Ps 89 must be reckoned among the cor-

15. In the pseudepigraphic literature, thrones are also given to the glorified patriarchs, but in distinction to Dan 7:9 their thrones are explicitly distinguished in dignity from the throne of YHWH, and the execution of the eschatological judgment is not attributed to them. In 1 Enoch, however, it is attributed to him who is like a son of man, but there the singular “throne” is used (1 Enoch 47:3; see also: 60:2). As already noted, the equation of Enoch with him who is like a son of man seems to be secondary. In the *Book of the Giants* (1Q530 col. i:17) and the *Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice* (11Q17 col. x:7), we also find the plural “thrones,” but these thrones are all for YHWH. In Rev 4 the thrones of the twenty-four elders are distinguished from the throne of God and of the Lamb (Rev. 4:1ff.; 22:3).

16. Hamilton, *Clouds*, 147ff.

17. Cf. Zehnder, “Why the Danielic ‘Son of Man’ is a Divine Being,” 343. Zehnder is a little bit more reserved than I and says that this interpretation is highly probable.

18. W. Bittner (“Gott–Menschensohn–Davidsohn. Eine Untersuchung zur Traditionsgeschichte von Daniel 7,13f.,” *FZFT* 31 [1985]: 362–364) and Paul G. Mosca (“Ugarit

pus of messianic psalms. Ernst Haag considers Ps 89 an intermediary link between the Zion-David tradition and Dan 7.¹⁹ There are not only topical but also linguistic relationships between Ps 89 and Dan 7.²⁰

Let us look first at the latter type of links; I would point to the fact that topical relationships are after all a subset of linguistic relationships. In Dan 7:2 we find the word *חִזּוֹן* (vision) and in Ps 89:20 its Hebrew equivalent, *חִזּוֹן*. Both in Dan 7:2–3 and Ps 89:10, 26 we find the word *יָם* / *יַם* (sea) in relation to the raging of the nations. In Dan 7:13 we read of the *עַנְנֵי שָׁמַיִם* (clouds of heaven) and in Ps 89:7, in a similar context of the greatness of YHWH above all other heavenly beings, of *שָׁחַק* (cloud). In Ps 89:38 the word *שָׁחַק* is used to describe the exalted position of the Davidic king. In Dan 7:9 we read of the *כְּרִסְוֹן* (thrones), and in Ps 89:5, 37 of the *כִּסֵּא* (throne) of the Davidic king.²¹ Finally, I would point to correspondence between the word *עֹלָם* (eternal) with regard to the dominion of the one who is like a son of man in Dan 7:14 and the phrases *עַד-עוֹלָם* (forever) in Ps. 89:5, *לְעוֹלָם* (forever) in Ps 89:29, 37, *לְעַד* (forever) in Ps 89:30, and *עוֹלָם* (forever) in Ps 89:38 with regard to the seed of the Davidic king and the steadfast love promised to the Davidic king.

With regard to the topical correspondences between Dan 7 and Ps 89, in that psalm just as in Ps 2, the king is seen as son and YHWH as father.²² In Dan 7:21, 25 we read of the persecution of the saints of the Most High, and in Ps 89:42–46 we read of the Davidic king himself. Coupled with the throne of YHWH/the Ancient of Days is the motif of the divine council in Dan 7:9–14 and Ps 89:6–9.

and Dan 7: A Missing Link,” *Bib* 67 (1986): 496–517, point to the close connection between Dan 7 and Ps 89. Not only Mosca but also several other scholars have pointed that we can see behind both Dan 7 and Ps 89 Ugarit influences. See Lacocque, “Allusions to Creation in Daniel 7,” 118; J. Walton, “The Anzu Myth as Relevant Background for Daniel 7?,” in *The Book of Daniel*.

19. Ernst Haag, “Der Menschensohn und die Heiligen (des) Höchsten. Eine literar-, form-, und traditionsgeschichtliche Studie zu Daniel 7,” in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (ed. A. S. van der Woude; BETL 56; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993), 137–86.

20. Zehnder, “Why the Danielic ‘Son of Man’ is a Divine Being,” 344.

21. See pp. 8–9.

22. See pp. 7–8. Whereas in Ps. 2:7 YHWH addresses the king as “my son,” in Ps. 89:27 the king addresses YHWH as “my father.”

If we acknowledge a relationship between Dan 7 and Pss 2, 89, and 110, it is almost impossible not to identify him who is like a son of man as the future ideal king of the house of David.²³ At the least, it cannot be denied that the task and function of him who is like a son of man is identical to the task of the future ideal king as he is portrayed in the books of Isaiah and Psalms. This view is at the core of the oldest interpretation of Dan 7:13–14.²⁴

23. W. Bittner, “Gott–Menschensohn–Davidsohn,” 343–72; James M. Hamilton, *With the Clouds of Heaven: The book of Daniel in Biblical Theology* (NSBT 32; Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2014), 147. Here I disagree with Koch. According to Koch (“Menschensohn,” 373), the universal significance of him who is like a son of man is no reason to see a relationship between this figure and the future ideal king of the house of David.

24. The writer of 1 Enoch 46 sees the figure of him who is like a son of man in Dan 7:13 as an individual with heavenly qualities elected and appointed by God to accomplish the final, eschatological salvation. He is identified with the Messiah. First Enoch consists of several sections, the oldest of which must be dated to the second century BCE. There is no consensus as to the overall date of 1 Enoch. Nevertheless, we can be sure that the book as a whole cannot have been composed later than the beginning of the common era. There are no indications that 1 Enoch 37–71 (the Similitudes) underwent a Christian editing. See M. Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer, *Der Messianische Anspruch Jesu und die Anfänge der Christologie* (WUNT 138; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2001), 117; Peter Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2009), 72. Aramaic fragments of all parts of 1 Enoch with the exception of 1 Enoch 37–71 were found in Qumran. While the other parts of 1 Enoch must be dated to the Hasmonean period, 1 Enoch 37–71 probably originated during reign of Herod the Great. See William Horbury, “Jewish Messianism and Early Christology,” in *Contours of Christology in the New Testament* (ed. Richard N. Longenecker; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 11. There is no consensus about the relationship between Daniel and 1 Enoch. There are three possibilities. Both might go back to a common tradition. The second and third possibilities are that either 1 Enoch precedes Daniel or the reverse. I advocate the third possibility. The fact that in 1 Enoch the son of man is explicitly equated with the Messiah is a strong indication for this view. See Ernest C. Lucas, *Daniel* (AOTC 20; Downers Grove: IVP, 2002), 184–86. The texts on him whose is like a son of man in 1 Enoch can be regarded as an interpretation of Dan 7. In 1 Enoch 71, he who is like a son of man is identified with Enoch. It not unlikely that 1 Enoch 71 was not a part of the original text, but a secondary addition in reaction to Christian appropriation of this title for Jesus. Elsewhere in 1 Enoch, we never read of an earthly career of the son of man: he seems to be a celestial figure. See Adela Yarbro Collins and John J. Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 92–94.

In 4 Ezra 13, too, the son of man and the messiah are equated, and this text can without any reservation be seen as an interpretation of Dan 7:13–14. Fourth Ezra must be dated at the end of the first century CE. In the second century CE, both the famous Rabbi Akiba (BT *Hagiga* 14a; *Sanhedrin* 38b) and the Christian apologist Justin Martyr interpreted Dan 7:13–14 in a messianic way. Justin Martyr presupposes in his discussion

THE ONE WHO IS LIKE A SON OF MAN HAS A DIVINE IDENTITY

We can say that the one who is like a son of man is a member of the heavenly court and the least we can say that it is highly probable that he is Davidic king. What is the identity of the one who is like a son of man? What is his status in the divine council?²⁵ The Book of Daniel mentions two angels by name: Gabriel (Dan 8:15–16; 9:21) and Michael (Dan 10:21; 12:1). The suggestion has from time to time been made that he who is like a son of man should be equated with one or other of these two angels.²⁶ However, there are several indications in the text of Dan 7 that who is like a son of man shares in the identity of the Ancient of Days.²⁷ He is clearly above the level of lesser heavenly beings.

In the following section I shall give reasons why the theophany of the glory of YHWH, as described in Ezek 1–3 and 8–11, is to be considered as background to the portrayal not only of the Ancient of Days but also of the one who is like a son of man. Now I shall furnish,

with his Jewish companion Trypho that Trypho has no difficulties equating him who is like in son of man in Dan 7:13 with the Messiah (*Dialog.* xxxii).

25. When, in the second century, Rabbi Akiba (BT *Hagiga* 14a; *Sanhedrin* 38b), basing himself on Dan 7:9, placed the throne of the Messiah beside God's throne, he was rebuked by his colleagues. According such a high status to the Messiah was felt to come too close to the heresy of the two powers in heaven. The idea that there are two thrones in heaven was considered a heresy in rabbinic Judaism. Alan F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1977). In 1 Enoch in its original form, he who is like a son of man is a celestial figure with a divine status. What the exact nature is of this status is not very clear.

26. Michael: Nathaniel Schmidt, "The Son of Man in the Book of Daniel," *JBL* 19 (1900): 22–28; John J. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 103ff.; Lacocque, "Allusions to Creation in Daniel 7," 122; Gabriel: Ziony Zevit, "The Structure and Individual Elements of Daniel 7," *ZAW* 80 (1989): 385–396; Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 182. Alan F. Segal (*Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee* [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990], 53) speaks of "one of the principal angels in whose form God deigns to appear." Larry W. Hurtado (*One God, one Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988], 77) writes: "It is possible that the "one like a son of man" in Dan 7:13–14 may also have been a high angel, perhaps Michael, though this must be inferred and is a view not shared by all readers."

27. Richard Bauckham (*Jesus and the God of Israel: 'God Crucified' and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity* [Milton Keynes: Pater-noster, 2008]) coined the phrase "sharing in the identity of the God of Israel" and uses it to designate the status of Jesus in the New Testament.

in order of importance, other arguments for identifying the one who is like a son of man with YHWH himself.

Coming with the Clouds

In Dan 7:13 we read that he one who is like a son of man comes with the clouds of heaven (עָנָן שְׁמַיִם) to the Ancient of Days. Elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, it is said of YHWH alone that he rides upon the clouds or is surrounded by clouds (Exod. 34:5; Num. 11:25; 12:5; Deut. 33:26; Is. 19:1; Nah. 1:3; Ps. 18:11; 68:5; 97:2; 104:3).²⁸

*Thrones*²⁹

We already noted that the throne that is given to the one who is like a son of man just as the throne of the Ancient of Days is located in heaven. Both the fact that the second throne in heaven is given to him who is like a son of man and the fact that he partakes with the Ancient of Days is given worldwide and everlasting dominion and a share in the execution of eschatological judgment are indications that he who is like a son of man is a celestial figure who shares in the identity of YHWH. These things are not ascribed to any heavenly being in the Hebrew Bible.³⁰ The phrases used in Dan 7:14 and 7:27 are parallel to those we

28. In Dan 7:13 the preposition עַם is used. Yet, elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible where we hear of YHWH riding on or being surrounded by clouds, we find the preposition בְּ (Pentateuch and Ps 68:5) or עַל (Isa 19:1; Pss 18:11; 104:3). In Nah 1:3 and Ps 97:2 we do not find a presupposition. In the Pentateuch, with the exception of Deut 33:26, in Nah 1:3 and Ps 97:2, the word עָנָן is used with regard of the riding of YHWH. In Deut 33:26 we find שְׁמַיִם, in Isa 19:1; Pss 68:5; 104:3 עָב (plural in Ps 104:3), in Ps 18:11 כְּרוֹב and in Ps 68:5 עֲרֹבוֹת.

29. Cf. pp. 8–9.

30. David J. Halperin (*The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision* [Tübingen: Mohr–Siebeck, 1988], 76–77) thinks that the mere fact that he who is like a son of man is the representative of the oppressed Jewish people is reason enough to distinguish him from the Ancient of Days. However, D. Völter (“Der Menschensohn in Dan 7, 13,” *ZNW* [1902]: 173–174) rightly states that Dan 7:9–10 must be interpreted as a theophany. For Christopher Rowland (*Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* [London: SPCK, 1982], 181; idem, *Christian Origins: An Account of the Setting and Character of the Most Important Messianic Sect of Judaism* [London: SPCK 1985], 63) that is an indication that when in the verses following the description of this theophany we hear of him who is like a son of man, we can be sure

find in Dan 6:27b and Ps 145:13. These texts speak about the universal and everlasting dominion of the living God/YHWH.

The Verbs אָתָא and פִּלְחָ

In Dan 7:13 the verb אָתָא is used of the coming of the one who is like a son of man, and in Dan 7:27 it is used of the coming of the Ancient of Days. This suggests a very close relationship between these two persons. In the Aramaic parts of the Hebrew Bible פִּלְחָ always, with the possible exception of Dan 7:27, denotes religious worship.³¹ In Dan 3:14, 18 it is a worship that ought to be directed to the gods of Babylon, and in all other cases to the living God of Israel (Dan 3:17, 28; 6:17, 21; Ezra 7:24). This is an indication that the serving of the one who is like a son of man in Dan 7:13 has a religious and divine character.

The position is defensible that in Dan 7:27 the saints of the Most High are the object of פִּלְחָ. However, the singular number here, לָהּ, suggests otherwise. It is highly probable that in Dan 7:27 פִּלְחָ refers to the Most High. As already stated in Dan 2:44; 3:34; and 6:27, the kingdom or kingship of the living God of Israel is everlasting. And Dan 7:14 shows us that the one who is like a son of man and who represents the saints to Most High shares in the worship given to him. The wording of Dan 7:14, 27 is an indication that the one who is like a son of man must be identified with the Most High.³²

that he is an individual, celestial person.

31. Biblical Aramaic must be considered a form of Imperial Aramaic. I am certainly not suggesting that in Imperial Aramaic פִּלְחָ has exclusively religious connotations; nor is that the case in the Aramaic of the Targumim. That פִּלְחָ has, with the possible exception of Dan 7:27, exclusively religious connotations in Biblical Aramaic has to do with the fact that the size of that corpus is very limited. However, it remains true that the reader of the Hebrew Bible is struck by the fact in its Aramaic parts the verb always or nearly always refers to religious worship.

32. John Walton, "The Anzu Myth as Relevant Background for Daniel 7?," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception, Volume 1*, 82.

A BABYLONIAN OR CANAANITE MYTH
AS BACKGROUND FOR DANIEL 7?

What is the background to the distinction that is maintained between the Ancient of Days and the one who is like a son of man, if we assume that even the latter must be seen as a divine person exalted far above all other members of the heavenly council? In 1895 Hermann Gunkel became the first to propose that the background to Dan 7 lay in the Babylonian myth *Enuma Elish*.³³ Since the discovery of Canaanite texts at Ugarit in Syria in 1928, several scholars have investigated the possible parallels between the myths they contain and Biblical passages.

Aage Bentzen was the first to propose that Dan 7 drew upon the Canaanite Baal myth found in the Ugaritic texts.³⁴ J. A. Emerton popularized this proposal in his attempt to demonstrate a parallel between the Baal of Canaanite myth and the one who is like a son of man in Dan 7.³⁵

The similarities are that in both texts the sea is featured, both Baal and the one who is like a son of man ride on the clouds and receive dominion, and while the God of Israel is described as the Ancient on Days in Dan 7, El is called the Father of Years in the Ugarit texts. Yet other features of Dan 7 are not found in the Canaanite Baal myth: it does not mention the winds of heaven, nor the strange beasts from the sea, and there is no slaying of Baal's enemy with fire.³⁶ Neither is there any rivalry between the Ancient of Days and the one who is like a son of man as there is between El and Baal, and there is no struggle for

33. Hermann Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895), 323–325. Parallels include the four winds of heaven, the churning of the seas, and beasts from the sea. Gunkel did not explain why much that is in *Enuma Elish* has no parallel in Dan 7 and much in Dan 7 has no parallel in *Enuma Elish*.

34. Aage Bentzen, *King and Messiah* (London: Lutterworth, 1955), 74–75.

35. J. A. Emerton, "The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery," *JTS* 9 (1958): 225–242. Until the present day this view has found support. John J. Collins (*Encounters with Biblical Theology* [Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2005], 180) assumes that the one who is like a son of man is the euhemerization of a Canaanite mythological character, with the mythology in question distinguishing between El as high god and his son Baal. See also: page 10 note 18.

36. Arthur J. Ferch, "Daniel and Ugarit: A reconsideration," *JBL* 99 (1980): 75–86.

prominence.³⁷ Moreover, the longtime gap between the Ugaritic texts (fourteenth century BC) and the composition of Daniel is an important argument that Dan 7 draws directly on the imagery evidenced in that corpus of texts.³⁸

We may draw the cautious conclusion that Daniel was familiar with examples of Ancient Near East mythology but did not borrow wholesale from a single known tradition.³⁹ Older Canaanite mythological traditions were probably mediated through earlier biblical material. Even more important is that Daniel used this material to express faith in YHWH and his rule over the world, a set of beliefs that, in complete agreement with the earlier authoritative traditions, was committed to writing in the books of the Hebrew Bible.⁴⁰

THE VISIONS OR APPEARANCES⁴¹ OF EZEKIEL AS
BACKGROUND TO THE PORTRAYAL NOT ONLY OF THE
ANCIENT OF DAYS BUT ALSO OF THE ONE WHO IS LIKE A
SON OF MAN

We will look to imagery in the distinctively Hebrew prophetic tradition that is directly relevant as the background of the Ancient of Days and the one like a son of man in Dan 7. There are several indications that the portrayal of the Ancient of Days in Dan 7 is inspired by what we read about the glory of YHWH in the vision or appearance that is related

37. Lacocque (“Allusions to Creation in Daniel 7,” 121), who defends the view that the pair Ancient of Days and the one who is like a son of man parallels very closely El en Baal in Ugarit literature, has to admit this fact.

38. Lucas, *Daniel*, 175; Andrew E. Steinmann, *Daniel*, (Concordia Commentary; St. Louis: Concordia, 2008), 334.

39. John Walton, “The Anzu Myth as Relevant Background for Daniel 7?,” 85.

40. Cf. Lucas, *Daniel*, 176; Steinmann, *Daniel*, 334–335.

41. In Ezekiel we have thirty-six references to מְרֵאָה (appearance). The singular מְרֵאָה (vision) does not occur. That is an indication that we must at least reckon with the possibility that מְרֵאָה in the expression אֱלֹהִים מְרֵאָהוֹת is the plural not of מְרֵאָה (vision) but of מְרֵאָה. Margret Odell, *Ezekiel* (SHBC; Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2005), 17. It is remarkable that when in the book of Ezekiel we read about what the prophet sees, we find not the word מְרֵאָה but מְרֵאָה (Ezek 11:24 [2x]). That supports the presupposition that the Masoretes also understood מְרֵאָהוֹת as the plural of מְרֵאָה. Otherwise, they would presumably have preferred the vocalization מְרֵאָה in Ezek 11:24.

in Ezek 1–3; 8–11. Likewise, we read in Ezek 1 and 10 about a throne (פְּרִסְאִ/פְּרִסְאָ) (Dan 7:9c; Ezek. 1:26; 10:1) and about wheels (גְּלִגְלִי) (Dan 7:9c–10; Ezek 1:16; 10:2, 6, 13). In both cases, images related to light and fire are used (Dan 7:9c; Ezek 1:4, 13, 14, 27, 28; 8:2).

What is more important, the glory of YHWH is described as having a human form (דְּמוּת כְּמִרְאָה אָדָם) (the likeness of the appearance of a man) (Ezek 1:26). I would also point to the fact that in Ezek 8:2, the Septuagint did not read דְּמוּת כְּמִרְאָה אֵשׁ (likeness as the appearance of fire) but כְּמִרְאָה אִישׁ.

However, we can see the portrait of the glory of YHWH in Ezek 1–3; 8–11 not only as the outline behind the description of the Ancient of Days in Dan 7:9–10 but also behind that of him who is like the son of man in Dan 7:13–14. The likeness of the appearance of a man of the glory of YHWH in Ezek 1–3; 8–11 is reflected not only in the figure of Ancient of Days in Dan 7 but also in the figure of the one who is like a son of man. In particular, Ezek 8 must be mentioned in this connection because there the human figure is described without any mention of the throne on which he sits. In that passage the human figure occurs separately from the throne.⁴²

What is of special importance is that we can postulate a relationship between the glory (כְּבוֹד) of YHWH that is portrayed in the appearance of a man in Ezek 1:26 (דְּמוּת כְּמִרְאָה אָדָם) and the one who is like a son of man (כְּבֶן אָנוּשׁ) in Dan 7:13, that he who is like a son of man is given dominion, glory (יְקָר), and the kingship that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him. Although not a definite argument, this glory is a strong indication that he who is like a son of man has divine status.⁴³ I would also point to the fact that in several codices of the

42. Matthew Black, “Throne Theophany Prophetic Commission and the ‘Son of Man’: A Study in Tradition-History,” in *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity. Essays in Honor of William David Davis* (ed. R. Hamerton-Kelly; SJLA 21; Leiden: Brill, 1976), 60ff.; Paul M. Joyce, *Ezekiel: A Commentary* (LHBOTS 482; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 73; Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 96ff.; Seyoon Kim, *The Son of Man as the Son of God* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1983), 15ff.

43. Walter Eichrodt (*Theologie des Alten Testaments* [Stuttgart: Ehrenfried Klotz Verlag, 1961], 2:6ff.) speaks about him who is like a son of man in the context of what he calls “spiritualization of the theophany.” Michael B. Shepherd (“Daniel 7:13 and the NT Son of Man,” *WTJ* 68 [2006]: 103) points to the fact that nowhere else in the Old Testament are dominion and glory given to angels.

Septuagint, the one who comes with the clouds of heaven is equated both with him who is like a son of man and with the Ancient of Days.⁴⁴

Finally, I would point the use of the particle *כִּי* in the expression *כִּי בֶּבֶר אֲנִי*. In the first instance, this is indicative of the difference between the ultimate kingdom of YHWH and the temporal kingdoms of the nations the world, which four kingdoms are compared with beasts. Nevertheless, we must establish that just as the kingdoms of the world are not actual beasts, the particle *כִּי* in the expression *כִּי בֶּבֶר אֲנִי* makes clear that we are dealing here with a person who is more than an ordinary human being. The particle *כִּי* points to the figure's status transcending humankind.⁴⁵

In combination with the other parallels between Dan 7 and Ezek 1, this is a strong indication that not only the Ancient of Days but also the one who is like a son of man can be identified with the glory of YHWH. In the throne visions of Ezekiel, we find the particle *כִּי* again and again, particularly in Ezek 1.⁴⁶ Above all, as I have already noted, the expression *דְּמוּת כְּמִרְאָה אָדָם* in Ezek 1:26 is important for the identification of the one like a son of man with the glory of YHWH.

44. In several codices of the Old Greek translation, Dan 7:13 is translated as follows: ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὄραματι τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἤρχετο, καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν παρήν, καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες παρήσαν αὐτῷ. The most important codices that stress the proximity of the one like a son of man to the Ancient of Days are P967, Codex 88 and the Syro-Hexapla. The fact that we have καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν and not καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἤρχετο ἕως παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν means that the one who comes with the clouds of heaven is equated both with the one who is like a son of man and with the Ancient of Days. This is of primary importance in our understanding of the portrait of Jesus in 2 Thess 1:8 and Rev 1:13–16. Certainly we must presuppose a scribal error in the Old Greek translation. Although a scribal error, it is certainly a very remarkable one, and it is not without significance that no need to correct it was felt. The scribal error must have been made no later than the beginning of the common era. Theodotion follows the MT in his translation.

45. Zehnder, “Why the Danielic ‘Son of Man’ is a Divine Being,” 342–343.

46. The particle *כִּי* — apart from the expression *כִּי עָבַד* — occurs sixteen times (Ezek 1:7, 13 [2x], 14, 16, 24 [3x], 26 [2x], 27 [2x], 28; 8:2 [2x]; 10:1), while the expression *כִּי עָבַד* occurs seven times (Ezek 1:4, 7, 16, 22, 27; 8:2; 10:9). P. de Vries, *The Kābôd of YHWH in the Old Testament with Particular Reference to the book of Ezekiel* (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 252.

HE WHO IS LIKE A SON OF MAN IN DAN 7:13–14 AND HE
WHO IS LIKE OF A SON OF THE GODS IN DAN 3:25 AND THE
ANGEL OF GOD IN DAN 6:23

We have already noted that we can understand Dan 7 as a commentary on Dan 1–6.⁴⁷ In Dan 3 we find the narrative of the three friends of Daniel who are thrown in the burning furnace because they refuse to bow to the statue made by Nebuchadnezzar. After the three friends of Daniel are thrown in the fiery furnace, Nebuchadnezzar confesses: “But I see four men unbound, walking in the midst of the fire, and they are not hurt; and the appearance of the fourth is like a son of the gods” (דָּמָהּ).

This angel of the God of Israel is with the three friends of Daniel in their oppressions. When they are oppressed, they experience his nearness. His function is comparable with the function of him who is like a son of man, who is the representative of the oppressed remnant of Israel.

The fact that the three friends of Daniel are called servants of the Most High God (אֱלֹהֵי אֱלֹהִים) in Dan 3:26, 32 undergirds the relationship with Dan 7. In Dan 7:25 we also have the name אֱלֹהֵי אֱלֹהִים for the God of Israel.

Just as the angel of the God of Israel was close to the three friends of Daniel in the fiery furnace, so he drew near to Daniel in the lions’ den. Daniel tells Darius that his God sent his angel to protect him when he was oppressed (Dan 6:23). Here again this angel had a comparable function of the one who is like a son of man in Dan 7:13.⁴⁸

While Dan 1–6 describes a situation wherein favor toward those who serve YHWH is the rule and persecution of them by the kings of the nations is the exception, we see the reverse in Dan 7. What unites Dan 1–6 with 7 is that YHWH protects those who serve him. In Dan 3 and 6 he sends his angel to the three friends of Daniel and later to Daniel himself, and in Dan 7 universal dominion over all nations is given to the one who is like a son of man, as the representative of the oppressed people of God.

47. Cf. page 4.

48. Cf. Steinmann, *Daniel*, 195, 321. Certainly, John in the book of Revelation seems to have understood Daniel in this way. Speaking in Rev 1:13–16 about one like a son of man, he brings together the descriptions of heavenly beings in Dan 3; 7; and 10 and applies them all to Jesus Christ (cf. LXX of Dan 3:25; 7:13; 10:5–6, 18).

If we acknowledge that Dan 7 is a commentary on Dan 1–6, we can understand the portrayal of him who is like a son of man as further indication of the identity of the angel sent to Daniel and his three friends: he is an angel who has a status elevated above all other heavenly beings in the divine council.

HE WHO IS LIKE A SON OF MAN IN DAN 7:13–14 AND THE ANGELIC FIGURE OF DAN 8:16, 10:5FF., AND 12:6FF.

As already noted, Dan 7 can be seen as a commentary on Dan 1–6, while Dan 8–12 is a further elaboration of Dan 7.⁴⁹ It was suggested earlier that the heavenly being we encounter in Dan 3 and 6 must be equated with the one who is like a son of man. Do we meet a heavenly being in Dan 8–12 of whom the same can be said?

We can start to address this question by noticing that we re-encounter the second and third beast of Dan 7 in Dan 8. The second beast (the Medo-Persian power) is represented in Dan 8 by a ram, and the third beast (the kingdom of Alexander the Great) by a goat. Daniel 10–12, while briefly stating what will happen to the Medo-Persian Empire and the empire of Alexander the Great, focuses on the horn with eyes and a mouth that is on the head of the fourth beast of Dan 7; a horn that in the first instance symbolizes the Seleucid king Antiochus IV Epiphanes.⁵⁰

In Dan 8–12 we meet two angels who are mentioned name, Gabriel (8:15–16; 9:21) and Michael (10:21; 12:1). From time to time the suggestion has been made that he who is like a son of man should be equated with one or other of these two angels.⁵¹ This suggestion does not correspond what is proposed in this article, namely that the one who is like a son of man has a status above all other heavenly beings in the

49. Cf. pp. 4, 21.

50. The persecution of the saints, the removing of the regular burnt offering, and the abomination of the sanctuary (Dan 7:25, 8:11–3; 9:27; 11:21–39) corresponds to the historical reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. But this not true for Dan 11:40–45. What is described there does not fit with the final actions and death of this king. Combined with the fact that the kingdom of the Most High did not materialize immediately after the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, this leads to understanding that descriptions of the Maccabean situation in the book of Daniel have typological meaning with reference to a future time.

51. See note 26 above.

divine council. However, in Dan 8:16; 10:5ff; and 12:6ff. we meet a heavenly being who is in Dan 8:16 distinguished from Gabriel and in Dan 10:13 from Michael. The other angelic figures who are mentioned in Dan 12:5 and distinguished from the man clothed in linen could perhaps be Gabriel and Michael.⁵²

There are linguistic indications that we must equate this heavenly being with the one like a son of man. In Dan 8:16 we read of the קול-אדם (“voice of man” or “human voice”) of this heavenly being. A much stronger linguistic indication than that is the fact that this heavenly being is described in Dan 10:16 as *לְוַמְדָבָרֶיךָ*

If we affirm that the heavenly being we meet in Dan 8:16; 10:5ff.; and 12:6ff. is the same as the one like a son of man in Dan 7, then we obtain further light on the identity of the one who is like a son of man. The way the heavenly being is described whom we encounter in Dan in 8:16f.; 10:5f.; and 12:6–7 bears remarkable similarities to the portrait of the glory of YHWH as it is described in Ezek 1–3; 8–11.⁵³ The fact that the words *דמות* and *מראה* appear in both Dan 10

52. Michael plays an important role in sectarian documents of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Usually, Michael is identified with the Prince of Light and the Angel of Truth. Although it is never explicitly stated, it is a reasonable inference that the last two expressions point to the same figure. The Prince of Light is the heavenly being who exerts dominion over all the sons of justice. Against the Prince of Light stands the Angel of the Darkness, who has total dominion over the sons of deceit (e.g., 1QS 3:17–36). A strong case can be made that Michael is identical with the Prince of Light, especially since the *War Scroll* states that Michael is exalted above all heavenly and angelic beings (e.g., 1QM 17:6–7). If that is the case, we have in the sectarian documents of the Dead Sea Scrolls a different picture of the heavenly hierarchy than that found in Daniel, where the heavenly being described in Dan 10:5ff. is distinguished from Michael, and that found in 1 Enoch, where Michael is distinguished from the son of man. Nevertheless, I am not entirely sure that Prince of Light must be equated with Michael. Michael can be compared with other angels, although he certainly is the chief among them (e.g., 1QM 9:14, 16). The position of the Prince of Light seems to be more unique.

53. Words that occur both in Ezekiel and Daniel are: *גִּוְיָתוֹ* (Dan 10:6; Ezek 1:11, 23), *תְּרַשִׁישׁ* (Dan 10:6; Ezek 1:16; 10:9), *בְּמִרְאֵה בְּרִקַּק* (Dan 10:6; Ezek 1:13), *לְפִידֵי אֵשׁ* (Dan 10:6; Ezek 1:13) and *קוֹל* (Dan 10:6; Ezek 1:24; 10:5). After the figure described in Dan 10:5f. has appeared to Daniel, it is said to him: *וַעֲמֹד עַל-עַמְדָּךָ* (and stand upright) (Dan 10:11). After the appearance of the glory of YHWH it is said to Ezekiel: *עֲמֹד עַל-רַגְלֶיךָ* (stand on your feet) (Ezek 2:1). In Dan 8:16 we hear of the voice of a man, which must be the voice of Gabriel. After hearing this voice, Daniel — just like Ezekiel upon hearing the voice of the glory of YHWH — falls on his face (Dan 8:17; Ezek 1:28). He who speaks with Daniel says to him that he must stand upon his feet (Dan 8:18). The same command, although formulated a little differently, we find in Ezek 10:11.

and in Ezek 1, 8 quite remarkable. Both words in combination with the particle אֲ (as) are used several times in the description of the glory of YHWH in Ezek 1, 8 and 10.⁵⁴

The parallels between these chapters of Ezekiel and the passages in Daniel are so striking that the only conclusion that can be drawn is that the celestial and heavenly being in the aforementioned passages of Daniel is a manifestation of YHWH himself. Seeing the linguistic parallels between the heavenly being we meet in Dan 8:16; 10:5ff; and 12:6ff., the same must be said of the one who is like a son of man. Once we detect the relationship between him who is like a son of man in Dan 7:13–14 and the angelic, celestial figure in Dan 8:16; 10:5f.; and 12:5ff., we have an additional argument for ascribing a divine status to him who is like a son of man.⁵⁵

CONCLUSION

The identity of him who is like a son of man is a much-debated subject. It is incontrovertible that in 1 Enoch and in the New Testament this figure is seen as an individual, but with regard to Dan 7 there is a diversity of opinions. The structure of Daniel, besides other indications, undergirds the view not only that he who is like a son of man is an individual but also that this individual is a celestial figure who shares in the identity of YHWH. In Dan 3 and 6 we see him appearing in the midst of oppressions. In Dan 7, dominion, glory, and kingship are given to him. Both in Dan 7:13, 14 and even more clearly in Dan 10:5ff. and 12:6ff., his full identity is revealed when he is portrayed with all the colors used elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible—and especially in Ezekiel—for YHWH, the God of Israel.

It is a very attractive option to identify this angelic figure in Daniel with the angel of YHWH, as he is known, whom we meet elsewhere

54. Ezek 1:5, 10, 27; 8:2, 4; 10:1. In Dan 10:18–19 we have five occurrences of the verb הִקָּה. This seems to be an indication that the author is alluding to the name of the prophet Ezekiel, by whose book he is influenced.

55. Hamilton (*Clouds*, 144ff.) objects to the identification of the angelic beings in Dan 10–12 with the one like a son of man in Dan 7:13–14. His main argument is that the figure in Dan 10:5–6 is not described in a way that would link him with the figure in Dan 7:13–14. However, he fails to pay attention in this context to Dan 10:16, 18.

in the Hebrew Bible, who must be equated with YHWH himself.⁵⁶ This angel of YHWH may be seen as a manifestation and expression of YHWH but also as a separate personality sharing in the identity of YHWH.⁵⁷

Not only the angel of YHWH but also the glory of YHWH can be identified with YHWH and in a certain sense distinguished from him. YHWH is more than his angel or his glory, and yet his angel and his glory fully share in his identity.⁵⁸ The angel of YHWH and the glory of YHWH must be designated as hypostases of YHWH; hypostases that act when YHWH reveals himself to man.⁵⁹ The monotheism of the Hebrew Bible, and also of the Judaism of the Second Temple, did not exclude the hypostatization of aspects of YHWH himself.⁶⁰ Daniel Boyarin has argued that rabbinic Judaism reduced the use of hypostases of God as much as possible because of the opportunities that could be found therein for the Christian church to explain the meaning of the person of Jesus.⁶¹

If we equate the one who is like a son of man with the angel of YHWH whom we encounter elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, this can

56. Gen.16:7f.; 22:11f.; Exod 3:2; 23:20–21; Num 22:22f.; Judg 2:1f.; 5:23; 6:11f.; 13:3f.; Zech 3:1f.; 12:8. The texts from the book of Zechariah are especially important, because just as the Book of Daniel does, these passages reflect the milieu of (proto-) apocalypticism. Ithamar Gruenwald (*Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* [AGAJU 15; Leiden: Brill, 1980], 55). explicitly equates the angelic figure in Dan 10:5–6 with YHWH. Margaret Barker (*The Great Angel: A Study of Israel's Second God* [London: SPCK, 1992], 34ff., 38) too, tends to the view defended in this article.

57. Edmond Jacob, *Theology of the Old Testament* (trans. Arthur W. Heathcote and Philip J. Allcock, [New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers] 1958), 75–76; Th. C. Vriezen, *Hoofdlijnen der theologie van het Oude Testament* (6th ed.; Wageningen: H. Veenman en Zonen, 1987), 226; James D. G. Dunn, *The Parting of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity* (2nd ed.; London: SCM, 2006), 283. Eichrodt (*Theologie des Alten Testaments*, 2:15) explicitly lays a relationship between the angel of YHWH who must be equated with YHWH himself and the one who is like a son of man. Cf. page 20 note 43.

58. Vriezen, *Hoofdlijnen*, 228; de Vries, *The Kābôd of YHWH*, 247, 363, 364.

59. Eichrodt, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, 2:6ff.

60. Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel*, 14. Bauckham mentions in this context the word, the spirit and the wisdom of God.

61. Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2004), 130ff.

help us to understand better the identification of the one like a son of man and the heavenly messengers that appear to help Daniel and his three friends in their persecution and affliction. Especially in Exod 3:2, Isa 63:9, and Zech 1:11, the revelation of the angel of YHWH is related to the persecution and affliction of Israel. If we grasp the relationship between the heavenly beings in Dan 1–6 and 8–12 and the one like a son of man in Dan 7, then the heavenly beings in Dan 3 and 6 cannot be seen as angels who are mere messengers of YHWH but must rather be beings who represent him and share in his identity.

In the New Testament we read that Jesus understood both his mission and identity in terms of one who is like a son of man. Certainly, in considering the totality of the Son of Man sayings uttered by Jesus, it is impossible to deny that Dan 7 is their main background.⁶² By designating himself as the Son of Man, Jesus was not only making clear that he came to suffer but was also alluding to his divine identity.⁶³ The person and work of Jesus surpass the portrait of the one like a son of man because of the reality of the incarnation. By this token, the New Testament's way of speaking of hypostases of God is intimately related to the expectation of the Davidic, messianic king. But even that New Testament idiom has its basis as far back as Dan 7.

62. C. Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God's Kingdom," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception, Volume 2*, 526; James D. G. Dunn, "The Danielic Son of Man in the New Testament," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception, Volume 2*, 528–549.

63. Seyoon Kim, *The Son of Man as the Son of God* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 79ff., 95ff.

Intertextual Links between Deuteronomy and Ecclesiastes as a Pointer to Qohelet's Positive Message

KYLE C. DUNHAM

Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary
kdunham@dbts.edu

Intertextual links between Deuteronomy and Ecclesiastes have begun only recently to garner interest as a possible literary source for Qohelet. In examining these proposed links, Deuteronomy proves, in fact, to be the sole literary precursor from which Qohelet draws by all three rhetorical modes: citation, allusion, and echo. In addition, Deuteronomy and Ecclesiastes share several important discourse concepts, including eating as the joyful response to God's provision, remembrance as an antidote against spiritual apostasy, and divine kingship as the source for wisdom. These cumulative links form a chain of evidence suggesting that Deuteronomy's positive message of enjoying the blessings of life as grateful and obedient recipients of divine grace is perhaps more influential upon Qohelet than realized. The literary connections suggest furthermore that Qohelet should be read in a more positive light than interpreters have been accustomed to do.

KEYWORDS: *Intertextuality, Qohelet, Ecclesiastes, Deuteronomy, wisdom, joy, fear, torah*

INTRODUCTION

Deuteronomy and Ecclesiastes share a key literary relationship that has begun to be explored only recently.¹ Deuteronomy is, in fact, the only

1. See Richard Schultz, "'Fear God and Keep His Commandments' (Ecc 12:13): An Examination of Some Intertextual Relationships between Deuteronomy and Ecclesiastes," in *For Our Good Always: Studies on the Message and Influence of Deuteronomy*

biblical writing that Qohelet evokes by all three categories of allusive mode— literary citation, allusion, and echo.² This correspondence in terminology and themes points to Deuteronomy as a primary literary backdrop for Ecclesiastes, perhaps the most important source outside Genesis. Such a link should come as no surprise, as scholars of biblical wisdom have long recognized correlations between Deuteronomy and the biblical wisdom corpus.³

Deuteronomy's wisdom emphasis emerges in its introduction, where conformity to its legal code is lauded as the means to superior wisdom: "Keep them and do them, for that will be your *wisdom* (חכמה) and your *understanding* (בינה) in the sight of the peoples, who, when they hear all these statutes, will say, 'Surely this great nation is a *wise and understanding* people'" (Deut 4:6).⁴ Deuteronomy elsewhere grounds its wisdom in the fear of Yhwh, as within the biblical wisdom tradition: "The LORD commanded us to do all these statutes, to *fear* (ירא) the LORD our God, for our good always, that he might preserve us alive, as we are this day" (Deut 6:24). As a vital source of authoritative wisdom affirming life and goodness for Israel, Qohelet evokes Deuteronomy through several verbal links as well as through a number of shared semantic fields and discourse concepts. Both Deuteronomy and Ecclesiastes commend to their readers

in Honor of Daniel I. Block, ed. Jason S. DeRouchie, Jason Gile, and Kenneth Turner, 327–43 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013); Bernard M. Levinson, "Better That You Should Not Vow Than That You Vow and Not Fulfill': Qoheleth's Use of Textual Allusion and the Transformation of Deuteronomy's Law of Vows," in *Reading Ecclesiastes Intertextually*, ed. Katharine Dell and Will Kynes, 28–41 (New York: Bloomsbury T-&T Clark, 2014); Craig G. Bartholomew, *Ecclesiastes*, BCOTWP (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2009), 368n45.

2. For a definition of these literary categories, see below. On the nature of these allusive modes, see John Hollander, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1981), 64; Katharine Dell, "Exploring Intertextual Links between Ecclesiastes and Genesis 1–11," in *Reading Ecclesiastes Intertextually*, ed. Katharine Dell and Will Kynes (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 5; Fernando Milán, "Biblia e intertextualidad: una aproximación," *ScrTh* 48 (2016): 367–68.

3. Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1972), 244–319; R. N. Whybray, *The Intellectual Tradition of the Old Testament*, BZAW 135 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1974), 87–89, 150–51; Gerald Wilson, "'The Words of the Wise': The Intent and Significance of Qohelet 12:9–14," *JBL* 103 (1984): 175–92.

4. All Scripture translations, unless otherwise noted, are from the English Standard Version (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2011).

a life of joy in celebrating the daily provisions of food and drink, spouse, and the capacity to enjoy life itself.⁵ These connections reinforce positive aspects of Qohelet's message that many interpreters reject or downplay in preference for a pessimistic reading of the book.⁶ While Qohelet commends obedience and joy like Deuteronomy, he does so not merely as a means of obtaining superior wisdom. Rather, obedience and joy serve as an antidote to the pain and suffering endemic to a fallen world. These clear verbal links establish a similar trajectory of theme and message to which we now turn.

LITERARY CITATION (DEUT 23:22–23 IN ECCL 5:3–4)

The clearest literary link between Deuteronomy and Ecclesiastes occurs in Qohelet's discussion of proper oath-taking in Eccl 5:3–4.⁷ Before turning to examine the literary citation, we will define briefly the category. Literary citation is the formal or informal rhetorical use of an earlier text by a later author such that the author preserves explicit literary markers from that text.⁸ The citation is intentional and objective (i.e., with a definable repetition of collocated terms).⁹ It functions

5. Schultz, "Fear God and Keep His Commandments," 342–43.

6. A negative reading of Ecclesiastes remains the majority view. See, e.g., James L. Crenshaw, *Ecclesiastes*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987), 28; Tremper Longman III, *The Book of Ecclesiastes*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 31–32; Michael V. Fox, *A Time to Tear Down & a Time to Build Up* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 30–33; Shannon Burkes, *Death in Qoheleth and Egyptian Biographies of the Late Period*, SBL Dissertation Series 170 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999), 48–80; Peter Enns, *Ecclesiastes*, THOTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 5, 31, 43.

7. Verse numbers follow the Hebrew text which differs from the English versions of both books.

8. Ziva Ben-Porat first identified literary links between texts as "markers" which serve to signify "the simultaneous activation of two texts." She notes the integral connectivity between markers in the evoking text and the larger, independent component or system of the evoked text: "In its manifest belonging to a larger independent system (i.e., the evoked text) the marker maintains the metonymic structure of the relationship of the sign-referent which characterizes all allusions" ("The Poetics of Literary Allusion," *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature* 1 [1976]: 108.

9. Christopher A. Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 15–17. Beetham posits that a quotation must entail six or more words. Although this test provides a helpful benchmark, it is rather arbitrary. B. Abasciano is on firmer ground in declining to specify a minimum number of words

to signal the author's in-groupness or fluency, to persuade or motivate the audience, or to organize the discourse.¹⁰ A formal literary citation includes a quotation formula (e.g., "it is written"), while an informal citation lacks an introductory marker.

In the context of the appropriate handling of vows and dreams, Qohelet invokes the legal stipulations of Deut 23:22–23 to bolster his admonitions about correct worship practices. In a more general sense, the pericope of Eccl 4:17–5:6, with its successive instructions on a circumspect approach to the cult, is the most unique rhetorical unit within the book and provides the most fruitful source for drawing intertextual links.¹¹ Although not all proposed intertexts have proved equally persuasive,¹² Qohelet adapts here a near-verbatim excerpt from Deut 23:22.

Verbal Correspondences in the "Law of Vows"			
Deut 23:22–23	Translation	Eccl 5:3–4	Translation
כִּי־תִדְרַר נִדְר לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לֹא תֵאָחֵר לְשַׁלְּמוֹ כִּי־דַרְשׁ יִדְרֹשׁנּוּ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מֵעַמְדָּךְ וְהָיָה בְּךָ חַטָּא: וְכִי תִחְדַּל לְנִדְר לֹא־ יְהִי בְּךָ חַטָּא:	If you make a vow to Yhwh your God , you shall not delay in fulfill- ing it , for certainly Yhwh your God shall require it from you and it will be sin for you. And if you refrain from vowing, it will not be sin for you.	כַּאֲשֶׁר תִּדְרַר נִדְר לְאֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהֶיךָ תֵּאָחֵר לְשַׁלְּמוֹ כִּי אֵין חֶפֶץ בְּכַסְיִים אֶת אֲשֶׁר־תִּדְרַר שָׁלֵם: טוֹב אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תִדְרַר מִשְׁתַּדּוּר וְלֹא תִשְׁלֵם	When you make a vow to God , do not delay in fulfilling it , for he takes no plea- sure in fools. Fulfill what you vow! It is better that you not vow than that you vow and not fulfill it.

(*Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9:1–9: An Intertextual and Theological Exegesis* [London: T&T Clark, 2005], 16).

10. Alison Wray, *Formulaic Language and the Lexicon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 16, 93.

11. Hubert Tita, "Ist die thematische Einheit Koh 4,17–5,6 eine Anspielung auf die Salomoerzählung?" *BN* 84 (1996): 87–102; Antoon Schoors, "(Mis)Use of Intertextuality in Qoheleth Exegesis," in *Congress Volume Oslo 1998*, ed. A. Lemaire and M. Sæbø, 45–59 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 48–57; Jean-Jacques Lavoie, "Critique culturelle et doute existential: étude de Qo 4,17–5,6," *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 26 (1997): 147–67.

12. For example, Ruth Fidler proposes an intertext between this unit and the Jacob narrative in Genesis 28 and 35 ("Qoheleth in the 'House of God': Text and Intertext in Qoh 4:17–5:6 (Eng. 5:1–7)," *HS* 47 [2006]: 7–21). The comparison is not compelling, however, as she overloads the semantics of "dream" with too much weight from the Jacob narrative, leading her to impose this context upon Qohelet's admonition.

The Hebrew texts of the passages share six words in nearly identical sequence. The preferable classification for this textual link is literary citation with an informal citation marker.¹³ Qohelet modifies the apodictic legal prohibition against frivolous vows to a more practical warning about proper oath-taking in worship. He modifies four elements of the Deuteronomy text.

- (1) Deuteronomy's clause-initial protasis particle **כִּי** ("if" or possibly "when") Qohelet alters to his preferred discourse marker **כַּאֲשֶׁר** ("just as, when"). This alteration serves at least two purposes. First, it underscores the reality and immediacy of the depicted vow. The vow is envisioned not merely as to its potentiality but as to its likelihood in the worshipper's observance of the cult ("when you make a vow"). Second, the discourse marker **כַּאֲשֶׁר** hints to Qohelet's use of source material in the formulation of this injunction, as the lexeme functions uniquely in Ecclesiastes as a discourse marker introducing adapted literary material.¹⁴
- (2) The divine covenant name **יהוה אלהיך** ("Yhwh your God") Qohelet abbreviates, in keeping with his omission of the divine name, to the more general nomenclature of **אלהים** ("God"). This again turns the covenantal legal stipulation into generic wisdom instruction. (3) The enduring status of Deuteronomy's legal prohibition, marked by the negative particle **לֹא**, Qohelet shifts to a more specific and immediate prohibition marked by the vetitive **אַל**. Dallaire shows that the negative particle **לֹא** marks prohibitions related to a lasting future lifestyle in which a person of greater rank addresses someone of lower rank, while the vetitive **אַל** marks a one-time, specific prohibition in which social and class dynamics have no bearing.¹⁵

13. Schultz identifies this as an explicit quotation (*NDBT*, s.v. "Ecclesiastes," by R. Schultz, 214).

14. Qohelet uses the hybrid term **כַּאֲשֶׁר + כִּי** eight times in Ecclesiastes (4:17; 5:3, 14; 8:7, 16; 9:2 [2x]; 11:5). Of these, five appear at the head of a syntactical clause in the discourse (5:3, 14; 8:7, 16; 11:5). In at least four of these occurrences, Qohelet uses **כַּאֲשֶׁר** to introduce a citation or allusion to another literary source or to his own earlier material (Eccl 5:3 cites Deut 23:22; Eccl 5:13 alludes to Job 1:21; Eccl 8:7 alludes to Gen 3:11; and Eccl 8:16 alludes to Eccl 1:17).

15. Hélène Dallaire, *The Syntax of Volitives in Biblical Hebrew and Amarna Canaanite Prose*, LSAWS 9 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2014), 105.

Hence Qohelet's modification is consistent with his instructional genre and implied audience.

- (4) Qohelet refashions Deuteronomy's motive clause asserting that Yhwh will recompense the sin and punish the offender to the common rhetorical wisdom form of the "better-than" proverb. Ogden has observed that Qohelet utilizes this literary device "to express conclusions drawn from the observations recorded in the pericope."¹⁶ Often these conclusions highlight the most significant warnings or affirmations within the unit.¹⁷ Here Qohelet concludes with a significant warning that disobedience to torah constitutes a breach of wisdom norms, leading to divine disapproval and the possible thwarting of the violator's ability to enjoy God's gifts. Qohelet modifies Deuteronomy's identification of the oath breaking as sin (חטא) to classifying it first as folly (בטיל, "the fool") (v. 4) and later as "sin" (חטא) (v. 6). He transforms the legal notion of divine recompense to a more wisdom-oriented outcome of divine displeasure. He concludes with an imperative stressing the need to fulfill the vow and reiterates the harm that overtakes the fool who approaches vows flippantly.

These changes are in keeping with the suggestion that Qohelet consistently connects the concept of folly with sin in his wisdom instruction. Conversely, he designates wisdom as a desirable attribute that God bestows to the person who pleases him (cf. Eccl 2:26; 7:11, 25; 8:1; 9:18). This means that Qohelet has *not* "detheologized" and "relativized" the Pentateuchal formula from a stark prohibition to "a lesser transgression of wisdom and good sense."¹⁸ Rather, Qohelet diagnoses the violation of torah as a rash and devastating replication of the folly of original sin. The fool who cavalierly disregards torah repeats the conceit of the original fools and sins audaciously as they did. Qohelet is not minimizing the legal prescription of Deuteronomy but merely pointing out the madness of flouting it.

16. G. Ogden, "The 'Better'-Proverb (Tôb-Spruch), Rhetorical Criticism, and Qoheleth," *JBL* 96 (1977): 497.

17. *Ibid.*, 504–5.

18. Levinson, "Better That You Should Not Vow," 32, 38.

LITERARY ALLUSION (DEUT 13:4 IN ECCL 12:13)

In addition to the citation, Ecclesiastes includes at least one literary allusion to Deuteronomy. This category is slightly more difficult to discern. Literary allusion is the freer rhetorical adaptation of an earlier text by a later author in a way that is intentional and recognizable by the audience.¹⁹ For rhetorical effectiveness the evoked source must be traceable and the allusion sufficiently clear to stand out in its new context.²⁰

The epilogue concludes with its well-known directive to “fear God and keep his commandments” (Eccl 12:13). This language resonates closely with a frequent injunction in Deuteronomy to fear and obey Yhwh.²¹ In eight passages Deuteronomy combines the concepts of revering God with keeping his decrees, with the verbs ירא (“fear”) and שמר (“keep”) (Deut 5:29; 6:2; 8:6; 10:12–13; 13:4; 17:19; 28:58; 31:12). Four of these passages include the additional keyword מצוה (“commandment”): Deut 5:29; 6:2; 8:6; 13:4. Of these possible literary precursors, the texts that share most extensively the vocabulary and sequence of the epilogue are Deut 5:29 and 13:4.²² In Deut 5:29 Yahweh expresses his desire that the people of Israel would always have the inner disposition “to *fear* me and to *keep* all my commandments.” Although the terms ירא (“fear”), שמר (“keep”), and מצוה (“commandments”) occur in proximity as in Eccl 12:13, there are a few key differences. In Deut 5:29 Yahweh speaks to Moses, and only indirectly to his

19. Beetham defines allusion as “a literary device intentionally employed by an author to point a reader back to a single identifiable source, of which one or more components must be remembered and brought forward into the new context” (*Echoes of Scripture*, 20).

20. The criterion that the allusion must have a single identifiable source does not preclude the combination of sources within a given passage; it simply means that each portion of the allusion should be clearly traceable to its source text.

21. Only ten texts in the OT collocate the key terms ירא (“fear”), שמר (“keep”), and מצוה (“commandment”) in the same verse (Deut 5:29; 6:2; 8:6; 13:4; 2 Kgs 17:37; Neh 1:5; Eccl 12:13; Dan 9:4). Of these texts, four are found in Deuteronomy, one is a clear allusion to Deuteronomy (2 Kgs 17:37), and two appear in postexilic prayers of confession that likely reflect Deuteronomy (Dan 9:4; Neh 1:5). This correspondence strengthens the likelihood that Deuteronomy functions as a literary precursor to Eccl 12:13. Cf. also Wilson, “The Words of the Wise,” 189.

22. Deut 6:2 and 8:6 differ from Eccl 12:13 by interposing several additional terms and phrases or by altering the sequence of the directive.

people. The rhetorical mode is hence more relaxed, and the conjugation of the verbs is non-finite (Qal infinitive construct) rather than volitional (Qal imperative). Yahweh urges the solicited fear and obedience toward himself by use of the first-person singular pronominal suffixes. In Eccl 12:13 God is more distant rhetorically as indicated by the third-person pronominal suffix. In addition, Deut 5:29 characterizes the desired obedience as comprehensive in entailing “all” God’s commands (כל), while Eccl 12:13 omits this.

In view of these differences, Deut 13:4 offers several clues as the potential literary source for Eccl 12:13. First, similarity in linguistic structure suggests that Deuteronomy has influenced Ecclesiastes. Both texts front their accusatives in the preverbal field to highlight God as the object of fear and obedience by making him the focus of the utterance.²³ The larger context of Deuteronomy 13 includes instructions on how to ferret out false dreamers and false prophets. Moses charges his audience, as an antidote to prophetic deception, that they fear the Lord and obey his commands: “You shall fear *him* and keep *his commandments*” (ואתו תיראו ואת-מצותיו תשמרו). The accusatives אתו (“him”) and את- (“his commandments”) precede their respective verbs to stress Yhwh’s personal and exclusive prerogative as the sovereign recipient of Israel’s reverence and obedience. Likewise, the author of Eccl 12:13 fronts the accusatives to stress the exclusivity of God and his authority: “Fear *God* and keep *his commandments*” (את-האלהים ירא ואת-מצותיו תשמרו). Second, Deut 13:4 carries the closest resemblance of any OT text to Eccl 12:13 in its verbal mood, syntax, and sequence. Although Qohelet adapts the Deuteronomy text in marginal ways by shifting from the *yiqtol* to the imperative mood and by adding the proper noun האלהים (“God”) in place of the pronoun אתו (“him”), these are minor changes. The *yiqtol* conjugation in Deut 13:4 is likely the injunctive imperfect, constituting a command that carries a meaning close to the imperatival conjugation.²⁴ Moreover, in syntactical arrangement Deut 13:4 and Eccl 12:13 align more closely than any other biblical texts,

23. On the terminology and significance of “fronting” as identifying the focus of the utterance, see Christo H. J. van der Merwe, Jackie A. Naudé, and Jan H. Kroeze, *Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 337–38, 346–47.

24. Williams, *Williams’ Hebrew Syntax*, 72; Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze, *Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*, 148–49; Waltke and O’Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 509.

carrying the same linguistic structure: (1) accusative particle with suffix or accusative + (2) verb (3) + (ירא) *waw* conjunctive with accusative particle and 4) + (מצוה) verb (שמר).²⁵

Third, the larger context of Ecclesiastes favors Deut 13:4 as a source text. Elsewhere Qohelet appears to echo another text within Deuteronomy 13 to censure rash speakers and dreamers who needlessly multiply empty words and impose *hebel* on others (Eccl 5:2, 6) (evoking Deut 13:3, 5). Deut 13:1–5 and Eccl 4:17–5:6 are, in fact, the only passages in their respective books to use the term חלום (“dream”). Both texts use the term in a negative fashion to condemn dreamers who mislead others. Qohelet’s evocation of this Deuteronomy context elsewhere heightens the likelihood that he adapts a text from the passage here.²⁶ This correlation undergirds the important methodological step of relating text and intertext more systematically to find other latent resonances beyond the immediate context.²⁷

LITERARY ECHO

In addition to providing the backdrop for a literary citation and allusion, Deuteronomy provides a few other source texts that Qohelet echoes in Ecclesiastes. The literary echo is the most elusive category to define. Literary echo is the intentional or unintentional rhetorical adaptation of an earlier text by a later author, often due to that text’s formulaic shaping of the author’s worldview or language.²⁸ Often literary echoes result from lexical priming, which is the subconscious, accruing record of the

25. None of the other Deut texts listed above carries this same structure, terminology, and semantic collocation. The closest is Deut 6:2, but there the text does not front the accusatives and has חק (“statute”) in place of מצוה (“commandment”).

26. This alignment fits the “volume” criterion that Richard B. Hays outlines as one of seven indicators of intertextuality (“the degree of explicit repetition of words or syntactical patterns”) (*Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989], 29–32).

27. On the importance of this step in the methodology of intertextuality, see Will Kynes, *My Psalm Has Turned into Weeping: Job’s Dialogue with the Psalms*, BZAW 437 (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2012), 37–60.

28. Beetham defines literary echo as “a subtle, literary mode of reference that is not intended for public recognition yet derives from a specific predecessor” (*Echoes of Scripture*, 24).

context and co-text of a given word or phrase, fixed by an authoritative or widely-known text, in this case antecedent Scripture.²⁹ The echo may be characterized as a fragment or whisper of a previous text, similar in function but fainter in form than the allusion.³⁰

In the same unit (4:17–5:6) Qohelet warns against speaking rashly to God because of the divine authority inherent in the Creator/creature distinction: “Be not rash with your mouth, nor let your heart be hasty to utter a word before God, for God is in heaven and you are on earth. Therefore let your words be few” (Eccl 5:2). The language of the transcendent “God in heaven” (האֱלֹהִים בַּשָּׁמַיִם), distinct from the sphere of finite humans on “the earth below” (עַל־הָאָרֶץ), is surprisingly rare in the OT, occurring only five times (Gen 1:17; Deut 4:39; Josh 2:11; 1 Kgs 8:23 [=2 Chr on 6:14]; Eccl 5:1). In assessing these texts, Gen 1:17 occurs in the opening creation discourse in which God places the greater lights in the expanse of the heavens to illuminate the earth below, a theme and emphasis different from Eccl 5:1. Another possible literary antecedent, Josh 2:11, is itself an allusion or citation of Deut 4:39, with six identical lexemes occurring in succession. These unlikely precursors leave two texts as the possible backdrop for Eccl 5:1: Deut 4:39 and 1 Kgs 8:23. The latter text offers interesting possibilities in that there Solomon prays to dedicate the newly-constructed temple during the Festival of Sukkot. Several commentators have noted pervasive links to Deuteronomy in Solomon’s dedicatory prayer, suggesting his knowledge of the Mosaic Covenant.³¹ Solomon’s traditional connection to Ecclesiastes provides a tantalizing nexus for the literary echo. In the end, however, it appears most plausible that both 1 Kgs 8:23 and Eccl 5:2 depend literarily on Deut 4:39.

29. On lexical priming, see Michael Hoey, *Patterns of Lexis in Text* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1991), 3; idem, *Lexical Priming: A New Theory of Words and Language* (New York: Routledge, 2005), 8–12; idem, “Lexical Priming and Literary Creativity,” in *Text, Discourse, and Corpora: Theory and Analysis*, ed. Michael Hoey, Michaela Mahlberg, Michael Stubbs, et al. (New York: Continuum, 2007), 7–8; Michael Pace-Siggs, *Lexical Priming in Spoken English Usage* (London: Palgrave Macmillan), 1–3.

30. Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 21.

31. Simon J. DeVries, *1 Kings*, WBC (Waco, TX: Word, 1985), 126; Peter Leithart, *1 & 2 Kings*, Brazos Theological Commentary (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006), 68; Lissa M. Wray Beal, *1 & 2 Kings*, AOTC (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2014), Paul R. House, *1, 2 Kings*, NAC (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1995), 143–45.

In Deuteronomy 4 Moses addresses the Israelites in his first speech to underscore the uniqueness and authority of Yhwh, evidenced historically from several key creative and redemptive acts: the creation of the world, the exodus from Egypt, the destruction of Israel's enemies, and the provision of the Law on Sinai. God's singular authority is evident both in his transcendence from the created realm and in his imminence among his people: "Know therefore today, and lay it to your heart, that the Lord is God in heaven above and on the earth beneath; there is no other" (Deut 4:39). The pairing of "heaven" and earth" is a merism denoting God's unique sovereignty over the whole created order.³² Qohelet has adapted the pairing of "heaven above" and "earth beneath" not only to highlight God's sovereignty but to accentuate mankind's finitude. Rather than emphasizing that *God* is operative and authoritative in both spheres, Qohelet shifts the terminology to point to God's transcendence and man's limitation: God is in heaven but finite, foolish humans are on earth. More than a hint of Qohelet's frustration over the lot of fallen man lies behind the exhortation. The singular divine authority underscored in the Deuteronomy text is intended to serve as a check on fallen man's tendency toward rash outspokenness. Since humanity cannot sufficiently or exhaustively "mind the gap" between themselves and God, they must learn to hold their tongues.

The final literary echo of Deuteronomy in Ecclesiastes occurs in the same chapter. In Eccl 4:17–5:6 Qohelet exhorts his audience concerning the need to restrain one's words before God in view of human transitoriness, finitude, and evil (5:1–16). In Eccl 5:2, 6, Qohelet contrasts the danger posed by elusive dreams and foolish diatribes as over against the value of personal piety. The wise person, exhorts Qohelet, demonstrates his unswerving commitment to God largely through his silence. Qohelet likely draws here again from Deuteronomy, namely from a passage dealing with the identification and eradication of false prophets and dreamers. Deut 13:1–18 underscores the necessity of personal and exclusive covenantal devotion to Yahweh due to the threat of future defectors and apostates, led often by false prophets.³³ In

32. Rabbinical authorities identified this statement as the most overt assertion of monotheism in the Hebrew Bible (Jeffrey H. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, JPS Torah Commentary [Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996], 57).

33. See J. Gordon McConville, *Deuteronomy*, AOTC (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2002), 234–35.

Deut 13:4–5 these religious apostates offer the blandishment of false revelation to entice Israel. Israel must repudiate these seductive seers and their spurious claims: “You shall not listen to the *words* of that prophet or that dreamer of *dreams*. For the Lord your God is testing you, to know whether you love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul. You shall walk after the Lord your God and *fear* him and keep his commandments and obey his voice, and you shall serve him and hold fast to him” (Deut 13:3–4 [HB 4–5]). An interesting facet of these verses is the constellation of the prominent terms דְּבָרִים (“words”), חֲלוֹם (“dreams”), and יִרָא (“fear”). The collocation of “words” and “dreams” in the same text is relatively rare in the OT, occurring in seven instances (Gen 37:8; 41:32; Num 12:6; Deut 13:3; Eccl 5:3, 7; Jer 23:28). When combined with the imperative conjugation of יִרָא, however, this sequence occurs only in Deut 13:4–5 and Eccl 5:7. Qohelet appears to draw again from the wellspring of Deuteronomy in formulating his wisdom exhortation. In the context of foolish dreams and profuse words, Qohelet identifies a subtle threat to proper worship. Heeding futile dreams and empty words serves no lasting purpose but only to spiritual detriment and folly; the wise person instead fears God.

SHARED SEMANTIC FIELDS AND DISCOURSE CONCEPTS

Having surveyed several literary ties between Deuteronomy and Ecclesiastes, we turn to the more oblique yet significant commonality of semantic fields and discourse concepts. Within the fields of hermeneutics and discourse linguistics, many recognize the importance of going beyond word studies to engage in linguistic and intertextual analysis.³⁴ Grant Osborne thus champions a semantic theory that transcends the meaning of individual words or phrases: “We dare never study only occurrences of the particular term if our purpose is to trace the theology behind a word or phrase. Such will help in determining the semantic

34. Peter Cotterell and Max Turner, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1989), 146–55; Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1988, 1989), 1.xvi; Moisés Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meanings: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics*, 2nd revised ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 112–14; Andreas J. Köstenberger and Richard D. Patterson, *Invitation to Biblical Interpretation: Exploring the Hermeneutical Triad of History, Literature, and Theology* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2011), 626–30.

range of that particular term but will not recapitulate the range of the author's thought or of biblical teaching."³⁵ In this vein, Deuteronomy and Ecclesiastes share not only a number of key terms but also several discourse concepts that go beyond literary echoes to exhibit a common theology.

Bartholomew identifies several potential conceptual links between Deuteronomy and Ecclesiastes: (1) the theme of eating and drinking, (2) the prohibition of adding to or subtracting from God's work (Deut 4:2; 12:32; Eccl 3:14; 12:12), (3) the motif of remembrance, and (4) the "one shepherd" of Eccl 12:11 as reflecting the "one God" of the Shema in Deut 6:4.³⁶ In the light of the links already explored, these other conceptual connections may provide corroboration that Deuteronomy is an important source for Qohelet.

Eating and Drinking

Eating and drinking is a motif common to Deuteronomy and Ecclesiastes. The customary term for "eat," אכל, occurs 95 times in the two books (80x in Deut; 15x in Eccl), while its usual paired term שתה ("drink") occurs 14 times (9x in Deut; 5x in Eccl). Given the relatively rarer occurrences of "drinking" in the two books, the collocation of eating and drinking in the same context would seem at first glance to hold significance as a possible thematic link. The verbs for "eating" and "drinking" occur together in the same verse or in adjoining verses 8 times in Deuteronomy (Deut 2:6, 28; 9:9, 18, 28:39; 29:6; 32:13–14, 38) and 5 times in Ecclesiastes (Eccl 2:24; 3:13; 5:17; 8:15; 9:7). Only once in Deuteronomy is the concept of "drinking" *not* paired with eating, and this appears in a context in which the land is drinking water from heaven (Deut 11:11). In Ecclesiastes drinking is *always* paired with eating.

35. *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*, 2nd revised ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2006), 92–112, here 92.

36. Bartholomew, *Ecclesiastes*, 368–69n45. Bartholomew adds a few other links, several of which we treated earlier, including the law of vows (Eccl 5:4–5; Deut 23:22–24), the exhortation to fear God and keep his commandments (Eccl 12:13; Deut 5:29; 13:4), and the so-called Name theology of Deuteronomy and Eccl 5:1–7 (Bartholomew does not elaborate as to what he means by "Name theology" so this cannot be pursued further). Unfortunately Bartholomew relegates these insights to a footnote without further development, so we intend to fill out this lacuna.

To examine possible links, however, in the theme of eating and drinking, we must first discern if the books present a similar purpose and goal for the activities. Qohelet depicts eating often in Ecclesiastes as a positive activity. The activities of eating and drinking are commended as a way to reprise in small measure the good lost by the fall (Eccl 2:24; 3:13; 5:17; 8:15; 9:7). Eating and drinking when taken together in Deuteronomy, however, carry almost none of the positive, commendable features of Ecclesiastes. Twice the notion of eating and drinking occurs in the context of Israel's difficulties in obtaining provisions from foreign peoples on the way to Canaan (Deut 2:6, 28). Twice they occur in the context of Moses' abstention from food and water during his forty-day fast on Sinai (Deut 9:9, 18). Twice they occur in the context of the *absence* of available food due to Yhwh's judgment (Deut 28:39; 29:6). Once they appear in the context of idolatry, where foreign gods supply illicit food and wine to their worshippers (Deut 32:38). This leaves one possible context where eating and drinking are acclaimed as a desirable and profitable activity. In Deut 32:13–14 Moses rehearses in his concluding song the Lord's provision for the Israelites, including his bestowal of lavish foods and abundant wine: "He [Israel] *ate* the produce of the field, and he suckled him with honey out of the rock, and oil out of the flinty rock. Curds from the herd, and milk from the flock, with fat of lambs, rams of Bashan and goats, with the very finest of the wheat—and you *drank* foaming wine made from the blood of the grape." These images pertain likely to God's historical provision of food and drink during the wilderness wandering, including Israel's longer sojourn in the fertile Transjordanian region.³⁷ Alternatively, the references may anticipate the future bounty accessible in Canaan.³⁸ In either case, Moses commends eating and drinking here as God's provision for the enjoyment of his people in a way resonant with the theme of Ecclesiastes, although the wording is different. This passage provides a clue that Deuteronomy, beyond the largely negative function of eating and drinking when taken together, may offer elsewhere a positive outlook on food itself, especially as an aspect of God's provision in blessing his people.

37. Eugene H. Merrill, *Deuteronomy*, NAC (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994), 415.

38. Peter C. Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 381; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 305.

This view is corroborated in several texts that mention eating as a beneficial and desirous activity. In these texts eating often stands as a cipher for the fertility and productivity of the land to which they are going, a land that holds the potential for divine blessing: “It is a good land that the LORD our God is giving us” (Deut 1:25). Moses extols the periodic and seasonable eating to one’s fill as an activity consistent with the expected gratitude and humility that should characterize Israel’s response to the Lord’s provision (Deut 6:11; 8:10, 12; 11:15; 12:7, 15, 18, 20; 14:23, 26, 29; 15:20; 26:12; 27:7; 31:20). Significant in these latter passages are texts which celebrate eating as a reverential reflection on the goodness and provision of God: “When you have eaten and are satisfied, praise the LORD your God for the good land he has given you” (Deut 8:10, NIV; cf. 14:29). Other texts link eating specifically to joy or blessing: “There, in the presence of the LORD your God, you and your families shall eat and shall rejoice in everything you have put your hand to, because the LORD your God has blessed you” (Deut 12:7, NIV; cf. 12:18; 14:26; 27:7). Likewise, the thematic emphasis of Ecclesiastes commends eating and drinking as consistently linked to joy and “seeing good” (Eccl 2:24; 3:13; 5:17, 19; 8:15; 9:7). So while it is difficult to posit a single text in Deuteronomy where eating and drinking clearly function as a literary source for Qohelet, the discourse concept of eating as the appropriate and grateful response to divine goodness and favor resonates in both books. While Deuteronomy and Ecclesiastes may be drawing from the common stock of ANE cultural norms in their positive view of eating and drinking,³⁹ it is likely, given the other textual links discussed so far, that Deuteronomy has influenced Ecclesiastes toward a positive view of eating (and drinking) as a means of applying divinely-granted joy and blessing.

Remembrance

Another theme present in both books is remembrance. The verb “remember,” *בָּזַר*, occurs 19 times in the two books (15x in Deut; 4x in

39. On eating and drinking in ancient Israel and its environs, see Oded Borowski, “Eat, Drink and Be Merry: The Mediterranean Diet,” *Near Eastern Archaeology* 67 (Jun 2004): 96–107; E. W. Heaton, *Everyday Life in Old Testament Times* (New York: Scribner, 1956), 81–87; Philip J. King and Lawrence E. Stager, *Life in Biblical Israel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 64–68.

Eccl), while the noun “remembrance,” בזרון, occurs 3 times in Ecclesiastes. “Remembering” functions mainly in a positive and hortatory sense in Deuteronomy, where the Israelites are enjoined to keep in mind the continuing significance of God’s deliverance from Egypt and his provision in the wilderness (Deut 5:15; 7:18; 8:2; 9:7; 15:15; 16:3, 12; 24:18, 22; 25:17). To remember in Deuteronomy is never cast simply as an historical framework whereby Israel recalls an element of her past but always in an obligatory sense whereby Israel must keep foremost in her mind key truths concerning the character of God, expressed through the volitional imperative (Deut 9:7, 27; 32:7), imperatival infinitive absolute (Deut 24:9; 25:17), or the *weqatal* stipulating future behavior (Deut 5:15; 8:2, 18; 5:15; 16:12; 24:18, 22).⁴⁰

Remembering in Ecclesiastes, however, functions mostly throughout the book in a negative sense. Here the all-too-common lack of remembrance whereby evil days are soon forgotten (Eccl 5:19; 11:8) or the memory of the deceased quickly fades (1:11; 2:16; 9:5, 15) underscores Qohelet’s frustration over the brevity and enigma of human life. In one text, however, there is a closer correspondence between the books. In Eccl 12:1 Qohelet casts remembrance with a positive and imperatival focus redolent of Deuteronomy as he charges his readers to remember their Creator while they possess ample time and ability: “Remember your Creator in the days of your youth, before the days of trouble come and the years approach when you will say, ‘I find no pleasure in them’” (NIV).

Although Deuteronomy never juxtaposes remembering with the idea of divine creation (rather, it almost always links it to divine redemption in the exodus), its frequent exhortations to remember hold a conceptual correspondence to this final appearance of זכר in Ecclesiastes. In both writings the command to “remember” bears significant present implications. Remembrance involves adjusting one’s mental disposition to a proper view of God’s sovereignty and goodness. To remember is to meditate upon God and his character as exemplified powerfully in the past as the antidote to one’s present sinful tendencies toward pride (Deut 8:2), fear (7:18), greed (8:18), and spiritual laxity

40. Dallaire shows that when the *weqatal* is governed by an imperative expressing a command, it occurs almost exclusively in discourse situations where a person of greater rank is addressing someone of lower rank, a scenario that fits the rhetorical context of Deuteronomy (*The Syntax of Volitives in Biblical Hebrew and Amarna Canaanite Prose*, 222).

(5:15; 16:3, 12; 24:18). Similarly in Eccl 12:1 the imperative to remember God's powerful and personal act of creation in the past fortifies the reader against the follies of youth and makes the most of the fleeting brevity of life. To remember in Deuteronomy and in Eccl 12:1 is to bear in mind definitive and decisive elements of God's character as a dynamic shaper of one's behavior and as an inducement toward godly and reverent piety.

Adding and Subtracting

The theme of adding and subtracting may carry ties between the books. In this connection, however, the links are not as clear as in the previous motifs. The notion of adding occurs in these books primarily through the verb *הסי* ("to increase") and the noun *רתוי* ("what remains, excess, left over"), while the idea of subtracting occurs with the verb *ערג* ("to diminish, lessen"). The concept of adding and subtracting is significant to the programmatic framework of Ecclesiastes, as Qohelet ruminates on the relative advantages and detriments of life under the sun. In most cases there is little or nothing of value that can be added to one's life in view of human mortality (Eccl 2:15; 6:8), finitude (3:14; 7:16), and ignorance (Eccl 12:12). Still, Qohelet adds key elements to his knowledge as part of his wisdom enterprise. He adds wisdom in his quest for more comprehensive understanding (1:16), he adds one item to another in his pursuit of ultimate solutions (7:27), and he adds together a litany of aphorisms to form an arrangement of pleasing proverbs (12:9–10). Subtraction, on the other hand, appears only in the negative sense concerning what cannot be removed from God's work (3:14).

The concepts of adding and subtracting are not as prevalent in Deuteronomy and connect only to the prohibition against adding to or excising the commandments of God (Deut 4:2; 12:32). The latter text occurs in the larger context of warning against potential seduction from dangerous false prophets (Deut 12:32–13:18), a passage which we already suggested has influenced Qohelet particularly in Ecclesiastes 5. Given this ligature, it is possible that this text has colored Qohelet's view of addition and subtraction, although it seems unlikely owing to the absence of other clear literary markers.

Divine Kingship

Finally, the concept of divine singularity and kingship carries an intriguing possible link between books. As noted earlier, Bartholomew suggests that in formulating the “one Shepherd” in Eccl 12:11 the author may be drawing from the oneness of God as expressed in the Shema of Deut 6:4: “Hear, O Israel! The LORD is our God, the LORD is one!” (NASB).⁴¹ Michael Fox raises the possibility of this interpretation and promptly dismisses it.⁴² He adduces several arguments against the view. (1) God is called a shepherd in his protective capacity in the Hebrew Bible, but this is unrelated to the context of Ecclesiastes 12. (2) God is never called a shepherd in isolation but always in tandem with his other characteristics. (3) The words of the wise and the teachings of the sages are never attributed to God. (4) What is “given” in this context is not “the words” but “the goads” that any shepherd might employ. (5) The verse, if read as “one shepherd,” would place too much emphasis on the term “one” to the exclusion of the other similes and would amount to an assertion of monotheism at odds with the context. He concludes that the term אֶחָד (“one”) conveys the sense of an indefinite article and that the one shepherd here denotes simply “a shepherd” or any shepherd, functioning as the nameless character in an analogy depicting the stinging nature of the sages’ sayings.⁴³

Fox’s arguments fall short, however, for several reasons. First, the divine shepherd metaphor is more robust in the OT and *not* as disconnected from the milieu of biblical wisdom as Fox suggests. Focusing on the divine shepherd imagery of Psalm 23, Beth Tanner has argued persuasively that the term “shepherd” constitutes a frequent and pervasive royal title for God that appears throughout the OT and transcends merely the role of divine preservation (Gen 48:15; 49:24; Isa 40:11; Jer 31:10; Ezek 34:15; Ps 23:1; 28:9; 80:2): “God does provide protection and care, but as a function of God serving as king.”⁴⁴ She points

41. Bartholomew, *Ecclesiastes*, 369n45.

42. Fox, *A Time to Tear Down*, 355–56; idem, *Qohelet and His Contradictions* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1989), 325–26. Cf. Choon-Leong Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, AB (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 388; Longman, *Ecclesiastes*, 279; Thomas Krüger, *Qoheleth*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004), 211.

43. Fox, *A Time to Tear Down*., 349.

44. Beth Tanner, “King Yahweh as the Good Shepherd: Taking Another Look at the

to two OT passages in which God indicts Israel's wicked leaders by using the metaphor of evil shepherds and contrasts their malevolent leadership with his own. He is the great shepherd who will restore the sheep and judge these rapacious rulers (Ezek 34:1–24; Zech 11:4–17). Tanner calls attention to a canonical correlation within the Psalter that underscores the royal connotations of the shepherd title. Besides Psalm 23, only three psalms open with a verbless nominal clause, and in each case the opening clause identifies Yahweh as king (Pss 93, 97, 99). She suggests, based on this correlation, that attentive readers of the Psalter would connect the shepherd metaphor of Ps 23:1 to its underlying royal imagery made explicit in these other psalms. Moreover, the divine shepherd-as-king metaphor was common stock throughout the ANE, in writings as diverse as the Akkadian “Ritual of the *Kalū*-Priest,” the Egyptian “Sea Peoples’ Record of Ramesses III,” and the Akkadian Creation Epic.⁴⁵ Given that the royal court and the person of the king were the originating context and medium of wisdom not only in the Bible but in all of the ANE, the possible connection in Eccl 12:11 to divine shepherd imagery simply accentuates God as the ultimate king and supreme sage, the source of true wisdom (cf. Job 28:12–28).⁴⁶

Second, the words of the wise should not be divorced from their source in divine wisdom, the same source underlying all canonical wisdom literature. The phrase “the words of the wise” (דברי חכמים) as found here in Eccl 12:11 occurs only 4 times in the OT, twice in Proverbs (Prov 1:6; 22:17 [cf. 24:23]) and twice in Ecclesiastes (Eccl 9:7; 12:11). Gerald Wilson emphasizes the meaning: “In all instances the reference is to a knowable body of knowledge (Prov 22:17–18),

Image of God in Psalm 23,” in *David and Zion: Biblical Studies in Honor of J. J. M. Roberts*, ed. B. F. Batto and Kathryn L. Roberts, 267–84 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004), 271. Dennis Pardee concurs that the divine shepherd imagery “is only comprehensible in the context of royal ideology,” (“Structure and Meaning in Hebrew Poetry: The Example of Psalm 23,” *Maarav* 5–6 [Spr 1990]: 272).

45. See *ANET*, 69, 71, 72, 337; *COS*, 4:12. Cf. also *TDOT*, s.v. “רָעָה,” by G. Wallis, 13:547–49.

46. On the royal court setting of ancient wisdom, see Christopher Ansberry, *Be Wise, My Son, and Make My Heart Glad: An Exploration of the Courty Nature of the Book of Proverbs*, BZAW 422 (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2011), 184–90; Bruce V. Malchow, “A Manual for Future Monarchs,” *CBQ* 47 (Apr 1985): 238–45; Udo Skladny, *Die ältesten Spruchsammlungen in Israel* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), 58–62.

which is to be the subject of meditation (Prov 22:17; Qoh 9:17) and understanding (Prov 1:6) and which is commended to the reader for personal benefit.⁴⁷ In other words, the phrase designates a quantifiable and carefully collated corpus of sapiential sayings presumably coextensive with the biblical wisdom writings.⁴⁸ To claim, as Fox does, that the wise never trace their wisdom to God ignores the foundation of all biblical wisdom as predicated upon the fear of Yhwh (Prov 1:7; Eccl 12:13; Job 28:28). Indeed, the final exhortation of the “the wise” in their first compendium in Proverbs (Prov 22:17–24:22) centers on an admonition, placed last for emphasis, to fear Yhwh: “Fear the LORD and the king, my son, and do not join with rebellious officials, for those two will send sudden destruction on them, and who knows what calamities they can bring?” (Prov 24:21–22, NIV). This directive provides an important link to the preamble of Proverbs (1:7) and subtly creates a canonical correlation to the divine source and governing norm of wisdom as Yhwh (cf. Prov 2:6; Eccl 2:26; Job 28:23). Moreover, “the wise” appear elsewhere in Proverbs as the commended cadre of sages (Prov 10:1–15:33). The wise are engaged in prudent speech or receptive listening, functioning as the gatekeepers and disseminators of wisdom and knowledge, the sort of companions the young person is to seek (10:14; 13:20; 15:2, 7, 12, 31). To detach the assembly of the wise from their important function as the mediators of divine wisdom is unlikely.

Third, the indefinite meaning of *חכם* that Fox suggests is neither the best understanding of the term nor the best nuance for this context. Exactly what Fox means to say in arguing that a gloss of “one” for *חכם* would emphatically overwhelm the other similes of the passage is unclear. The similes stand whether or not the interpreter reads *חכם* as a numeral. An analysis of the usage of the term *חכם*, in fact, points in the opposite direction. The term occurs 19 times in Ecclesiastes, nearly always meaning “one,” possibly to be glossed “the same” a few times (e.g., Eccl 2:14; 3:19–20; 9:2–3 in the NIV and NET).⁴⁹ In the canoni-

47. Gerald Wilson, “‘The Words of the Wise’: The Intent and Significance of Qohelet 12:9–14,” *JBL* 103 (1984): 176.

48. Richard L. Schultz, “Unity or Diversity in Wisdom Theology? A Canonical and Covenantal Perspective,” *TynB* 48 (Nov 1997): 280.

49. Eccl 2:14; 3:19, 20; 4:8, 9, 10, 11, 12; 6:6; 7:27, 28; 9:2, 3, 18; 11:16; 12:11. On the meaning of “the same” for *חכם*, see Arnold and Choi, *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew*

cal wisdom corpus of Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes, **רֹחֵל** occurs 35 times and never carries the sense of an indefinite article. When **רֹחֵל** does represent an indefinite article in the other, predominantly narrative, portions of the OT it most often denotes, as Waltke and O'Connor suggest, a “specific indefinite.”⁵⁰ Given such a connotation would convey here the sense of “a *certain* (specific) shepherd” or perhaps “a *single* shepherd.” Therefore, it is doubtful that one should render the phrase, as Fox does, simply as “a shepherd” or “any shepherd.” Rather, nouns with **רֹחֵל** possess a higher degree of specificity. These evidences suggest that the “one shepherd” points to more than a random, illustrative shepherd adapted for the purposes of the analogy. The shepherd terminology suggests a specific, unique shepherd. Furthermore, to identify God as the royal shepherd who disseminates wisdom is not foreign to the context. But is the shepherd here to be identified specifically with the one God of Deut 6:4?

Jason DeRouchie suggests that this may be the case, as he links this text to messianic and divine references made elsewhere in the OT, predominantly in Ezekiel.⁵¹ He argues that the shepherd terminology should be tied back as a thematic thread to Qohelet's earlier expressions concerning humanity's inability to control reality. In these summary statements Qohelet frequently uses the metaphor of striving after the wind (**רָעוּת רוּחַ**) (Eccl 1:14; 2:11, 17, 26; 4:4, 6; 6:9).⁵² DeRouchie posits that a reference to divine monotheism is not foreign to the immediate context but in keeping with the epilogue's concluding exhortations not

Syntax (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 34.

50. Waltke and O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 273.

51. Jason S. DeRouchie, “Shepherding Wind and One Wise Shepherd: Grasping for Breath in Ecclesiastes,” *SBJT* 15 (Fall 2011): 4–16.

52. Koehler and Baumgartner designate **רָעוּת** as an Aramaic loanword deriving from **רָעָה** under the rubric of a third homonym meaning “to desire,” “strive after,” in addition to the more common homonyms meaning “to shepherd” and “to associate with” (*HALOT*, 1265). Lauha follows this track and glosses the term as “intent” (Wille) or “decision” (Entscheidung) (*Kohelet*, 46). These suggestions are not persuasive, however, as the Aramaic term they allege to be borrowed connotes “good pleasure” or “desire” elsewhere in the OT (cf. Ezra 5:17; 7:18), which is difficult to align with the term's use in Ecclesiastes. This would turn the objective genitive (“striving after” or “chasing wind”) into a subjective genitive (“the good pleasure” or “desire of the wind”), which makes comparatively little sense in the context of Qohelet's frustrations over *human* finitude in the face of the enigmas of life.

to exceed the established wisdom directives, to fear God and keep his commandments, and to live with a view toward God's future judgment.

The final chapter has in this regard a distinctly divine orientation, where God is referenced as the creator (12:1), the provider and sustainer of life (12:7), the authoritative law-giver (12:13), and the sovereign judge (12:14). The pairing of vivid images depicting God as creator and shepherd in fact forms an inclusio at the beginning and close of chapter 12. Elsewhere in the OT the concepts of God as creator and shepherd are juxtaposed as powerful metaphors depicting God's relationship to his people (Ps 95:6–7; 100:3; Jer 23:3). Moreover, the phrasing of "one shepherd" (רעה אֶחָד) occurs only two other times in the OT: Ezek 34:23 and 37:24. In both texts the one-shepherd terminology carries divine, and more precisely messianic, overtones as describing the future Davidic king of the eschatological kingdom who will reign absolutely. Hence, to view the shepherd in 12:11 as referring ultimately to the God who supplies wisdom is not contradictory to the context. Instead, it points vividly to the source of Qohelet's wisdom. Thus a connection here to the one God of Deut 6:4 is possible, although demonstrating a more concrete literary link to this specific passage is difficult to substantiate. Nonetheless, the divine oneness that shapes the theology of Deuteronomy shapes also the theology of Qohelet. Qohelet seeks to explore wisdom as an enterprise balancing obedience to the torah with the realities of life in a fallen world.

CONCLUSION

With these numerous literary connections, Deuteronomy shapes Qohelet's discourse and theology in profound ways. The importance of this influence may be contextualized by recognizing that Deuteronomy carries an ultimately positive message concerning the blessings of life that God's people enjoy as the grateful and obedient recipients of divine grace.⁵³ These literary links suggest that Qohelet, like Moses,

53. Daniel I. Block, "The Grace of Torah: The Mosaic Prescription for Life (Deut. 4:1–8; 6:20–25)," *BSac* 162 (Jan–Mar 2005): 3–22; idem, "The Joy of Worship: The Mosaic Invitation to the Presence of God (Deut. 12:1–14)," *BSac* 162 (Apr–Jun 2005): 131–49; Merrill, *Deuteronomy*, 52–56; J. Gordon McConville, *Grace in the End: A Study in Deuteronomistic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993), 132–39; E. R. Clendenen, "Life in God's Land: An Outline of the Theology of Deuteronomy," in *The Church at the Dawn of the 21st Century: Essays in Honor of W. A. Criswell*, ed. Paige Patterson, John

balances the tensions between divine blessing and divine curse, as well as between salvation and judgment, to accentuate ultimately the positive aspects of life over its negative aspects. Although Qohelet is often viewed as a skeptic whose outlook on life is entirely bleak, the positive perspective of Deuteronomy, when silhouetted with Ecclesiastes, would suggest otherwise. Moses promises future happiness in the land: “There, in the presence of the LORD your God, you and your families shall eat and shall rejoice in everything you have put your hand to, because the LORD your God has blessed you” (Deut 12:7, NIV). The Hebrew verb for “rejoice,” *שמח*, appearing 11 times in Deuteronomy often in the context of the joyful celebration of festivals,⁵⁴ appears 9 times in Ecclesiastes.⁵⁵

In Ecclesiastes, the term *שמח* underscores Qohelet’s frequent summons to celebratory joy as a means of appropriating God’s blessing and mitigating the sorrows of the curse. The frequency with which Qohelet commends joy has been noted (Eccl 2:24–26; 3:12–13, 22; 5:17–19; 8:15; 9:7–10; 11:7–12:1). Eunny Lee summarizes the prominence of the joy motif in Ecclesiastes: “Joy appears in virtually every literary unit of the book—with other sobering elements, to be sure, but nonetheless present everywhere. It is notable also that this repetition does not occur at random, but in strategic places in the movement of the book, often marking the climactic moment of a literary unit where Qohelet engages in explicit and sustained theological reflections.”⁵⁶ These recurrent summons to joy surpass the *שמח/הח* word group to include the notions of “seeing good” (2:1, 24; 3:13; 5:17), “doing good” (3:12), “satisfied by the good” (6:3), “being in (the) good” (7:14), and “seeing life” (9:9). Moreover, Qohelet’s invitations to enjoyment “increase steadily in emphasis as the book proceeds” constituting a *Leitmotiv*.⁵⁷ This common theme of joy is a pointer to the likelihood that Qohelet should be relieved from the wholly negative strains in which he is so frequently cast. Instead, Qohelet is applying Deuteronomy’s theology

Pretlove, and Luis Pantoja, 159–78 (Dallas: Criswell Publications, 1989).

54. Deut 12:7, 12, 18; 14:26; 16:11, 14, 15; 24:5; 26:11; 27:7; 33:18.

55. Eccl 2:10; 3:12, 22; 4:16; 5:18; 8:15; 10:19; 11:8, 9.

56. Eunny Lee, *The Vitality of Enjoyment in Qohelet’s Theological Rhetoric* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005), 3.

57. R. N. Whybray, “Qoheleth, Preacher of Joy,” 88.

of grace in fresh, albeit realistic, ways. Joy is a mechanism for Qohelet and by extension for his readers to alleviate the pain and disappointments of fallen life by appropriating God's good gifts with a posture of gratitude and reverence. Such joyful appropriation is, for Qohelet, a vital aspect of the whole duty of man (Eccl 12:13).

BOOK REVIEWS

The Message of the Twelve: Hearing the Voice of the Minor Prophets by Richard Alan Fuhr, Jr. and Gary E. Yates. Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2016, xx + 360 pp., \$34.99, softcover.

Richard Fuhr, Jr. and Gary Yates have written *The Message of the Twelve* to provide the church with an introduction to the oft neglected and confused minor prophets. Their goal is not only to demystify these biblical books for the Christian, but also to instruct others in how to read these books. Fuhr is associate professor of biblical studies at Liberty University. He has co-authored *Inductive Bible Study* with Andreas Köstenberger. Yates is professor of Old Testament, also at Liberty University, and has published many articles in theological journals, dictionaries, and study bibles.

The Message of the Twelve contains sixteen chapters, the first four of which cover (1) the historical background to the Minor Prophets, (2) the role of the prophet, (3) the literary devices used within prophetic material and (4) the contemporary debate on the Minor Prophets as one book or twelve. The following twelve chapters look at each minor prophet individually. Each of these chapters follows the same outline of Introduction, Structure, Exposition, Theological Message and Application. Throughout the book there are also maps, pictures (e.g. the Cyrus Cylinder, [16]) and topical excursions (e.g. “Jonah and Jesus” [175]).

Though there is a strong emphasis by Fuhr and Yates on the role of the covenant within the prophets’ speech (14, 20, etc.), occasional confusion seems to appear as to how this covenantal message is applied today. For example, when applying Amos’ denunciation of social injustices, Fuhr and Yates write: “On a national level, social injustice exists where pay day loan operations are established in the poorest neighborhoods, along with the abortion clinics” (145). Or, when noting the significance of the book of Zephaniah for today they state: “. . . consider the church that is worldly, the church that lies complacent in attitude and action. Is this church exempt from discipline and judgement? There is a degree to which many in the church have absorbed a worldly form of religious syncretism” (250). Amos’ message is for the covenant

community and his concern is with a lack of צדק and משפט expressed toward the members of this community. He is not primarily concerned with Israel's lack of social justice towards the Moabites. While the *new* covenant community—the regenerate church—cannot overlook their role as salt and light in a fallen world filled with injustices, Amos' message applies fundamentally to the church exercising justice to one another within this new covenant community. Additionally, no one would deny there is a worldly "church" today, however most would agree that these worldly churches are nominal, "church" in name only. And so, the message of Zephaniah—the coming Day of the Lord to judge the complacent within the mixed community of Israel—cannot be applied in a one-to-one fashion to the *unmixed* new covenant community of today, the church, in which all know the Lord. This "nationalistic" tone within the book is rare, yet still present, and understood in the best light, it is probably Fuhr and Yates' attempt to "prophetically" speak to the situation of church in America today.

The authors state that one of their goals is to instruct Christians how to read the Minor Prophets (xvi). This is well accomplished by them noting the literary devices within the prophets. Often abused by a so-called "literal" reading, Fuhr and Yates are sensitive in their understanding of the terminology used within these books. For example, they demonstrate how the language used at the beginning of Zephaniah points to a reversal of creation (241), that the locust plague in Joel alludes to the exodus (95), and that historical allusions permeate Hosea drawing upon Israel's story (61). Moreover, Fuhr and Yates evidence an evangelical Christological reading of the minor prophets. Thus, Obadiah's mention of the cup of God's wrath points to Jesus drinking the same cup (156) and the thirty pieces of silver and the piercing of YHWH in Zechariah typologically point to the passion of Jesus (291, 295). Fuhr and Yates do not unpack their hermeneutical method where they arrive at these conclusions, and so this Christological reading is more caught than taught.

The authors show awareness of the redaction criticism of the Minor Prophets scholarship (i.e. James Nogalski, Jacob Wörle, and others) throughout the book, yet particularly in chapter four. Though different in some details, proponents of the new redaction criticism argue that the Minor Prophets represent one book—The Twelve—that resulted from a long process over many centuries by many hands. Others, who are

more critical of these “critical” theories, will still advocate a canonical reading that focuses on the final form of the text intended to have ongoing significance for a community of faith. In other words, then do not reject *per se* the redaction theories, they simply find the process of redaction unimportant and focus on the final product of redaction, the canon. The comments made by Fuhr and Yates throughout are often conflicting regarding a traditional historical understanding and the new critical redaction theories.

The authors spend a whole chapter describing the historical background of the prophets, use historical arguments to date undated books (e.g. Obadiah at the time of the exile [147–150] and Jonah being the earliest prophet [3] when critical scholarship holds him to be the last), and argue for understanding the original meaning for the original audience (e.g. “Amos’s prophecies must be understood within the context of the sociopolitical setting of his day” [139]). Even their chapter on “Approaching the Minor Prophets as a Canonical Unity,” which mentions the new redaction criticism, argues more for a thematic unity rather than a redacted unity. And then, also, each book is treated individually—echoing Ben Zvi’s emphasis on *twelve* books rather than one *book* of twelve. However, at the same time, the authors argue that Joel is a late composition, using similar arguments used by redaction theorists, and to be read canonically (92) and “the historicity of Jonah is not ‘a litmus test of orthodoxy’” (166). Moreover, to use the term “The Twelve” in the title of this work, given current scholarship, seems to hint at a certain leaning within the debate for more literary unity than individual composition.

Yet the method employed throughout the work, though canonical readings and redaction-theory conclusions are at times preferred, appears to be a traditional historical understanding of twelve historical individuals who wrote or at the very least had “direct oversight and authority” (25) over the composition of the works bearing their names. Thus, the book evidences the traditional conservative approach to reading the prophets while also gleaning from newer theories without offering any synthesis of sorts or convictional stance one way or the other.

Since the book is an introductory work, these criticisms noted above are minor and do not affect the overall worth of the book. *The Message of the Twelve* is a helpful, up-to-date tool in which the bulk of the book expounds the content of the minor prophets enabling the reader

to grasp more clearly their message. This book would be a benefit to every Christian, and could be used individually or studied as a group. Moreover, it could serve as a textbook as a comprehensive introduction to the minor prophets.

JONATHAN ATKINSON
Union School of Theology, Wales

Women's Divination in Biblical Literature: Prophecy, Necromancy, and Other Arts of Knowledge by Esther J. Hamori. Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2016. ix + 271 pp., \$85.00, hardcover.

Women's Divination in Biblical Literature by Esther J. Hamori is a recent addition to the Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library series. This book is a comprehensive survey of women's participation in divination in the Hebrew Bible. It is divided into two main parts and contains fifteen main chapters and a brief conclusion. The first part covers key issues related to divination, paradigms, methodology, and rationale for this research. The second part of this book examines specific women in the Hebrew Bible (listed in Jewish canonical order) who appear to be engaging in divination.

Part one (chapters one and two) provides the framework for the rest of the book by addressing issues related to access of divine knowledge, divination, and problematic dichotomies (magic versus religion; divination versus prophecy; popular versus official religious practice). Hamori observes that there are far more women engaged in divinatory activity than in the role of prophet in the Hebrew Bible. Her goal is to explore each instance of these women associated with divination and assess the portrayal in light of ancient Israelite concepts of divination and the range of nuanced attitudes within the biblical text.

Chapter three begins with Rebekah and looks at three occurrences (Genesis 24; 25; 27) where she is portrayed as being autonomous and decisive, which contributes toward the association with deviance and divination. Genesis 25 is an example of Isaac's prayers contrasted with Rebekah's "inquiring" of Yahweh (p. 45). Hamori identifies a connection between inquiring and divining in the Hebrew Bible, pointing to Deuteronomy 18:10–11, Isaiah 19:3a, and 1 Chronicles 13:3 as a few

examples. She makes an interesting observation that Rebekah does not only interpret signs, but also “embodied a sign,” (p. 58).

Chapter four examines Miriam’s role as first female prophet in the Hebrew Bible, even though there is no account of explicit prophesying. The Song of the Sea (Exodus 15:1–21) has often been connected to Miriam’s prophetic activity, but Hamori challenges this position arguing it is primarily a victory song. She points to Numbers 12 as indication of tension within the biblical text concerning Miriam’s status. It is noteworthy that while Moses is the key figure in the narratives where Miriam appears, she is still affirmed as a prophet.

Deborah is addressed in chapter five and Hannah in chapter six. In addition to a judge and prophet, Deborah is also called “a mother of Israel” (Judges 5:7), which Hamori concludes has divinatory connotations. Just as Miriam’s song has been rejected as prophetic activity (in the previous chapter), also Deborah’s song is considered separate from her role as prophet. Hannah (chapter six) is not presented as prophesying in the narrative, but in late Jewish and Christian tradition becomes associated with the role of the prophet.

The necromancer of En-dor (1 Samuel 28) is discussed in chapter seven and serves as a good example of how scholarship often contrasts magic from religious activity in a manner which does not accurately reflect the ancient world. Moreover, these dichotomies are further intensified by gender differences in the Hebrew Bible. Hamori persuasively presents a case as to why the woman in this narrative is a necromancer but not a “witch” and she proposes a positive reading of the woman as a diviner.

The “wise women” of 2 Samuel are addressed in chapter eight and Huldah in chapter nine. The Hebrew Bible does not link these women with divination, but Hamori looks to examples in the wider ancient Near Eastern context for evidence of the activities and role of these women. She also examines the occurrences of “wise men” in the Hebrew Bible as a means to better understand the references to “wise women.” Huldah (chapter nine) receives a fairly positive presentation as a female prophet called upon by Josiah, without indication in the text that her gender was problematic for this role. Even though part her prophecy is wrong (according to Kings), the Deuteronomist does not appear to be concerned by this and interestingly maintains her authority as prophet.

Chapter ten looks at the female prophet in Isaiah 8:3 and chapter eleven focuses on “the daughters of your people who prophesy” reference in Ezekiel 13:17–23. Hamori disagrees with many scholars who present the women in Ezekiel as engaging in occult activity, as a result of over simplistic readings of this text. Instead, she suggests that they are necromancers who are condemned mostly because they pose a threat to Yahwism.

The women in Joel’s vision are discussed very briefly in chapter twelve and Noadiah in chapter thirteen. There is debate over the gender of Noadiah (who is male in the Septuagint, Syriac, and Arabic), but if she is female it is unclear if the text singles her out for that reason (p. 187). In both chapters Hamori finds the evidence is insufficient to draw conclusions on the divinatory role of these women.

Chapter fourteen explores nuances of divinatory practice and use of the teraphim as demonstrated by Rachel and the mother of Micah. Rachel is known for taking the teraphim, which Hamori suggests is for the purpose of using it. She also observes Rachel’s role as the mother of Joseph who is presented in the narrative as a diviner par excellence. Thus, Rachel is portrayed in a positive manner despite her association with divination. The mother of Micah is included in this chapter in addition to instances of men’s use of the teraphim. Chapter fifteen includes several additional texts related to imagery, metaphor, sorcery and sexual deviance in connection with divination.

The concluding chapter provides a summary of the book and draws together some final points. The literary depiction of female diviners indicates a level of uneasiness with women in prophetic and divinatory roles. Hamori highlights that women’s divination does not look very different from men’s (with a few exceptions) and therefore gender is an important component in the examples included in this book.

Hamori claims that one of her aims for this book is to demonstrate “the spectrum of ideas regarding women’s many divinatory activities,” (p. 223) and this is certainly accomplished. This work is accessible to non-specialists while still providing ample depth on the topic of divination. The first two chapters situate this work in the broader context of scholarship and current paradigms on magic, which strengthens the clarity and evidence presented in the subsequent chapters. There are a number of books which provide an in-depth study of magic and divination (i.e., Cryer: 1994; Jeffers: 1996; Schmidt: 2016), but none of

them look specifically and exhaustively at women in the Hebrew Bible. Thus, this book is a true asset and is highly recommended for anyone interested in divination in the Hebrew Bible.

JULIANNE BURNETT
University of Manchester

Grammar of Biblical Hebrew by Wolfgang Schneider. Translated and revised by Randall L. McKinion. Studies in Biblical Hebrew 1. Edited by Dennis R. Magary. New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2016. xvi + 275 pp., US \$90.95, hardcover.

Wolfgang Schneider served as lecturer in linguistics and Hebrew at the Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal from 1970 until he retired in 1995. During this time Schneider became convinced that, “Hebrew is a normal language of normal people” and, therefore, must be studied as such (xiii, emphasis in original). This conviction in turn caused Schneider to emphasize the study of Hebrew at the level of text rather than clause or sentence. In this regard he is much in line with the rise of discourse analysis.

The meteoric ascent in recent years of discourse analysis of the biblical languages is evident. Prior to the emergence of this discipline, emphasis was given to systematic categorization of the grammatical uses of linguistic units. However, discourse analysis (generally called text-linguistics or text-grammar in Europe) has taken another approach: how these linguistic units function within the broader text. Schneider’s grammar, it must be said, is not intended to replace traditional grammars such as Gesenius, Williams, Joüon, or Waltke/O’Connor, but instead to supplement these grammars by adopting a different approach, namely a syntactic analysis of texts rather than smaller units such as clauses, sentences, words, etc.

This English translation of Schneider’s grammar, titled *Grammatik des biblischen Hebräisch: Ein Lehrbuch* in the German editions, begins with two very short forwards, one for the 1973 edition and one for the 2001 edition. In the forward to the first edition, Schneider presents the intention of his work, what will be discussed, and what will be left untouched. He intends to discuss how Hebrew grammar functions at the level of the text. He intends to leave unaddressed issues of historical

development. Furthermore, since his interest is grammar and syntax, he provides no complete conjugation tables, because “the information in the text and the special tables in the individual paragraphs of the grammar are enough for the analysis of verb forms” (xv, emphasis in original). By this, Schneider is pointing to the fact that verbal forms will be discussed under the rubric of syntactic analysis at the level of text. In the forward to the 2001 edition, Schneider informs the reader that the first edition of his grammar generated much and lively discussion on the European continent regarding the nature of Hebrew syntax. Moreover, he is pleased to announce that his method has been reviewed and accepted by grammarians such as Alviero Niccacci and Eep Talstra. And now, thanks to its translation, his proposals have made it to the English speaking world.

In Part One, called “Elements: Speaking, Writing, Reading,” Schneider’s grammar offers ten chapters on the basic elements of the Hebrew language such as vowels, consonants, gutturals, and the *dag-esch*. However, this section also provides discussion of many elements that are often left unaddressed in introductory grammars. For example he discusses the *Ketib*, *Qeré*, *Méteg*, and Masoretic accent signs. But even within his discussion of these elements, it is clear that Schneider is interested in their influence on the syntax of the Hebrew Bible at the level of the text. This is clear when he notes that the function of accents is not to provide punctuation but structure to the verse into constituent parts.

In Part Two, called “Forms: Particles, Nominals, Verbs,” Schneider provides the reader with further building blocks of biblical Hebrew. Although his discussions and explanations here are less thorough than most grammars, he does provide helpful insights into their uses in Hebrew syntax. For example, when discussing Hebrew affirmative prepositions he is not content to simply provide possible translations but instead describes their syntactical function: ׀ (*b*) is the “preposition of contrast,” ׀ (*l*) is the “preposition of unspecified attention,” and ׀ (*c*) is the “preposition of comparison” (40). Moreover, as soon as he introduces the *he* locale (52) he provides direction to its related discussion in his section on textual syntax (186). Such concern for syntax is evident throughout the text; Schneider is not content that the reader simply learn to recognize linguistic elements but wants them to understand

how these elements are used within the text to accomplish the communicative task.

In Part Three, called “Texts: Clauses and Parts of Clauses, Text Syntax,” Schneider delves into the heart of his grammatical task, namely to present to the reader the syntax of Hebrew texts. As the title of Part Three suggests, he begins with the discussion of syntax at the lower level (such as the construct state, verbal nominals, or verbal tense). All such topics have already been introduced to the reader in Part Two; now his interest is how these grammatical elements function within the surrounding text. The grammar ends with a discussion of the syntax at the broader level of text. Such discussions include anaphoric and kataphoric referencing elements, the function of the conjunction ו (*w*), the introductory formulas ויהי (*wyhy*) and והיה (*whyh*), as well as the particles כי (*ky*), אשר (*ʔšr*), אם and (*ʔm*).

This final section is perhaps the greatest strengths of Schneider’s work. Many grammars assume that students only need to learn how to translate the Hebrew Bible into their own language. By contrast, grammars such as Schneider’s demonstrate that there is much more to reading the Hebrew Bible than mere translation. Schneider presents a strong case for the student’s need to comprehend the textual syntax of Hebrew. Although Schneider is unfortunately not transparent about his methodology, the predominant concern of Schneider’s work is clearly to place the emphasis of syntactical analysis upon the text rather than the clause or sentence. Indeed, he believes that the text is the largest unit of grammatical analysis; this conviction is central to his work. This, then, is his central aim and his major accomplishment.

This volume, however, is not without its peculiarities. First, McKinion has offered a *translation*, pure and simple. This becomes immediately evident from the fact that McKinion has provided no preface to the English edition; he simply translates Schneider’s forwards from the first and second German editions. McKinion’s approach to translating Schneider also means that, although he provides English translations of Hebrew examples, he has left references to the German language intact without recontextualizing them for an English speaking audience. For example, with regard to construct chains McKinion writes, “In most cases, construct connections can be rendered in German with a genitive attribute or with the preposition ‘von’” (151). Such instances of pure translation without recontextualization occur throughout this text. That

his English speaking readers may not understand references to German seems of lesser concern to McKinion than offering a translation of the original. It, therefore, becomes immediately clear that teachers who adopts this text for their classrooms will have to provide guidance to students who may be puzzled by references to German.

This peculiarity points to a different concern regarding this grammar, namely its function. It is more than a teaching grammar, but it is also less than a complete reference grammar. However, I do not think that either Schneider or McKinion imagines this book being used by students in the classroom. In fact, according to the forward to the 1973 edition, Schneider writes, “This is a textbook. This does not mean that one can use it for teaching Hebrew continually from §1 to §54 or that it should in general be regarded as the sole object of instruction” (p. xv). This grammar is viewed by its author and translator as more of a tool for the instructor rather than a student textbook. Students will certainly benefit from referencing such a grammar, but it is intended to be accompanied by proactive instruction and guidance.

As a result of such characteristics, this volume is best suited for teachers and moderate to advanced students of Hebrew. It will serve well as a reference grammar of Hebrew syntax at the broader level of clauses and texts. It will also serve well in advance Hebrew classrooms as long as it is accompanied with clear instruction. Moreover, I can see the material of this grammar acting as fruitful subjects of discussion in PhD-level seminars and Hebrew reading groups. Additionally, Schneider’s insights are worthy of an audience in the English speaking world and I look forward to seeing them make their way into more discussion on Hebrew syntax and grammar.

STEPHEN D. CAMPBELL
Durham University

Wellhausen and Kaufmann: Ancient Israel and its Religious History in the Works of Julius Wellhausen and Yehezkel Kaufmann by Aly El-rafai. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 490. Edited by John Barton, Reinhard G. Kratz and Markus Witte. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2016. xiv + 304 pp., € 99.95, hardcover.

In this slightly revised edition of his PhD dissertation submitted to the University of Göttingen, Aly Elrefaei presents an insightful and eminently approachable analysis and comparison of two of the most important biblical scholars of the 19th and early 20th centuries, Julius Wellhausen and Yehezkel Kaufmann.

The book begins with a short introduction in which Elrefaei lays out the structure and significance of his argument. One of strengths of Elrefaei's aim is to present Wellhausen and Kaufmann independently so as to address their individual claims and approaches on their own terms before comparing them side-by-side. Furthermore, Elrefaei is emphatic in his aim to reserve judgment on the claims he investigates.

After this short introduction, the volume is divided quite naturally into three distinct parts. In Part One, Elrefaei describes Wellhausen's reconstruction of the history of Israel. In this section, the author operates with the understanding that Wellhausen "moved from a criticism of the sources, mapping out different stages of religious development in Israel, to a historical synthesis on the history of Israel and Judah (10). Part One is rather short, perhaps because of the relative familiarity that current scholars have of Wellhausen's work. However, Wellhausen's scholarship does receive less discussion than Kaufmann's does.

In Part Two, the author describes Kaufmann's interpretation of ancient Israel. In this study, Elrefaei moves from Kaufmann's literary criticism, to his phenomenology, and ends with his sketch of the early history of ancient Israel. Because Kaufmann's scholarship is less known than Wellhausen's, Elrefaei helpfully ends Part Two with a discussion of Kaufmann's historical setting and scholarly influences. These foundations, Elrefaei demonstrates, have a profound impact on the way that Kaufmann understands paganism, popular religion, and the role of Israel's prophets.

And in Part Three, Elrefaei compares and contrasts the respective views of Wellhausen and Kaufmann. In terms of agreement, it is significant to note that both of these scholars accepted the historical-critical method and both believed that the biblical text was the main source for reconstruction Israel's history, but they nonetheless arrived at different conclusions on many basic details. According to the author, the three main points of disagreement between Wellhausen and Kaufmann are religious history, the nature of pre-monarchical Israel, and the trustworthiness of the biblical text. In terms of religious history, Elrefaei

strongly supports his conclusion that Kaufmann believed that the Israelite religion was born fully fledged under the leadership of Moses, Wellhausen understood the development of Israelite religion in evolutionary terms. Secondly, with regard to pre-monarchial Israel, Wellhausen strongly emphasized the role of the prophets in developing the religion of Israel whereas Kaufmann placed this power of influence and creation upon the shoulders of Moses, believing that Israel's religion remained largely unchanged. Thirdly, Elrefaei rightly recognizes that a major distinction between Kaufmann and Wellhausen is their view of the biblical text. Both believed that the biblical text is the main source for reconstructing the history of Israel, but they were greatly divided as to how trustworthy the biblical text is. In practice, Kaufmann's Jewish roots were instrumental in his strong faith in the reliability of the biblical text.

One of Elrefaei's main objectives in this volume is to remind biblical scholarship of its roots. And although Elrefaei recognizes that no biblical scholar would adopt Wellhausen's or Kaufmann's theories without modification, he recognizes the importance of remembering the heritage of modern critical scholarship of the Old Testament (7). Elrefaei lucidly concludes his book with the following words, "We should clearly see that future scholarship needs to understand the foundation on which it is building or the ideas it is rejecting and must examine earlier, classical masterpieces to do so. I am convinced that instead of a complete denial of Wellhausen and Kaufmann's reconstruction, we should look for what can be learned from the works of these two gifted scholars. For some of the thoughts of Wellhausen and Kaufmann regarding the history of ancient Israel and its religion still surprise us" (274). With these words, Elrefaei hopes to both reserve judgment on these scholars and invite modern scholars to look back at the same time that they look forward.

However, it is always a challenge to reserve judgment when engaging in a project of this type. For this reason it is not surprising to find that Elrefaei favors one of these scholars over the other. Elrefaei has, without a doubt, done a huge service to biblical scholarship, but there are several instances where Elrefaei noticeably discusses critiques that have been offered against Kaufmann, though never offering scholarly critique of Wellhausen. The decision to offer critiques of Kaufmann but

not of Wellhausen intimates that Elrefaei is favoring one over the other, but fortunately, such instances are few.

As Reinhard Kratz, Elrefaei's research supervisor, says in the preface, "The great merit of [this] study is to have retraced and analyzed in detail the works of Wellhausen and Kaufmann with focused attention to the question of ancient Israel's earliest history, thus making their views on this question accessible to scholars today" (viii). Indeed, this is a great strength of this work. Not only is this text eminently readable, it is clear and engaging. Furthermore, because the majority of the quotations have been translated from the German (all Hebrew quotations have been translated) this text is also accessible to younger scholars and students as well. This text, then, would function just as well as text for senior scholars as for an introductory class on biblical studies at the graduate level.

STEPHEN D. CAMPBELL
Durham University

Ruth, by Daniel I. Block. Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2015. 272 pp., US \$27.99, hardcover.

Daniel I. Block (Gunther H. Knoedler Professor Emeritus of Old Testament at Wheaton College) serves as the general editor for the Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the Old Testament (ZECOT) series—the Hebrew Bible counterpart of the well-established Zondervan Exegetical Commentary of the New Testament series—as well as the author of the volume on Ruth. The series identifies its intended audience as pastors and Bible teachers with a basic knowledge of biblical Hebrew. Due to the lack of attention given to the biblical authors as rhetoricians and the shortcomings in paying heed to *how* the biblical authors employed strategies to impress their message, the series specifies its primary goal as, "to help serious students of Scriptures, as well as those charged with preaching and teaching the Word of God, to hear the message of Scripture as biblical authors intended them to be heard" (p. 9). To fulfil this task, the series adopts discourse analysis, where "contributors to this commentary series will concentrate on the flow of thought in the biblical writings, both the macroscopic level of entire compositions

and at the microscopic level of individual text units” (p. 10). In other words, the series studies the text beyond the level of sentence, and pays attention to the selection, arrangement, and syntactical shaping of the composition.

The primacy of discourse analysis in this volume is a welcomed and much needed approach that furthers the depth and breadth of burgeoning synchronic investigations of the Hebrew Bible. As the field expands, however, students and ministers might additionally benefit from a brief discussion distinguishing the method of this volume from other complimenting synchronic approaches such as rhetorical criticism (such as employed in the *Berit Olam* series) as well as other linguistic methodologies (as applied in the *Baylor Handbook on the Hebrew Bible* series).

In the introduction, Block contends, “Ruth is constructed as a lively literary piece intended to be read orally and heard at one sitting. It exhibits a tightly knit and carefully controlled plot” (p. 41). Thus, as a drama, Block outlines the book of Ruth’s structure on page 41 as follows:

Introduction:		(1:1–5)
Act I:	In the Land of Moab: The Emptying of Moab	(1:6–22)
Act II:	In the Field of Bethlehem: Ruth’s First Encounter with Boaz	(2:1–23)
Act III:	At the Threshing Floor: Ruth’s Second Encounter with Boaz	(3:1–18)
Act IV:	In the Town of Bethlehem: The Refilling of Naomi	(4:1–17)
Conclusion:		(4:18–22)

Block’s choice to designate Ruth as “drama” accords with a recent scholarly trend that identifies various books in the Hebrew Bible as “drama” such as Paul R. House’s *Zephaniah: A Prophetic Drama*, as well as Lena Sofia Tiemeyer’s *For the Comfort of Zion: The Geographical and Theological Location of Isaiah 40–55*. Reading Ruth as a “drama,” of course, will likely illicit for some people the common

question of whether the Hebrew text or ancient Near Eastern comparisons support the use of the modern literary designation “drama.” Block’s genre classification as “drama” would benefit by incorporating insights from performance criticism. While performance criticism only recently appeared within biblical scholarship, the theory’s growth is evident from the Society of Biblical Literature’s annual meetings hosting two sessions “Performance Criticism of Biblical and Other Ancient Texts” and “Bible in Ancient and Modern Media” that explore the oral aspect of the biblical text, as well as Wipf and Stock’s new series, *Biblical Performance Criticism* that launched in 2008.

Throughout the commentary, Block succeeds in fulfilling the series’ aim in bringing to light the text’s macro structure, as well as smaller syntactical unit. A salient feature in the commentary is the literary structure/diagram both in Hebrew and English marked with arrows, indentations, and varying colors to indicate literary units and syntactic relations. The diagrams are easy to follow and function as an example that students should aspire to emulate. Block also identifies and illustrates the numerous chiasms (pp. 71, 93, 113, etc.), and parallel structure between chapters 2 and 3 (p. 164). Even on a closer syntactical level, Block exemplifies careful attention to literary techniques, such as identifying *Leitwörter* (pp. 60, 203), chronological formula marking new literary units (p. 164), sentences beginning a parenthetical statement (p. 220) to name a few. Block should be commended, especially, for explaining the varying functions of *wayyiqtol* verbs (pp. 61, 79, 232, etc.) that are often difficult for beginning Hebrew students to understand, but nonetheless integral for proper exegesis. Another prevalent feature in the commentary is Block’s great canonical sensibility, understanding Ruth’s canonical position between Judges and Samuel (in the Pentateuch and English Bibles) giving its illocutionary purpose (p. 59), as well as seeing allusions and parallels, including the book of Ruth reflecting David’s rule in 2 Sam 5:13–8:18 (p. 39).

Finally, as a minor note, although the current volume primarily transcribes the text in vocalized Aramaic script, at times the text switches between vocalized and non-vocalized Hebrew script (e.g. *אלי תבוא המלכות* p. 67). Also, when discussing a term’s root, occasionally the word is vocalized in the standard Qal 3ms form, whereas, in other instances, the commentary omits vowel pointing even though the word exists in the Qal (e.g. *נגש* p. 136; *שלל* p. 137). Similarly, for

West Semitic inscriptions, the commentary uses the Aramaic script for Kuntillet 'Ajrud Pithos (לֵאבְדִין בֶּן עֲדֹנָה בֶרֶךְ הָא לִיהוּ) [p. 144 n. 131]) as well as the Arad Ostrakon (בִּרְכַתִּי לִיהוּהָ) [p. 145 n. 133]), whereas transliterates the Deir 'Alla inscription (*šdyn* and *'lhyn* p. 102). Thus, a standardized practice is desired for ZECOT's future volumes.

Despite some of its setback, Block's commentary is packed with valuable insights that will certainly benefit the innumerable students studying Ruth for their Hebrew grammar and exegesis course, as well as pastors preparing for sermons. It is a volume I wish I had during my undergraduate years studying Ruth, and am excited to own for my future studies.

KAZUYUKI (KAZ) HAYASHI
Trinity International University

The Formation of the "Book" of Psalms: Reconsidering the Transmission and Canonization of Psalmody in Light of Material Culture and the Poetics of Anthologies by David Willgren. *Forschungen zum Alten Testament* 2, Reihe 88. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, xvii + 491 pp., \$149.00/99,00 €, softcover.

In seeking to answer *how* and *why* the "Book" of Psalms was formed, Willgren, a young Swedish psalms specialist, considers the Psalter an *anthology* (compilation) rather than a *book* in the traditional sense (hence, the quotation marks). As an anthology, emphasis is placed on the *selection* of psalms rather than their editorial *shaping* (p. 25). For him, the "Book" of Psalms is *not* a coherent whole (p. 20) and the final form of the Psalter does not provide any interpretive context to understanding an individual psalm (p. 19).

Willgren first contextualizes his study in an ancient Near Eastern scribal and material culture, comparing the Psalms with the Sumerian Temple Hymns, the Hodayot, and the "psalms" scrolls from the Judean desert. He observes that various paratextual elements (e.g., superscriptions and colophons) often serve preservation and canonization purposes (p. 79). Willgren argues that the "'authoritative' unit was the individual psalm itself, possible to juxtapose in a great number of ways" (p. 132). These observations constitute his preliminary ideas for reconstructing the formation process.

Willgren then devotes the central part of his book to discussing five important paratextual elements, summarised as: (1) *Psalm 1* (or Pss 1–2) did not provide any interpretative framework for the rest of the Psalter (pp. 147, 170); (2) *Superscriptions* were added later (p. 186) and were not indicative of earlier existing collections, nor served any organizing function (p. 192); (3) The *colophon in Ps 72:20* marked “the end of the first [of two] scroll of a collection of psalms” (p. 199); (4) The *ברך doxologies* in Pss 41:14, 72:18–19, 89:53 and 106:48 were incorporated to “create a conceptual similarity with the Pentateuch,” resulting in some authoritative status (p. 225); (5) The *הלל doxologies* (Pss 146–150) superseded the *ברך doxologies* framework and belonged to a late formation period (p. 250).

At the end of his work, Willgren lays out *how* the “Book” of Psalms was formed. There was no “*Ursammlung*” (primitive collection) of psalms with fixed sequence or content to begin the reconstruction. Individual psalms could be “easily rearranged, or new psalms inserted (and probably removed from) anywhere in the sequence” (p. 376). The collection then grew to two full scrolls with a sizable number of psalms. The colophon Ps 72:20 “would divide such a collection into two roughly similar parts, with the second scroll slighter shorter” (p. 379). By the early postexilic period, the first scroll would contain “Pss 1–119” (not to be confused with MT Pss 1–119), and Ps 72:20 was incorporated at the end of the scroll following Ps 119. The Korahite and Asaphite psalms were included at this stage. By the Persian period, longer sequences of psalms linked to David via superscriptions appeared (p. 381). When 1–2 Chronicles were composed, the Song of Ascents, the doxologies of Pss 135–136 and Pss 2:12; 41:14; 89:53 were added to the collection of psalms. Psalm 72:20 was left as a frozen colophon at the end of the first scroll, now following Ps 72. Thereafter, the entire “Book” of Psalms was divided into five parts (pp. 381–382). The final stage of formation, which Willgren dates to the “late third or early second century BCE” (p. 383), was the incorporation of the “Hallelujah framework.” Willgren argues that one motivation in the formation process was having “psalmody in conversation with Torah of Moses” (p. 387). However, no single purpose can be identified, and no theological motivation is ascribed to the final text. Rather, the formation process was driven by practical issues such as scroll sizes and preservation needs (p. 388).

Willgren should be commended for his detailed work on which further research can be built. He has amassed huge amount of comparative materials, placing them in conversation with the MT Psalter. Willgren has also astutely capitalized on a significant impasse in Psalms research. The lack of consensus in reading the Psalms as a literary whole provided him with an angle of analysis. He has correctly identified the major paratextual elements surrounding this impasse. Finally, Willgren is to be credited for pursuing a radically different path in Psalms scholarship, recapturing the diachronic aspect of the Psalter.

Nonetheless, several issues dampen his argument. First, Willgren's propositions are not based on any hard evidence, but are inferences and conjectures from studying external comparative materials and internal literary features. Willgren often explains away uncanny lexemes or thematic connections as later additions (i.e., not originally intended) or coincidental. Unfortunately, there is no concrete way to prove or deny his arguments.

Second, there is a methodological disconnect between Willgren's work and those of his opponents. Primarily, Willgren uses the comparative approach, which is based on selective and extant evidence. In contrast, canonical/editorial critical approaches to the Psalter generally proceed from the final text. Though projected as the same referent, we must cautiously note that Willgren's "Book" of Psalms and the final text of the Psalter are actually different. The latter has not "existed" yet! In short, his deconstruction of the canonical/editorial critical approaches appears as methodologically high-handed.

Third, it remains unclear in his reconstruction if there were a larger set of *authoritative* psalms from which a subset was selected or if only those selected psalms were considered authoritative. If the former holds true, then the selection was independent of the authoritative status of selected psalms. However, if the latter is sustained, it would be difficult to freely include or exclude selections because of their authoritative status. Based on Willgren's reconstruction, MT Ps 119–134 were absent in the second scroll before the Persian period. That meant that many psalms originally in the second scroll would be excluded to make way for MT Pss 119–134 subsequently. Such massive content changes contradict Willgren's view on psalms formation motivated by the status of psalms authority and material limitations.

Willgren's concept of anthology includes so much intentional content changes that it seems to support editorial *shaping* for coherency rather than mere *selection* of psalms. His methodology, while bold and novel, is fluid, and his conclusions remain highly conjectural and problematic. It was also unnecessary for him to dismiss editorial/critical methods in order to justify his own. While I do not consider Willgren's work as wholly convincing, his work remains highly valuable.

PETER C. W. HO
University of Gloucestershire

The Return of the King: Messianic Expectation in Book V of the Psalter by Michael K. Snearly. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 624. New York; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015, xii + 236 pp., \$120.00, hardcover.

Those interested in how the Psalms is organized with a coherent message will welcome Michael Snearly's book as one of the latest additions to this area of study. In this work, Snearly shows that Book V can be organized into five distinct groups (Pss 107–118, 119, 120–137, 138–145, 146–150) and that certain *keywords* associated with the royal/Davidic promises identified for these groups provide the main themes in Book V of the Psalter. Moreover, when Book V is viewed with Pss 1–2 and 89, a storyline across the entire Psalter can be traced. Book V, at the end of the Psalms, is a signal for renewed hopes of the royal/Davidic promises (1).

About half of the book addresses methodological issues and contextualizes the work. The most interesting feature in Snearly's methodology is his appropriation of a criterion for identifying keywords. First, he creates a concordance for the words of Book V via the Logos Bible Software, allowing him to compare every lexeme exhaustively. Setting a weighted criterion: "50 percent of all occurrences [of a lexeme] in Book V are in one group and/or at least 20 percent of all occurrences in the Psalter are in one group" (1, 120, 187)," Snearly identifies keywords that display these characteristics in Book V. Subsequently, he reviews where these words are concentrated as a group in Book V, along with a close reading of the texts, before arriving at the main themes and their designated psalm-group boundaries (52).

For Snearly, the Psalter has met two most important linguistic standards for an integrated text: “cohesion” (when certain text recurs) and “coherence” (when the structure of the text “makes sense”; 44, 50). Furthermore, the Psalms also meets the conditions of text *narrativity*. The Psalms has a meaningful plot with a beginning (Pss 1–2) where the dominant motifs of kingship, Zion and Torah-fidelity are introduced. In the middle of the storyline (Ps 89), the deplorable state of the Davidic dynasty is depicted. Yet because of Yahweh’s covenantal faithfulness and *hesed*, an enduring hope remains for the destiny of the people of God (85). It is this hope that sets the stage for Book V at the end of the Psalter.

In the second half of his book, Snearly provides detailed structural arguments for Book V of the Psalter. He shows convincingly how Psalms 107–118 is a cohesive group based on the dominant theme of Yahweh’s eternal (עולָם) covenantal love (120, 1; חסד). Psalm 119 is a standalone psalm with the keyword “Torah” (תורה). The next group, Pss 120–137, is united by keywords associated with “Zion” (145–154). Psalms 135–145 is a cohesive unit based on the word “king” (מלך; 1, 160–155) and this unit emphasizes the earthly Davidic “vice-regent *par excellence* in the Psalter” (168). In sum, these keywords/dominant themes show that Book V, as a whole, features positive and favorable depictions of the royal/Davidic hopes.

Snearly’s approach is positive in several ways (188). First, his criterion allows large units of text to be analyzed exhaustively as any surfeit of identified word links are filtered based on concentration and text proximity. Second, Snearly draws from the latest research on poetics and text linguistics (e.g., narrative theory) in his methodology, raising helpful discussions relating to textual unity of the Psalms. Third, the use of an objective criterion, as Snearly has contended, would reduce subjective and impressionistic reading of thematic connections across the Psalter.

Nonetheless, several issues identified below weaken his argument. (1) *Snearly’s method remains somewhat arbitrary* because there is no justification on how the figures of 50% or 20% in the criterion were chosen. Clearly, a different figure would result in a different set of keywords. (2) *Snearly struggles to meet his own criterion*. He admits that the keywords, posited as “eternal” in Pss 107–108 and “king” in Pss 138–145, *do not* meet the stringent percentages in the criterion. Yet

they are still considered as the “dominant themes” (1, 120, 126) uniting these groups. (3) *There is fluidity in the delimitation of a so-called “cohesive unit”* (145, 176). Snearly’s criterion cannot clarify when a word is considered part of a psalm-group. For instance, the verb, ידע (“to know”) and the noun, דעת (“knowledge”), bind Pss 138–145 as a cohesive unit as they appear frequently within these eight psalms (156). However, a single reference of ידע in 147:20 is excluded from this unit despite being in close proximity. This exclusion is the result of superscription considerations. In other words, the bounds of a “cohesive unit” cannot be demonstrated by the weighted criterion *alone*. (4) *It is unclear how keywords and dominant themes for a particular psalm-group were finalized.* Are these the only keywords found for the groups? How did Snearly decide which was more significant if there were multiple keywords. For instance, even though ידע is a keyword that meets the criterion (156), Snearly decides that מלך (which does not meet the criterion) is the representative word for the group Pss 138–145. (5) *Snearly’s work is limited to Pss 1–2, 89 and Book V.* Consequently, any overarching thematic proposal cannot account for more than two-thirds of the Psalms that are left out in the analysis.

The concerns above are not insurmountable. The identification of keywords and dominant themes based on the weighted criterion can be refined and expanded to the rest of the Psalms. It is to Snearly’s credit that methodological bounds of word links analyses and thematic connections in Psalms research have been pushed with this book. This work is an important volume to have in the library of all serious students of the Psalms, especially those who are interested in the canonical approach to the Psalter.

PETER C. W. HO

University of Gloucestershire, UK.

Biblical Aramaic: A Reader & Handbook by Donald R. Vance, George Athas, Yael Avrahami, and Jonathan G. Kline, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2016, xiv + 233 pp., \$29.95, hardback.

For many pastors and scholars, learning and maintaining two ancient languages for biblical study presents significant challenges. The creators of *Biblical Aramaic: A Reader & Handbook* have designed a tool

to assist students of Scripture to work in the oft-neglected third biblical language. Vance (Oral Roberts University), Athas (Moore Theological College), and Avrahami (Oranim Academic College) collaborated on *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia: A Reader's Edition* (2014). This stand-alone volume expands the Aramaic sections to further assist readers who have had very little training in Aramaic. Kline, academic editor for Hendrickson, joins their reader with study tools to make this volume a handbook for language study and biblical exegesis. *Biblical Aramaic: A Reader & Handbook* (BARH) aims to provide students and scholars with an easily accessible resource for engaging the Aramaic portions of Scripture.

The authors present three distinct study aids: (1) a basic introduction [14 pp.], (2) annotated Aramaic texts [55 pp.], and (3) analytical vocabulary lists [178 pp.]. The introduction offers a brief history of Aramaic before discussing the study of biblical Aramaic and the use of BARH. The authors chose to use the Aramaic as it appears in *Biblia Hebraica Leningradensia* (BHL), though other major Masoretic variations appear in the footnotes. The single column Aramaic text stands out in a large, bold font, easily differentiated from the footnote markers. The footnotes appear in numbered, verse-by-verse paragraphs. Within the paragraphs, individual words occur with alphabetic markers. Each entry follows this formula:

—grammatical analysis, Aramaic root, English gloss (HALOT), comments—

Abbreviations for the grammatical analysis appear after the introduction. Words occurring over 25 times do not have an English gloss, though they do appear in an appended glossary.

The analytical vocabulary lists offer arrangements according to frequency, parts of speech, verbs by stem, verbs by root type, suffixed words, confused words, and loanwords. While the entire volume does not contain any page numbers, each vocabulary list possesses its own number for easy reference. The authors intend for these vocabulary lists to complement the reader portion and assist in acquisition of biblical Aramaic vocabulary.

The authors accomplish their goal of providing students and scholars with an accessible tool for engaging with the Aramaic portions of Scripture. Those who possess a Hebrew reader or computer Bible program may wonder what benefit a separate Aramaic reader would

provide them. Many printed readers do not contain parsing information and suffer from small print. BARH overcomes both of these difficulties. While computer programs automatically parse the text, many students still prefer to read a printed text. This handy volume containing all biblical Aramaic text, essential grammatical analysis, and vocabulary lists commends itself.

Nevertheless, BARH is not a textbook. This volume requires a working knowledge of Aramaic. The introduction does provide some basic tips on moving from Hebrew to Aramaic, but this is by no means comprehensive. The main deficiency of BARH is the lack of a singular, comprehensive list of Aramaic paradigms for easy review. With over 170 pages of vocabulary lists, a few pages of exemplar verbs and nouns would have rounded out this resource. Instead, the vocabulary lists by verbal root present verbs only as they appear in biblical texts. This may help analyze the text, but this provides rather indirect instruction in the language. Other handbook style reference grammars like Muraoka's *A Biblical Aramaic Reader* (2015) and Rosenthal's *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic* (2006) provide grammatical discussions, paradigms, and a glossary—but no complete reader text. Van Pelt offers the complete pedagogical experience in *Basics of Biblical Aramaic* (2011) with a full grammar, workbook, glossary, and reader text, but the size of this volume reduces its value as a portable handbook. Thus, BARH nicely fits the niche of an accessible reader/handbook for those looking to examine the Aramaic text and refresh their memory.

Instructors may find this volume useful as a course text in at least two ways. First, for instructors with their own course notes and handouts on biblical Aramaic, this text offers vocabulary frequency lists for student memorization. Second, due to the limited corpus of biblical Aramaic, the reader makes this useful as a focal point for class discussion, translation, and reading. While BARH will not function well as the primary text for an academic course or for self-study, this volume would make an excellent supplement to course notes and exercises.

Biblical Aramaic: A Reader & Handbook offers easy access to the biblical texts and some basic tools for refreshing the memory. I will find myself reaching for this volume when I need to study these passages of Scripture. This is not pedagogical text, but the tools contained herein may prove useful as a course supplement. This volume will prove most valuable to students and scholars when they need to study Ezra and

Daniel beyond the language classroom. In a day when computers and projection screens have come to dominate academic study, BARTH offers a vibrant alternative for engaging with God's word unplugged.

MARCUS A. LEMAN

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

Psalms 101–150 by Jason Byassee. Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible. Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2018, xxv + 262 pp., \$32.99, hardcover.

Jason Byassee is the Butler Chair in Homiletics and Biblical Hermeneutics at the Vancouver School of Theology. Byassee is the author of several books, including *Praise Seeking Understanding: Reading the Psalms with Augustine*, an adaptation of his PhD thesis at Duke University on Augustine's *Enarrationes in psalmos* where Byassee advances an Augustinian allegorical hermeneutic centered on christology. It is this hermeneutic that Byassee applies in the present commentary under review. Byassee's theological exegesis in the commentary fits clearly into the Brazos series' distinctive that "the Nicene tradition . . . provides the proper basis for the interpretation of the Bible as Christian scripture" (p. xii).

Despite this distinctive hermeneutical approach, Byassee does not spell out his approach in detail—the introductory chapter is limited to a mere five pages—and readers interested in a thorough understanding of Byassee's hermeneutic will have to refer to *Praise Seeking Understanding* (itself a thought-provoking read). Though brief, Byassee's introduction to the commentary does lay down three key parameters of the hermeneutic that he will apply in his commentary. First, exegesis must serve Christian spiritual formation. Byassee puts it strongly: "Scripture exists only for the formation of a people in faith and love" (xxi), and "the real determination of the validity of an exegetical approach is the character of the people it produces" (xviii). Second, Byassee will engage with both contemporary commentators and ancient interpreters. For the latter, given Byassee's adoption of an Augustinian hermeneutic, it is not surprising that Augustine's views loom large in the commentary.

Third, and most importantly: Noting that the New Testament reads the Psalms christologically, Byassee argues that this provides warrant for the Church to adopt a “christologically maximalist” (xxii) interpretation of the Psalms. Byassee further qualifies this emphasis on christology via the lens of *Christus totus* (the whole Christ), that is, both his head and his members. Thus, Byassee comments: “Sometimes Jesus Christ speaks as his head in the psalms, referring to his own life and ministry. Sometimes he speaks in us, his members, who are bound to him by baptism by being transfigured by him from sinners into saints” (p. xvii).

This shifting focus between Christ and his people is often on show throughout the commentary. For example, commenting on Ps 121:4 (“Behold, he who keeps Israel will neither slumber nor sleep”), Byassee reads against the grain of the text when he observes, “Perhaps God *actually* sleeps. In Christ, God does every ordinary human thing we do, sleep included . . . A God in our flesh indeed sleeps. Yet at our urgent summons he awakes. Even beyond that, he sleeps when he dies our death. And he rises when we don’t even think to try to summon him” (134–135). In this, Byassee relates the idea of divine wakefulness to Jesus’ death and resurrection, reformatting it christologically through a meditation upon the gospel.

At other times, Byassee’s approach is more ecclesiological (the “members”) than christological (the “head”). In commenting on Psalm 137, Byassee notes the particularity of the psalm and avers that it thus needs to be read in ways that are not “narrowly historicist” (187). Thus, Byassee re-reads the difficult verse of Ps 137:9, interpreting the עוללים as “‘troublesome spiritual thoughts,’ which should be rooted out of our minds ‘even at their birth’” (187, quoting Origen). Byassee defends this spiritualized reading by averring that this sort of reading, designed for the spiritual formation of faith communities, is only objectionable if those faith communities themselves are objectionable in principle.

How successful are Byassee’s readings? As already mentioned, Byassee sees spiritual edification as the primary criterion for assessment. However, this criterion cannot be divorced from the question of whether one agrees with Byassee’s hermeneutic, since how edifying a Scriptural reading is depends also on whether one thinks the reading is justifiable. In this regard, as the aforementioned readings show, it was not uncommon for Byassee’s readings to go against the grain

of the literary and historical contours of the Psalms. Therefore, those committed to a strict grammatical-historical approach to discern the author's original intent in order to translate that intent for contemporary communities will find the readings unconvincing and thus unedifying. The objection which will likely be raised is that Byassee's readings seem uncontrolled and arbitrary. (In *Praise Seeking Understanding*, Byassee argues that allegorical controls are applied when one reads christologically and when one's reading yields interpretative beauty. However, this is unlikely to appease his critics as these controls are not strong controls which result in clear deductive results.)

Having said that, Byassee does succeed in another way. In explaining his use of Augustine and other ancient interpreters, he argues that ancient interpreters "often succeed precisely where modern ones fails: they're interesting" (xxiv). Likewise, Byassee's readings indeed are interesting and the commentary often provokes self-reflection and provides much pastoral inspiration. In this regard, those involved in the work of pastoring and preaching will find the commentary helpful in providing a different point of view and in challenging one's prophetic imagination. The commentary would be especially profitable read in conjunction with *Praise Seeking Understanding*. The latter provides a clear methodological discussion which are then given concrete form in the commentary's discussions of the psalms. This volume is a welcomed contribution to the burgeoning field of theological exegesis.

WEN-PIN LEOW
University of Aberdeen

The Psalter as Witness: Theology, Poetry, and Genre, edited by W. Dennis Tucker, Jr. and W. H. Bellinger, Jr. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2017, xii + 204pp., \$49.95, hardcover.

This collection of essays is the fruit of the inaugural Baylor University-University of Bonn Symposium on the Book of Psalms held in 2013. It seeks to present, from both North American and German perspectives, "the complexity of the Psalter's theology and its performative role in bearing witness to the theological claims that comprise Israel's traditions" (viii). In order to assess whether the volume is effective in meeting this goal, this review provides an overview of the volume by

first summarizing the overall structure of the book, and then by providing a more in-depth look into three noteworthy chapters of the book. A concluding paragraph then provides an assessment of the volume as a whole.

Psalter as Witness is divided into three major sections. The first, entitled “Theological Approaches to the Psalms” provides interpretations of various psalms from different methodological perspectives, namely, poetics (chapter 1), exploring feminine imagery (chapter 2), micro-canonical reading (chapter 3), political theology (chapter 4), and critical spatial theory (chapter 5). The second section is titled “Theological Themes in the Psalms” and focuses on a number of major theological themes in the Psalter. For example, chapter 6 focuses on human temporality vis-à-vis God’s justice and mercy, chapter 7 on God’s immanence, and chapter 8 on the theology of the poor. Chapters 9 and 10 then conclude the section with a diachronic analysis of the formation of the Elohistic Psalter and how such an analysis sheds light on its theological message. The volume concludes with a shorter third section that focuses on the relationship between genre and theology. Chapter 11 asks the questions of whether there is a genre called “psalter,” and “what kind of text is the Psalter as a complete literary unit” (157). Finally, chapter 12 explores how two *Gattungen* (individual laments and royal psalms) provide insight into a theology of God.

Having provided an outline of the volume, this review will now take a more focused look at three chapters of the book, one from each of the major sections. The first of the three is “Spatial Theory and Theology in Psalms 46—48” by Till Magnus Steiner (chapter 5). The major question that Steiner seeks to answer in his chapter is why Ps. 48 is part of a postexilic Psalter. This question, Steiner observes, needs to be answered since elements of Ps. 48 appear preexilic, portraying Zion as impregnable, which would have been rejected in a postexilic context by those who understood “the exile as an exposure of the gigantic self-deception of the preexilic Zion theologies” (64). Steiner’s approach in answering this question is notable due to his combination of three different approaches. First, Steiner applies critical spatial theory by paying close attention to the different spaces discussed in Ps. 48. Second, based on this spatial analysis, Steiner is then able to diachronically analyze the psalm, concluding that it not only has a primary preexilic layer which champions the aforementioned inviolability of Zion, but

also has a secondary layer which shifts the focus onto Yhwh instead. This second layer claims that Yhwh “is an almighty God, who acts to the end of the world . . . for the city . . . and for his people” (66). Third, Steiner then applies redaction criticism to Ps. 46—48, concluding that Ps. 46 and 47 function as a “prolegomena to Ps 48, establishing the unshakeable trust in God . . . as ruler over the whole world” (73). In this way, Steiner answers his guiding question by concluding that “Ps 48 could have perhaps been *prayed* in exile as a vision of God as king of the world residing again as *מלך רב* on Mount Zion” (73).

This interaction of space and Zion theology is also discussed in another significant chapter, “The God of Heaven in Book V of the Psalter” by W. Dennis Tucker Jr. (chapter 7), who is one of the two editors of the volume. Like Steiner, Tucker addresses the exile and the challenge that it poses to Israel’s understanding of the inviolability of Zion. In response, he argues “that selected psalms in Book V of the Psalter adopted and expanded the notion of Yhwh as the ‘God of heaven’ and, in so doing, reassigned the previous theological claim concerning inviolability” (89). By studying those texts in Book V that locate the dwelling place of Yhwh in heaven, and those texts that refer to Yhwh as “Maker of Heaven and Earth,” Tucker argues that “the notion of inviolability that was associated with Zion has shifted spatially, placing attention on Yhwh, the God of heaven, as the inviolable one who will defend his people” (97). Zion’s role, in Tucker’s view, has altered to an “intermediary function” as “the ‘dispenser’ of God’s good gifts” (97). He then concludes that this shift of emphasis away from Zion to Yhwh in heaven does not minimize the nearness of Yhwh but instead “emphatically suggests that the full power of the heavenly enthroned Divine King will intervene into the history of his threatened people to bring deliverance” (98–99).

Tucker’s chapter reminds one of how the psalms bear witness to Israel’s theologizing about Yhwh. Such theologizing is brought to the fore in another chapter, “Genre, Theology, and the God of the Psalms” by Rolf Jacobson (chapter 12). Jacobson’s essay focuses on what insight on the person of God is given by the two genres of (a) the prayers for help and (b) the royal psalms. In studying the former, Jacobson observes how those psalms often speak of God as “immutable in terms of God’s existence, person, and personal character and God’s election of Israel and revelation in God’s word to Israel” (181). In contrast, the cries

for attention/action as well as the motivating clauses that are directed to Yhwh in these psalms testify that “in terms of God’s particular actions and dealings with creation, with Israel, and with individual Israelites, God is passable” (181). Meanwhile for the latter (the royal psalms), Jacobson examines the concept of election in those psalms and what they have to say about the God who elects. He comes to the conclusion that these psalms witness to “a God who freely elected Israel to love and who surrendered some divine freedom both for the sake of relationship with Israel and for the sake of the divine purpose of Israel” (189).

As the foregoing shows, *Psalter as Witness* lives up to its name and stated goal. The essays within the collection adequately demonstrate how the psalms testify to how postexilic Israel (re)conceptualized Yhwh, Zion, the Davidic dynasty etc. Moreover, as demonstrated in the three summaries, the book helpfully surveys a number of methodologies for studying the psalms along with providing concrete examples of how such approaches can be applied. This breadth appears to be partly due to the book being the product of a collaboration between North American and German scholars, resulting in a healthy balance of synchronic and diachronic approaches. As such, I would heartily recommend this book to anyone looking to broaden their horizons on psalms studies, especially on the vast array of methodologies being used to study the Psalter today.

WEN-PIN LEOW
University of Aberdeen

The Samaritan Version of Saadya Gaon’s Translation of the Pentateuch: Critical Edition and Study of MS London BL OR7562 and Related MSS by Tamar Zewi. *Biblia Arabica* 3. Boston: Brill, 2015, xii + 501pp., \$202.00 hardback.

Tamar Zewi is Professor of Hebrew and Semitic Linguistics at the University of Haifa. She has written numerous articles pertaining to the study of biblical Hebrew grammar, comprised of topics such as tripartite nominal clauses, the particle *hnh*, the negative particle as a predicate, and word order. She has also written on topics in Modern Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic, the El-Amarna letter, and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Her books include *Parenthesis in Biblical Hebrew* (Brill, 2007) and *A*

Syntactical Study of Verbal Forms Affixed by -n(n) Endings in Classical Arabic, Biblical Hebrew, El-Amarna Akkadian and Ugaritic (Ugarit-Verlag, 1999).

In her most recent book, Zewi produces a critical edition of the Samaritan Arabic version of Saadya Gaon's translation of the Pentateuch found in MS London BL OR7562. Saadya Gaon—a prominent Jewish Hebrew grammarian and commentator in the 10th century—translated the Pentateuch into Arabic called the *Tafsir* (25). Zewi notes that the impact of Saadya's *Tafsir* "was huge and immediate" and that it "established a new standard" among Jewish, Christian, and Samaritan communities (26, 27). The manuscript in question—MS London BL OR7562—is dated about the 14th century (42) and is a Samaritan translation and adaptation of the Pentateuch (105–17), primarily based on Saadya's *Tafsir* (1). The Samaritan Pentateuch in MS London BL OR7562 is a triglot comprised of three versions in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic in Samaritan script (1).

Zewi's study of MS London BL OR7562 is divided into two parts. In the first part, Zewi's aim is "to validate all conclusions" regarding the Samaritan version of the *Tafsir* "that could be recognized as original and belonging to" the first stage of transmission of MS London BL OR7562. The first part consists of nine chapters in which she provides a general background of Arabic bible translations (ch. 1), Saadya Gaon's *Tafsir* (ch. 2), and a detailed description of MS London BL OR7562 (chs. 3–9).

In chapter 3, Zewi describes the relationship of MS London BL OR7562 and other Samaritan versions of the Pentateuch to the *Tafsir*, the types of changes made by later hands on the original text of MS London BL OR7562, and the stages of transmission of the manuscript. In chapter 4, Zewi details the kind of Samaritan script and the diacritical marks used by the original scribe to distinguish certain Arabic letters used in the manuscript. She then discusses the orthography of the manuscript, delineating the alternation of various Arabic letters and the representation of various Arabic orthographic signs like the *tā' marbūa* (65–67). In chapter 5, Zewi examines the language of MS London BL OR7562, setting it in the context of early Samaritan Arabic translations and their later revisions and of Saadya's *Tafsir*. Analyzing features such as the preservation of cases, the dual, and the conforming to Classical Arabic rules, Zewi concludes that the Saadyan component of

MS London BL OR7562 reflects an “early medieval post-Classical Arabic” (180). In chapter 6, Zewi studies the Samaritan tenth commandment to determine if the original scribe copied the commandment from earlier Samaritan versions, or adapted the commandment from Saadya’s *Tafsir*. Based on vocabulary, Zewi concludes the latter (112). Lastly in chapters 7 and 8, Zewi looks at parallels in vocabulary and various phrases between the manuscript and Christian and Karaite versions (ch. 7) and non-Saadyan Samaritan Arabic versions (ch. 8). In chapter 9, Zewi summarizes the previous eight chapters and her conclusions. Chapter 10 is an introduction to the critical edition of the manuscript.

The second part of the book is the critical edition of the Arabic column—transliterated in Samaritan characters—from MS London BL OR7562. The Samaritan characters are written in a familiar SBL Hebrew font for the text written by the original hand and the Hebrew font Guttman Mantova for later hands (184). The text is unpointed, and Zewi indicates erasures and additions by setting the emendation in brackets or parentheses, or by underlining the letter(s). The critical edition includes three appendices which provide missing portions of MS London BL OR7562; the missing portions are based on other existing manuscripts.

Zewi’s work is a praiseworthy addition to the study of the history of interpretation of the Hebrew Bible and of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Albeit relatively brief, her background both on the influence of Arabic on Jewish, Samaritan, and Christian communities and their translations of the Hebrew Bible, and also on Saadya Gaon and his *Tafsir* is informative and properly sets MS London BL OR7562 in its historical context. Zewi’s analysis of the manuscript is highly detailed and she ably delineates the manuscript’s features and history of transmission. For example, she demonstrates that the language of the manuscript is “early medieval post-Classical Arabic” (180) and that the Saadyan *vorlage* of the manuscript was written in Arabic script (64).

Beyond the history and background information she provides, however, the benefit of Zewi’s work may be of limited value to many Hebrew Bible scholars. Interaction with the critical edition of MS London BL OR7562 and with Zewi’s detailed analysis of the manuscript in chapters 3–8 requires a familiarity with Arabic. Zewi’s analysis constantly refers to various Arabic grammatical categories and to

orthographic features. And while the critical edition is in a familiar SBL Hebrew font, the critical edition is a Samaritan transliteration of Arabic. On another note, it can be difficult to tell the difference between the two fonts Zewi employs to differentiate between the original hand and later hands.

Overall, Zewi's work is a valuable resource and contribution to the study of the history of interpretation of the Hebrew Bible.

RICHARD C. MCDONALD
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

The Old Testament: A Historical, Theological, and Critical Introduction by Richard S. Hess. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016. 816 pp. \$49.99, hardcover.

Every generation can point to a select group of scholars that seem to rise above the rest, scholars who cast long shadows by means of their critical insight and innovative ideas. For Evangelicals, who are more restrictively defined, that group is more limiting, but Richard Hess is one of those scholars. With this massive Old Testament introduction, he demonstrates a balance between a critical mind, canonical awareness, and theological sensitivity, all of which are hallmarks of Evangelical scholarship.

Hess' introduction represents the results of a long and successful career. Hess is most comfortable with interpretive methods that emphasize history, comparative analyses, and attention to the Hebrew text. However, this volume is not restricted to discussing only those methods. Thus, this work seeks to appeal to a variety of students (viii). Its purpose is three-fold: "1) to explain the definition and structure of the Old Testament, 2) to provide essential guidance regarding the composition and manuscript evidence of the Old Testament, and 3) to orient readers to the study of the Old Testament" (1). Overall, this work accomplishes its purposes. It is accessible, exceptionally well informed, and comprehensive in its scope. It is therefore an introduction that must be consulted. Hess' mastery is on display.

The introduction chapter concisely and fundamentally prepares the reader for what is to come. Basic topics are discussed, including a general definition of the Old Testament and Canon. In addition, there is

a rudimentary discussion of the compositional and manuscript history of the Old Testament, as well as textual criticism and major interpretive approaches. In each section, just enough information is given to produce more questions, a phenomenon that incidentally can be either good or bad. For example, Hess suggests a basic model for the Old Testament's formation, which was eventually centered in the Jerusalem temple but was then dictated by the implications of the Exile (8–9). Yet one wonders when the formation process began and what role the royal court played in the process. In addition, how did the formation process develop throughout Iron II, the Exile, and the Second Temple period? In his defense, Hess does provide ample footnotes to satisfy the reader's curiosity and stimulate further research.

As one would hope, the layout of each chapter is uniform. Each chapter is devoted to a particular book and opens with a discussion of basic material, including some general information on the book, any significant textual critical issues, and an outline. An overview section follows, and here Hess summarizes the content of each book. This gives way to a section on interpretive trends –past, present, and future. So, premodern and post-modern trends are discussed alongside prominent historical critical trends. There is also a brief discussion of the book's place within the Canon and the most important theological themes within the book. Side-bars appear throughout the work and discuss a range of scholarly and popular topics. Each chapter concludes with a useful section devoted to “Key Commentaries and Studies.”

The layout of the work is typical of the genre. Those seeking a work that largely compartmentalizes the books of the Old Testament according to basic canonical divisions (Pentateuch, Historical Books, Poetic Books, and Prophetic Books) will not be disappointed. However, there is a detectable effort, primarily in the sections of “Canonical Context” and “Theological Perspective,” to provide a sense of how separate books are connected and any unity within the Old Testament. Moreover, a final chapter, entitled “Transition,” provides a preliminary commentary on the connection between the Old and New Testaments. Among other things, Hess proclaims that the Old Testament “provides the absolutely essential foundation for all that follows. Without the Old Testament, the New Testament would have no meaning. Its value and the value of all that follows from it would be compromised, as the words and works of Jesus Christ and his apostles would appear odd” (711). At

the core of this connection is the exhortation to love God and love one another (712). According to Hess, if we do not understand how loving God is varyingly discussed and demonstrated throughout the Old Testament, then we will not be able to appreciate Jesus' exhortation and thus our role in the mission of God. One cannot help but wonder if Hess is setting the stage for a volume on Biblical Theology.

However, this work also displays the shortcomings typical of the genre. To explain, consider Hess' entry on Samuel. Hess opens his chapter with some general comments on 1 and 2 Samuel together and then offers a useful outline for the narrative. Then, after a basic summary of Samuel's content, Hess engages a brief history of interpretation, which includes premodern interpretations, higher-critical trends, and synchronic readings. The ancient Near Eastern context is also discussed, and here Hess spends time on some of the main socio-historical issues fundamental to Samuel. For example, the rise of the monarchy and the nature of David's kingdom are discussed with an attention to the socio-historical details involved.

Hess also entertains the canonical impact of Samuel, which is a nice touch. Moreover, Hess concludes his entry with a discussion of the theological perspectives found throughout the narrative. However, those discussions merely revolve around the three main characters: Samuel, Saul, and David. While it is undeniable that key theological themes circulate around the narrative's major characters, the reader wonders about the key themes, not to mention structures, that transcend individual characters and give coherence to the whole.

Consequently, this reveals a criticism. The nature of Hess' entry on Samuel makes it difficult to efficiently find the structures and themes that are providing the book's macro-level coherence. Too often, the structure of the text is understood merely as its divisions. Thus, any statement on the logical and semantic coherence between the units is normally brushed aside or largely ignored. When a discussion of a book's consistency does occur, it is often embedded among other issues, resulting in a literary "hide-and-seek." So, for instance, in reading Hess' entry the reader is left to ponder the strategic significance of the Bathsheba episode for the book as a whole. How does it function within the narrative as a whole, and how does it serve as a catalyst for the comparison and contrast between David and Saul?

To be clear, the dynamics of this criticism should not be interpreted as anything specific to Hess' work or a suggestion that his work is somehow fundamentally deficient. Rather, Hess' work manifests a ubiquitous shortcoming within the genre of Old Testament introductions. While the historical, textual, interpretive, and archaeological issues that Hess and others so often emphasize as critical to a well-rounded understanding of the Old Testament is certainly correct, there is a need within the genre of Old Testament introductions for a more systematic understanding of the logical and semantic coherence of the individual books. For example, if one understands that Samuel presents the *proper* monarchy as the solution to the community's (internal and external) pressures, then one can appreciate more effectively the contrast between David's family and Saul's family as well as the author's socio-political statements that were at the heart of Israel's development in the Levant during early Iron II.

Hess has been at the forefront of Evangelical Old Testament scholarship for some time. His publication list is massive and eclectic. However, there is something about writing an introduction that elevates one's stature even further. With this work, Hess is now forever entrenched as one of the premier voices among Evangelical biblical scholars.

DAVID B. SCHREINER
Wesley Biblical Seminary

My Psalm Has Turned into Weeping: Job's Dialogue with the Psalms by Will Kynes. BZAW 437, Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012. xiv + 230 pp., \$154.00, hardcover.

Boldly forging a path through the twin forests of Joban and intertextual studies, Will Kynes examines a network of allusions occurring between the dialogue section of Job (Job 3–27) and select psalms. Kynes, an Associate Professor at Samford University, offers this monograph as a revised version of his doctoral dissertation completed at Cambridge under the supervision of Katharine Dell. One of the 2015 winners of the Manfred Lautenschlaeger Award for Theological Promise (formerly the John Templeton Award), this work demonstrates methodological creativity and interpretational precision that rewards a careful reading. Building on the widely recognized allusion to Psalm 8 in Job 7, Kynes

proposes that Job and his three friends regularly allude to multiple psalms for their own rhetorical purposes.

The book is divided into three parts with two introductory chapters preceding part one and a concluding chapter that summarizes the argument and includes theological reflections. In the first two chapters, Kynes situates his study by overviewing the history of research regarding intertextuality and Job as well as outlining his eight step method for analyzing allusions. His method is unique in three ways. First, Kynes combines diachronic impulses (which prioritize a direction of borrowing) and synchronic impulses (which prioritize a reader's perception of links regardless of authorial intent) into a single method. Second, after identifying a clear allusion to a particular psalm, Kynes looks for cases of *recurrence* — the same psalm being alluded to elsewhere in the dialogue cycles though perhaps not as overtly marked as the primary allusion. Third, once allusions have been identified and analyzed, Kynes considers how the reuse of the particular psalm by Job sheds light on the psalm itself. The method outlines a workable approach to analyzing biblical allusions that attempts to balance concerns of authorial intent and readers' perceptions.

Chapters three through eight comprise the main part of the work in which the allusions to a specific psalm are discussed in each chapter. Kynes only examines Joban allusions to six psalms (Psalm 1, 8, 39, 73, 107, and 139) since these are the clearest and most concentrated examples, though he readily admits that additional allusions in the book are likely. Each part of the primary argument consists of two chapters that are grouped together based on the similar function of the psalms. Part one investigates two praise psalms (Psalm 8 and 107), part two analyzes prayers of supplication (Psalm 139 and 39), and part three considers psalms of instruction (Psalm 139 and 39). Finally, Kynes' concluding chapter summarizes his argument and evaluates how the mis/use of the psalms by the friends and Job contribute to their theological orientation.

Kynes himself sees his main contributions to be both methodological and hermeneutical. Methodologically, Kynes offers an eight step process to identify potential allusions, propose their direction of borrowing, and evaluate their implications for interpretation. Each of the six chapters in the main portion of the study follows this method that Kynes submits can be employed when analyzing inner-biblical

allusions more broadly. Hermeneutically, Kynes suggests that the dialogue cycles involve not only a discussion of the nature of Job's suffering but also an implicit disagreement over the proper use of select psalms. Even though the characters appeal to the same psalms, they employ the psalms toward different ends. The friends use the psalms in order to condemn Job while Job appeals to the psalms in order to spur God to action on his behalf.

On the whole, Kynes deserves praise for both his methodological and hermeneutical contributions. The chapter on method is clearly written and in each step of the process the operative assumptions are recognized so that both synchronic and diachronic impulses are helpfully joined together. Explicitly combining both synchronic and diachronic approaches into one coherent method offers promising possibilities for future works interpreting biblical allusions. Regarding the material claim that the dialogue cycles demonstrate an implicit debate over the interpretation of certain psalms, Kynes capably substantiates the presence of numerous verbal, thematic, and structural links between Job and the Psalms so that allusions are probable. His analysis of the rhetorical purpose for the allusions is most intriguing as he suggests that Job, even when he parodies a certain psalm, implicitly affirms the psalm's theology while the friends contravene the theology of the psalms in their condemnation of Job.

Nevertheless, there are a pair of criticisms that challenge aspects of both the method and the chief claims. First, the criteria to determine a direction of borrowing comes across as vague. When determining the direction of borrowing, Kynes prioritizes arguments from external coherence. Such an argument contends that Text A alludes to Text B when the rhetorical purpose for Text A being the borrower is judged more likely than if Text B is the borrower. However, nowhere does Kynes provide guidance for how these rhetorical purposes should be surmised or evaluated. While he explains and employs the criterion effectively, without a more thorough explanation of the means to use it, such implementation seems *ad hoc* rather than being derived from a clear methodology.

Second, while Kynes admits that some of the allusions he proposes are stronger than others, some claimed cases of recurrence (i.e., an additional allusion that is not as marked as the primary allusion) are unconvincing. For example, he proposes that Job responds to Eliphaz

in 7:18 by alluding to Psalm 73:14 even though they only share one substantive lexeme לְבֹקְרִים (“each morning”) along with some thematic links (166–67). Similarly, an allusion between Job 6:11 and Psalm 39 is based on the common words יחל (“to wait”) and קץ (“end”) that are separated in the Psalm by 38 words (130–31). Such claimed instances depend more on thematic parallels than lexical correspondence so an allusion to a specific text seems less likely in these cases. This critique does not undermine the basic claim that the dialogue cycles include a network of allusions to certain psalms, but it does temper the extent of the correspondence to those cases that are sufficiently demonstrable.

These criticisms notwithstanding, this book is highly recommended for scholars interested in Job, the Psalms, or the field of biblical intertextuality. The creative method, provocative textual insights, and corresponding theological implications deserve thoughtful consideration. In sum, this work is a welcome and substantive addition to the already sizable field of biblical intertextuality generally and the growing interest in Joban intertextuality more specifically. Most intriguing will be to see whether Kynes’ method and insights prompt further investigations into Joban intertextuality that either study allusions from other sections of the book or analyze allusions between non-psalmonic texts.

COOPER SMITH
Wheaton College

The Shape of the Writings, edited by Julius Steinberg and Timothy J. Stone. With the assistance of Rachel Stone. Siphrut: Literature and Theology of the Hebrew Scriptures, 16. Winona Lake, IN, 2015, xiii + 370 pp., \$54.50, hardcover.

A common scholarly assertion about the various orders of the books in the Writings section of the Hebrew Bible is that they are late, liturgical, and unstable. Many who note the tight sequence of the Law and the Prophets also hold that the Writings are at best a miscellaneous anthology of compositions with broad similarities and a smattering of shared vocabulary. Both Julius Steinberg and Timothy J. Stone have challenged these assumptions in recent monographs. In *Die Ketuvim: Ihr Aufbau und ihre Botschaft* (Hamburg, DE: Philo, 2006), Steinberg examines the Writings corpus as a whole, and in *The Compilational*

History of the Megilloth: Canon, Contoured Intertextuality and Meaning in the Writings (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), Stone focuses on the compilational logic that is at work within the five-book Megilloth grouping. In *Shape of the Writings*, Steinberg and Stone further this project by gathering a series of constructive essays that address this canonical query.

In their introductory essay, Steinberg and Stone provide an overview of the critical assumptions and methods that necessarily inform an analysis of the “shape” of a canonical collection. In short, they contend that the books in the Writings were not only *collected* but also *arranged* with a particular purpose and with an awareness of a broader canonical context. Defining canon as “a fixed or delimited collection of texts received and recognized as sacred (authoritative) by a faith community” (8), they first address the closure of the Hebrew canon and its tripartite shape as Law, Prophets, and Writings. In particular, they examine the prologue to Ben Sira, the Dead Sea Scrolls, select New Testament texts (Luke 11:49–51, 24:44), Josephus, and 4 Ezra (4–35).

They then examine the sequence and ordering logic of the arrangements found in the Talmudic tradition (in *Baba Batra* 14b) and in the Masoretic tradition (in the Leningrad Codex). For Steinberg and Stone, these are the two most significant ancient ordering traditions. Moreover, “the similarities between these two arrangements far outweigh the differences, and the arrangements of both orders is not random” (49). This comparative work does not yield a “center” of the Writings, but rather demonstrates that “most books are in dialogue with at least one other book in the collection” (49). In fact, “the canonical shape of the collection foregrounds these relationships” (49). Within this contextual space, the associations are not straightforwardly uniform. Rather, “the nature of this dialogue is varied, with no two relationships the same” (49). The achievement of the Writings corpus, then, is that the collection allows the reader to overhear this diverse dialogue.

Stone and Steinberg conclude that the Writings “took their character as a collection over a long process in which books were shaped and located, in various degrees, by authors, redactors, and compilers in order to highlight various relationships *between* books” (49). This process was organic, as the “canonical process is primarily one of growth to maturity rather than a process of trimming or rejecting other texts” (49). Peter Brandt follows this broad introduction with a detailed

analysis of all of the extant literary orders of the Writings found in Jewish and Christian traditions. While acknowledging the wide-ranging variety of these sequences, Brandt maintains in line with Steinberg and Stone that “the multitude of individual orders can be shown to result from only a limited number of multidimensional arrangement traditions” (59).

Several of the following essays address historical concerns, but most of them focus on the shape of the Writings corpus and interconnections within that grouping of books. Stephen Dempster examines the migration of Ruth within the Hebrew Bible and argues that Ruth’s position at the head of the collection before the Psalter is Ruth’s “original home.” Frank-Lothar Hossfeld and Erich Zenger highlight the “Davidization” of the Psalter and the impact of this textual emphasis on the book’s overall message. Will Kynes examines the effect of reading Job after the book of Psalms. For Kynes, Job followed by Proverbs creates an important dialectic between two approaches to understanding humanity’s response to God’s ways.

Steinberg then investigates the nature of “wisdom literature” and seeks to show that ordering impacts the way this wisdom tradition is understood in the scope of an Old Testament theology. Stone argues that Ruth’s original location was between Judges and 1–2 Samuel but that it was then shaped to follow Proverbs and begin the five-scroll Megilloth collection. Amber Warhurst discusses the intended “associative effects” (187) of the book of Daniel within the Writings versus prophetic corpus. Hendrik J. Koorevar argues that Chronicles was written as the “intended conclusion” to the Old Testament canon. Georg Steins also envisions Chronicles as a fitting ending to the Hebrew canon, especially in the way that it highlights the continuing function of the Torah. Finally, Stephen Chapman examines the possible citations of “groupings” or “canonical divisions” by early Jewish and Christian writers.

This collection of essays is significant for several reasons. On a micro-level, the individual essays themselves contain substantive treatment and reflective insight into issues of book-level meaning and the effect of ordering and association among the Ketuvim. Many of the essays point to the given author’s more substantial research in the field, representing a window into broad swaths of scholarship. In this regard, the English translation of four previously untranslated German articles is a most welcome feature (e.g., Koorevar and Steins). Though

these particular articles are the most dated contributions (Steins: 1996; Koorevar: 1997; Brandt: 2001), they each represent research that has directly impacted the current discussion.

On a macro-level, these essays collectively champion an often-underrepresented emphasis. The contributors believe that the shape of the Writings collection has hermeneutical implications for the interpretation of the individual books and the theological message of the grouping as a whole. They advance arguments on both the historical formation of the Ketuvim as a discrete corpus and also the contours of the collection. Consequently, this volume is a helpful entry point into the canon discussion in general as well as the Writings corpus in particular.

Moreover, under the banner of this broad approach to the Hebrew canon, there is also lively dialogue (and sometimes even genuine debate) between the contributors. For example, Stone and Steinberg set the shared agenda for the volume, but within their introductory essay, they fall on different sides of several important debates (see 3, 40). For example, Steinberg's starting point is the Talmudic ordering (40–46) and Stone's is the Masoretic ordering (47–51; see also 177n8). Steinberg follows the consensus and views the Megilloth as a later liturgical development (152), while Stone argues for this grouping's ancient roots (see 47n197; 50–51). Steinberg argues that the Ben Sira prologue attests a tripartite Hebrew canon around 130 BCE, though Stone's conclusion is "more modest" (12n49). Stone is comfortable with the notion of "context-sensitive redactions" of the individual books in the Writings, while Steinberg is "rather hesitant" (49n208). Far from a distracting element, these methodological tensions demonstrate the strength of their overall approach as it accounts for minor and even substantial disagreement over the interpretation and significance of textual evidence.

In this vein, the critical responses at the end of the collection by John Barton, Tamara C. Eskenazi, and Christopher Seitz highlight and amplify the diversity represented in the essays. The contrast between Barton's and Seitz's response to the broader approach taken in this project is particularly illuminating and instructive. After articulating several points of agreement, Barton maintains that the analysis in this volume presents more puzzles than patterns (315), and the question of "order" is only appropriately understood as a feature of "reception history" or even "reader-response criticism" (316). Barton concludes that "there

comes a point beyond which some collections do not constitute a unity of any kind” and is “inclined to think that this is true of the Writings” (316). By contrast, Seitz reviews each essay in the volume and brings this conversation into dialogue with his own research. Significantly, Seitz concedes that in his previous work, he “probably overstated the individuality of the witnesses in the third division as being what characterizes this division, given the thorough evaluation provided in the present volume for the different arrangements and associations” (338). Seitz also highlights that this volume is nevertheless supportive of his broader insight that “the associations that mark the main canonical section (Torah + Prophets) are of a thicker nature than what we see in the Writings” (338). Thus, Seitz views the work of these essays as a slight corrective and substantial confirmation of major aspects of his canonical approach to the Writings.

Accordingly, *The Shape of the Writings* summarizes an important area of Old Testament scholarship and also sets an agenda for further study. Though one might suggest that many of these case studies are only sketches and still require serious exegetical, theological, and historical development, this is part of the function of the book. These essays do not represent the “final form” of this discussion but represent a lively project that will hopefully garner an increasing amount of attention and draw more participants. Carefully considering the work of this volume will prompt readers of the Writings to explore more fully the contours of this corpus, from Ruth’s threshing floor to Ezra-Nehemiah’s re-built walls. Let them go up!

CHED SPELLMAN
Cedarville University

Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honour of Julio Treballe Barrera (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 157) edited by Andrés Piquer Otero and Pablo A. Torijano Morales. Leiden, Brill, 2012, xxviii + 427 pp., \$213, hardcover.

This *Festschrift* volume, edited by Julio Treballe Barrera’s colleagues Andrés Piquer Otero and Pablo A. Torijano Morales from Universidad Complutense de Madrid, is a fitting tribute to a scholar who has excelled in his studies of the ‘history and composition of the Bible, the

Septuagint and the Dead Sea Scrolls' (back cover). His reputation as a 'polymath' (ix) is well known, and Florentino García Martínez's 8-page recollection (xv-xxii) demonstrates the breadth of Treballe Barrera's scholarship whilst at the same time marrying this with his humanity. His interest and proficiency in music and literature more generally is profoundly inspiring.

The *Festschrift* contains 23 essays, of which one is in German, two are in French, and the remainder in English. All the contributors are established scholars in the fields of Hebrew Bible (and ancient versions) textual criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls studies. There is naturally no consistent *modus operandi* in such a collection—the unifying factor is that each contribution touches on areas closely allied to Treballe Barrera's own work. Nevertheless, many of the articles focus on the books commonly labelled as part of the 'Deuteronomistic History'. It is unclear whether this is deliberate. More strikingly, many essays engage with something that lies close to Treballe Barrera's recent work, that of questioning the oft-made distinction between 'higher' and 'lower' criticism. The literary/editorial and the text critical roles had traditionally been seen as distinct. Examination of the Dead Sea Scrolls has challenged many of these assumptions, and Treballe Barrera has played a significant part in this new perspective. Accordingly, a number of the contributors address this 'paradigm shift' in the context of their own specialities.

The essays are as follows: Anneli Aejmelaeus, 'Corruption or Correction? Textual Development in the MT of 1 Samuel 1' (1–18); A. Graeme Auld, 'David's Census: Some Textual and Literary Links' (19–34); Hans Ausloos, 'The Septuagint's Rendering of Hebrew Toponyms as an Indication of the Translation Technique of the Book of Numbers' (35–50); George J. Brooke, '4QGenesis Reconsidered' (51–70); Devorah Dimant, 'Abraham the Astrologer at Qumran? Observations on *Pseudo-Jubilees* (4Q225 2 i 3–8)' (71–82); Florentino García Martínez and Marc Vervenne, 'Ancient Interpretations of Jewish Scriptures in Light of Dead Sea Scrolls' (83–98); Ronald S. Hendel, 'The Two Editions of the Royal Chronology in Kings' (99–114); Philippe Hugo, Ingo Kottsieper and Annette Steudel, 'Reflections on Epigraphy and Critical Editing of 4Q51 (4Q51) Col. XI' (115–132); Jan Joosten, 'Textual History and Linguistic Developments: The Doublet in 2 Kgs 8:28–29 // 9:15–16 in Light of 2 Chr 22:5–6' (133–146); Armin Lange

and Matthias Weigold, 'The Text of the Shema Yisrael in Qumran Literature and Elsewhere' (147–178); Timothy M. Law, 'An Often Neglected Witness to the Textual History of the Septuagint: The Syro-hexapla of 3 Kingdoms' (179–192); André Lemaire, 'Critique textuelle et critique historique: remarques méthodologiques et exemples' (193–202); Bénédicte Lemmeljin, 'Influence of a So-Called P-Redaction in the "Major Expansions" of Exodus 7–11? Finding Oneself at the Crossroads of Textual and Literary Criticism' (203–222); Johan Lust, 'The King/Prince of Tyre in Ezekiel 28:11–19 in Hebrew and in Greek' (223–234); Corrado Martone, 'Zadokite Interpolators at Work: A Note on CD III,21-IV,4' (235–240); Andrés Piquer Otero, 'Who Names the Namers? The Interpretation of Necromantic Terms in Jewish Translations of the Bible' (241–276); Emile Puech, 'Glanures épigraphiques: le livre des Proverbes et le livre de Job à Qumrân' (277–302); Adrian Schenker, 'Nach dem Exil wurden im Land Israel zwei Tempel errichtet. Ist der Bericht 1 Esdr 5:49 vom Tempelbau der Völker des Landes die älteste literarische Erwähnung des Tempels in Samarien?' (303–320); Mark S. Smith, 'Textual Interpretation in 7th-6th Century Israel. Between Competition, Textualisation, and Tradition' (321–324); Pablo A. Torrijano Morales, 'The Contribution of the Antiochean Text to Text Criticism in Kings: Rahlfs' Study of the Lucianic Recension Revisited (1 Kgs 1:3, 36, 40, 41, 45)' (325–342); Emanuel Tov, 'The Chapter and Section Divisions in Esther' (343–360); Eugene Ulrich, 'The Old Latin, Mount Gerizim, and 4QJoshua' (361–376); and James C. VanderKam, 'Another Citation of Greek *Jubilees*' (377–392).

The volume concludes with a bibliography of Julio Treballe Barrera's expansive scholarly writing (393–404), and two indices: one of ancient sources (405–421) and the other of modern authors (422–427). Overall it is a helpful book containing penetrating insights. Certainly, for those interested in textual criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls studies it offers a number of up-to-date perspectives that will challenge previously held assumptions and provoke further investigation. The technical nature of some contributions may mute its appeal to the non-specialist, nonetheless it admirably achieves its aims of honouring a senior scholar and advancing the very scholarship that Treballe Barrera champions so well.

JONATHAN M. SQUIRRELL
Spurgeon's College, London

Sinai and the Saints: Reading the Old Covenant Laws for the New Covenant Community by James M. Todd III. Grand Rapids, MI: InterVarsity Press Academic, 2016, x + 224 pp., \$24.00, softcover.

What are Christians to do with the old covenant laws? In *Sinai and the Saints*, James M. Todd III, who teaches biblical studies at College of the Ozarks, engages this important theological question with pastoral sensitivity. He shows the apologetic need for modern believers unfamiliar with the debate to think through this question carefully. What Todd ends up with is an introduction to Christian ethics, grounded in a robust biblical theology.

Chapters one through three frame the discussion. Todd describes the different ways that legal language is used in the Bible and some of the traditional taxonomies of law in the literature. Because of his desire to apply the principles of the laws, Todd limits his discussion to the laws that were given to Israel at Sinai and on their journey to the Promised Land. For Todd, the essential context is that these laws were given to “a specific group of people at a specific time in a specific place for a specific purpose,” and these laws were “part of a covenant” (15). He then describes the canonical divisions of laws, explains several types of laws, and surveys various paradigms for applying the laws.

Chapters four and five rehearse the storyline of Israel as it unfolds in the Pentateuch and surveys similarities and differences between the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants (58). In short, Yahweh established the old covenant so Israel would “reflect their identity [as holy mediators of God’s blessing to the nations] in their national life” (61). He frames the Pentateuch’s storyline around rebellion narratives and parallelisms in Israel’s pre-Sinai and post-Sinai journeys.

Chapter six is the most significant and controversial since it addresses the role of the Decalogue for the new covenant community. Todd asserts that the Ten Commandments are “not a mere part of the covenant,” but they are “the essence of the covenant” (93). Because of this, these laws, just like all the others, are no longer binding. He devotes considerable space to a discussion of the Sabbath’s relation to the new covenant, concluding that, because the Sabbath is a “sign” of the old covenant, it does not carry over into new covenant ethics (101). Todd goes further to describe several ways that the “Ten Commandment Christian” view is actually harmful to the Christian witness.

Chapters seven and eight lay out some of the implications of Todd's view. He is careful to show how his position is not a form of antinomianism, and he explains how the "law of Christ" is to function as the central ethical rule for the Christian. Todd defines the "law of Christ" as "the law of love: love of God and love of neighbor" (110). He acknowledges that there is overlap in the ethical ideals among the covenants, and asserts that the image of God and universal natural law accounts for that overlap. Nevertheless, Todd affirms that Christians have "a responsibility to read, know, and apply the old covenant laws" (127). These laws help to paint a full picture of major biblical themes such as the tabernacle, priesthood, sacrificial system, atonement, and holiness. The various laws help the reader make theological connections and identify allusions in the New Testament, as well as provide general principles of wisdom.

Instead of concluding that the Pentateuch is irrelevant, chapter nine describes the hope and good news taught by the Pentateuch. It prepares the reader for Yahweh to effectually work a change of heart among his people, it builds anticipation for a coming king, and it highlights the significance of the land promise to Abraham. All of these trajectories are begun in the Pentateuch, carried forward in the Prophets, and find their expanded fulfillment in the gospel (175).

After some concluding remarks, Todd includes three appendices that address important pastoral implications of his position. Appendix A explains how Christians ought to use the old covenant laws in conversations about homosexuality. Appendix B is about the second commandment and the use of images in Christian worship. Finally, Appendix C deals with some exegetical challenges to Todd's position.

Among the greatest strengths of the book are its clarity and timeliness. The prose is accessible and engaging, and the arguments are cogent and orderly. Todd fairly represents opposing positions and frequently points the reader to the truth and hope of the gospel. For this he is to be commended. Furthermore, the book comes at an important time, with the rising influence of progressive covenantalism (like Gentry and Wellum's *Kingdom through Covenant*, Crossway, 2012 and Wellum and Parker's *Progressive Covenantalism*, B&H, 2016). Todd explicitly aligns himself with this movement (42). Todd's work is a welcome addition to the conversation, because critics of progressive covenantalism have argued that the movement is difficult to engage

because not enough time has elapsed for significant publications to gain traction and because the movement is hardly monolithic. Todd's book is a step in the right direction since it articulates the position so clearly, answers questions confidently, and responds to common objections. Because of this, the book is worth engaging at the academic level, but its readability makes it useful to put in the hands of laypeople as an introduction to these issues.

One weakness of the book is its lack of engagement with historical theology. For instance, there is no mention of how his view fits within the history of Protestant theology (and no mention at all of pre-Reformation reception). The Westminster Confession of Faith of 1646 and the 1689 Second London Baptist Confession of Faith engage these issues and inform modern faith and practice in significant ways—Todd would have strengthened his book by including an engagement with these confessional traditions. This is especially important because both of these traditions contradict the position that Todd asserts since they affirm the three-fold division of the Law, sabbatarianism, and the perpetuity of the moral law for Christians. To be fair, Todd briefly addresses these positions in chapter two, giving a cursory critique, but never engages their historical significance. Given the importance of these confessions, Todd invites suspicion by the absence of historical theology in his theological argumentation.

In the end, this book does not aim to blaze a new trail, but it is a faithful explanation of the role of the old covenant laws for the new covenant community from the progressive covenantal perspective. This book could easily be used in small groups, among high school and college students, and in introductory seminary classes. Progressive covenantalism has needed a resource like this, and whether or not the reader is persuaded by his arguments, Todd is to be commended for this excellent work.

GARRETT M. WALDEN
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary