

NEW STUDIES IN THE BIBLE

by SHMUEL AHITUV

עיונים במקרא. ספר זכרון ליהושע מאיר גרינץ. עורך, בנימין אופנהיימר. (תעודה. ב.) תל-אביב, אוניברסיטת תל-אביב, הוצאת הקיבוץ המאוחד, תשמ"ב.

Bible Studies. Y.M. Grintz In Memoriam. (Te'uda. The Chaim Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies Research Series. II.) Edited by B. Uffenheimer. Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University and ha-Kibbutz ha-Me'uhad, 1982. 416 pp.

Yehoshua Meir Grintz (1911–1976) was Professor of Bible at Tel-Aviv University. This memorial volume, published by his colleagues, students and admirers, is a testimony to the memory of a versatile scholar, sharp-penned writer, and militant polemicist on behalf of his independent views, whose interests were not limited to the world of scholarship. He was deeply engaged by contemporary issues, publishing essays and articles on current matters in which he expressed a proud and uncompromising nationalist stance, also reflected in his scholarly work. He was also involved in belles-lettres and translation. One reads his memoirs in the periodical *ha-Umah*, which for some reason were not included in his bibliography, with great pleasure for the narrative ability revealed therein. Grintz' Hebrew style combined the erudition of the traditional Study House (*Beth Midrash*) with the turbulence and vitality of modern Hebrew.

Dr. Shmuel Ahituv serves on the Editorial Board of the *Enşeqlopedyah Miqra'it* (i.e., *Encyclopedia Biblica*) and is the General Editor of the *Encyclopedia Biblica Library*. He also lectures at the Department of Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies of Ben-Gurion University of the Negev in Beer-Sheba.

This volume consists of three sections: thought and history of exegesis, exegetical and historical problems, and philological concerns. Due to the limited space available, I am unable to do justice to all of the excellent material in this collection, but can only give the reader a personalized sampling of what it contains.

The article by the volume's editor, Binyamin Uffenheimer, "Prophecy and Sympathy" (pp. 17–35)¹ is a systematic critique of the late A.J. Heschel's theory of prophecy. Heschel approaches prophecy as a phenomenon of sympathy, that is, of a deliberate act of identification by the prophet with "divine pathos," i.e., God's relation to man. Therefore, the prophet's response is not an unmediated human one, but the outcome of divine pathos as felt by the prophet. Where the prophet speaks in the first person, he expresses or reveals divine pathos; when he speaks in the third person, we find prophetic sympathy. Uffenheimer effectively refutes this distinction, by demonstrating the rapid and sudden transitions to and from first and third person, indicating the sources of this style in ancient Near Eastern literature; it has nothing in common with the distinction drawn by Heschel. Uffenheimer draws a sharp distinction between the believer's identification with divine pathos and his personal autonomy, distinguishing among the manifold manifestations of prophecy, which include ecstasy, in whose center is the feeling of mission driving the prophet. Indeed, it would seem that for an explanation of the prophetic impulse one must turn, not to theologians, but to psychologists.

From the theological-psychological realm, we turn to that of textual history. In his article, "They Should Bring All of Their Mind, All of Their Strength, and All of Their Wealth into the Community of God' (I QS I:12)" (pp. 37–41), Moshe Weinfeld demonstrates that the source of the demand found in the Biblical verse, "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your might" (Deut. 6:5), is in the ancient Near Eastern vassal treaties, in which the vassal must serve the suzerain with all his soul and all his wealth. This demand finds its way into the oath of loyalty of the initiate into the *yahad*, the fellowship of the members of the Dead Sea sect, referred to in the quotation from the Manual of Discipline which serves as a title to the article.

To turn from the *genizah* of Qumran to that of Cairo: a number of valuable, lost literary works from the Second Commonwealth period — including the Hebrew versions of the Proverbs of Ben-Sira, the Book of the Damascus Covenant, the Aramaic version of the Testament of Levi, and four pseudepigraphical psalms attributed to King David — were rediscovered in the Cairo Geniza. David

1. An English translation appears in *Immanuel* 16 (1983), pp. 7–24.

Flusser and Shmuel Safrai discuss the latter in their article, "A Fragment of the Songs of David and Qumran" (pp. 83–109). The first to publish these psalms, A.A. Harkabi (in 1902), thought that they were written in the Middle Ages. The present authors demonstrate that these are "the remnants of an epigraphical book, containing much material composed during the Second Temple period, which came from Qumran to the Cairo Geniza via the same channels as did the Book of the Damascus Covenant and the Aramaic Testament of Levi, whose remnants are also found in Qumran." These "hymns of the day" are the remains of a pseudepigraphical book attributed to King David himself. There is evidence of the relationship of these psalms (for the dates 1–4 Iyyar) to the Dead Sea sect in a scroll from Qumran which claims that David composed 4050(!) psalms, of which 364 were hymns to be sung over the daily offerings — a number corresponding to the number of days in the year according to the calendar of the Qumran sect and related circles. Moreover, there is extant evidence from the head of the Nestorian church in Seleucia in Syria from ca. 800 C.E. of the existence of Hebrew writings near Jericho which came into the hands of Jews from Jerusalem, including "more than two hundred Psalms of David." The hymns published here may be a remnant of those same psalms found near Jericho. It should be noted that the Divine Name appears on this scroll in the ancient Hebrew script, rather than in the square, so-called "Assyrian" script. There is internal evidence indicating that the author of these psalms used a text of the Book of Psalms close to that of the Septuagint, rather than to the Masoretic text. Thus, for example, in Psalm 147:3 we read: "He who heals those broken of heart, and dresses their bones [*le- ašmotam*]" (in the Masoretic text: *le- ašvotam* — their sadness). Many expressions familiar from the prayer book and from daily usage find their earliest source in these hymns. Thus, we discover here for the first time the phrase *shiroi uzekha* ("the hymns of Your praise"), which is at the basis of the phrase "as is said in the songs of your praise" from the Sabbath Morning *Qedusha*; likewise, the use of the phrase "the true judge" (*dayan ha-emet*) relating to God appears first here. It is impossible not to be reminded by the phrase here, "May the master of all generations be blessed and exalted; May He who rules over all His creations be sanctified and praised; May He be united in the mouth of all his servants, the righteous Magistrate and true Judge," of phrases from the *Qaddish* and *Qedushah*.

From Cairo we return to Qumran. Yitzhak Avishur, in his article, "Who Has Measured the Waters in the Hollow of His Hand' (Isa. 40:12), in the Massorah, Qumran and the Accadian" (pp. 131–137), relies upon a new text from Qumran, paraphrasing Isaiah 40:12–13: "Shall man measure in his palms the great waters?" This paraphrase reflects a different version than that of the Massorah, namely, that of the Isaiah scroll from Qumran: "Who shall measure in his palms the waters of the sea" (*mei yam*; in the Massorah: *mayim*). Both refer back to an Accadian text, which refers to Marduk, the head of the Babylonian pantheon, as

“measuring the waters of the sea” (*madid mê tâmti*); the word *tâmti*, i.e., “sea,” is the equivalent of *tehom rabbah* (“the great depth.”)

One of the central events in Biblical historiography is the Exodus from Egypt; yet the author of the Book of Chronicles seems to have been interested in obscuring and concealing this tradition. In “The Position of the Exodus Tradition in the Book of Chronicles” (pp. 139–155), Yaira Amit discusses the marginality of the Exodus to this book. Following a survey of those passages in which the Exodus is mentioned, and of those in which the author eliminated the tradition of the Exodus, the author reaches the conclusion that the author of Chronicles recoils from the centrality of the Exodus tradition on moral grounds, relating to why and how the Israelites were enslaved in Egypt and why they later merited to be redeemed from there. Due to the centrality of the Exodus traditions in Israelite history, it was impossible to excise them completely, but they could be relegated to a secondary place, emphasizing instead the traditions concerning the patriarch Abraham as the starting point of the connection of God to His people and those of the Temple as the central motif in Israelite history. The Exodus is correspondingly transformed from the central event in Israelite history to a mere point in time.

“The Lineage of the Prophet Nathan” (pp. 175–186) is the subject of Alexander Zeron’s study. According to him, the prophet Nathan was a priest, a theory based upon his interest in the Temple and in the royal house. Nathan approached David on the subject of the construction of the Temple, and took part in the struggle for the succession to the throne, analogous to the role played by Jehoiada the priest during the reign of Jehoash, and even took an active role in anointing Solomon as king. One may assume that Yigal son of Nathan, who was mentioned among David’s warriors, was the son of the prophet Nathan, and that his town Zobah was nearby to Jerusalem. His origins in the area around Jerusalem explains his earliest appearance there, and his joining with the supporters of Solomon, most of whom were from the Jerusalem area. Nathan is also portrayed as the heir of the prophet Samuel: concerned with matters pertaining to the priesthood, opposed to innovations, and fighting against the king’s unrighteousness.

According to the Sages, “the words of Torah are poor in one place and rich in another.” In “Some Considerations Concerning the Law of Restitution, Numbers 5:5–8” (pp. 197–203), Jacob Licht learns that the law of theft and oath in Lev. 5:20–26 is the original, basic law, while the law in Num. 5:5–8 is intended to complete those details missing from the original law. That the law in Numbers complements that in Leviticus may be inferred from the fact that the former is unintelligible without knowledge of the latter. For what reason, then, does the author of the supplementary law need to repeat the original law, with the addition

of only eleven words, rather than adding what needs to be added in Leviticus itself? According to critical Biblical scholarship, the basic law — or even the entire collection — was already closed at that time, and nothing could be added to it. But how can one argue such a thing, when from the Qumran Scrolls and the Samaritan Version of the Pentateuch we learn that even during the Second Temple Period these texts were “open” and subject to additions and editorial changes? The author of this study postulates that the priests did not have only one book of laws, but that the manner in which the laws were crystallized indicates the existence of several different scrolls which they followed. In order to publicize an addition to the law, it was not enough to add it to one collection of laws, but a supplementary law had to be formulated, repeating the main elements of the basic law — but without all the details, which would have been known to those who needed to know them — in another scroll or collection of laws, which would be available to those who needed it. Here, the author provides an opening “for what is learned from it concerning the editing of the Torah,” while his original argument remains to be applied from the specific case to the general.

It seems doubtful whether Grintz would have been happy with Nadav Naaman’s sharp discussion in “The Shihor, which is before Egypt” (pp. 205–221). Naaman here questions one of the accepted axioms of the historical geography of Palestine. In a previous paper² (appendices to which appear in this article), he identifies “the Brook of Egypt” (Isa. 27:12, etc.) with Nahal ha-Besor (Wadi Ghazeh), thereby contracting the Biblical borders of the Land of Canaan. Using the same method and line of reasoning, Naaman suggests the identification of “Shur which is before Egypt” with Tell el-Far’ah, on the banks of Nahal ha-Besor. A.F. Rainey³ has already refuted Naaman’s arguments regarding the Brook of Egypt, reconfirming its traditional identification as Wadi el-Arish, as well as his identification of Shur with Tel el-Far’ah, by demonstrating the impossibility of interpreting Ex. 15:22, “And Moses and all Israel journeyed from the Sea of Reeds, and they went out into the wilderness of Shur...” as referring to other than the Western extremity of the Sinai Peninsula. Nowhere can the verses describing Shur be interpreted as referring to a settlement in the Western Negev. Naaman’s attempt to reject the traditional identification of “Shihor of Egypt” with the Pelusiac arm of the Nile also depends upon his theory that the Brook of Egypt is Nahal ha-Besor, strengthening the assumption that the Egyptian word *shihor* entered Hebrew(!) as referring to any river or river-bed, so that it is nothing but another synonym for *Nahal Misrayim* (which he identified with Nahal ha-Besor). The rejection of the identification of Nahal Mişrayim with Nahal ha-Besor *ipso*

2. “The Brook of Egypt and the Assyrian Policy in the Border-Region with Egypt” (Heb.), *Shenaton le-Heqer ha-Miqra* 3 (1978), pp. 138–158.

3. *Tel Aviv* 9 (1982), pp. 131–132.

facto also refutes the claim that *Shiḥor Miṣrayim* is the Brook of Egypt. The use of the proper name *Shiḥor Livnat* to infer the development of the term *Shiḥor* in Hebrew does not apply with regard to the Brook of Egypt, which does not carry water, while *Shiḥor Livnat* may be called that by way of comparison with the permanent bodies of water in Egypt. However, Naaman's controversial study requires the scholars to reexamine accepted views.

Grintz had devoted a number of his studies to the language of the Priestly Source (he did not believe in P) and wished to prove its antiquity. In "Studies in the Vocabulary of the Priestly Code — The Use of *She'er* and *Shekhar* in the Books of Leviticus and Numbers" (pp. 299–305), Avi Hurvitz argues that these two words belong to the earliest layer of Biblical Hebrew, and that they were forgotten over the course of time. Ezekiel, who was influenced by the Priestly source and its language, no longer uses them. The history of these two words serve the author as a proof of the antiquity of the Priestly source and its relationship to the period preceding the Babylonian Exile.

This volume also contains a biography of Prof. Grintz, a bibliography of his scholarly writings, and articles by N. Aminoah, Y. Amir, Yosef Rachaman, Y. Hoffman,⁴ S.E. Loewenstamm, M. Anbar, F.H. Polak, P. Karny, S. Shmida, J. Blau, G. Brin, A. Tal, Ch. Cohen, M.Z. Kaddari, and E. Rubinstein.

Immanuel 18 (Fall 1984)

4. See *Immanuel* 17 (1983), pp. 7–21.