

Thomas Wahl

IN MEMORIAM PAUL KAHLE
ed. by M. Black and G. Fohrer.
Berlin: Alfred Topelmann, 1968.
Pp. 253 + 20 plates. \$22.

In 1935 Professor Paul E. Kahle, orientalist of the University of Bonn, was honored on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday with a Festschrift. In his case this was not the crowning recognition of his fertile career, because for almost thirty years more, despite exile from Germany in 1939 and failing eyesight in his last decade, he continued his many-faceted work in biblical and Near Eastern studies. These studies tended to center in biblical text criticism, massoretic and targumic studies, but ranged as far as patristic philology and medieval Chinese-Islamic relations. He was noted for his generosity in sharing ideas and materials with others, especially his students. The present memorial volume of essays, largely the writings of his students and protégés, naturally tends to emphasize manuscript studies. It is introduced by an all too brief essay on Professor Kahle by H. S. Nyberg, stressing this great orientalist's scholarly generosity.

In view of the diversity of the essays I shall only summarize the theses of the authors, sometimes indicating their method.

Specific problems of Bible text and translation are dealt with in three articles. In a study of "Is. 52:13-53:12: the Servant of the Lord," G. R. Driver makes several emendations of the consonantal text and many reinterpretations based especially on Arabic lexicography, concluding that the Servant was an influential preacher or prophet who lost favor with his countrymen or with the Babylonians, but was ultimately successful in his mission and regained favor. W. D. McHardy ("The Horses in Zechariah") by means of textual emendations presupposing erroneous scribal restorations of abbreviated

Thomas Wahl is a student in the Th.D. program at Union Theological Seminary.

words, concludes that there were four horses of four colors traveling in four directions. D. Winton Thomas ("A Drop of a Bucket") judges that all three cola of Is. 40:15 are parallel, meaning "like dust on the scales," or "weigh like dust." Whatever is to be made of his etymologies, he might have noted that the root dqq is parallel to šhq in II Sam. 22:43 (cf., Ex. 30:36). G. D. Kilpatrick in "BAEŦETE Philippians 3:2" concludes that the word means "consider" rather than "beware."

Several articles continue Kahle's work on texts and versions, particularly the painstaking task of trying to work out the relationships among the various Targum traditions. Alejandro Díez-Macho in "A Fundamental Manuscript for an Edition of the Babylonian Onqelos to Genesis: MS 152 of the Jewish Theological Seminary of New York," insists on clearly distinguishing Yemenite manuscripts like this from Babylonian ones. In "Nouveau fragment de la Massorah Magna du Targum de Babylone," G. Weil treats problematic words and verses in this Bodleian manuscript of Lev. 1-3. G. J. Kuiper in "A Study of the Relationship between A Genesis Apocryphon and the Penta-teuchal Targumim in Genesis 14:1-12" concludes tentatively that the former is a unique recension of the Palestine Targum tradition, and that Onqelos is dependent on the same tradition. Malcolm C. Doubles ("Indications of Antiquity in the Orthography and Morphology of the Fragment Targum") concludes from a study of MS Vaticanus 440 that linguistic evidences for a late dating of the Fragment Targum are deceptive, reflecting the unconscious influences of medieval copyists. S. Lund, studying "The Sources of Variant Readings to Deuteronomy 1:1-29:17 of Codex Neofiti 1," finds that these marginal readings may well derive from only two manuscripts, one of which is a Fragment Targum with a high degree of continuity. R. Edelman, writing on "Sopherim--Massorettes, 'Massorettes'--Nakdanim" treats the titles and functions of the various persons who preserved the biblical text. P. A. H. de Boer ("Hebrew Manuscripts in the Netherlands") describes eighteen manuscripts, some of them previously unrecorded.

In the field of historical linguistics, Joshua Blau ("Some Difficulties in the Reconstruction of 'Proto-Hebrew' and 'Proto-Canaanite'") maintains that we are not likely ever to succeed in reconstructing them "if they existed at all," and that even in relatively limited questions of development we can attain to nothing better than probabilities. A. Murtonen in his "Prolegomena to a Comparative Description of Non-Massoretic Hebrew Dialects and Traditions" sketches the history of non-Masoretic Hebrew studies and defends the grammatical terminology and the method of his Materials for a Non-Masoretic Hebrew Grammar. In "Aramaic Studies and the

Language of Jesus," Matthew Black surveys the recent controversies regarding Palestinian and Babylonian Targums and Qumran materials specifically as they bear on the character of Aramaic dialects and the oral use of Hebrew in Palestine during the first century of our era.

Kahle's broad interests are reflected in his students' treatment of Arabic topics, Islamic as well as Jewish. Aziz S. Atiya surveys the history and extent of the 1950 microfilming of "The Arabic and Turkish Scrolls of Mount Sinai," with brief indications of their importance for various areas of Islamic studies. Franz Altheim and Ruth Stiehl deal with problematic citations from Aḥiqar and classical authors in "Maṣḥafa falāsfā ṭabībān," an Arabic translation of an Ethiopic edition of a Persian florilegium. D. M. Dunlop studies the historical circumstances and scriptural quotations of "A Letter of [the Islamic apologete] Hārūn ar-Rashīd to the Emperor Constantine VI." F. Pérez Castro and M. J. Azcárraga ("The Edition of the Kitāb al Khilaf of Mišael Ben ʿUzziel") voice serious reservations about the Lipschütz edition and give ten pages of corrections and additions. G. Vajda ("Du prologue de Qirsānī à son commentaire sur la Genèse") translates from the introduction to this great Karaite's Genesis commentary.

Other articles treat historical problems raised largely by archaeological and documentary discoveries. A. von Rohr Sauer in "The Cultic Role of the Pig in Ancient Times" surveys the old and new evidence, but arrives at no new conclusions. G. Levi della Vida in "The Shiloah Inscription Reconsidered" proposes that the inscription is a pericope from an annalistic source. V. Henning ("Ein persischer Titel im Altaramäischen") concludes that hpthpt' in a fifth century B.C. Egyptian document is a Persian title meaning "master of a seventh (of a province)." In "Neue Belege für das phönizische Hermes-Emblem" O. Eissfeldt finds recent excavation reports which produce more of the Phoenician Hermes symbols, i.e., six- and eight-pointed stars from Roman times, which Eissfeldt thinks facilitated the adoption of the Christ monogram. Studying "The Decalogue and the Minim" G. Vermes judges that the antagonists were Hellenistic Jews rather than Judeo-Christians when the decalogue was dropped from the daily liturgy "because of the claim of the Minim" (that it alone was binding). A. von Scheiber edits one Cambridge Geniza text of a proselyte's prayerbook, and describes another: "Von den Gebetbüchern der Proselyten." According to G. Fohrer in "Die israelitischen Propheten in der samaritanischen Chronik II," the negative attitude of the Chronicle toward the prophets can be understood only in the light of Samaritan religious thought,

which recognizes only Moses as a prophet. John Bowman ("Temple and Festivals in the Persian Diatessaron") maintains that elements proper to this Persian Church document (which is not necessarily even connected with Tatian's work) indicate that it caters to "the needs of its own people in the very difficult period at the end of the 13th century."