Untersuchung", *ZAW* 10 (1890), p. 226, takes up Hoffmann's suggestion favorably.

⁷ Gen. xxxiii 17; Neh. viii 15; Deut. xvi 13; and Lev. xxiii 42 have no *mater lectionis* to represent the vowel *ō*, whereas other passages have the *plene* spelling: 2 Sam. xxii 12; Neh. viii 14, 16, 17; Lev. xxiii 34, 43; Deut. xvi 16, xxxi10; Zech. xiv 16, 18, 19; Ezra iii 4; 2 Chr. viii 13; 2 Sam. xi 11; 1 Kgs xx 12, 16. Interestingly, with the exception of Gen. xxxiii 17 all the other defective spellings appear in the context of verses where the *plene*: spelling is used.

⁸ Hoffmann (n. 5), p. 226, correctly suggests that the 3 m.s. suffix could refer back to David, but stretches the point when he argues that the 3 f.s. suffix in the phrase "I will build it" relates to "the land". He ignores the fact that the closest example of "land" appears two verses away (ix 9). If the 2 f.s. suffix intended "land" as the antecedent, it would have to bypass three other feminine nouns in the MT (not only "booth" in ix 11, but "sword" and "calamity" in ix 10). Such a syntactical oversight appears highly unlikely.

⁹ Amos ix 11 twice uses "I will raise", and uses the synonyms "I will wall up" and "I will rebuild" to create the second half of the AB/A'B' schema.

¹⁰ Compare, for example, Gen. xxx 43 and 1 Sam. xxv 18, where the feminine singular "sheep" takes a plural adjective. See also GK §132*g* and §145*c*.

¹¹ See, for example, Num. xxvii 17, where the feminine singular noun appears with the plural pronoun.

¹² For a classic example of this opinion, as well as a more detailed summary of the arguments, see Wolff (n. 1), pp. 405-6. For a dissenting opinion, see Rudolph (n. 1), pp. 284-5.

¹³ Isa. i 8 uses this metaphor to refer to Jerusalem.

¹⁴ While one must acknowledge that the context does not provide precise definitions of the extent of territory and people involved in the metaphorical "booth", it must nevertheless be stated clearly that the collective attributes of the MT within the larger context do not allow the supposition of the consonants *skt* as the Transjordanian city as suggested by commentators such as H. Neil Richardson, "SKT (Am 9:11): 'Booth' or 'Succoth'?", *JBL* 92 (1973), pp. 375-81; and Stuart (n. 1), p. 398.

THE INCLUSIO IN LEVITICUS XI

In the Bible two verbs generally are used to refer to God's bringing the Israelites out of Egypt: *hôṣî*, literally "to bring out", and *heʿĕlāh*, literally "to bring up". Of the two the former is the more common. In the Pentateuch this trend is even more evident, and when God speaks in the first person it is still more evident. First-person usages in the Pentateuch appear in Exod. vi 6, vi 7, vii 4, vii 5, xii 17, xvi 32, xx 2, xxix 46; Lev. xi 45, xix 36, xxii 33, xxiii 43, xxv 38, xxv 42, xxv 55, xxvi 13, xxvi 45; Numb. xv 41; Deut. v 6 (these include perfect and imperfect verbs with first-person markers, infinitive construct with the suffix -*î*, and participle preceded by *ʾănî*). All these passages except one use the verb *hôṣî* (in its various forms). The exception is Lev. xi 45 where the rarer

verb *he'ĕlāh* appears,[1] in particular in the phrase *'ănî yhwh hamma-'ăleh 'etkem mē'ereṣ miṣrayim* "I am the Lord who brought you up from the land of Egypt".[2]

Such a ratio of usages prompts the question: why in Lev. xi 45 alone is the verb *he'ĕlāh* used, in the particular form *ma'ăleh*, the masculine singular participle?[3] The answer lies in recognizing the presence of an inclusio in this chapter. This section of the Pentateuch deals with the permitted and forbidden animals. A common word used at the beginning of Lev. xi is the term *ma'ălēh, ma'ălê, ma'ălat*, meaning "to chew the cud" (*vv.* 3, 4 [*bis*], 5, 6).[4] In the light of this, the singular use of *ma'ăleh* in Lev. xi 45 is explained.[5]

The inclusio, "the bracketing device in which a composer returns to a note he has already sounded in order to wrap it in an envelope",[6] is a technique usually associated with Hebrew poetry, especially the book of Psalms.[7] Examples of inclusio in prose texts are rarer, though they do exist. For example, E. F. Campbell noted the efficient use of inclusio in the book of Ruth ([n. 6] p. 14).

The one genre of biblical literature wherein scholars have been slow to recognize the presence of inclusios is the legal material. This is not surprising, of course, since to many minds the law collections of the Pentateuch are written in dry, legalistic language, devoid of literary expression.[8] But the brilliant study of Meir Paran already has demonstrated the errancy of this judgement.[9] Among the many important conclusions reached by Paran is the widespread use of numerous types of inclusios in the portions of the Torah traditionally associated with the priestly source, including the legal and cultic material of Leviticus.[10]

The literary approach to the Bible has made important strides in recent years. There is no reason to exclude the legal portions of the corpus from this enterprise.[11] Instead, scholars should come to recognize the validity of the general observation of S. E. Loewenstamm, who referred to "the distinctive literary character of pentateuchal law", in contrast to the legal material from Mesopotamia.[12] The presence of an inclusio in Lev. xi is just one small example of a rhetorical device in the legal sections of the Torah. When viewed in the light of the substantial amount of material amassed by Paran, it speaks loudly in support of Loewenstamm's claim.[13]

Ithaca, New York   Gary A. Rendsburg

[1] Most commentators on this chapter have failed to notice this unique usage. For an exception, see J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16* (New York, 1991), p. 688, though there is no attempt to explain this single instance of *heʿĕlāh*.

[2] Another possible exception is Exod. iii 17, but these words are in the mouth of Moses.

[3] In the Talmud (B. Baba Meṣiʿa 61b) there is recognition of the unique usage of *maʿăleh* in Lev. xi 45. R. Hanina of Sura on the Euphrates asked: *ʾnʾ hmʿlh qʾ qšyʾ ly mʾy šnʾ hkʾ hmʿlh* "My difficulty is with *hammaʿăleh*. Why the change to *hammaʿăleh* here?" This question arises in a context totally different from the subject of the present article, and there is no attempt to answer it through literary means. But the discussion points to the fact that, not surprisingly, the rabbis (or at least one among them) recognized the singular nature of *maʿăleh* in Lev. xi 45.

Later in the Bible instances of *heʿĕlāh* in the first person occur in Judg. vi 8; 1 Sam. x 18; Amos ii 10, iii 1, ix 7; Mic. vi 4. But as a whole the verb *heʿĕlāh* (in all persons) becomes more common in later books of the Bible in contexts recalling God's bringing the Israelites out of Egypt.

[4] The words *maʿăleh* "chew the cud" and *maʿăleh* "bring up" are essentially the same, of course. Both are H-stem participles derived from the root *ʿlh* "go up", though with different meanings. See F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1907), p. 749; and L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros* (Leiden, 1953), p. 706.

[5] This finding may call into question the conclusion of J. Milgrom, "The Composition of Leviticus, Chapter 11", in G. A. Anderson and S. M. Olyan (ed.), *Priesthood and Cult in Ancient Israel*, (Sheffield, 1991), pp. 182-91, that *vv.* 43-45 are "alien to the chapter" (p. 189) and were added at a late stage in the redactional process.

[6] E. F. Campbell, *Ruth* (Garden City, N.Y., 1975), p. 14.

[7] For examples, see the references in M. Dahood, *Psalms I* (Garden City, N.Y., 1965), p. 327; *Psalms II* (1967), p. 393; and *Psalms III* (1970), p. 483. Note, however, that many of the examples he cited are spurious.

[8] For discussion, see D. Damrosch, "Leviticus", in R. Alter and F. Kermode (ed.), *The Literary Guide to the Bible* (Cambridge, Mass., 1987), pp. 66-77, especially pp. 66-7.

[9] *Darkhe ha-Signon ha-Kohani ba-Torah: Degamim, Shimushe Lashon, Mivnim* (Jerusalem, 1989). For a lengthy review of the book, see V. (A.) Hurowitz, *Hebrew Studies* 32 (1991), pp. 156-62.

[10] Paran (n. 9), pp. 139-237. See also B. S. Jackson, "Practical Wisdom and Literary Artifice in the Covenant Code", in B. S. Jackson and S. M. Passamaneck (ed.), *The Jerusalem 1990 Conference Volume* (Atlanta, 1992), pp. 65-92. I am grateful to Professor Jackson for bringing his study to my attention.

[11] An American jurist who is famous for literary input into his legal writings is Judge Bruce M. Selya of the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit in Boston. See David Margolick, "At the Bar: Sustained by dictionaries, a judge rules that no word, or word play, is inadmissible", *The New York Times* (27 March 1992), p. B16.

[12] "Law", in B. Mazar (ed.), *Judges*, (New Brunswick, N.J., 1971), p. 235. He may have overstated the case a little especially in the light of some recent studies. For an attempt to find literary structure in Mesopotamian law collections, see B. Eichler, "Literary Structure in the Laws of Eshnuna", in F. Rochberg-Halton (ed.), *Language, Literature and History: Philological and Historical Studies Presented to Erica Reiner* (New Haven, Conn., 1987), pp. 71-84. Victor (Avigdor) Hurowitz of Ben Gurion University of the Negev gives me permission to cite his discovery of

a literary structure to the prologue and epilogue of Hammurapi's Code (though these sections of the stela obviously are more literary, and less legal, in nature). But even these insights do not affect the overall accuracy of Loewenstamm's observation. Anyone who has read both Israelite and Mesopotamian legal collections will realize that the former possesses a far greater literary quality than does the latter. For example, the structures uncovered by Eichler (he discussed not only Eshnuna, but also Hammurapi) pale in comparison with the "unified masterpiece of jurisprudential literature" which characterizes the laws of Deuteronomy. For the latter see S. A. Kaufman, "The Structure of Deuteronomic Law", *Maarav* 1 (1978-9), pp. 105-58, in particular p. 147.

[13] Again, one should consult Kaufman (n. 12) for further evidence of sophisticated literary input into the composition of biblical law.

BOOK LIST

Y. GITAY, *Isaiah and his Audience. The Structure and Meaning of Isaiah 1-12.* Studia Semitica Neerlandica 30. x + 285 pp. Van Gorcum, Assen, 1991. 49.50 guilders. Distributed in the U.S.A. by Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake. The first twelve chapters of Isaiah are analysed in thirteen "addresses", each being studied in two main parts: "the first part determines the speech, discusses its rhetorical situation, and throws light on Isaiah's modes of appeal. The second part is more detailed and concentrates more on the issue of style" (p. 7). As those familiar with Gitay's previous work will expect, there are many perceptive comments on the oral and rhetorical features of the text which help to explain how it may have functioned effectively in its original historical setting. Unfortunately, however, this is also the point which will probably lead to the present work being widely dismissed, for Gitay assumes Isaianic authorship throughout (his occasional comments justifying this assumption do not begin to come to terms with the usual view that much later material has also been included), and he furthermore skates over many debated and controversial exegetical issues. Most readers, therefore, will find unconvincing an analysis which expects them to read all this material against the specific background of the Syro-Ephraimite war, and may not have the patience to think through how some of the same analysis could be held to illuminate the final form of the text in its later, literary context.   [H.G.M. WILLIAMSON]

G. GLAßNER, *Vision eines auf Verheißung gegründeten Jerusalem. Textanalytische Studien zu Jesaja 54.* Österreichische Biblische Studien 11. x + 278 pp. Österreichischen Katholisches Bibelwerk, Klosterneuburg, 1991. ÖS 262. This detailed study of a single chapter moves from a (conservative) discussion of textual criticism through a long description of syntax and structure (both micro and macro) to a consideration of the chapter in its wider context in the work of Deutero-Isaiah and beyond (especially Jer. iv 5-31). Against the current of much recent scholarship, Glaßner affirms the unity of the chapter and, indeed, of Isa. xlix-lv as a whole, of which it forms a part. A particularly welcome feature of this book is its insistence that detailed textual and literary analysis should be the servant of exegesis rather than an end in itself. The author is thoroughly at home with, and makes good use of, various recent theoretical approaches, but he succeeds in making them work towards a better understanding of the text (see especially his trenchant remarks on p. 91).   [H.G.M. WILLIAMSON]

R. GNUSE, *Heilsgeschichte as a Model for Biblical Theology: the Debate Concerning the Uniqueness and Significance of Israel's Worldview.* College Theology Society Studies in Religion 4. viii + 179 pp. University Press of America, Lanham, New York and London, 1989. Ch. 1 sets out the purpose of the book, which is an examina-