

PRINTED FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION

The Society for Old Testament Study

(Founded 1917)

BULLETIN FOR 2003

President: Professor Robert Gordon

WINTER MEETING

The seventy-eighth Winter Meeting of the Society was held from Monday 6th to Wednesday 8th January 2003 at Manor House, University of Birmingham, with the theme 'The Hebrew Bible against its Ancient Near Eastern Background'.

The retiring President, Professor John Bartlett (Dublin), installed as President for 2003 Professor Robert Gordon (Cambridge), who delivered his Presidential Address on the subject "'Comparativism" and the God of Israel': The steady accession of comparative Near Eastern material has almost inevitably fostered a perception of resemblance, rather than of difference, between Israel's God and the gods of the ancient Near East. This tendency towards convergence is evident in a number of areas, four of which were highlighted: divine action in history, prophecy, the national covenant, and aniconism. On the other hand, expressions of what may be termed 'reverse comparativism' have also been forthcoming in recent writing. According to this approach, the Old Testament is seen as impoverished and constricted by Deuteronomic and similarly motivated manipulation of Israel's religious and literary traditions. Monotheism itself is regarded as having robbed the tradition of the variegation and richness of polytheistic religion as it actually existed in (principally) pre-exilic Israel — a form of Israelite religion to which the Old Testament itself is the primary witness. In response, the paper examined 'ways in which even the heavy hand of Deuteronomism or monotheism has worked positively, imaginatively and insightfully with Israel's traditions'. Four features of the Old Testament were cited in illustration: the Old Testament's ready attribution of characteristics (forms, functions, epithets) of ancient Near Eastern gods to the God of Israel ('The Coat of Many Colours'), the development of the Israelite narrative tradition ('God and the Narrative Tradition'), the anthropomorphic depiction of God ('The Anthropomorphized God'), and the integration of the ancient Near Eastern 'council of the gods' into a range of Old Testament texts ('The Conciliar God'). In conclusion, it was maintained

that ‘there is no reason why the making of cultural comparisons [between Israel and its neighbours] should be abandoned’, and that it is legitimate, and even desirable, to attempt to highlight and discuss elements of cultural uniqueness in the biblical text.

The following papers were delivered:

Dr Janet Tollington (Cambridge), ‘Abraham and his Wives: Culture and Status’: The narratives in Genesis 11:26–25:11 include stories about Abraham’s relationships with three wives, Sarai/Sarah, Hagar and Keturah and the sons born as a result of these unions. This paper explored the origins of each wife and the terminology used to describe her status and relationship to Abraham; and in respect of Sarah and Hagar their relationship to each other. The discussion incorporated a consideration of cultural attitudes towards marriage, adultery, and what in today’s world might be called surrogate motherhood with respect to the birth of Ishmael. A theological approach was adopted towards the question of status, and issues of authority, dominance, mutuality and self-interest were considered alongside a discussion of the ways in which the narrator presented each character. This revealed significant differences in terms of the level of interaction between Abraham and each of his wives, a literary device also used by the narrator to portray each character’s attitude towards God. Both Sarah and Hagar are depicted as more aware of God’s presence and ongoing involvement in the fulfilment of the divine promises than Abraham. Each marriage relationship showed Abraham’s primary concern to be that of self-interest with an ambivalent attitude towards the well-being of his wives. However, whilst Abraham was presented in the narratives, when interacting with wider society, as the important person in each partnership, in the relationships themselves he appears less authoritative and rarely in control of events. Certainly Sarah is portrayed directing her husband’s actions as often as she allows him to direct her. The paper argued that all three marriages have importance theologically for Israel’s self-understanding as the elect nation living in relationship with kindred peoples; and that in the Abraham/Sarah marriage Abraham represents the leaders of Israel who put the nation, represented by Sarah, at risk. Perhaps these narratives are not as patriarchal as is generally presumed, for close attention to the women’s stories reveals a distinctive theological voice at work challenging received tradition.

Dr Anselm Hagedorn (Berlin), “‘Who Would Invite a Stranger from Abroad?’: The Presence of Greeks in Palestine in Old Testament Times’: The paper surveyed the textual and archaeological evidence for a possible presence of Greeks in Syro-Palestine before the conquest of Alexander the Great. Starting from Homer, *Odyssey* 17.382–385, where migrant craftsmen from the East are mentioned, the possibility was explored of the existence of ‘travelling specialists’ from the Greek mainland and the Aegean islands in Palestine. Herodotus, the

only Greek author who explicitly calls Palestine 'Palestine', stresses that there has been contact between Greece and especially Phoenicia from a very early stage onwards. Strikingly, the only Greek active in Palestine whom we know by name is the brother of the poet Alcaeus who served as a mercenary in the army of Nebuchadnezzar II and was probably involved in the siege of Ashkalon. Generally speaking, these so-called mercenaries (or probably better: 'soldiers of fortune') are about the only Greeks for which one can establish a secure presence. Next to the *Kittim* mentioned in the Arad ostraca, the Judean fortress of Mezad Hashavyahu deserves attention. Here, an archaeological site that cannot be identified from the biblical text, Greek soldiers lived next to Judean military personnel. This mercenary presence certainly does not allow us to subscribe to W.F. Albright's thesis of a coast 'dotted with' Greek settlements, because there is no evidence of a specific Greek way of life at the sites where pottery has been found. Since pottery is often used to argue for Greek presence, it was necessary to survey this evidence. If we are correct to assume that the preferred mode of existence of Greeks in Palestine has been the *enoikismos*, it is hardly surprising that we do not find any architecture of a specific Greek style, since this mode of 'colonial' existence is generally expressed by making use of the exterior structure (houses etc.) of the native population but using interior furnishings (pottery etc.) which reflect the place of origin of the settlers. This would explain why the existence of Aegean Greece and its inhabitants is known in biblical sources but concrete points of contact are missing. If the Greeks living in Palestine were not part of any elite group, it is hardly surprising that the written evidence is sparse (and always next to Semitic inscriptions) and that the elite circles mostly responsible for the authorship of the biblical documents hardly mention contact with them. True, 'in the ancient Near Eastern universe Israel and Judah are something of a backwater' and both states probably never had any direct political dealing with Aegean Greeks, but on the non-elite level we can confidently argue for contact and exchange as well as some permanent Greek presence in Palestine before Alexander the Great.

Mr Mervyn Richardson (Woubrugge), 'Characteristic Features of Peripherally Biblical Traditional Literature': Traditions associated with Coptic sacred sites show that only some have been preserved in textual form. Such texts as Papyrus Westcar, which contains fantastic stories of the historically verifiable Old Kingdom pharaohs, also seems to rely on oral tradition. Why that text has not usually been included in anthologies of Near Eastern literature illustrating the Old Testament is not clear, for there are abundant parallels. The story of Sinuhe is regularly quoted, though little is made of the duplicate texts on ostraca written in the school at Deir el-Medineh. These show that there were attempts to set *Sinuhe* within the context of a later world and to resolve grammatical cruces, aims which figure prominently

within biblical exegesis. Similarly, the duplicate of the Merenptah stele confirms that it was composed as a religious hymn rather than a historical annal, and this, together with circumstances surrounding its first discovery, means that it needs to be reassessed in terms of its historical value for the emergence of Israel. An insight into the ancient Egyptian view of ancient Palestine can be gleaned from the letter of Hori in Papyrus Anastasi. Allen in *The Context of Scripture* provides more details about an Egyptian's awareness of the language of his neighbours than that given by Wilson in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*. There are several Hittite and Akkadian texts which also show the range of change a literary narrative undergoes when evolving into traditional literature. Such examples may well provide the context in which the scriptural narrative as we know it evolved.

Dr Stephanie Dalley (Oxford), 'Athaliah the Queen of Sargon II and Assyrian Relations with Judah': Evidence from two Assyrian letters and an administrative text from Nimrud, and from two sculptures from Sennacherib's palace at Nineveh, contain evidence that Judah in c. 716/715 BCE and thereafter was a vassal of Assyria supplying tribute and troops. Details on the Lachish relief indicate that Sennacherib largely blamed the Nubians for Hezekiah's disloyalty in 701. The Assyrian-style stamp seal of a high official of Uzziah suggests a long-term close relationship between Judah and Assyria. Assyrian interest in Palestine focussed largely on trade with Egypt. On the border of Egypt both Tiglath-pileser III and Sargon used Arab agents to organise their trading posts. Since those kings marched past Judah on several occasions, the biblical account of how Hezekiah 'harrassed' the Philistine cities may imply that Judean kings acted as agents for Assyria. This would explain why Padi of Ekron was delivered to Hezekiah, why Sennacherib called Hezekiah 'strong and mighty', and why Jerusalem was wealthy and important. Deportation figures for 701 may be high because they include Philistines with Judeans. In addition, the tomb found recently at Nimrud containing the sarcophagus of Yaba wife of Tiglath-pileser III and Athaliah wife of Sargon II with inscribed grave-goods may be significant, since Athaliah is almost certainly a Hebrew name, and Yaba, presumably related to her, is likely to be Hebrew also. If so, Hebrew spoken by Sargon's wife would account for why the *rab shakeh* could speak Hebrew to the people of Jerusalem. Diplomatic marriages with foreign royalty were common at that period, and help to allow a more nuanced approach to Assyrian policy. Mistranslation and unwarranted assumptions have led to wrong interpretation of Sennacherib's intentions in 701; corrections suggest that he did not attempt to capture Jerusalem.

Professor Kevin Cathcart (Dublin), 'From Akkadian to Ugaritic: Comparative Semitic Philology and the Text of the Hebrew Bible': One of the events in the 1960s which many Old Testament scholars remember well was the publication of James Barr's *Comparative*

Philology and the Text of the Old Testament. No less interesting were some of the lively reviews of that book. This paper briefly examined Barr's definition of comparative philology, his distinction between the two types of treatment: the textual and the philological. It is not an uncommon situation to work with a combination of the textual and comparative approaches. Excesses in philological treatments should not deter scholars from engaging in the comparative philological approach, nor should the wholesale reckless emendation of the biblical text associated with a previous era be used to block sensible and convincing solutions based on emendation. In the second part of the paper, worked examples were presented which took into account recent research and epigraphical discoveries. They involved the use of comparative data from Akkadian, Ugaritic and Old Aramaic. For example, modern English translations of the Old Testament must acknowledge (as does the REB) that at Ezekiel 16:30, אַמְלָה לְבַתְּךָ means 'How angry I am with you', not 'How sick is your heart' (NRSV) (see Akkadian *libbati malû*, 'to become angry with'). Other texts chosen for discussion were Numbers 23:9; Job 30:3, 17; Nahum 2:14; 3:17; and Habakkuk 2:3.

Dr Peter Williams (Cambridge), 'Are the Biblical Rephaim and the Ugaritic *RPUM* Healers?': The biblical Rephaim and Ugaritic *RPUM* are generally connected with the root רָפָא 'heal'. It is usually suggested that the Ugaritic form is a participle and that the Masoretic vocalization רָפְאִים represents a tendentious correction from an original participle, רָפְאִים. MT's non-participial vocalization is supported by the Septuagint and probably Samaritan Pentateuch, and, contrary to the claim of R. Liwak, the participial vocalization is not demanded by the Neo-Punic inscription from El-Amruni. Consideration of the difficulty involved in the systematic tendentious alteration of the vocalization of a common Hebrew term suggests that the theory of revocalization should be set aside as implausible. Since it is unlikely that Ugaritic and Hebrew had the same vowel pattern for the term, the argument that the Hebrew term has not been revocalized brings into question the consensus vocalization of the Ugaritic *RPUM* as a participle. The lack of support for the participial vocalization of the Ugaritic word, combined with the observation that as yet no Hebrew, Phoenician or Ugaritic text mentioning these figures need imply that they have healing powers, suggests that scholarly association of the Rephaim or *RPUM* with healing is not warranted.

A paper on Tamar in Genesis 38 was delivered by Dr Sarah Nicholson (Glasgow).

At the Business Meeting of the Society, on the final morning of the Winter Meeting, the Treasurer presented the Society's accounts for the year ended 31st October 2002 (as printed in the centre pages of this Bulletin). They were approved by the Meeting.

SUMMER MEETING (SOTS/OTW JOINT MEETING)

The seventy-ninth Summer Meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study, being also the twelfth Joint Meeting of the Society and the Dutch–Flemish Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap, was held from Monday 21st to Wednesday 23rd July 2003 at St Catharine’s College, Cambridge (with the papers being presented at the Mill Lane lecture building), under the joint presidency of Professor Robert Gordon and Professor Arie van der Kooij. The meeting continued the theme of the Society’s Winter Meeting, ‘The Hebrew Bible against its Ancient Near Eastern Background’.

The following papers were delivered:

Professor Kenneth Kitchen (Liverpool), ‘The Hieroglyphic Inscriptions of the Neo-Hittite States (c. 1200-700 BC): A Fresh Source of Background to the Hebrew Bible’: Indigenous written sources from the North Levant in the 1st millennium BC are very limited in scope and quantity as compared with Mesopotamia and Egypt. Most familiar is the modest collection of West-Semitic texts (mainly Old Aramaic and Phoenician). A larger group of inscriptions from Syria and south-east Anatolia is the so-called ‘Hittite Hieroglyphic’ inscriptions (strictly, hieroglyphic Luvian) left to us by the kings and ruling elites of the Neo-Hittite states such as Carchemish, Malatya, Gurgum, Hamath, Que, and Tabal (among others), close neighbours of Aram and Phoenicia. Full decipherment of these texts followed from the discovery in 1946 of the bilingual inscriptions (‘Hittite Hieroglyphic’ and Phoenician) at Karatepe, and intensively worked out in recent decades, culminating (to date) in the recent publication of a full and accurate *Corpus* of these texts by J.D. Hawkins (plus H. Cambel for Karatepe), with translations and commentary. The language is Indo-European, deriving from the cuneiform Luvian of the Hittite Empire of the later 2nd millennium, and precursor to the Lycian of classical times. Their potential input for Old Testament studies is varied. Politically, there was a brief age of ‘mini-empires’ within c. 1190-950 BC, headed by Carchemish and Tabal, with which those of Aram-Zobah/Damascus and the Hebrew United Monarchy have affinities. We can now ‘personalize’ the ‘kings of the Hittites’ of 2 Kings 7:6. In the social/religious sphere, these texts illustrate the roles of royalty in the areas of cult and rituals, and of deity in royal activities in war and peace; with one ‘Hittite Hieroglyphic’ text, we may end (as was said of Jezebel) by ‘going to the dogs’!

Dr Jan Wagenaar (Utrecht), ‘The Priestly Festival Calendar in its Ancient Near Eastern Context’: The festival calendar recorded in Leviticus 23 and Numbers 28–29 seems to combine the features of two mutually exclusive festival calendars. On the one hand they share the tripartite lay-out of the pre-exilic festival calendar preserved in

Exodus 23:14-19; 34:18-26; Deuteronomy 16:1-17, while on the other they agree with the biannual scheme adopted in Ezekiel 45:18-25 and the priestly festival calendar (Exodus 12:1-13; Leviticus 23:5-8, 23-27, 33-37). The data suggest that the celebration of three harvest festivals a year in agreement with the course of the agricultural year may in the late exilic or early post-exilic period have been abandoned in favour of the custom of observing two major festivals a year after the example of the vernal and autumnal new year festivals of the Babylonian festival calendar. The present text of the festival calendar recorded in Leviticus 23 and Numbers 28-29 may be explained as a late post-exilic scribal compromise between the pre-priestly and priestly festival calendars.

Dr Jan-Wim Wesselijs (Kampen), 'Language Play in the Old Testament and in Ancient North-West Semitic Inscriptions': It is well known that we find an entire array of instruments of what we could call language play in the Old Testament: ambiguity, double entendre, and intra-textual repetition being only a few of them. Numerous scholars have pointed out that there are parallels to this in Mesopotamian, Egyptian, Hittite and Ugaritic texts. It has, however, been noticed only to a limited degree that certain North-West Semitic (especially Phoenician and Aramaic) inscriptions also contain some of these elements. This remarkable agreement serves to further the interpretation of some of these inscriptions, of which the Phoenician Kilamuwa inscription and the Old Aramaic Tel Dan inscription were discussed in some detail in this paper, and of the literary traditions of the Old Testament in their ancient North-West Semitic context.

Dr Nathan MacDonald (St Andrews), 'Whose Monotheism? What Rationality?': The axis 'monotheism'-'polytheism' is frequently used to locate religious expressions from ancient Israel and her Near Eastern neighbours. Though pervasive in biblical scholarship, the use of this axis is not self-evident and depends on a particular construal of the nature of God, the world and religious belief. It is well known that 'polytheism' does not belong to any religious self-description. But what of 'monotheism'? Whose monotheism is it, and what kind of rationality does it presuppose? And what difference might it make to our understanding of Old Testament articulations of Yahweh's oneness?

Dr Marjo Korpel (Utrecht), 'Disillusion among Jews in the Persian Empire': For many Jewish exiles in the Neo-Babylonian empire, disillusion with their own religion was so deep that neither the high hopes of Second Isaiah nor the Edict of Cyrus allowing them to return to their homeland and start rebuilding the temple was sufficient incitement to repatriate. Often they allowed themselves to be integrated into the culture of the country they lived in. Throughout the Persian empire the mixture of religions that resulted from the liberal religious policy of the new masters resulted in a slackening *[continued on page10]*

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT for the year ended 31st October 2002

	<i>Bursaries</i>	<i>Book</i>	<i>Confer-</i>	<i>General</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>2001</i>
	<i>£</i>	<i>List</i>	<i>ences</i>	<i>Fund</i>	<i>£</i>	<i>£</i>
Income						
Subscriptions and donations	–	–	–	8141	8141	8208
Income tax recovered in respect of deeds of covenant	–	–	–	737	737	725
Conference income	–	–	21757	–	21757	18394
Bursaries	–	–	–	–	–	–
Dividends and interest received and receivable	–	–	–	850	850	1207
Total income	–	–	21757	9728	31485	28534
Expenditure						
Printing and stationery	–	31	2318	112	2461	2868
Postage and secretarial expenses	–	2082	10	912	3004	3571
Conference expenses	–	–	22085	–	22085	16129
Accountancy	–	–	–	263	263	214
Bursaries	490	–	–	–	490	45
Bank charges	–	–	–	390	390	12
Total expenditure	490	2113	24413	1677	28693	22839
Net surplus/(deficit)	(490)	(2113)	(2656)	8051	2792	5695

NOTES TO THE ACCOUNTS for the year ended 31st October 2002

1. Fixed assets

	<i>Computer Equipment</i>
Costs at 1st November 2001 and at 31st October 2002	864
Depreciation at 1st November 2001 and at 31st October 2002	863
Net book amount at 1st November 2001 and at 31st October 2002	1

2. Bank accounts

	<i>2002</i>	<i>2001</i>
Barclays Bank plc: Current Account	1720	1175
Higher Interest Business Account	15027	23604
National Savings Bank Investment Account	17812	9426
	34559	34205

3. Investment at cost

546.44 units, Friends Provident Stewardship Unit Trust (Market Value £2890 at 5th December 2001)	–	1000
549.6863 units, Friends Provident Stewardship Growth Fund Retail Shares (Market Value £2153.12 at 31st October 2002)	1020	–

4. Accumulated surpluses and reserves

	<i>General</i>	<i>Bursary</i>	<i>Total</i>
	<i>Fund</i>	<i>Fund</i>	
At 1st November 2001	33635	1601	35236
Surplus/(deficit) for the year	3282	(490)	2792
Transfers	(300)	300	–
At 31st October 2002	36617	1411	38028

BALANCE SHEET at 31st October 2002

	2002 £	2001 £
Assets		
Fixed assets (note 1)	1	1
Debtors	2698	305
Bank accounts (note 2)	34559	34205
Investments at cost (note 3)	1020	1000
	<u>38278</u>	<u>35511</u>
Liabilities		
Sundry creditors and reserves	250	275
	<u>38028</u>	<u>35236</u>
Represented by		
Accumulated surpluses and reserves (note 4)		
General fund	36617	33635
Bursary fund	1411	1601
	<u>38028</u>	<u>35236</u>

PRINCIPAL ACCOUNTING POLICIES for the year ended 31st October 2002

The accounts have been prepared under the historical cost convention.

The principal accounting policies of the Society are substantially unchanged from the previous year and are set out below.

Subscriptions and donations received: these represent amounts received during the year and no account is taken of any subscriptions due but unpaid at the date of the balance sheet.

Income tax recoverable: no account is taken of any income tax recoverable but not yet received in respect of subscriptions under Gift Aid or Covenant or investment income received during the year.

Stocks: no account is taken of unused stocks of book lists or general stationery.

Depreciation: depreciation is calculated on a straight line basis and aims to write down the cost of fixed assets over their expected normal lives; the rate applicable is 20% per annum.

Investments: investments are included in the accounts at historic cost and no account is taken of unrealised investment gains and losses; following reorganisation by the Investment House of their funds, the Society's holding has been transferred into Friends Provident Stewardship Growth Fund Retail Shares and any distributions due are being reinvested in the fund.

Accumulated surpluses and reserves: the recognition of separately designated funds is primarily for the purpose of administration and control, and any accumulated surpluses shown are part of the general reserves of the Society and, as such, are unrestricted in application.

ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT TO THE MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY FOR OLD TESTAMENT STUDY

We have prepared the accounts and notes for the year ended 31st October 2002 without audit. We confirm that the accounts are in agreement with the books and information supplied to us.

TUNSTALL & BLACKBURN, Accountants
Kiln Hill, Market Place, Hawes, North Yorkshire

[continued from page 7] observance of traditional religious duties. Some Jews adopted religious practices from other peoples they lived in contact with, intermarriage with non-Israelites became quite normal, and some of them abandoned religion altogether, trying to organise their lives autonomously.

Ms Ora Lipschitz (Jerusalem), 'Camels, Philistines and Writing': It was noted that the Bactrian and the Dromedary were domesticated in different regions at different times. The issue as far as the Old Testament is concerned is the domestication of the Dromedary which, William Albright rightly claimed, could not be prior to the 12th century BCE. Camels are absent from early records, e.g. at Mari and Ugarit, and there is not even a word for 'camel' in Egypt. Various representations of camels from earlier periods were discussed. 25 of the 54 references to camels in the Old Testament occur in Genesis, most of them in ch. 24 (18 times). Some references locate camels in their correct Arabian cultural context (Ishmaelites/Midianites); in other cases camels have been added routinely to already existing lists of animals. Genesis 24 is to be regarded as a late *exemplum* (at least post-Deuteronomic) in which the proper treatment of camels is a key element. It was noted that the Philistines never appear in the many lists of the pre-Israelite inhabitants of the land. These lists consist of six peoples in two fixed groups, each containing three elements (only the later Deuteronomist adding the Gergashites). Since this recurrent 3 + 3 form probably indicates fixed oral tradition, the absence of the Philistines from these lists may reflect awareness of their late arrival in the region. Finally, although the Pentateuch is free in its association of writing with Moses, it does not associate this skill with the patriarchs. The explanation may be that there was a clear conception of what could be attributed to whom, and writing was not thought appropriate for the patriarchs. The discussion concluded with reflections on the occasional value of the 'argument from silence' as potential evidence of accurate historical reminiscence, and sometimes as good as (other) facts and artefacts which tend to be regarded by some as evidentially more reliable.

Professor Peter Machinist (Harvard), 'The Old Testament in Comparative Perspective: The Case of Julius Wellhausen and Assyriology': As great a biblical scholar as Julius Wellhausen was, it has often been stated that he had a major weakness, namely his failure to apply to the understanding of the Old Testament the burgeoning evidence of the broader ancient Near Eastern world that was fast becoming available during his lifetime. Indeed, the charge has been made that he cared little or nothing for this evidence and remained largely ignorant of it, because for him the only real analogy to biblical Israel was the culture of the pre-Islamic Arabs. The paper revisited this view of Wellhausen by focusing on his relationship to one of the then developing ancient Near Eastern fields, Assyriology. His relationship,

it was argued, was in fact a complex one, and if he failed to utilize Assyriology fully in his Old Testament work, it was not out of ignorance or disdain. The explanation appears to lie, rather, in a combination of Wellhausen's personal circumstances and his sense of what the priorities should be for a field like Old Testament. Wellhausen's views here take us straight into the larger arena of philology and how it was conceived in the nineteenth century, even as they remain a provocative challenge to contemporary studies of the Old Testament and the larger ancient Near East.

Dr Meindert Dijkstra (Utrecht), 'Annals and Chronicles in the Bible and the Ancient Near East': In his seminal studies on the historical traditions of ancient Mesopotamia and Anatolia, Hans Güterbock formulated the basic distinction between 'historical documents' in which royalty prescribed how to be remembered by posterity (in general: annals) and literature (usually called: chronicles) in which posterity selected and wrote what it wanted to be remembered from the past. The latter form was the beginning of real ancient Near Eastern historiography. This distinction has often been neglected in comparative studies. From this perspective the paper discussed some of the problems of ancient Israelite historiography in the context of ancient Near Eastern historiography.

Dr Philip Johnston (Oxford), 'Death in Egypt and Israel: A Theological Reflection': The Egyptians invested more in preparation for death than any other human group. Their positive view of the afterlife and its gradual extension from pharaohs to officials to commoners is well documented in primary sources and secondary literature. But the ideal of respect for the dead was widely flouted in practice, with early abandonment of funerary offerings, later reuse of mortuary material, and endemic robbery of tomb contents. Negative views always co-existed, in the early period regarding the non-elite, and from the New Kingdom onwards in various *carpe diem* expressions. By contrast, Israel invested relatively little in death and had a largely negative attitude towards it. The underworld was an unwelcome fate, but is only an infrequent theme in the canonical text. Contact with and veneration of the dead occurred and were condemned, but they were not major concerns of the biblical writers. Positive views only developed later, mainly from within Yahwism and without noticeable assimilation of Egyptian concepts. So in contrast to Egypt, Israel's approach to death was cheaper, more egalitarian, less socially conservative and less delusionary. Where Egyptians sought divinisation in death, Israelites were to seek God in life.

Dr Pierre Van Hecke (Tilburg), 'Pastoral Metaphors in the Hebrew Bible and in its Ancient Near Eastern Context': The metaphor of God as shepherd has received quite some attention in scholarly literature (e.g. De Robert 1968, Willmes 1984, Hunziker 2001). All these treatments have concentrated, however, on the biblical texts in

which the shepherd image is affirmed and elaborated, leaving out of consideration the texts in which the metaphor is either questioned, rejected or reversed (e.g. Jeremiah 49:19-20; 50:44-45; Hosea 4:16; 13:4-9; Amos 3:12; Lamentations 3:1-6). This paper argued that the inclusion of the latter texts is necessary for a correct understanding of the use and development of pastoral metaphors in the Hebrew Bible. It was shown that biblical authors treated their religious images and traditions in a dynamic and sometimes iconoclastic way. Like many other religious metaphors, the metaphor of God as shepherd was not limited to the Hebrew Bible, however; its use in different ancient Near Eastern cultures is well attested and has received extensive scholarly discussion (Müller 1961, Seibert 1969, De Moor 1982, Bosetti 1984). The paper addressed the question to what extent the dynamic and, at times, iconoclastic way in which the biblical authors treated their metaphors has parallels in the literature of these surrounding cultures. Finally, the question of a possible (negative or positive) influence of the ancient Near Eastern pastoral images on the biblical metaphor was dealt with.

The papers will be published in the series *Oudtestamentische Studiën*.

A reception was given on the first evening of the Meeting by the Faculties of Divinity and Oriental Studies at the University of Cambridge.

The Joint Meeting was held in coordination with the Society of Biblical Literature International Meeting taking place at the University of Cambridge from Sunday 20th to Friday 25th July. SOTS and OTW members were welcome to attend SBL sessions, and SBL members were welcome to attend SOTS/OTW sessions. On the evening of 22nd July a joint reception and buffet dinner was hosted by SBL, and Professor Machinist's paper was read to a plenary session of all three societies.

The following papers were presented by SOTS members at sessions of the SBL International Meeting: Dr James Aitken (Reading), 'A Database of Septuagint Greek'; Professor John Barton (Oxford), 'The Fall and Human Depravity'; Professor Lyn Bechtel (Drew), 'The Metaphor, the "Canaanites" and "Baal", from a Feminist Perspective'; Dr Thomas Brodie (Limerick), 'A Verifiable Alternative to Q: Matthew's Deuteronomy-Based Logia, and Septuagint-Based Proto-Luke'; Professor George Brooke (Manchester), 'Justified Deviance: The Place of Scripture in Qumran Self-Understanding'; Dr James Davila (St Andrews), '(How) Can We Tell If a Greek Apocryphon or Pseudepigraphon Has Been Translated from Hebrew or Aramaic?'; Dr John Day (Oxford), 'Why Does God "Establish" Rather Than "Cut" Covenants in the Priestly Source?'; Dr Kristin De Troyer (Claremont), 'The Hebrew Text of Joshua as a Contemporary Rereading of the Old Greek?' and 'Following Orders Given by an Old Joshua'; Dr Crispin

Fletcher-Louis (Nottingham), 'Aaron as God's Image and Idol (Exodus 25-31)'; Dr Knut Heim (London), 'A Closer Look at the Pig in Proverbs'; Professor Richard Hess (Denver), 'Arrowheads and the Onomastic Profile of the Southern Levant in the Early Iron Age'; Dr Geoffrey Khan (Cambridge), 'The Karaite Grammarians and the Masoretic Tradition'; Professor Kenneth Kuntz (Iowa City), 'Hendiadys as an Agent of Rhetorical Enrichment in the Poetry of the Hebrew Prophets'; Ms Helen Leneman (Amsterdam), 'Who Counts in the Book of Ruth and Its Musical Settings?'; Professor Abraham Malamat (Jerusalem), 'The New Old Babylonian Texts from Tuttul and the Bible'; Professor Heather McKay (Edge Hill), 'Electronic Mentoring of Students: Practice and Process'; Dr Alison Salvesen (Oxford), 'The User Versus the Lexicographer: Practical and Scientific Issues in Creating Entries'; Professor Christopher Seitz (St Andrews), 'Isaiah's Royal Texts and Interpretation'; Dr Simcha Shalom Brooks (London), 'The Hebrew/Apiru and "Ibrim" and the Connection with 1 Samuel'; Dr Peter Williams (Cambridge), 'On Matching Syriac Words with their Greek "Vorlage"' and 'Pseudo-Agreements between Codex Bezae, the Old Latin and Early Syriac Translations of the Gospels'; and Revd Glenn Wooden (Acadia), 'Inspired Interpretation in Daniel 7-12'. Professors John Barton (Oxford) and Bernard Jackson (Manchester) were panelists in a discussion of John Van Seters' *A Law Book for the Diaspora*.

MEMBERSHIP NEWS

Among honours received by members of the Society: Professor Bertil Albrektson has been elected President of the Royal Society of Sciences in Uppsala, and has been awarded the British Academy's Burkitt Medal for Biblical Studies of 2003. Mrs Margaret Barker has been appointed as biblical scholar to the Ecumenical Patriarch's Committee for Religion, Science and the Environment. Professor Athalya Brenner has been awarded an honorary doctorate by the Catholic Faculty of Theology at the University of Bonn (the first woman to be so honoured by that faculty). Professor Graham Davies has been elected a Fellow of the British Academy. Dr John Day has been awarded a D.D. by the University of Oxford. Professor Otto Kaiser has been awarded an honorary doctorate by the Paris Lodron University, Salzburg. Dr Mary Mills has been appointed Head of Theology at Newman College, Birmingham.

The Society has learned with regret of the deaths of the Venerable R.G.F. Jenkins, Professor George Knight, Dr Gareth Moore, Revd Professor Norman Porteous (President of the Society in 1954), and Rt Revd P.E.S. Thompson.

The following have been elected to membership of the Society:

At the Winter Meeting: Dr David Baker, Professor Lyn Bechtel, Revd Dr Keith Grüneberg, Dr Constantin Jinga, and Ms Helen Leneman. At the Summer Meeting: Dr Gillian Greenberg, Dr Diana Lipton, Dr Pekka Pitkänen, Dr Francesca Stavrakopoulou, and Professor Tryggve Mettinger (Honorary Member).

MISCELLANEOUS NOTICES

The seventy-ninth Winter Meeting of the Society will be held from Monday 5th to Wednesday 7th January 2004 at Manor House, University of Birmingham, under the Presidency of Professor Hugh Williamson. The eightieth Summer Meeting will be held from Monday 19th to Thursday 22nd July 2004 at St Catherine's College, Oxford.

The eighteenth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament will be held from Sunday 1st to Friday 6th August 2004 in Leiden, under the Presidency of Professor Arie van der Kooij. For information, contact the Secretary of the Congress, Dr Konrad Jenner, Faculty of Theology, PO Box 9515, 3200 RA Leiden, The Netherlands (e-mail k.d.jenner@umail.leidenuniv.nl).

The Society has accepted an invitation from the Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap that SOTS join with that society and the Belgian and South African societies for Old Testament study in sharing editorial responsibility for the *Oudtestamentische Studiën* series (published by Brill), to be expressed in the subtitle of the series and by appointing a SOTS member to the Advisory Board (to which office Professor Hugh Williamson was elected at the Summer Meeting).

The *SOTS Book List* is now available electronically as well as in hard copy from the Continuum Publishing Group (formerly Sheffield Academic Press). The Society has also agreed to a proposal from Oxford University Press that the volume *Text in Context: Essays by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study* (edited by A.D.H. Mayes and published by OUP in 2000) be made available electronically to subscribers to the new *Oxford Scholarship Online* database.

The Continuum Publishing Group has indicated that the *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* is available to SOTS members at a 20% discount.

Members are reminded that they may submit to the Committee (via the Home Secretary) the name of any person thought appropriate to be considered for office in the Society or for Honorary Membership of the Society. You may wish to note that the terms of office of the current Treasurer, Foreign Secretary, and Membership Secretary come to an end in 2004, and new incumbents will need to be identified for these offices, in addition to a new President-elect (to be President in 2006) and a new Honorary Member.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES FOR 2004

President: Professor Hugh Williamson, Oriental Institute, Pusey Lane, Oxford OX1 2LE (tel. 01865 278218, e-mail hugh.williamson@orinst.ox.ac.uk).

Retiring President: Professor Robert Gordon, 85 Barrons Way, Comberton, Cambridge CB3 7DR (tel. 01223 335118, e-mail rpg1000@hermes.cam.ac.uk).

President-elect and Foreign Secretary: Professor Graeme Auld, Nether Swanshiel, Hobkirk, Bonchester Bridge, by Hawick TD9 8JW (tel. 01450 860636, e-mail a.g.auld@ed.ac.uk).

Treasurer: Dr Peter Addinall, Myrtle Grove, Carperby, Leyburn, North Yorkshire DL8 4DA (tel. 01969 663311).

Home Secretary: Dr John Jarick, St Stephen's House, 16 Marston Street, Oxford OX4 1JX (tel. 01865 432298, e-mail john.jarick@theology.ox.ac.uk).

Membership Secretary: Professor Heather McKay, Edge Hill College of Higher Education, St Helens Road, Ormskirk L39 4QP (tel. 01695 584293, e-mail mckayh@edgehill.ac.uk).

Hospitality Secretary: Dr Janet Tollington, Westminster College, Cambridge CB3 0AA (tel. 01223 741091, e-mail jet40@cam.ac.uk).

Book List Editor: Professor George Brooke, Department of Religions & Theology, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL (tel. 0161 275 3609, e-mail g.brooke@man.ac.uk).

Information Officer: Dr Philip Jenson, 15 Henleaze Road, Henleaze, Bristol BS9 4EX (tel. 0117 968 2803, e-mail philip.jenson@trinity-bris.ac.uk).

Committee: The above Officers of the Society plus Dr Adrian Curtis, Dr Eryl Davies, Ms Elizabeth Harper, Professor Robert Hayward, Dr Kieran Heskin, Dr Walter Houston, Dr Mary Mills, Dr Deborah Rooke, and Professor Gordon Wenham.

Programme Sub-Committee: The President, the President-elect/Foreign Secretary, and the Home Secretary; plus Dr James Aitken, Dr Jennifer Dines, and Dr Hugh Pyper.

Publications Sub-Committee: The *Book List* Editor (Convener) and the Editor of the monograph series; plus Professor David Clines, Professor Graham Davies, Dr David Reimer, and Professor Hugh Williamson.

Editorial Board of the monograph series: Mrs Margaret Barker (Editor), Mr Edward Ball, Dr Eryl Davies, Dr Katharine Dell, and Dr Paul Joyce.

Honorary Members of the Society: Professors Bertil Albrektson (1983), Athalya Brenner (2002), Walter Brueggemann (1997), Henri Cazelles (1972), Brevard Childs (1979), Frank Moore Cross (1988), Georg Fohrer (1970), Menahem Haran (1981), Sara Japhet (1999), Otto Kaiser (1992), Bernhard Lang (1997), Avraham Malamat (1976), Tryggve Mettinger (2003), Eduard Nielsen (1988), Kirsten Nielsen (2000), Helmer Ringgren (1973), Rudolf Smend (1979), and Jan Alberto Soggin (1992).

PAST PRESIDENTS OF THE SOCIETY

1917-19	Revd Principal W.H. Bennett	1963	Revd Prof. G.W. Anderson
1920	Revd Prof. A.R.S. Kennedy	1964	Revd Prof. B.J. Roberts
1921	Revd Canon R.H. Kennett	1965	Prof. F.F. Bruce
1922	Dr G.B. Gray	1966	Revd Principal G. Henton Davies
1923	Revd Canon G.H. Box	1967	Most Revd Archbishop F.D. Coggan
1924	Prof. A.S. Peake	1968	Very Revd M. Black
1925	Dr S.A. Cook	1969	Revd J.N. Schofield
1926	Revd Prof. W.B. Stevenson	1970	Revd Prof. A.S. Herbert
1927	Revd Canon D.C. Simpson	1971	Prof. E. Ullendorff
1928	Revd Prof. T.H. Robinson	1972	Revd Prof. P.R. Ackroyd
1929	Revd Principal H. Wheeler Robinson	1973	Revd Prof. J. Barr
1930	Dr C.G. Montefiore	1974	Mr D.R. Ap-Thomas
1931	Revd Prof. W.O.E. Oesterley	1975	Baroness E.F. de Ward
1932	Revd Principal W.F. Lofthouse	1976	Revd Canon Prof. D.R. Jones
1933	Revd Principal W.L. Wardle	1977	Prof. R.J. Williams
1934	Revd Prof. A.C. Welch	1978	Revd Prof. W. McKane
1935	Revd Prof. W. Emery Barnes	1979	Revd Prof. J.A. Emerton
1936	Revd Canon J. Battersby Harford	1980	Prof. D.J. Wiseman
1937-38	Mr G.R. Driver	1981	Mr R. Loewe
1939-40	Mr H. Loewe	1982	Revd Prof. R.N. Whybray
1941-45	Revd Principal H. Wheeler Robinson (<i>Acting</i>)	1983	Prof. the Revd Canon J.R. Porter
1946	Revd Prof. T.H. Robinson	1984	Prof. W.G. Lambert
1947	Revd Father C. Lattey, S.J.	1985	Revd Prof. R.E. Clements
1948	Prof. E. Robertson	1986	Revd Prof. B. Lindars, S.S.F.
1949	Revd Prof. C.R. North	1987	Revd Dr R. Murray, S.J.
1950	Revd Prof. H.H. Rowley	1988	Revd Prof. E.W. Nicholson
1951	Prof. S.H. Hooke	1989	Prof. the Revd Canon J.W. Rogerson
1952	Revd Mgr Consultor J.M.T. Barton	1990	Revd Prof. W. Johnstone
1953	Prof. D. Winton Thomas	1991	Revd Dr A. Gelston
1954	Revd Prof. N.W. Porteous	1992	Dr A.D.H. Mayes
1955	Revd Prof. A. Guillaume	1993	Revd R.J. Coggins
1956	Revd Prof. A.R. Johnson	1994	Prof. J.C.L. Gibson
1957	Revd Principal N.H. Snaith	1995	Prof. G.H. Jones
1958	Revd Canon L.E. Elliott-Binns; Revd Prof. C.R. North (<i>Acting</i>)	1996	Prof. D.J.A. Clines
1959	Revd Prof. J. Mauchline	1997	Dr R.A. Mason
1960	Very Revd Dr C.A. Simpson	1998	Mrs M. Barker
1961	Prof. J. Weingreen	1999	Prof. R.P. Carroll
1962	Revd Prof. H.F.D. Sparks	2000	Prof. J. Blenkinsopp
		2001	Prof. M.D. Goulder
		2002	Revd Prof. J.R. Bartlett
		2003	Prof. R.P. Gordon