and the Bible’s only occurrences of ma’ākelet): “The Literary Influence of ‘The Binding of Isaac’ (Genesis 22) on ‘The Outrage at Gibeah’ (Judges 19)”, *HAR* (1980), pp. 161-6. A positive assessment of the concubine is arguably crucial to Unterman’s reading of Judg. xix as a crushing blow against Gibeah and its inhabitants (motivated by a desire to undermine Saul). For how could its narrator hope to provoke outrage by reporting the albeit gruesome death of a “disposable” pawn? The absence of divine intervention does not imply condemnation of the concubine, but rather intensifies the human tragedy, and Isaac’s comparable near-silence on the brink of sacrifice suggests, again, that factors other than race, sex and social status determine the audibility of a textual voice.

The recent proliferation of publications using the Genesis narratives to address social ills and injustices of our time has generated a body of textual interpretation from which both lay-readers and scholars can learn. Balancing the interests of these two groups is no trivial feat, but Hemchand Gossai offers a compelling blend of sensitive close readings and provocative exercises in consciousness-raising. His book deserves to be read.  

[**Diana Lipton**]

*Miscláne de Estudios Árabes y Hebraicos II: Filología hebrea, biblía y Judaismo* 43/2 (1994). Of the seven articles in this issue, none is concerned directly with the O.T. J. Corell shows that a Hebrew inscription in Sagunto thought to be the tombstone of a military leader under King Amaziah is actually that of a 14th-century Jew. M. Jiménez Sánchez analyses the treatment of the biblical root gll in the medieval grammarians. M.A. Bel Bravo describes a Castilian translation of Claude Fleury’s *Mours des Israélites*, published in Barcelona in 1769.  

[**N.R.M. de Lange**]

R.E. Murphy, *Responses to 101 Questions on the Psalms and Other Writings*, xii + 129 pp. Paulist Press, New York and Mahwah, 1994. $8.95. One of a series of question-and-answer-style books on the Bible, this book by Murphy covers the psalms and other writings of the O.T. The style is lively and provides a useful mine of information for those who desire an introduction to this substantial portion of the O.T. and its contents. There are some preliminary questions asked on the definition of “the Writings” and on the different Jewish and Christian canons. The Psalms are looked at in their classified types, as formulated by H. Gunkel. There is also a concern with the spiritual dimension of the psalms and how to use them in one’s prayer life as a Christian. Murphy advocates a proper concern for the O.T. context and yet with an appropriate Christian slant. He treats messianic psalms in particular depth with a Christian audience in view. He discusses the wisdom books at some length, but some of the other writings he treats a little more briefly, with only two questions on Ruth. It is interesting that, at the end of the book, when asked which of the Writings is his favourite, he answers: the wisdom books—this impression was already gained by reading the book. He considers also the Song of Songs, Esther, Lamentations, 1-2 Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah and Daniel and Apocalyptic and so covers a great deal of material in a short space. A wide range of questions are often brought in, for example, the patriarchalism of the Bible and issues of the validity of biblical interpretation through the ages. The questions are intelligent ones ranging from the historical, theological, spiritual and literary to the interpretational and faith-oriented ones. The answers are knowledgeable, but without reference to extensive scholarly debate. The book ends with the raising of the question whether one can find an overall theology for these writings, or indeed for the whole O.T. and with issues of canonicity. The book is easy to follow and well-written—an invaluable guide both intellectually and spiritually for the newcomer to biblical study, and for the churchgoer and the student alike.  

[**Katharine J. Dell**]

survey of scholarship to c. 1988, there are successive chapters providing detailed studies of the Law relating to Festivals (11QT 18.1-23.1), the King (57.2-59.21), Purity (48.1-51.5, treated separately from chs 45-7 which are specifically concerned with Temple and City) and the Temple (4.1-7.15). All in all, therefore, Swanson discusses a little over 14 out of the 66 columns of 11QT, omitting most of the “rewritten Deuteronomy” portions.

The author notes the dependence of the writer on sources additional to the Pentateuch, above all on Chronicles, as well as a close connection with motifs drawn from other Qumran texts (esp. CD). He also acknowledges a particular frequency of “mishnaic” language in 49.11-16.

Specifically with regard to the Temple legislation, Swanson points out the importance of 1 Chron. xxviii while noting the surprising absence of links with Ezek. xl-xlvi. He offers a striking quotation from M. Noth, who in 1943 had precisely postulated what turned out to be the Temple Scroll’s procedure: a (for him) hypothetical reformer wanting to provide legal validation for the Chronicler’s Levitical innovations would effectively have to incorporate them into the traditions about Moses (Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I [Halle, 1943; Tübingen, 1957?], p. 174 = The Chronicler’s History [E. tr. by H.G.M. Williamson, Sheffield 1987], p. 100).

The conclusion highlights four methods of textual manipulation: (i) inserting into the biblical base text a word form from a supplementary text, (ii) introducing supplementary texts by means of a related key word (גַּזְרָה יָעָד, although Swanson does not use this term), (iii) signal anticipation of a text before a fuller citation and (iv) multiple uses of the same base text. Swanson then goes on to compare these methods to other forms of rabbinic and pre-rabbinic midrash, including the New Testament’s use of the Old. The special importance of Chronicles in 11QT is explained in terms of the authors’ “post-exilic Levitical campaign for their place in the Temple system” (p. 239). On the disputed question of 11QT’s relationship to the specifically sectarian scrolls of Qumran, Swanson plausibly suggests that the line of influence went from the Temple Scroll to the sectarian texts, while 11QT itself originated outside the Qumran community. This conclusion goes hand in hand with a suggested origin prior to the Maccabean revolt (a point which, while not implausible, is asserted rather than argued). A comparatively slender bibliography and an index of passages (unfortunately none of authors) complete the book.

This is a solid piece of work which shows Swanson to have acquired a broad competence in the skills of his trade. Its weaknesses are primarily due to the familiar bane of dissertations prepared for publication after the writer has embarked on a busy teaching post in an institution with possibly limited library resources. Style and argument remain largely unrevised, somewhat wooden and dissertation-like (in felicities include “secondly” after “second” on p. 241; cf. pp. ix, 235). More seriously for a fast-paced subject such as this, the delay in publication immediately makes the study feel a little dated: there is no substantive interaction with literature after 1989, except for a few cursory references to M.O. Wise’s 1990 dissertation on the Temple Scroll (though it is not in the bibliography). One indication of this time lag is that the latest English translation here cited is the 1987 third edition of G. Vermes’s The Dead Sea Scrolls in English (no sign of F. Garcia Martinez, or R.H. Eisenman and M.O. Wise). More specifically in relation to the subject at hand, there is also no mention of A. Vivian’s commentary, Rotolo del Tempio (Brescia, 1990), and other significant publications by writers like F. Garcia Martinez, M.O. Wise and B.Z. Wacholder. See also now the critical edition by E. Qimron and F. Garcia Martinez (Beer Sheva and Jerusalem, 1996).

Despite these lacunae, however, Swanson’s work remains a methodologically careful and measured contribution to Scrolls scholarship. While the omission of the “rewritten Deuteronomy” sections of 11QT establish his results on a somewhat slimmer textual basis than might be thought desirable, the conclusions of this study never-