tables in A. L. Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago, 1964): 335-347. Artaxerxes III Ochus followed Artaxerxes II Memnon as the first Persian king who bore the same throne name as his predecessor.

57. On the royal titulary in Egypt see A. H. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar* (3rd ed.; London: Oxford Univ., 1957): 71-76.

58. Regardless how many Inyotefs and Mentuhoteps there were in the 11th Dynasty, all of the Inyotefs preceded all of the Mentuhoteps. In the 12th Dynasty, Sesostris III followed Sesostris II and Amenemhet IV followed Amenemhet III. In the 18th Dynasty Thutmose I, II and III ruled successively and Amenhotep IV followed Amenhotep III. For tables listing the pharaohs, see A. H. Gardiner; *Egypt of the Pharaohs* (New York: Oxford-Galaxy, 1966): 430-453. To understand the full significance of the successive use of such names, one needs to know the names of the other sons of these kings and such information is still fragmentary.

59. For the Seleucids: Antiochus I Soter—Antiochus II Theos, Seleucus II Callinicus—Seleucus III Soter, Antiochus IV Epiphanes—Antiochus V Eupator and Antiochus VI Dionysus—Antiochus VII Sidetes. Oppenheim (N 56): 341-342. For the Ptolemies: Ptolemy I Soter through Ptolemy XI Auletes, followed by Cleopatra and her husbands.

60. For the texts see the references in n. 27 above. For a discussion of this historical period see W. W. Hallo, "From Qarqar to Carchemish: Assyria and Israel in the Light of New Discoveries," *BA* 23 (1960): 33-61, reprinted in *Biblical Archaeology Reader* 2 (1964): 152-188. Note especially pages 159-162.

MAARAV 1/2 (1978-79): 177-196

ON M. H. POPE'S *SONG OF SONGS* [AB 7c]

JACK M. SASSON
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAPEL HILL, NC 27514

This review is guided by the venerable premise that serious works of scholarship deserve—indeed demand—serious considerations and responses. For better or worse, however, this genre of literature, to which the following exercise belongs, almost always exaggerates criticism at the expense of praise and encouragement. For this reason, I should like to make it clear at the outset that future research into the Song of Songs can scarcely progress without frequent recourse to Marvin Pope's recent contribution.

Within this gargantuan addition to The Anchor Bible, we have one of the finest commentaries on the Canticles ever presented to a modern audience. An amazingly learned mind has gathered evidence far and wide, has unlocked the secrets of words scarcely attested in the Semitic lexicons, has given generous space to the opinions of others, and has often succeeded in perceptively locating the right idiom with which to convey a Hebrew expression.

But, as these creative activities were turned into the finished product that is now under review, no boundaries, either spatial or temporal, seem to have been set to limit the gathering process. As a result, the literatures from the earth's four corners were considered legitimate sources of evidence. In attempts to calibrate the precise meaning of individual words and expressions, previous discussions are repeated at lengths which often

rival those of the original formulations. Such luxuries might be afforded on occasions when it is crucial to support a debatable rendering. But we meet with them repeatedly, even when they are culled from the brinks of scholarship. I believe that judicious editing of these excesses, either by Pope or by his editors, would have spared the readers much toil and would have helped them focus on the more important cruxes within the Canticles. It would, moreover, have prevented a serious tendency to trivialize by giving equal attention to problems and solutions of differing merits and importance. Certainly, an editor should have advised against an inclination—more legitimate in a classroom or among friends—to indulge in a sense of humor that is decidely personal (e.g. at pp. 111, 247, 326, 347 etc.), to elaborately recall anecdotes that have little to do with the task at hand (e.g. at pp. 115, 123, 125, 126 etc.), to undertake irrelevant discussions (e.g. at pp. 504-505; 553-554), and to enter into *non-sequiturs* (e.g. at pp. 379, 382, 401-402, 414). The last often take shape in the form of a chinese-box, e.g., within pp. 307-318. There, the word "black" launches discussions which successively broach such disparate topics as "Cushites," "black Jews in America," "Dark-eyed beauties," "black-goddesses," "Chemosh," "Black Rocks," "Mecca," "Hittite Goddesses," and "Kali" (cf. pp. 379, 382, 417).

Then too, there is the matter of photographs and line drawings. I believe that Pope is badly counseled in this respect by his editors and by The Anchor Bible. What are we to make of all these representations of sexual acts frozen at one moment or another? Surely even the most victorian among us must realize that ancient Near Eastern folk were endowed by their creator with penises and vaginas and that, either guided by duty or driven by instinct, these organs occasionally disobeyed the laws of gravity, if not decency, in order to mingle in the most impossible of angles. While a few of these photos and sketches reproduced in this volume will undoubtedly be welcomed for their application in highlighting certain passages of the Song of Songs (e.g. pl. III, VII, perhaps even XI and XII), the majority can hardly be thought of as complementing the words of the Hebrew poet. Some are definitely chosen to please a very singular sense of humor (e.g., IV-VI); others, if intended to flesh a poetic verse, are either absurd (p. 457; pl. IX), grotesque (pl. X), or simply

kitschy (pl. XIV). The cover design, against which, I am told, even the author objected, might easily serve to sell Sealy-posturepedic mattresses.

But these objections to what I consider excesses of well-intended purposes, are plainly minor in importance. I hope that they might help reshape a second edition. In the following lines I will entertain considerations that are more substantial. These will deal with matters of translating and interpreting the Song of Songs. Appended to these remarks will be suggestions towards alternate understanding of the meaning and purpose of individual words and expressions.

Pope presents his translation of the Song of Songs on pp. 1-13. In general, this rendering reads very smoothly, and has definite advantages over previous attempts. Pope commendably breaks the Hebrew verses into short stanzas, so that even the longest does not contain more than 6 to 8 English words. The vocabulary chosen is that of contemporary American. For obscure reasons, however, Pope does resort to an occasional "o'er" (2:8d), "Methinks" (7:9a) and to the recurrent "hark" and "lo." An occasional line is incomprehensible or unidiomatic (e.g., 5:9) or too apocopated to make sense in English (e.g., 2:4b).

The Song of Songs, as any biblical scholar knows, poses many translational problems. Within its relatively brief span of almost 120 verses, the text bristles with vocabulary unattested elsewhere in the OT and scarcely found in other Semitic languages. Verbal forms seem to defy the contexts in which they are set. Most troublesome to the translator is an abundance of sequences, each of which is made up of individually coherent images which, however, rarely build up into an identifiable whole. The longest of these is to be found in chapter 5. The extent of this particular sequence, even when defined by the most broadminded speculation, is limited to fifteen verses (vv 2-16). The majority of these units of expression, however, are all too brief. Moreover, it is not uncommon that the boundaries of these units are impossible to chart. At the risk of anticipating other points of discussion, let me choose vv 2-4 of the first chapter with which not only to highlight the difficulties that are experienced by the translator, but also to present some criticism of Pope's approach to solving them.

1:2 *yiššāqēnî minnəšîqôt pîhû*
kî-ṭôbîm dôdêkā miyyāyin
3 *lərêªḥ šəmānêkā ṭôbîm*
šemen tûraq šəmêkā
ʿal-kēn ʿălāmôt ʾăhēbûkā

Most renderings divide 1:2-3 into two poetic units (henceforth, I shall follow Pope's numbering and subdivision of verses). Thus an unemended version, e.g. *JPSV*'s (1969) rendering, would read as follows: "Let him give me of the kisses of his mouth! / For your love is more delightful than wine." and "Your ointments yield a sweet fragrance, / Your name is like finest oil— / Therefore do maidens love you." Pope, who is very much aware of the syntactical difficulty caused by the preposition *lamed* when attached to *rêªḥ*, takes his cue from a statement of Albright who, "on the basis of Ugaritic solves the difficulty simply by connecting this line [3a] with the preceding and construing *lĕrēaḥ* as parallel to the preceding *miyyayin*" (p. 300). Thus Pope divides the same verse into four units: "Let him kiss me with his mouth's kisses! / Truly, sweeter is your love than wine, / Than the smell of your precious oil. / Turaq oil is your name. / Therefore girls love you."

In reading this translation, one notes that Pope has (a) left forlorn 2a; (b) incongruously paralleled the sweetness of love's wine to the smell of oil; (c) permitted a statement on the swain's name to float with no verse to depend on; and (d) declared maidens to be in love for no reason. Note also that Pope makes no distinction between *lə* and *min*. Despite recent opinions (bibliography in O. Loretz, *Das althebräische Liebeslied* [AOAT 14/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer, 1971]: 4 n. 4), *lamed* is hardly attested as a comparative preposition. All in all, it seems to me that this is not an improvement on past translations.

I certainly do not have the answers to the difficulties contained in these particular verses. Below, I will offer a suggestion that might point to alternative renderings; but I will be quick to urge: *caveat lector*. I do want to take this occasion, however, to reflect on two points which grow out of the above examples. First, I would suggest that the problems of the Song are not ones that will simply yield to philological acuity, but are ones that must also be

approached from literary and aesthetic directions. Thus, even the most tested of Semitists, in which ranks I unhesitatingly would place Marvin Pope, will occasionally find his inexhaustible philological resources to be of minimal help.

At the outset we might admit that the task of any translator of the Canticles is not merely to transmit to those to whom Hebrew is inaccessible a *precise* English equivalent of the Hebrew original. To do so would be to present them with fragmentary and hyperbolic descriptions. Rather, a translator is also charged with alerting his readers to those qualities of the Song which have made these poems transcend their narrow and specific origins—those qualities which make them some of the finest verbal expressions of physical (and spiritual) love. What we seek, therefore, is not necessarily a rendering in which the resources of each Semitic language are brilliantly exploited to duplicate, word for word, the vocabulary of the ancient Hebrew poet. Rather, what we ought to have is a translation which would approximate the nuances and the ambiguities of the Hebrew original. In short, if any translation of the Song of Songs is to succeed in conveying the shimmering quality of these Hebrew poems, we ought to be less ready to pin down our poet, forcing him to tell us exactly what he meant. I will amplify on this thought by turning to another passage drawn from Pope's translation and, at the same time, broach the second point I wish to make.

For the sake of this argument, let me grant that Pope's philology is faultless and that his understanding of the vocabulary found in 7:3ab is sound. Let me accept his urgings that *šorrēk* means "your vulva," (pp. 617-618), that *sahar* means "turned" (pp. 618-619), that *ʾal* should be considered as a particle of emphatic negation (p. 619), and that *mezeg* is a "spicy mixture" (p. 620). His translation, "Your vulva is a rounded crater; / May it never lack punch!" would still, in my opinion, be insensitive. For what this rendering achieves is not faithfulness to the *erotic* quality of the passage, but one which has opted for a *pornographic* interpretation of the Canticles. The reader of this English translation, especially one who cannot dare to plunge into the formidable array of proof-texts and comparative Semitic found in the commentary, would have little choice but to accept that the Hebrew poet did not want his

13th centuries, while a more "rational" approach, in praise of wisdom, circulated in the later Middle Ages and the Early Renaissance. It must be admitted, however, that some exegeses were peculiar to diaspora Judaism, as it attempted to deal with the horrors of the *gālût*, and that others were found only in Christianity, as it sought to find biblical prognostications of the triumph of Protestantism or, in one startling case, of Britannia.

Because of its variety, flexibility, adaptability and manifold permutations, the allegorical approach to interpreting the Song of Songs has thus lasted for at least two millennia, attracting to its cause some of the best minds from both faiths. Pope believes that these same qualities "contributed to its progressive discredit and almost complete desertion" (p. 90). This opinion might find acceptance if one were to adopt a strict definition of the term "allegory." But if one considers it as merely a convenient term for an approach that is antithetical to the "literalist" mode of interpretation, then it would be easily perceived that almost all other approaches—the so-called "dramatic," "cultic," "wedding week," "humanizing," as well as Pope's own "funerary"—are themselves allegorizing, being rooted in a process that tries to *secularize* the theological symbolism permeating the allegories of the Synagogue and Church Fathers. The impulses behind such non-literalist contributions have rarely originated in a desire to "read" the text as it is written (for as stated above, this would be a rather limiting pursuit for those interested in biblical rather than merely literary scholarship), but in the hope of adequately recreating a context in which the poems first circulated and explaining the purpose which they fulfilled within Israelite society.

To develop such an observation adequately would require many pages. For the purpose of this essay, let me focus on three of the non-literalist understandings of the Canticles.

The (melo)dramatic reading of the Song arose in the late 18th and early 19th centuries during the first moments of the Romantic movement, at a time when the "pastoral" as a theme in literature was regaining favor. By keeping whole the venerable allegory of the religious leaders, but also by substituting human protagonists—Solomon as the lover rather than God/Christ; the Shulamite as the beloved rather than Israel/the Church—and by shifting the stage into an earthly, palatine setting, a secular

meaning was promoted for the Canticles. But it should be noted that the two interpretations *equally depended on regarding the Song as complete and on presuming that its contents retained all the ingredients necessary to permit a successful interpretation*. It was but a matter of time before the dramatic elements were accentuated by introducing Dodai, Solomon's rival for the attention of the Shulamite. The scene was shifted from a palace to a bucolic setting. It is curious to note that this "secularizing" scenario was adopted by some biblicists who found it, nevertheless, necessary to reinterpret the whole as an allegory(!) of the tensions created between the Northern and Southern kingdoms. That the "melodramatic" interpreters found it also necessary to shift passages around in order to fulfill the aims of their script need not concern us here. We might only note at this point that, as it lost its romanticizing—if not sentimentalizing—clientele, the melodramatic interpretation no longer received the attention it once attracted. More damaging for its cause was the fact that it could not compete with its own by-product, a presentation which sought its evidence in the literature of Israel's neighbors.

Beginning with the latter half of the 19th century, translation of Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Canaanite and Hurro-Hittite texts began to revolutionize our knowledge of ancient Near Eastern societies. Early in the 20th century the speculations began which ultimately led to what is now called the "cultic" interpretation of the Song. Although at least two major phases can be distinguished in its evolution, this particular school also depended on the earlier allegorical approach, in that the Hebrew God was replaced by a pagan deity, Tammuz-Adonis. Tammuz was "recovered" as the prototype of the lover who, in Hebrew circles, had been secularized into the figure of Solomon. The Shulamite was likewise regarded as a humanized Ishtar/Astarte. The setting was no longer the palace, but the temple. Some held that this building was located in either Canaan or Mesopotamia, and that the liturgy that went on within was imported together with the Song into Israel. Others found it more likely that these activities occurred in Jerusalem itself, at a time when the Hebrews had not committed themselves so wholeheartedly to Yahweh. An enormous amount of energy was expended in detailing the manner in which the vocabulary of the Canticles betrayed its foreign origins.

the plain sense of the Song were assailed as enemies of truth and decency. The allegorical charade thus persisted for centuries with only sporadic protests" (p. 17).

For me, what is most troubling about such a statement is its sure sense of what the Song is *not* about. I also find a certain amount of irony in the fact that, as Pope will strive to give us "the plain sense of the Song," he will constantly turn to the myths of Canaan, Mesopotamia and Egypt to buttress his remarks, ignoring the possibility that, in themselves, myths are but variant forms of allegory. Additionally, as it shall be soon noted, Pope's own understanding of the purpose of the Song can in no way be considered "literalist" merely because he is bolder than others in locating sexual organs in the text. Indeed, once any student of the Canticles begins to read a scenario into the text, or proposes a practical purpose for which the poems were destined, as Pope clearly does, then that interpreter can no longer be considered a "literalist." As far as I can note, true literalists have rarely belonged to the circles of biblical scholarship; rather, like Goethe and Herder, they have been humanists and "belles-lettrists." This is not accidental, of course, for it is the biblicists who are most concerned with examining the reasons behind the inclusion of the Song within the canon. And, even if some of them have shown little sympathy with the allegorists and have, consequently, espoused the theory that the Canticles was but a collection of love songs (e.g., Gordis), they too have seen some didactic purpose behind its preservation within the Old Testament.

It is also not accidental that what I consider to be "true literalists" among biblicists can be counted on the fingers of one hand (e.g., most recently, John B. White, *A Study of the Language of Love in the Song of Songs and Ancient Egyptian Poetry* [SBLDS 38; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978]). But while their *literary* contribution to the general theme of love and erotic literature, especially that from the ancient Near East, can be considerable and perceptive, their interpretive analysis of the Song as a biblical text is often sterile and rarely instructive. This is because the literalist's approach is limited to finding parallels for erotic poetry among sundry cultures and to collecting and categorizing topoi that are shared with the biblical example.

The so-called allegorical interpretation has certainly fallen on bad times nowadays. Two of its multifold variants, that the love expressed in the songs is that of God/Christ for Israel/the Church are venerable interpretations, dating from the earliest moments of biblical exegesis. While for us such views may seem redolent with piety and sometimes embarrassingly sectarian, it should nevertheless be stated that there is nothing in them that goes against the Old Testament grain. Israel's great prophets, Hosea, Jeremiah, Isaiah and Ezekiel, have each occasionally found allegory to be a perfectly reasonable vehicle by which to impart God-given pronouncements. In this light, Pope's use of the term "charade" in the judgment quoted above is definitely ill-advised. On the other hand, one could definitely object to this interpretation—as indeed to any interpretation—that presents itself as the *only* valid interpretation of the Canticles or could properly balk at accepting one that seeks to account for every passage in the Song as belonging to a specific interpretation. Therefore, I see absolutely no reason why one must espouse either one interpretive cause to the exclusion of another or why one must maintain a consistent explanation for each and every passage of the Canticles. Indeed, I find much that is admirable in the approach of Ibn Ezra (cf. pp. 103-105), who found it plausible to read the Song at multiple levels without unduly prejudicing one approach at the expense of the other.

Pope's narrative on the variations that the allegorical theme took throughout history makes fascinating reading (pp. 89-210). Despite the maze of opinions recorded in these pages, one can make the following observations. While the basic God/Christ–Israel/the Church scheme was maintained, ostinato-like, throughout the centuries by lesser minds within Judaism and Christianity, more vigorous and original interpretations were constantly promoted by intellectuals eager to use the Canticles to buttress new currents of theological and philosophical thinking. Moreover, these allegorical reinterpretations did not depend on sectarian considerations, but found acceptance at moments of intellectual ferment with little regard either to national demarcations or to religious persuasions. Thus, it could be noted that during the early centuries after Christ, gnostic understandings were read into the Song; in the Age of Chivalry, at a time when writings such as *Tawk al-ḥamāmah* were appreciated, a more cosmopolitan interpretation was highly regarded in some quarters; a mystical interpretation was favored in the 12th and

audience to climb anatomically a few centimeters upwards in order to find spiked wine in the *navel* (the usual understanding of *šorrēk*). Additionally, in view of the double meaning of the English word "punch" ("mixed, spiked drink" as well as "a thrusting, perforating blow with the fist") Pope's choice of vocabulary turns lurid a passage that might have been merely descriptive.

This is not to insist that the ancient Hebrew poet was free of prurient inclination and that it would never occur to him to write unchaste lines, but that, by his translation, Pope has given the reader of The Anchor Bible little choice in deciding the issue. A more sensitive approach, in my opinion, would have been to retain a more ambiguous rendering *in the main body of the translation* and to reserve *for the commentary* an explanation that touches on the *double-entendres* conveyed in the text. Indeed, while Pope's commentary will repeatedly show a tendency, perhaps legitimate in some moments, to overemphasize the sexual connotations of the Hebrew vocabulary, even the translation will sporadically exhibit this startling lack of discernment between eroticism and pornography (e.g., his highlighting the word "hand" in 5:4a by placing it between quotes; his insistence on translating *ʾap* in 7:9d as "vulva").

I believe that this is not a minor issue. For the Hebrew poet (better perhaps: the editor and redactor of these Hebrew poems) was above all extremely subtle. Even his frequent changes in subject matters, his bewildering stylistic changes, his willingness to leave unfinished some physical descriptions, his leaps from one context to another, and his changes of focus—all these resulted from the deliberate literary device of stitching together disparate and fragmentary poems (perhaps even incipits of such poems), ones which may have originated in differing circles and at different periods. Because of this apparent lack of thematic cohesion and contextual progression, the poet succeeded in giving his audience and readers a wide latitude for understanding individual passages and for interpreting his message. Perceived from this angle, any search for the Hebrew poet's own sense of symmetry (cf. pp. 40-54), one which would decode a pattern behind the seemingly haphazard structure of the Song, is bound to be fruitless and unconvincing.

These thoughts permit me now to turn to Pope's formidable

"Introduction" and "Bibliography." The last is divided into three segments. One which collects the "Texts and Versions" of the Song of Songs, to which are added a limited bibliography that immediately pertains to each (pp. 233-236; note, however, the subheading "Targum" is missing from p. 234); another which has a liberal selection of commentaries and homilies published before 1800 and arranged chronologically (pp. 236-251); and a third which has a generous listing of books and articles, written after 1800. This reviewer wishes publicly to thank the author for this selfless expression of devotion to the literature in behalf of the reader and future researcher.

The bulk of the "Introduction," which by itself spans almost two hundred pages, deals with the literary and interpretive history of the Song (pp. 40-229). So developed and complete is Pope's recounting of the last topic that it might well be lifted out of its present covers and given separate publication. Two chapters within this treatise contain topics original to this commentary. The first, "The Song of Songs and Women's Liberation" (pp. 205-210), is devoted largely to an issue raised by Phyllis Trible. Pope's opinion on the matter is stated on p. 210: "With regard to the Song of Songs she is certainly correct in recognizing the equal and even dominant role of the female and the absence of male chauvinism or patriarchalism." I would just like to object that love poetry, especially in its erotic variety, can hardly be dissected in search of social roles. Therefore, the Song would be the last context whence one should develop theses on women's liberation and the Bible. The last chapter, called "Love and Death" (pp. 210-229), contains Pope's own contribution to the interpretation of the Canticles. I shall return to this particular topic as I survey the interpretive history of the Song.

Despite its comparatively small size, the Song of Songs has elicited an unabating volume of secondary literature. Basically those interested in trying to deal with its contents can be divided into two main groupings. One grouping may be called "literalist," the other "allegorical." The first includes a limited number of interpretive avenues by which to remain faithful to the explicitly erotic vocabulary employed; the second, infinitely variegated in its presentations, seeks to unravel a hidden agenda behind the surface of the text. Pope's sympathy is made clear at the outset: "The trouble has been that interpreters who dared acknowledge

The second phase of the cultic interpretation began with the publication of Sumerian texts, mostly dated to the late Old Babylonian period, but generally understood to reflect the practices that occurred during the Neo-Sumerian empire centered at Ur (2100-1960 B.C.). What makes these texts more appealing to those sympathetic to the "cultic" presentation is the fact that the figure of the lover is here not reserved for a deity, but applied to an actual, living, historically attested, albeit deified, king. Thus, according to this pattern, the characterization of Solomon as a lover can be considered as belonging to efforts within Hebraic circles to establish for him the paradigmatic quality of a perfect lover. Seen from this perspective, it becomes totally unnecessary for those who would promote this interpretation to show that the activities attributed to Solomon had historical bases, just as it would be irrelevant, even foolish, for anyone to try to establish the historical facts behind the legend of George Washington and his cherry tree when its only point is to praise him for his attachment to truth.

If shorn of its sensationalist, often sexually lurid, detail, one can extract some valid points from the second phase of this interpretation. It would not, of course, permit speculation on the setting or the occasion for all those erotic moments, but it might allow us to understand the reasons which impelled a poet to idealize one aspect of human relationships by attributing its glorious moments to characters of paradigmatic virtues.

Pope's contribution to the discussion is, I believe, but a variant of the last interpretation, but one which takes its cue from its Tammuz-Adonis phase. His setting is a Hebrew society that has been totally assimilated to its Canaanite-Phoenician milieu. The ritual is no longer one that occurs in a temple, but one which allegedly occurs in a *bêt-marzē*^{a}*ḥ*. The last is interpreted as a funerary establishment where participants gathered to celebrate Love even as they lament the departure of a dearly beloved. But the protagonists of Pope's reconstruction seem endowed with an excess of libido which, to mention only the healthier activities, leads them to perform sodomy, bestiality and infanticide. It is never made clear why these celebrants seem to have so few inhibitions even as they mourn their dead. Rather, evidence is drawn from sources as late as the Patristic period to convince any skeptic who may not acknowledge these hedonistic moments in Israel's past.

It may be that Pope, as he indicated on pp. 228-229, will need more space in which to argue his case. As it now stands, however, his reconstruction is the least convincing part of his commentary. Rather than presenting closely argued assessments of the evidence—an approach that is necessary to defend such a bold thesis—Pope seems content to pile up data that are often incongruous in content and certainly uneven in reliability.

It seems fair to state that Pope's thesis is anchored in two passages of the Song. The most crucial of these occurs at 8:6. "The setting of Love and Passion," states Pope on p. 210, "in opposition to the power of Death and Hell in 8:6c,d is the climax of the Canticle and the burden of its message: that Love is the only power that can cope with Death." That this opinion goes somewhat counter to Pope's own conclusion concerning the lack of discernible progression or development within the Canticles (pp. 40-54) and that, consequently, it would be impossible to declare any of its passages to be the "climax," is not regarded as a difficulty. Nor is it seen as objectionable that (a) the precise meaning of *kî ʿazzā*^{h} *kammāwet ʾahăbā*^{h} is still a subject of legitimate debate; and (b) in the whole history of Jewish mourning practices the Song (to my knowledge) was never excerpted or invoked at funerals.

The second context allows Pope to expand his investigations and to collect his evidence extra-biblically. "The unique term 'house of wine' in *Song of Songs* 2:4 [*bêt hayyāyin*] is manifestly an elliptical expression for 'house of the drinking of wine,' as in Esther 7:8, since a musty wine cellar would hardly be an appropriate setting for the activity envisaged," declares Pope (p. 221). To a lesser extent, he also suggests that 2:5, which speaks of the beloved as requesting raisin cakes and apples, is also suggestive of "orgiastic revelry" (p. 222). Pope attempts to make a case for the occurrence, in the ancient world as well as in Israel, of a "sacred meal with ritual drinking of intoxicating beverage, music, song, dance, and sexual license" (p. 210). But his evidence is untrustworthy. I find it as dubious to arrive at such a conclusion on the basis of a few seal impressions and other forms of graphic representation as to make sweeping declarations on the mores of present-day Americans on the basis of *Hustler* or (even worse) *TV Guide*. I cannot for a moment

v 9c-e. These lines introduce material which seems to be a favorite theme in love poetry: the lover who comes near his beloved, but remains hidden to spy on her movements, or to incite her love (3:1-4; 5:2-7).

Within vv 10b-c and 13c-d invitations to the beloved to join the lover and a description of spring's awakening are to be found. The manner in which nature regenerates itself is highlighted not only by reference to activities which occur as this process unfolds, but also by the use of three verbal sequences in which the first of two verbs shades the meaning of the other: *ʿānāʰ . . . wəʾāmar* in 10a is not "spoke and said" (p. 364), but "kept on telling me"; *qûmî-lāk . . . ûləkî-lāk* in 10b-c/13c-d is not "Arise . . . come" (pp. 364-365), but "Begin to come"; *ḥālap hālak-lô* in 11b is not just "over, gone" (p. 365), but "has spent itself." Finally, the word *ʾereṣ*, 'land, earth,' emphasizes the linking of two activities that take place during spring, one which involves plants (v 12a), the other birds (v 12c). The two activities are further linked by the word *zāmîr*, which means both 'pruning' (referring back to plants) and 'singing' (referring forward to birds). C. H. Gordon, in a forthcoming review of the same book for the *JAOS* calls this "Janus Parallelism."

v 14. This verse returns to the description of the bride, connecting with the above by means of reference to *qôl*, 'voice.' I cannot explain the introduction of v 16 here. Whereas the call in v 16 for mutual belonging seems perfectly set into the context of 6:2-4, here it can only have been invoked as a coda to material that had begun by referring to "lotuses" (1b). Similarly, lines c and d of v 17 may have been recalled to give continuity to the descriptions that were begun in v 9. The material in a and b allows the poet not only to end his compilations of the preceding verses, but to prepare for the "nocturne" that begins in chapter 3.

2:5a samməkûnî (p. 378). Pope is too kind in treating Hirschberg's obscenity (*not* eroticism). As a matter of fact, almost every one of Hirschberg's opinions, cited by Pope (index, p. 706, s.v.), is concerned with emendation or distortion that betrays puerile interests.

2:6 (p. 385). Pope is to be commended for his repeated insistence not to tamper with the text on the basis of meter. To expunge or alter vocabulary and morphemes *metri causa* is an academic exercise that almost always reduces the genius of Hebrew poetry by eliminating those inspired "irregularities."

2:9 (p. 392). The point of 2:9 is not that the lover is a peeping Tom, but that he is inviting the beloved to share the glory of nature in spring.

3:6 (p. 427). The dictionaries derive *abacus* from Greek *abax*, 'slab.'

3:7-8 hinnēʰ miṭṭātô . . . (p. 431). Of interest in this context is the oracle concerning Esarhaddon, lines 16-26 (*ANET*³: 450), "Fear not, Esarhaddon! I, the god Bel, speak to you. The beams of your heart I strengthen, like your mother, who caused you to exist. Sixty great gods are standing together with me and protect you. The god Sin is at your right, the god Shamash at your left; sixty great gods stand round about you, ranged for battle." This motif, then, may have originated in a non-erotic context and was introduced into the Song because of its interest in Solomon and his deeds. I cannot quite see why Pope chose this passage to launch into a discussion on castrati, transvestites and other members of the "third sex."

4:8a ʾittî (p. 474). There is no need to emend this word to *ʾĕtî*, 'come.' It makes perfect sense that the lover is inviting the beloved to join him. Moreover, if one accepts the emendation, there might be a surfeit of verbs of motion: *tābôʾî, tāšûrî*.

4:16b (p. 498). The verb *bôʾ* alone never has a sexual sense; *bôʾ ʾel/ʿal* does.

5:2a etc. ʾănî yəšēnāʰ . . . (p. 510). With regard to this, the longest sequence in the Song, I would like to dispute Freehof's contention that it must necessarily reflect a dream rather than an actual experience. C. R. Baskervill has written a very interesting article on "English Songs on the Night Visit" (*Publication of the Modern Language Association* 36 [1921]: 565-614) describing a practice that was deeply rooted in Europe as far back as the medieval period, if not earlier. One night before marriage, a highly conventionalized custom was reenacted in which (a) the groom stealthily arrives at the future bride's window; (b) raps on it and asks to be admitted; (c) the girl refuses, citing her parents as her reason for her failing nerves; (d) the groom threatens to leave; (e) the girl capitulates. It is assumed that in some areas the future couple did take their own pleasure at that point. In New England, however, the sweethearts, fully clothed, "bundled" together. The Sumerian material discussed by Pope (pp. 515-

needless.

1:9a sûsātî (p. 336). The choice of this peculiar form may be guided by a euphonic desire to have a sequence of words with *-tî* (*sûsātî . . . dimmîtîk raʿyātî*).

While one might be better advised not to be drawn into a discussion which tries to give sense to a lovely Hebrew simile by alluding to evidence found in dingy Egyptian tombs of the New Kingdom (p. 338), it might be pointed out that this particular mare seems much too well outfitted (1:10-11) to act merely as a decoy for rutting stallions. At any rate I would take "Pharaoh" here to be somewhat equivalent to our "Rockefeller"; i.e., the mare was the best that was available.

1:9b dimmîtîk (p. 341). Pope errs when he states that the description in lines 10-11 refers to "an Egyptian war horse," since the suffix in those lines is that of the feminine singular, and Pope had just finished telling us (p. 338) that only stallions were hitched to chariots.

(p. 356). The *ʿênayim rakkôt* of Leah (Gen 29:17) is likely to be a euphemism for describing an ugly girl, and may have nothing to do with the weaknesses or diseases of her eyes. There is some irony in the fact that Jacob ends up marrying her because *his* eyes could not see her when she was brought into his tent.

Excursus. Chapter 2 allows a glimpse of a method by which a series of individual units could be linked into a whole which, despite the diversity of its content, nevertheless gives the impression of cohesion. Units that contain words shared with other units are linked together, thus leaving the impression that a development is taking place from one unit to another. As stated above, this type of compilation cannot be regarded as ultimately contributing to an overall pattern (cf. pp. 40-54, in particular the discussion of the work of Kessler and Exum), since it seems content with allowing the poetry to flow freely from one unit to another. In this short discussion the terms "lover" will be used for the male, "beloved" for the female.

v 1. The beloved calls herself *šôšannat hāʿămāqîm*, "lotus of the valley." In itself this verse may have stood independently either as an extremely brief, self-praising poem, or, more likely, may have been an incipit to such a poem.

v 2. The lover's use of the term *šôšannāʰ*, 'lotus,' gives the poet the opportunity to link this verse to the preceding one. See

also below, on v 17.

v 3. This verse is linked with the preceding one, not only by virtue of the fact that both are similes introduced by *kap*, but also by balancing the lover's *kēn raʿyātî bên habbānôt* (v 2) "So is my darling among girls," with the beloved's *kēn dôdî bên habbānîm*. This unit is actually quite long, ending in v 4. That the two verses may have been independent, however, cannot be ruled out, since the theme of "protection" (*bəṣillô ḥimmadtî wəyāšabtî* [v 3] // *wədiglô ʿālay ʾahăbāʰ* [v 4]) fuses the ideas in both verses rather well.

v 5. Appended to the previous statement of the beloved, this verse shares with it the substantives *tappûᵃḥ*, which opens v 3, and *ʾahăbāʰ*, which closes v 4.

v 6. This verse seems to me quite independent. It does not follow previous sequences nor is it easily placed with the following ones. This verse and the one following are almost identical to two others found in 8:3-4. Therefore, the possibility is strong that vv 6-7 functioned as a unit before the Song's last redactor/compiler/poet used them in their present context. It may also be a conscious act on the part of this same artist that, whereas in chapter 2 this unit (vv 6-7) follows a context (v 5) in which the lover brings the beloved to a tavern, in chapter 8 the almost identical unit (8:4-5) is placed after a declaration (v 3) that has the beloved bringing the lover to her mother's home in order to drink wine.

v 7. This verse contains vocabulary identical to that found in 8:4 and 3:5. Some linkage is achieved with previous lines by means of *ʾahăbāʰ*. (In 8:4, the linkage with succeeding materials is obtained by use of he verb *ʿrr: tāʿîrû / təʿôrərû* of 8:4 and *ʿôrartîkā* of 8:5.)

The allusion to *biṣbāʾôt ʾô bəʾaylôt haśśādêʰ* in 2:7 is an occasion for the poet to introduce a unit of two verses (8-9) which describes the lover by means of capriolic imagery. The unit is introduced by *qôl*, 'voice, sound,' a *leitwort* which allows the unit to *overlap* materials which stretch into v 14. A further overlap into v 17, the last verse of this chapter, is achieved by placing poetry between 9a-b ("My love resembles a buck / Or a young stag") and 17c-d ("Turn and be, my love, / Like a buck, or a young stag"). Within these verses, a number of poetic fragments, incipits, or short poems are assembled.

accept as uncritically as Pope obviously does (pp. 211-214; 220-221) the testimony of religious antagonists as they describe the excesses of their enemies. I think it might be fair to insist that before such a panurgic reconstruction of an important religious practice is promoted by modern scholarship, at least *one piece of direct evidence* should be called upon to flesh out any theory. Were we to find in Ugarit or any other ancient site an *administrative* tablet—mythological texts being usually extremely unreliable as guides to actual practices—which would have *any* of the following lines: "One virgin for defloration; one baby for infanticide; one youth for sodomy; one dog for bestiality; one prostitute to perform fellatio; one homer of choice excrement; destined for the funeral of Such-and-Such. Dated; sealed," then indeed Pope's reconstruction would begin to find vindication.

Pope makes much out of the material he collects on the *marzē*^{a}*ḥ*. Even if it is granted that his appreciation of the nature of that institution is correct, it has to be observed that, especially since the word does not occur in the Canticles, its pertinence to this book will depend on the acceptability of his declaration that "The 'Marzeāḥ (sic) House' is . . . virtually synonymous with the 'Banquet House' *bêṯ mišteh*" (p. 221) which, through the intermediary of Esther 7:8, is linked to *bêt hayyāyin* of Canticles 2:4. Finally, I seriously doubt that orgiasts, involved as they are likely to be in their overindulgences, will take time out to describe their partners with the sensitivity and tenderness exhibited in the Song.

While I am hardly convinced by Pope's interpretation of the Canticles, I nevertheless find it easy to recommend this commentary, especially to the reader of *MAARAV*, who is likely to have some knowledge of the points at issue and who does not mind some idiosyncracies in a truly extraordinary contribution to the scholarship on the Song of Songs. Below, I shall make a few comments on details of the translation. These remarks will, for convenience, refer to the Song according to Pope's versification and will refer to the page of the commentary section in which the particular point is first broached.

1:1 ʾăšer (p. 295). Although the relative *še* is used throughout the Song, *ʾăšer* may have been purposely employed in this verse to further the assonance in a line that repeatedly clusters the consonants *šin* and *reš*. Dismissing this verse as *secondary*, as

Pope does, implies that we know what is *primary* in the Canticles.

1:3a lərē^{a}*ḥ* (p. 299). See above.

1:3b šəmêkā (pp. 300-301). Read perhaps, *šm<n>k* (= *šamnəkā*, better perhaps *šəmānêkā*), a reading that is, admittedly, infinitely less interesting than the MT, one that may not be encouraged by Qoh 7:1a (*ṭôb šēm miššemen ṭôb*), but one which has the virtue of resolving the problem of 3b: "Because of the fragrance of your precious oil—it [i.e., your oil] being of Turaq quality—therefore do girls love you."

1:3c ʿălāmôt ʾăhēbûkā (p. 301). In view of the importance of 8:6c,d (*kî ʿazzā*^{h} *kammāwet ʾahăbā*^{h}) to Pope's thesis, it might have been interesting to point to the Rabbinic understanding of this verse (**ʿal-kēn ʿal māwet ʾăhēbûkā*), which links Death and Love in the same line (references in J. Goldin, *The Song at the Sea* [New Haven/London: Yale, 1971]: 116).

1:5d kîrîʿôt šəlōmō^{h} (pp. 319-320). Pope accepts a widely adopted vocalization which turns the last vocable into *śalmā*^{h}, an Arabian tribe cited in Assyrian, South Arabic and later Jewish sources, but not in the OT. It may be, however, that the poet was much more ambitious in his parallelism than this emendation assumes. While a rendering Salmah may satisfy a linking with Qedar of 5c, I think it possible, if not more probable, that we have here two separate and complementary similies: Black . . . like the tents of Qedar," and "comely . . . like the pavilions of Solomon." Furthermore, the poet may have taken the occasion to pun on *kîrîʿôt* which, aurally at least, may suggest *rēʿā*^{h}/*raʿyā*^{h}, 'friend, companion.' In this context, note how this chapter repeatedly returns to vocabulary that contains the consonants *reš* and *ʿayin: tirʿê*^{h} (v 7); *rəʿî, rôʿîm* (v 8); *raʿyātî* (v 9). It seems to me, therefore, that the beloved is challenging the girls from Jerusalem (courtesans?) by declaring that she may be as black as a Qedar tent, but/and she is as beautiful as any of Solomon's companions (if *yərîʿôt* is seen as a word that not only parallels *ʾohŏlê* but also suggests *raʿyā*^{h}).

1:6e karmî šellî lōʾ naṭārtî (p. 326). Since an interrogative *he* is not always necessary to form a question, this line may be understood rhetorically, "Have I not guarded my own vineyard?" thus responding affirmatively to the beloved's ability to guard her vineyard. Seen from this perspective, Pope's argument that the maiden is proudly proclaiming her loss of virginity may be

516) would indicate that the gods did take part in a playlet reminiscent of the Night Visit.

5:4a yādô (p. 517). Even if the sense 'penis' is given to the word *yād* in Hebrew, Pope's understanding that "coital intromission" (p. 519) is taking place seems definitely premature. Given the circumstances—the lover is outside; the beloved is inside, still in bed, still fully clothed—it would have been remarkable for that "hand" to attain the goal to which Pope thinks it is reaching.

6:4a kətirṣāʰ (p. 559). Pope would have been better advised to have heeded Freedman's warning about emending the text to *tirṣêʰ* (p. 560). Not only is the parallelism between Jerusalem and Tirzah excellent (both with *kap* prefixes!), but I doubt that the *Qal* of *rāṣāʰ* could have the sense that Pope proposes for it.

7:1a šûbî (p. 596). I do not quite see the virtue of emending to *šəbî* (from *yšb*) and understanding this well-known verb by its Arabic (not Hebrew) meaning 'to leap.' How is "leap, leap," better than the usual rendering "return, return"?

7:3 (p. 617). The point here is not which part of the anatomy, the belly or the vulva, can hold more liquid, but that its *shape* is that of a crater. I must also point out at this stage, after reading over 600 pages of commentary, that Pope does have a predictable propensity to favor the sexual meaning of an Arabic word over any of its more innocent possibilities. For anyone who is not reared with Arabic as a mother tongue, and who accepts Pope's nuances for its vocables, it must seem impossible for Arabs to conduct mundane conversations since almost all their vocabulary appears to be so single-mindedly, and dreadfully, sexual.

8:2b təlammədēnî (p. 658). There is nothing to be gained by restoring a whole line on the basis of an emendation which, although defensible, is not necessary.

8:8-9 (p. 681). The import of these lines would seem to be that if the girl remains chaste, she shall be honored; otherwise, she will be killed (either trampled upon by means of a board or placed in a coffin). But it may be that one should avoid being too literal with this type of literature.

MAARAV 1/2 (1978-79): 197-224

NOTES ON THE ARAMAIC FRAGMENTS OF ENOCH FROM QUMRAN CAVE 4

MICHAEL SOKOLOFF
BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY, RAMAT-GAN, ISRAEL

INTRODUCTION

After many years of waiting we finally have before us J. T. Milik's edition of the Aramaic fragments of the Books of Enoch from Qumran Cave 4.[1] Though the starting point of the book is clearly the publication of the surviving Qumran Aramaic fragments of 1 Enoch and related Enochian literature, quantitatively most of the book is taken up with a variety of other related items, such as a reconstruction of the missing portions of the "original" Aramaic text on the basis of the later versions (pp. 139-339), literary problems of the Books of Enoch (pp. 1-69), and even medieval artistic representations of the Enochian motives in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts (p. 212). While one must marvel at Milik's patience in putting together the hundreds of scraps of text, as well as his command of both Semitic and classical languages, and his wide erudition, it seems to me that the main and declared object of the book, viz., the publication of the Aramaic fragments, was occasionally obscured along the way.[2]

The surviving Aramaic fragments of the Books of Enoch are unfortunately pitifully small, as can best be seen from a glance at Milik's diplomatic transcription of the text (pp. 340-362) and the plates at the back of the book. A comparison with the total