event, and assumes there is still time to escape the disaster. By contrast, 6 addresses a general audience, blames God for bringing evil, and in the context of the larger poem, implies no possibility of escape.

These differences permit Pohlmann to propose criteria for dating verses. Sayings addressed to Benjamin are Jeremiah's words because the book elsewhere identifies him as a Benjaminites. Texts that assume the possibility of escape from disaster are early because history has not yet foreclosed a different future. Texts that blame God for evil are late because the community needed time to reflect before blaming or rebuking God for the collapse of the nation. Hence, 6:1 is an authentic saying of Jeremiah, whereas 4:6 is an adaptation of 6:1 to a later circumstance of the community. Similarly, laments about the disaster, such as 9:17-22, are late because they assume that the disaster has already occurred.

The Jeremiah tradition, therefore, underwent extensive updating in the face of new experiences of suffering wherein God again seemed absent. Pohlmann dates the final redaction of the book to the late fourth or early third century when eschatological expectation was flourishing within Judaism.

The last chapter of Pohlmann's book considers the impact of his conclusions upon prophetic investigation in general. If Pohlmann is correct in finding warnings and laments about absolute destruction to be post-exilic in Jeremiah, then they must also be post-exilic in other prophetic books as well. This book, therefore, is of interest not only to Jeremiah scholars but to all interpreters of prophecy. Its thesis is logical, provocative, and potentially of broad heuristic value for the field.

Pohlmann's approach to the quandary of dating prophetic speech, however, leaves too many unanswered questions to be fully convincing. For example, what would have prevented Jeremiah from delivering fully imagined disaster savings as a rhetorical device to impress his audience with the seriousness of their situation? Why would God's responsibility for the approaching evil need to be a post-factum recognition in a society in which God is seen as the direct cause of everything? Why must the suitability of the piety expressed in the confessions for a later period exclude Jeremiah's suffering at the hands of the religious leaders of his own time?

Often Pohlmann isolates verses from their context to fit his thematic schema. He separates 6:1 from the following verses, for example, in part because 6:2 speaks about the daughter of Zion and not Benjamin. Was Jeremiah a prophet only to Benjamin? Finally, given the nature of the evidence, is it possible to find out who Jeremiah was and what he said?

Kathleen M. O'Connor
Maryknoll School of Theology, Maryknoll, NY 10545


This is a slightly revised version of a dissertation presented to the University of Munich in 1986, for which Klaus Baltzer served as advisor.

In a preliminary discussion, the author notes that Ezekiel indeed referred to the history of Israel, though he did not call it "history" nor did he understand history in the same way that we moderns do. The bulk of the book consists of an exegetical
examination of 5:5-17, the related symbolic actions in 4:1-5:4, chaps 16 and 23 (where Jerusalem's behavior is likened to that of an adulterous woman), and chap 20. A massive chapter deals with the redactional intention of the canonical form of the book and of an earlier edition of the book dated to shortly after the prophet's death. A final chapter discusses the meaning of history for the religion of Israel, the theological relevance of this in light of the Christ event, and reflections on related modern discussions.

At the start of his career the prophet used a discussion of history to negate a mythical unity of God, city, and people, which might seem to guarantee Israel's permanent existence. He worked against Zedekiah and anti-Babylonian politics while his own role changed from watchman-observer to suffering servant. The Tat-Ergehen principle (evil deeds bring dire consequences) was fully supported by the prophet, and Jerusalem's destruction was seen as inescapable. In fact, Ezekiel believed that the entire house of Israel had begun to go to ruin through the events of 597. Zion theology, which interpreted the events of 597 as a purifying judgment and believed that the exiles would soon return home, was overcome by transferring categories of guilt and reconciliation from the realm of individuals in Jerusalem to the collective entity of Jerusalem/Israel. The prophet's appeal to history showed that the tie between Yahweh and Israel could be broken. Guilt had accumulated over the years, and earlier sanctions of Yahweh against Jerusalem justified Ezekiel's conclusion that utter judgment against Jerusalem was the only option left to Yahweh.

To conceive of the relationship between Yahweh and Jerusalem as a marriage, as in chaps 16 and 23, presupposed that this relationship was not something to be taken for granted since marriages are contingent and constituted in the realm of time. By its power-oriented politics, the royal city of Jerusalem destroyed the ties that linked God, city, and people. The destruction of Samaria served as a precedent for what would befall Jerusalem.

After 587, in chap 20 (the date in 20:1 is viewed as mistaken), the prophet argued against the widespread notion that Yahweh would restore the order destroyed by exile if Israel would only seek Yahweh. The historical focus was on pre-Palestinian Israel. Ezekiel concluded that the partial sparing of Israel in 587 did not contradict the prophetically-uncovered guilt of the people, nor did it testify to a trans-historical bond between God and people. Only because Yahweh was determined that his name would not be slandered among the nations did he promise to lead the people back to the land. His clear intention was that Israel itself would never again defile the divine name once it had returned to Jerusalem. Regardless of whether Israel would behave like the nations or attempt to appease Yahweh by its gifts, its restitution would come about solely because of Yahweh's concern for his name. Restitution in Ezekiel was portrayed as a new creation by Yahweh (chap 37), as a result of Yahweh's caring for his name, or as a "differentiating prophecy" (chap 34), that announced judgment for the shepherds, but salvation for the sheep. The tension between the general theocratic message of chap 34 and the limited messianic words of vv 23-24 does not result from the addition of these verses secondarily, but from the intention of the prophet to offer correction to common, contemporaneous messianic expectations.

The present book of Ezekiel was completed by the year 200 (p 305), or at least by the Maccabean period (p 470) and has a three-part arrangement: judgment on Jerusalem/Israel, judgment on the foreign nations, hope for Israel. The notion of
judgment on the nations is in some tension with chap. 20 and 36.18–38, in which the nations are not threatened with destruction, but are viewed as eyewitnesses of Israel’s restoration.

In an earlier form of the Ezekiel book, completed shortly after the prophet’s death, the materials from Ezekiel’s “files” were organized in a two-part arrangement of proclamations of judgment and salvation. The new form of Israel was expected to emerge from the Babylonian gölû (chap. 11) and included a restitution of Jerusalem (chap. 16) as the seat of the ruler from the line of Jehoiachin (chap. 17) and as a cultic site (chap. 20).

Kruger’s investigation of the references to history in Ezekiel is carried out with thoroughness and precision, and his proposal for the redaction history of the book offers a clear and persuasive alternative to the proposals of Zimmerli, Garscha, and others.

Ralph W. Klem
Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, Chicago, IL 60615


Readers who are familiar with Whybray’s earlier work on Qohelet will value this volume as a compendium of Whybray’s views, rather than as a significant new contribution. Whybray writes, however, with his usual economy and clarity, and gives a useful, balanced treatment of Qohelet. As a classroom textbook or guide for independent study the commentary is well-suited for students with competency in Hebrew.

The introductory section treats the following topics: title and place in the canon, historical background, author and place of composition, language, literary unity and structure, and thought. The Introduction concludes with a tabular analysis of the contents of Qohelet which serves as an outline for the commentary. Whybray’s reasons for dividing the text as he does, generally on the basis of perceived continuities of theme and style, are given in the heading comments to each section, which are then followed by verse-by-verse commentary.

Since the series format (“based on the Revised Standard Version”) does not allow for a fresh translation, Whybray takes care to discuss the passages where he disagrees with the RSV rendering (e.g., 1.8, 2.13, 4.1, 4, 15, 9.2, 10.19). In his discussion of textual-critical questions Whybray usually decides in favor of the MT against widely accepted emendations. For example, in Qoh 12.1 Whybray prefers to read “remember your Creator” (MT bôrê’eykâ), rejecting the common emendation bôrêkâ, “your cistern” (i.e., “your wife,” cf. Prov 5.15), or perhaps “your pit” (i.e., “your grave”).

Whybray conceives of the author of Qohelet as a well-to-do, Hebrew-speaking resident of Jerusalem in the mid-third century BCE. Although Hellenistic cultural influence is apparent in the book, Whybray thinks that the author of Qohelet was ignorant of the Greek language. Likewise, he doubts the theories of northern or Phoenician influence on the language of Qohelet. In keeping with the prevailing trend in Qohelet studies, Whybray does not stress possible outside literary or thematic influences upon Qohelet. Rather, he is concerned to take the book of Qohelet on its own terms within the framework of biblical thought. Whybray does, however, point out the chief extra-biblical parallels.