

DAVID EMANUEL, *An Intertextual Commentary to the Psalter. Juxtaposition and Allusion in Book I*, Pickwick Publications, Eugene, OR 2022, pp. X-204, € 26, ISBN 978-1-62032-185-0.

David Emanuel is Professor of Old Testament at Nyack College and author of a monograph on the intertextual allusions net embedded in the so-called «historical Psalms» (*From Bards to Biblical Exegesis. A Close Reading and Intertextual Analysis of Selected Exodus Psalms*, Pickwick Publications, Eugene, OR 2012). The volume under review is the first part of Psalms commentary that can be considered a follow-up of the monograph, resuming the methods there implemented and trying to apply them to the *whole* Psalter. Especially, the commentary is «intended to be foundational» (p. X) since «few, if any, have collected and discussed evidence of allusion and purposeful juxtaposition in Book I of the Psalter into a single volume» (p. 2). One of the main purposes of the volume is to detect, collect, and interpret the intertextual connections between the Psalms and the other books of the Hebrew Bible and the ratio of the sequencing of these poems. Indeed, the study of the intertextual allusions detectable in the Psalter enjoyed some scholarly attention in past decades and many comments on that issue may be found in commentaries and monographs (see, e.g. M. PAVAN, «*He Remembered that They Were Flesh, a Breath that Passes and Does Not Return*» [Ps 78,39]. *The Theme of Memory and Forgetting in the Third Book of the Psalter [Pss 73–89]* [ÖBS 44]; Peter Lang, Frankfurt a.M. 2014); however, according to Emanuel, «with regards to sequencing of individual psalms, much attention has fallen on macro structures and sequences concerning the whole Psalter, whereas attention to positioning of individual psalms has [...] fallen by the wayside» (p. X). Therefore, Emanuel's work is not aimed at justifying the *canonical* shape of the Psalter but at highlighting the net of connections that can explain the positioning of the individual psalms in their literary context.

The commentary is equipped with an extensive introduction meant to embrace the complex methodological discussion about juxtaposition and inner-biblical allusions. As for juxtaposition, the author declares that «the present work veers away from approaches uncovering potential organizational principles for the entire Psalter, and instead *focuses on the closer relationships between the psalms themselves*» (p. 3). This entails a choice of «smaller constructional units», i.e. individual psalms as the base of analysis. According to Emanuel, the basic question an interpreter should try to answer is: «Why is Psalm X next to Psalm Y?» (p. 3) – a choice that is more in line with the classical *Formgeschichte* than with the so-called «canonical» approach. Emanuel builds his analysis of juxtaposition on the analysis of the technique of *association* brought about by Delitzsch and Keil (cf. M. PAVAN, «The Psalter as a Book? A Critical Evaluation of the Recent Research on the Psalter», in G. BARBIERO – M. PAVAN – J. SCHNOCKS [edd.], *The Formation of the Hebrew Psalter. The Book of Psalms Between Ancient Ver-*

sions, *Material Transmission and Canonical Exegesis* [FAT.I 151], Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen 2021, 11-82), introducing different types of verbal or thematic associations (pp. 4-9): *lexical* associations, involving single word or combinations of words «replicated in contiguous psalms» (p. 4); *semantic* or *thematic* «commonalities» (p. 5), through which juxtaposed psalms are united by «a common identifiable theme, which is addressed with different words» (p. 5); *sequencing* associations involve «both lexical and thematic association, one that determines the specific ordering of the two psalms» (p. 6) and is used to detect why one psalm was put *before* the other and not the opposite provided that «[n]othing inherent within the shared themes or vocabulary dictates the final sequencing of the psalms» (p. 6); *logical connections* – i.e. «causation, temporal sequence or overlap, question and answer, and promise and fulfilment» (p. 6). Finally, after evaluating the four different kinds of juxtaposition, Emanuel goes on and identifies the two main reasons why the editors of psalms implemented this redactional tool: *inner-biblical interpretation*, since the purposeful juxtaposition of two psalms is meant «to generate new layers of interpretation» (p. 7; cf. Y. ZAKOVITCH, «On the Ordering of Psalms as Demonstrated by Psalms 136–150», in W.P. BROWN [ed.], *The Oxford Handbook of the Psalms*, OUP USA, New York 2014, 214-228); *liturgy*, even if it is difficult to unequivocally establish a connection between a given sequence of psalms and the series of events in a prescribed order of service to be held in a festival or ceremony. Emanuel adds that «none of the potential juxtaposition strategies mentioned above are mutually exclusive» (p. 8) and that «the point at which individual psalms converge may fail to reveal any signs of the above strategies» (p. 8). This point «deters from the need to force the identification of a juxtaposition strategy where it is not warranted» (p. 8). In addition, Emanuel assumes there was an «arranger of psalms similarly functioning as a psalmist» (p. 9). Consequently, «two psalms may exhibit notable similarities [...] simply because an editor composed a psalm purposefully to complement an earlier work» (p. 9); besides, an arranger «would naturally adopt some of the same motivations for organizing stanzas within a psalm in his arrangement of independent psalms» (p. 9). In this way, «individual psalms themselves serve as enlarged stanzas in the hands of the editor» (p. 9). Is it possible to uncover the original intention of the sequencing of Psalms? «[A]ll conjecture of juxtaposition strategy leans towards a relatively conservative estimation» (p. 9).

Emanuel also highlights the methodological issues of the study of Psalms intertextuality, focusing on its two main «schools»: synchronic and diachronic approaches. The author declares that «[d]espite the inherent difficulties [...], the present work leans slightly more towards the diachronic approach [...] as opposed to the synchronic approach of intertextuality» (p. 11). A three-step approach is therefore brought to the fore: establishing «a point of connection between each psalm and an intertext» (p. 11); establishing «which of the texts represent the source, and which reflects the later borrower» (p. 12); once established the diachronical order, the need arises to know why «the psalmist sought a connection to his source» (p. 13): «to supplement his work via a well-known intertext» (p. 13) or the desire «to add authority to his work» (p. 14) or «to comment on or add insight to another biblical text» (p. 14). In cases where it is not possi-

ble to establish the diachronical order of the texts «the present volume discusses the literary connection from both points of view» (p. 14). Moreover, according to Emanuel *echo* is deemed to be different from *inner-biblical allusions* even if «it is impossible to ascertain incontestably the inner thoughts of a psalmist's mind as he writes his compositions, or to discern his library of resources» (p. 15). Finally, in cases where juxtaposition and inner-biblical allusion overlap, «they do not represent mutually exclusive phenomena» (p. 15). In fact, «[an] editor-arranger of the Psalter could easily write a psalm specifically intending to juxtapose it with an existing composition within an established collection» (p. 15).

The core of the commentary is of course the analysis of the individual Psalms belonging to the first Book of the Psalter (Pss 1–41). The author follows a quite stable pattern: identification of the theme and literary genre of the poem; short consideration of its structure and dating; intertextual analysis. No translation of the scrutinized text is offered to the reader and the analysis is limited to highlighting the possible explanations of the intertextual connections detected in the individual Psalms. In so doing, Emanuel collects a wide array of data and scholarly opinions that cannot be summarized here. Some passing remarks, meant to give a taste of Emanuel's approach, are nonetheless in order. Emanuel spends some time reviewing the intertextual connections created by the so-called «historical» or «biographical» Psalms titles, a place where inner-biblical allusion can be more easily detected (pp. 14–15). Emanuel correctly notes the possible link between Ps 3:1 and 2 Sam 15:14 and lists the lexical connection between Ps 3 and 2 Sam. He adds that the prophetic words of Natan (2 Sam 12) are not mentioned or hinted at in the Psalm and that sleeping (cf. Ps 3:6) plays no role in 2 Sam; therefore, «reading this text together with the psalm intonates divine activity empowering Hushai's advice» (p. 38). Ps 18 and 2 Sam 22 are undeniably the same text, even if some differences between the two can be detected. Emanuel seems to consider 2 Sam 22 another version of the same composition (p. 91) and «tentatively leans towards» the idea that both texts stemmed from a source now lost «simply because 2 Samuel 22, as a poetic text, is not entirely organic to its surrounding narrative» (p. 92). Ps 34:1 bears an enigmatic title, linked to a specific episode of David's life (1 Sam 21:11–16). In a footnote Emanuel, however, mentions that the name Abimelech (Ps 34:1) does not correspond to Achis (1 Sam 21:11–16) – a fact that puzzled many commentators. According to Emanuel, «[t]he most probable reason for the conflicting names is that the word Abimelech reflects a Philistine monarchic title, like the title Pharaoh is used in Egypt» (p. 153). Moreover, he seems to be open to a midrashic origin of the «mistake» (quoting C.R. SEITZ, «Psalm 34: Redaction, Inner-Biblical Exegesis and the Longer Psalm Superscriptions – “Mistake” Making and Theological Significance», in C.R. SEITZ – K.H. RICHARDS [edd.], *The Bible as Christian Scripture. The Work of Brevard S. Childs*, Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, GA, 2013, 285s), since the title transforms the psalms from a «wisdom text» to a «thanksgiving» and generates an effect called by Emanuel «a practical-to-abstract relationship» (p. 154). Moreover, reading in parallel the psalm and 1 Sam 21 allows the reader to identify the divine action, apparently absent in 1 Sam narrative.

Emanuel also tackles the issue of «parallel» psalms (Ps 14//53; 40:14-18//70:2-6). Ps 14 is «one of the more challenging psalms to navigate in the Psalter» (p. 72). After reviewing the main hypothesis about the relationships between Ps 14 and 53, he states: «[t]hey represent variants of the same psalm» (p. 72). And «[t]hrough the passage of time, one or more editorial hands combined both collections as part of the Psalter reflected today in MT» (p. 73). Ps 40 is considered a «mixed composition» by most of the authors. It especially shows a striking parallel with Ps 70 (cf. Ps 40:14-18, and Ps 70:2-6). Emanuel reviews «a few potential explanations» (p. 183) of this parallelism and concludes: «[a]lthough inconclusive, evidence suggests Psalm 40's author reused Psalm 70 in addition to other texts, to develop and shape a new composition» (p. 184). Ps 40:14-18 is therefore an «independent version of the same composition» (p. 184). Emanuel highlights two notable differences between the two versions (Ps 40:16 and Ps 70:4; Ps 40:18 and Ps 70:6) and considers them to be scribal errors or «developments» (p. 185). Another difficult issue in Psalms scholarship is that of division or segmentation of the poems (cf. the recent: P.J. SANDER, *Alternate Delimitations in the Hebrew and Greek Psalters* [FAT.II 117], Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen 2020]). In this respect, a cornerstone is represented by the *vexata quaestio* of the division of Ps 9 and 10. Emanuel correctly notes that these psalms are not connected with their literary neighbors (p. 190; cf. also Ps 36) and goes on stating that they must be treated as a single composition for multiple reasons (acrostic shape; evidence from Vulgate and LXX; Ps 10's lack of a title; lexical and thematic connections). The separation of the two was a «mistake» by the MT editors and the text suffered «significant corruption» (p. 60) – a judgment that would have required a more thorough analysis (cf. the nuanced analysis in SANDER, *Alternate Delimitations*, 27-81).

At the end of the volume, in the «Afterword» (pp. 190-193) Emanuel sums up the major outcomes of his analysis. He recognizes that «the principle of association [...] patently serves as an influential factor in the sequencing of Book I of the Psalter» (p. 190). Many intertextual or inner-biblical allusions can be detected in Book I. However, in almost all cases it is difficult to ascertain the direction of influence, to the point that «irrefutable evidence regarding who borrowed from whom ultimately remains elusive at this time» (p. 191). Moreover, Emanuel finds evidence of «some psalmists also functioning as editors/arrangers, composing psalms with the specific intent of complementing an existing psalm» (p. 191). The author brings forth as evidence Ps 1-2; 20-21. Emanuel states that «the books of the Pentateuch form the most common target for psalmists» together with «prophetic literature and the Writings, especially with regards to the wisdom literature in Proverbs» (p. 192). Further examination, however, could reveal a «new rationale for the juxtaposition of psalms, or additional evidence for rarer strategies» (p. 192). Moreover, further analysis may «shed additional light on preferred sources employed by psalmists» (p. 192).

The volume under review stands out for at least two reasons. It offers a thorough discussion on the methodological issues of juxtaposition and inner-biblical allusions, systematically organizing criteria and problems whose mention is scattered in commentaries and monographs. Moreover, it collects and discuss-

es a wide array of data about the lexical and thematic connections between the Psalms and the books of the Hebrew Bible, functioning as a kind of «anthology» on the subject. Some of Emanuel's choices, however, may appear not entirely justifiable. At the beginning of the volume, he declares that he is basing on «a select group of prominent commentaries» (p. 2), duly listed in the final bibliography (pp. 193-197). Nevertheless, the reader cannot but notice the absence of works – especially in German – that would have greatly broadened the horizon of the author's analysis. Let it suffice here to note: G. BARBIERO, *Das erste Psalmenbuch als Einheit. Eine synchrone Analyse von Psalm 1–41* (ÖBS 16), Peter Lang, Frankfurt a.M 1999; J.L. SKINNER, *The Historical Superscriptions of Davidic Psalms. An Exegetical, Intertextual, and Methodological Analysis* (PhD Diss. Andrews University), Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 2016; P. SUMPTER, «The Canonical Shape of Psalms 1–14», *OTE* 32(2019), 514-543. In addition, the choice not to consider possible macrostructural structures allows Emanuel to focus on the features of the individual psalms but gives the impression of a «fragmentary» analysis that leaves the discussion open to further issues: does the analysis of juxtaposition and inner-biblical allusions warrant the idea that the Psalter – or part of it – was arranged as «book»? Are the lexical and thematic connections between psalms evidence of the editorial work of the arranger(s) of the Psalter? In general, however, Emanuel's volume can be considered a valuable contribution to psalms research and work of reference for those who investigate the phenomenon of inner-biblical allusion/exegesis within the Psalter.

Marco Pavan
Case Sparse Orgi, 28
52018 – Borgo alla Collina (AR)
eremosgiuseppe@gmail.com

MATTEO CRIMELLA, *Padre nostro*, San Paolo, Cinisello Balsamo 2020, pp. 126, € 14, ISBN 978-88-922-2088-1.

Il libro propone l'analisi letteraria e teologica della pericope del Padre nostro, approfondendo i rispettivi contesti e segnalando le peculiarità delle singole versioni. Nell'Introduzione (pp. 9-16) l'autore segnala l'importanza liturgica, spirituale e teologica della preghiera insegnata dal Signore e ne delinea le principali questioni. Poiché lungo la storia sono innumerevoli i commenti scritti sul Padre nostro, solitamente i commentatori segnalano le differenze e le convergenze delle due versioni e poi «procedono al commento della forma più lunga, quella matteana, limitandosi a notare le diversità della redazione lucana» (p. 15). Invece, Crimella percorre un'altra strada che consiste nel «comprendere il Padre nostro anzitutto nella versione di Matteo e poi in quella di Luca, dentro il loro contesto, valorizzando le peculiarità di ogni vangelo» (pp. 15-16). Tenendo presente lo sfondo anticotestamentario e giudaico, viene proposta in forma essenziale