

Poängen är alltså att det kan finnas fler tecken på kristna skrivare än just förkortningar av heliga namn (*nomina sacra*) i såväl texter som paratexter. En mycket vanlig typ av ackumulerade textvarianter i evangelierna är så kallade harmoniseringar, vilket förutsätter kunskap om parallella texter som skrivare harmoniserat till. Det är uppenbart att sådana typer av varianter förutsätter kristna skrivare som inte bara kopierar en förlaga. Mugridge antyder denna brist, "there is no treatment here of the use of harmonisation to remote parallel readings as a means of discovering the Christian conviction of the copyist" (139).

Å ena sidan måste jag ge Mugridge rätt i att förekomsten av *nomina sacra* inte i sig är ett säkert bevis på en kristen skrivare. För min del ser jag detta och liknande fenomen som stauogrammet i kristna handskrifter (när kombinationen *tau-rho* tar formen av Jesus som korsfäst i grekiska ord för kors och korsfästa) mer som indicier. Å andra sidan finns alltså andra mer eller mindre starka kännetecken i handskrifterna som tyder på att kristna texter i högre grad kopierades av kristna skrivare än andra texter även om det är omöjligt att kvantifiera, kännetecknen som Mugridge förbiser.

Oavsett om man håller med Mugridge i hans slutsatser är hans studie mycket värdefull bara genom det faktum att han sammanställt detaljerad information om nära 550 tidiga handskrifter på ett förtjänstfullt sätt, vilket gör monografen till en viktig resurs i framtida forskning.

Tommy Wasserman, Örebro teologiska högskola

KATRIN MÜLLER

*Lobe den Herrn, meine "Seele": Eine kognitiv-linguistische Studie
zur nēfæš des Menschen im Alten Testament*

BWANT 215, Stuttgart: Kolhammer, 2018, Paperback, 259 pages,
€70, ISBN: 978-3-17-034436-5

The present work is a revised version of the author's dissertation, presented at the Faculty of Theology of the University of Bern in 2016. It aims at defining the Biblical Hebrew word *nepēš*, its use in the Old Testament (OT) and its role for the conception of human beings in the OT.

The study consists of six main parts. The first one (11–18) is the introduction, where Müller spells out the various problems connected with the interpretation of *nepeš*. It is evident from the start the most important conversation partner for Müller is the 1973 work of Hans Walter Wolff, *Anthropologie des Alten Testaments*, where *nepeš* was termed an anthropological “key word” (“Hauptbegriff”) of special importance for the conception of human beings in the OT. Müller’s overarching research questions (13) are: What position does *nepeš* have in the OT conception of human beings?; Is it connected to or with different functions or aspects of human beings?; Is it in the long run possible to speak of a *nepeš* concept? A discussion of the difference between concept and word turns out to be of central importance throughout the book.

The second part (19–99) is a very ambitious survey of *nepeš* research, starting in “pre-critical” time. The earliest entry mentioned is the dictionary of J. Reuchlin from 1506. It turns out that already Reuchlin criticized the common translation of *nepeš* with “soul,” a problem of great importance for Müller’s study. I will return to this point. The first “modern” study dealing with *nepeš* was Charles Briggs’s study “The Use of *nepeš* in the Old Testament” from 1897. An important work is also the 1920 book of Johannes Pedersen (Israel), which would turn out to be of great importance for Wolff. This also goes for Aubrey Johnson’s *The Vitality of the Individual in the Life of Ancient Israel* (1949). Then Müller presents the work of Wolff, as well as a number of later works. Apart from presenting the various conversation partners of Müller’s study, the survey aims to show why another study of *nepeš* is motivated. As I understand it, this is mainly because of two flaws in Wolff’s work: 1) The idea of a peculiar “Hebrew thinking,” where *nepeš* plays a central part, especially in the “stereometrical way of thinking” and the “synthetic body conception”; and 2) Wolff’s confusion of “word” and “concept” (which is connected to the first point). The overarching idea here is of course that Wolff’s study is of central importance to how the research tradition after him has conceived of *nepeš*, a point I will return to.

In the third part (100–125), a couple of methodological questions are addressed. Here, the critical questions in connection to Wolff are

raised. First and foremost, the idea of a peculiar “Hebrew thinking” is criticized. Müller introduces her main theoretical frame, which comes from cognitive linguistics: “Conceptualization” and “conceptual structures.” When it comes to *nepeš*, the idea of conceptual metonyms, such as “body part for person” or “body part for function” is of special importance. In Müller’s view, this is an overarching definition of the function of *nepeš* in the OT. It should be noted at as such, it is a *Voraussetzung* for the subsequent analysis of the different meanings of *nepeš*. The conceptual metonyms, Müller notes, are universal, existing not only in Biblical Hebrew but also in present day German or English. This is in itself a strong critique against Wolff’s idea of a peculiar “Hebrew thinking,” a train of thought which, as Müller to my mind correctly states, goes back to Pedersen and Johnson.

In the fourth part (126–205), the different meanings of the word *nepeš* are outlined. The section consists of a survey of a great number of *nepeš* instances from different OT books. Müller starts with the concrete meanings “throat” (“Kehle”) and “breath” (“Atem”), from where various figurative meanings are supposed to have been derived. She then goes on to discuss a number of instances where *nepeš* stands for various emotions. Next, Müller discusses *nepeš* under the heading “body part for person,” thus one of the conceptual metonyms outlined in the third part. Then, the much discussed question if *nepeš* can mean “corpse” or “dead person” is addressed, as is the very common rendering “soul” (Müller concludes that the rendering “Seele” [“soul”] should at all times be avoided in a scholarly setting, whereas it might be justified in a confessional setting).

When the different meanings of *nepeš* have been surveyed, the question of the place of *nepeš* in the Old Testament *Menschenvorstellung* is addressed in the fifth and, to my mind, most important part of the study (206–304). Müller first raises the question if there is such a *Menschenvorstellung*, which she hesitantly confirms: there are, after all, certain common traits in the OT, such as the “createdness” (“Geschöpflichkeit”) of human beings. But, she warns, it is not self-evident that only by addressing the function and meaning of *nepeš* will one

uncover the *Menschenbild* of the OT. Then, the question of a synchronic vs. diachronic study is addressed. Müller says that since the metonymic use of *nepeš* is so frequent in all parts of the OT, there is no need for a diachronic study. Under the heading “the metonymic use of *nepeš*,” *nepeš* is then discussed in its different metonymic uses, such as “body part for person” or “body part for function.” In a latter part of the section, the metonymic use of *nepeš* is compared to the metonymic use of other “anthropological words,” such as *ruah*, *bašar*, *leb*, *lašon*, and *šapah*. Müller claims that different words stand for different functions of human beings. Based on these findings, she can refute the very common idea that different anthropological words are interchangeable with each other. She also refutes the idea that *nepeš* is an anthropological “key word,” since different anthropological words are of equal importance for the *Menschenvorstellung* of the OT. The human functions that *nepeš* designate, for example “vitality” or “neediness,” are not per se more important than other such functions.

Müller’s study is well written and well researched. She perfectly masters the very wide field of *nepeš* research, clearly arriving at new findings which cannot be overlooked. Still, I want to raise a couple of questions. First, it is not clear why Wolff’s work would merit such a status as to be the main starting point for a study on *nepeš*. After all, it is only 25 out of 350 pages (in the 2010 edition) of Wolff’s *Anthropologie des Alten Testaments* that focus on *nepeš*. And, as Müller notes, Wolff followed a train of thought already set by Pedersen and Johnson (and, I would claim, both of them focus on *nepeš* much more than Wolff does). Why, then, not start with either of them? It is a bit ironic that Müller herself notes on page 97 that Wolff’s main interest was not *nepeš* in itself, but the OT’s *Menschenvorstellung*. Secondly, Müller’s study reads at parts very much as a response to the question of whether *nepeš* can be translated as “soul.” This is obvious from the first part of the book’s title: *Lobe den Herrn, meine “Seele.”* Furthermore, on the first line on the first page of the introduction, Müller starts out with a quote from Tomas Krüger: “Die Seele ist uns abhandengekommen.” To my mind, this is a bit un-

fortunate, since Müller's aim is really not to discuss whether *nepeš* means "soul" or not. By still focusing so much on this question, Müller seems to be stuck in an older discussion, which draws attention from her primary aim. Furthermore, if this question is to be discussed, it is to my mind necessary to compare with other Ancient Near Eastern "soul concepts." But it is only on page 289, when the study is coming to an end, that such concepts are being addressed.

Despite these critical remarks, Müller's study merits attention for its contribution to the questions of the meanings of *nepeš* and the conception of human beings in the OT. No one doing research on *nepeš* can overlook this thoughtful, thought-provoking and well written study.

Richard Pleijel, Uppsala universitet

DANIEL C. OLSON

*A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch:
"All Nations Shall be Blessed"*

SVTP 24, Leiden: Brill, 2013, Inbunden, xii + 296 sidor,
SEK 1210, ISBN: 978-9-00424-530-3

Olsons bok om djurapokalypsen (hädanefter AnApoc) i 1 Hen 85–90 är ursprungligen hans doktorsavhandling (2010). Olsons vill visa att AnApoc är en ambitiös teologisk tolkning av mänsklighetens historia med hjälp av allegorier i ljuset av förbundet med Abraham (14). Denna förståelse av apokalypsen utgår från en *Urzeit wird Endzeit*-modell, med en första del från Eden till Isak och en andra del från Jakob till ett återvunnit Eden. Från den jordiske Jakob till en ankommande himmelske Jakob redogörs således för Israels historia. Syftet med Israels historia i AnApoc är, enligt Olson, att visa på det dynamiska i moraliskt ansvarstagande och betydelsen av ett autentiskt möte med Guds härlighet. I slutändan betjänar Israels historia inget annat syfte, och upphör dessutom att existera i slutet av apokalypsen när det sanna Israel uppstår i uppfyllelse av löftena till Abraham om universell välsignelse genom hans avkomma. Detta sista, menar Olson, är den styrande dynamiken i hela allegorin.