

sie werden vom mazdayasnischen Engel Saroš, vom Heiligen Geist oder Gabriel inspiriert, was aber vielleicht nur Bilder für die Stimme des eigenen Herzens sind. Sie sind Initiierte (*āšnā*), Geheimniskenner. Ihre Welt ist die Welt des Herzens, ihr Standort jenseits von Raum und Zeit, am himmlischen Thron (*‘arš*). Von hier aus erhalten auch ihre Hyperbeln und phantastischen Argumentationen eine andere Funktion. Was beim arabischen Dichter als Verzerrung der Wirklichkeit oder allenfalls als ein kühner aber zielloser Sprung in den grenzenlosen Raum der Phantasie erscheint, ist beim persischen Dichter esoterischer Richtung (und ebenso bei den ihm folgenden Dichtern anderer Sprachen des islamischen Kulturkreises) Ausdruck jener neuen Dimension. Die Seele des Dichters gleitet mühelos durch die verschiedenen Stufen der Welt und des Seins, die er, nach neuplatonischem von Schia und Sufik rezipiertem Weltbild, als Emanationen des Ureinen begreift.

So sind die Unterschiede zwischen arabischer und persischer Dichtung Ausfluss eines verschiedenen Weltbildes, einer verschiedenen Ontologie. Wahrheit und Wirklichkeit sind für den am inneren Sinn (*ma‘nā*, *bāṭin*) der Dinge interessierten persischen Dichter etwas Grundverschiedenes als für den im wesentlichen am *ẓāhir* haftenbleibenden arabischen Dichter. Das versuchte der in Krakau in 1972 gehaltene Vortrag durch zahlreiche programmatische Äußerungen arabischer Poetiker und persischer Dichter zu verdeutlichen.

ANDRZEJ ZABORSKI

STRUCTURAL METHODS AND OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES *

There is a very great variety of structural trends, schools and traditions which may have different value for Biblical studies¹. It must be very strongly emphasised that there is no „structuralism“² in singular since all trends which may be rather conventionally grouped under this name are very diversified. There is, however, a false tendency among Biblical scholars to equate „structuralism“ with C. Lévi-Strauss' „structural anthropology“ or with the ideologies of the so-called „French structuralism“ (these are also very differentiated) and to neglect other, much different and more promising methods in linguistics, poetics and the study of culture in general which have been developing

* This is the summary of an article published in Polish in RBiL, 2, 1973, pp.117—130, dedicated to the memory of Rev. Doz. Dr. Ludwik Stefaniak.

¹ It must be emphasised that Biblical studies represent a typical case of interdisciplinary research and they should group specialists from different branches, i.e. philologists, linguists, literary scholars, historians, etc. etc. and not merely universal „Alttestamentler“. There is a need both for specialization i.e. the emergence of separate and largely autonomous disciplines like e.g. literary study of the OT and for a simultaneous cooperation of specialists. This seems to be the very way for reestablishing contacts with other disciplines and for adapting their methodological lore in order to liquidate the long isolationism and the pseudo self-sufficiency of Biblical studies.

² Some scholars no more use the term „structural“ or „structuralism“ which has been, as a matter of fact, frequently misused. E.g. Chomsky criticizes „structural linguistics“ by which he understands taxonomic „classical“ schools and especially the American distributionalism. Chomsky must be, however, considered as structuralist in the broader sense of the word.

under the banner of „structuralism” since approximately sixty years. There is a „structuralist mode” in France with her particular intellectual milieu and this mode radiates into some other countries. The ideologies and attempts at constructing philosophical systems become, naturally enough, fashionable and known better than their scientific background — they become also subject to a severe criticism which is quite unjustly generalized and extended to „structuralism” *en bloc*. Biblical scholars should not confine themselves to the „French structuralism” which is too influenced by literary criticism and essay writing — „structuralism” is not a philosophy (though certainly the philosophical foundations and implications are extremely important) in the first place nor an ideology but a variety of methods *par excellence*.

There is an urgent need for familiarization of Biblical scholars with the really up-to-date linguistics³ in view of the importance of linguistics not only for the study of languages and for language teaching but also for the study of literature and of culture in general as integrated in the development of semiotics⁴ which treats the whole culture as a kind of text. This does not mean any devaluation of the philology which is obviously indispensable for editing the texts. There is an urgent need for really modern studies of Biblical languages combining the study of syntax (including traditional morphology) and semantics e.g. in the frame of transformational-generative⁵ grammar and extending the lin-

³ Cf. E. Nida, *Implications of Contemporary Linguistics for Biblical Scholarship*, JBL, 91, 1972, 73—89.

⁴ Cf. Th. Sebeok, *Semiotics: A Survey of the State of the Art*, The Hague 1972; G. Wienold, *Semiotik in der Literatur*, Freiburg 1972; Ed. J. Kristeva, *Essays in Semiotics*, The Hague 1971; Y. S. Stiepanov, *Semiotika*, Moskva 1971; *Sign, Language, Culture*, The Hague 1970; U. Eco, *La struttura assente*, Milano 1968, J. Ruesch, *Semiotic Approaches to Human Relations*, The Hague 1972.

⁵ Standard transformational-generative theory as developed by Chomsky has already become „traditional”. In the recent studies much more emphasis is being put on semantics and on the discourse (i.e. text) analysis. Chomsky's grammar is criticized as not „deep” enough and limited to sentence. This does not change the fact that Chomsky's theory „generated”, inspired or influenced most of the contemporary linguistics opening a new period.

guistic study beyond sentence i.e. producing text grammars^{5a}. Such studies would be extremely important for better understanding and translating the texts (e.g. the study of paraphrase i.e. of the occurrence of the same deep structure and of the same meaning in different surface-structures) and for preparing really modern and effective handbooks, programs⁶ and dictionaries⁷. In spite of the number of semantic studies dealing with Biblical problems, little use is being made of the really new structural semantics of which there has been a tremendous development in the past ten years⁸:

The literary study which did not develop within Biblical studies into an autonomous branch so far, follows, e.g. when analysing „literary genres”, the outdated, academic principles and methods which are taxonomic being limited to labeling with traditional, inadequate and quite superficial definitions⁹. Let

^{5a} Cf. T. A. van Dijk, *Some Aspects of Text Grammars*, The Hague 1972; J. Ihwe, *Linguistik in der Literaturwissenschaft*, München 1971; D. Brener, *Einführung in pragmatische Texttheorie*, München 1972; W. Dressler, *Einführung in die Textlinguistik*, Tübingen 1972; J. S. Petöfi, *Transformationsgrammatiken und eine kotextuelle Texttheorie*, Frankfurt 1971; P. Hartmann, H. Rieser, *Einführung in die Textlinguistik*, Braunschweig 1972.

⁶ Cf. my article *Teaching the Language of the Bible*, F. O., 14, 1973, 65—76.

⁷ Cf. especially the new model of dictionary elaborated by A. K. Žolkovskiy and I. A. Mielčuk, *Towards a Functioning „Text-Meaning”-Model of Language*, Linguistics, 57, 1970, 10—47. Cf. also L. Zgusta, *Manual of Lexicography*, Praha 1971.

⁸ Cf. e.g. Eds. D. D. Steinberg, L. A. Jakobovits, *Semantics — an Interdisciplinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics and Psychology*, Cambridge 1971; eds. D. Davidson, G. Harman, *Semantics of Natural Language*, Dordrecht 1972.

⁹ Cf. W. Richter, *Exegese als Literaturwissenschaft — Entwurf einer alttestamentlichen Literaturwissenschaft und Methodologie*, Göttingen 1971, which marks progress — cf. my review of this book in this (15, 1974) volume of FO. Cf. also K. W. Hempfer, *Gattungstheorie*, München 1972. For structural analyses of „literary genres” cf. especially the classical study by V. Y. Propp, *Morfologiya skazki*, 2d ed., Moskva 1969 (English translation of the first edition — Austin 1968, French one — Paris 1970), and by G. L. Permiakov, *Izbranniye posloviye i pogovorki narodov Vostoka*, Moskva 1968, and *Ot pogovorki do skazki*, Moskva 1970.

us quote a fragment of the most important book by van Dijk who describes the deficiencies of the classical (not only Biblical!) scholarship in the following way: „... the major defects concern its methodological foundations (if any), the (lack of) explicitness of its descriptions, definitions and explanations, and the form and interrelations of its theories (if any). The great bulk of traditional literary scholarship, or „literary criticism” can easily be considered as pre-, if not anti-, theoretical, and therefore must be qualified as pre-scientific in the sense defined below”¹⁰. Modern methods of literary research i.e. first of all those aimed at constructing text grammars which are based on the expanded transformational-generative theory and modern semantics must be applied in order to gain really valid results and to explain how the Biblical texts actually work. Theory of OT literature (this includes not only literary but also less-literary and non-literary texts!), a history of literature (with literature and literary problems in the focus!) as well as fundamentally new accounts of OT stylistics, versification etc. are badly needed. Certainly this does NOT mean an abandon or a neglect of the tradition, of its great lore. The criticism by van Dijk mentioned above is rightly followed by the sentence: „This does not mean, however, that many of its (i.e. classical literary scholarship — A. Z.) observations or intuitive generalizations could not be used, when made explicit, in the adequate theories to be developed”. Biblical scholarship has been too much concentrated on the problems of social and generally cultural environment of the literature neglecting the study of purely literary problems. The balance or better say the right proportions must be introduced — there should be a special emphasis on the study of literary texts by themselves without disregarding, however, the working of these texts in different (in time and space) societies. We need, as formulated by van Dijk, a study of literature „not as an undifferentiated whole, but rather as a SYSTEM of collected properties and certain properties of their psycho-social „environment”, i.e. of their conditions and functions”¹¹.

Though in the past some of the structural schools abstained

¹⁰ T. A. van Dijk, *op. cit.*, p. 169.

¹¹ T. A. van Dijk, *op. cit.*, p. 168.

(this was, however, by no means a total abstention) from diachronic i.e. historical studies, these are by no means neglected today and we witness a renaissance of historical and comparative¹² studies in linguistics and this may exercise an influence on adjacent disciplines. Also in this domain there can be no question of abolishing the tradition — there is only a necessity of its reincarnation.

I wonder whether there would be scholars having serious objections to the following program: „Finally, a general theory of literary grammar must explain, among other things, how speakers of a language acquire the specific text grammar(s) which enable them to read, to interpret and evaluate literary texts, how rules are learned which may deviate from the rules underlying non-literary texts, how these rules may change in different cultures or times, and how „deviant” structures can be assigned well-formed semantic representations. More generally, a (universal or simply general) theory of literature must also explain why literary texts having such or such properties are produced under given socio-historical circumstances and why texts with these properties have such or such effects on readers or have such or such functions in given cultures and times”¹³. Of course this is only a program for further research since poetics is indeed a developing, i.e. a living science. Biblical studies may even contribute to its development owing to the peculiar character of the OT literature. So far OT texts have been used in the studies of a general scope only to an extremely limited extent.

New and large horizons are being opened by semiotics, e.g. the semiotic typology of religions and of the culture in general¹⁴.

¹² The traditional comparative studies are still much influenced by the diffusionist theory of borrowing which ascribes too much of the OT literature to foreign influence without taking into consideration both convergence and universals of literary activity.

¹³ T. A. van Dijk, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

¹⁴ Cf. especially numerous studies by V. V. Ivanov and V. N. Toporov, as well as the most important works by Y. Lotman, e.g. his *Struktura khudozhestvennogo teksta*, Moskva 1970 (German translation München 1972). Y. Lotman, *Statii po tipologii kultury*, Tartu 1970. On semiotic approaches to the literature cf. n. 4, as well as J. Kristeva, *Le texte du roman*, The Hague 1971; T. Todorov, *Poétique de la prose*, Paris 1971.

Much of the research has an experimental character but this may provide no excuse for neglecting its presence. The old, „widely appreciated” and pseudo-uncontroversial methods were experimental at their beginnings as well and they remain controversial and overtly ineffective. Real science is always experimental. There is no doubt that Biblical studies urgently need a scientific methodological revival.

ZDZISŁAW J. KAPERA

SOME REMARKS ON A NEW BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARCHAEOLOGY OF PALESTINE *

Archaeological research in Palestine has been in continuous progress for many years, and now it has been well documented in a number of publications, including bibliographies. The reader realizes with astonishment, then, that E. K. Vogel's compilation is in fact the first bibliography of its kind. Of course we do have a few useful current bibliographies. First of all there is the monumental work of Peter Thomsen, *Die Palästina-Literatur*, the seventh volume of which was edited by O. Eissfeldt and L. Rost in 1969—1972 (four fascicles). It covers the years 1940—1945 and the archaeology of the Holy Land takes an important place in it¹. As the second work we can mention the periodic bibliography by M. Cassuto-Salzmänn. She has prepared compilations for the years 1948—1958, 1959—1960, 1961—1963, 1963—1967². Annual bibliographies can be found in the *Elenchus Bibliographicus Biblicus* edited by Peter Nöber in chapter XVIII: *Archaeologia biblica*³. The quarterly bibliography in the *Bulletin*

* Eleanor K. Vogel, *Bibliography of Holy Land Sites*, Hebrew Union College Annual vol. XLII, Cincinnati 1971 (publ. 1972), pp. 1—96.

¹ P. Thomsen, *Die Palästina-Literatur. Eine internationale Bibliographie in systematischer Ordnung mit Autoren- und Sachregister*, Bd. VII. Die Literatur der Jahre 1940—1945, Lieferung 1—4, Berlin 1969—1972, chapter III, Archäologie, pp. 346—508.

² M. Cassuto-Salzmänn, *Selected Bibliography. Publications on Archaeological Excavations and Surveys in Israel*. 1948—1958, 'Atiqot 2, 1959, pp. 165—183; 1959—1960, 'Atiqot 3, 1961, pp. 188—198; 1961—1963, 'Atiqot. Suppl. to vol. IV, 1965; January 1964—June 1967, 'Atiqot. English Series. Suppl. to vol. VIII, 1969.

³ In the recent volume 52, 1971 (Rome 1972), pp. 455—504.