

RBL 04/2008



Beck, Martin, and Ulrike Schorn, eds.

***Auf dem Weg zur Endgestalt von Genesis bis II Regum:
Festschrift Hans-Christoph Schmitt zum 65. Geburtstag***

Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche
Wissenschaft 370

Berlin: de Gruyter, 2206. Pp. x + 293. Cloth. \$118.80.
ISBN 3110185768.

Klaas Spronk
Protestant Theological University
Kampen, Netherlands

In this Festschrift the reader can learn something about the famous German professor Hans-Christoph Schmitt, his extensive field of research and his methods, but more about a number of his students and colleagues who congratulate him by presenting to him in most cases summaries and parts of their own fields of research. In the preface Schmitt is presented as a classical historical-critical scholar in a period in which the old general concepts are fading and new broadly accepted theories about the formation of the “books of Moses” and the “former prophets” are not in sight: “Das Herausarbeiten zusammenhängender Textbereiche bzw. Schichten und die sich daraus ergebenden Möglichkeiten zur Beurteilung der Vorgänge, die letztlich zum Werden des Komplexes von Gen bis II Reg führten, gehören zu seinem bleibenden Verdienst” (vii). Most of the articles collected in the present volume belong to the same category of such a detailed redaction-critical analysis. For this reason and because they are of a high standard, they can be regarded as an appropriate tribute to a scholar known for his discerning and profound exegetical studies.

The book opens with a nice photograph of Schmitt, showing him as a friendly and enthusiastic teacher. The fitting reference to him as a scholar, however, in the form of his bibliography is missing.

The first contribution is by Konrad Schmid, “Buchtechnische und sachliche Prolegomena zur Enneateuchfrage” (1–14). In presenting a more general theory about the relation between collections of books, it differs from most of the other articles as characterized above. Schmid offers a fresh and stimulating approach to the well-known questions about the first nine books of the Hebrew Bible as one coherent whole. First he makes clear that from a book-technical point of view, it is possible that these nine books were written on one big scroll. On the other hand, this history of Israel probably was never used apart from the prophetic tradition.

Christoph Levin, in “Die Redaktion R^J in der Urgeschichte” (15–34), takes up a part of his monograph on the Yahwist (1993) in discussing the way in which the sources P and J were combined, especially in the story of the flood.

Werner H. Schmidt’s “Eine Querverbindung—Jahwistische Urgeschichte und Plagen-erzählung” (35–40) also draws from the results of his own prior research to show that P was not the first to connect the primeval history with the story of the exodus. Already before P there was a “Zusammenhang mit theologischen Grundgedanken” (40).

Jan Christian Gertz, in “Beobachtungen zum literarischen Charakter und zum geistesgeschichtlichen Ort der nichtpriesterlichen Sintfluterzählung” (41–57), discusses the book of E. Bosshard-Nepustil, *Vor uns die Sintflut: Studien zu Text, Kontexten und Rezeption der Fluterzählung Genesis 6–9* (2005), but also gives us a preview of his own forthcoming monograph on this subject: *Noah und die Propheten: Rezeption und Reformulierung eines altorientalischen Mythos*. He emphasizes the influence of the “Unheilsprophetie” upon the story of the flood, which can be explicitly marked in the aspect of God’s repenting.

Jörg Jeremias’s “Gen 20–22 als theologische Programm” (59–73), offers an original contribution in which he shows how far more interesting it is not to discuss a possible Elohist source but to read these chapters as one coherent whole, comparing the parallel stories of 21:8–21 and 22:1–14, 19. Another interesting observation is that Gen 22 and Exod 20 “sich gegenseitig auslegen wollen: Gen 22 ist die vorweggenommene Sinaioffenbarung zur Väterzeit, wie umgekehrt Ex 20 zur Deutekategorie von Gen 22 wird” (72).

Hans Werner Hoffmann, “Die affirmativkonjugation mit präfigiertem *waw* in der Genesis” (75–88), presents a detailed philological discussion of Gen 21:25 as the (small!) basis of some tentative conclusions about different sources and their dates.

Ulrike Schorn, one of the editors of the Festschrift, gave her contribution the title “Genesis 22—Revisited” (89–109), referring to an article by Schmitt on the same subject

published twenty years ago. Within the present collection, it could just as well be read as a reference to the preceding article by Jeremias, in which one finds many similar issues discussed with often similar conclusions. Unfortunately, there are no cross-references between these two contributions.

Ludwig Schmidt, “Die Priesterschrift in der Josefsgeschichte (Gen 37; 39–50)” (111–23), significantly begins with a reference to the author’s monograph *Literarische Studien zur Josephsgeschichte* (1986) and ends with a reference to the author’s monograph *Studien zur Priesterschrift* (1993). Those who are familiar with these studies will not be surprised by the conclusions of this contribution.

In “Gen 47,13–26—Ein irritierender Abschnitt im Rahmen der Josefsgeschichte” (125–38), Peter Weimar takes up Schmitt’s remarks on this text in his *Die nichtpriesterliche Josephsgeschichte* (1980) and adds some subtle considerations, using the same literary-critical method.

Markus Witte’s “Die Gebeine Josefs” (139–56) offers the interesting suggestion to read Gen 50:24–26 from the perspective of Sir 49:15 and the way the treatment of the corpse of Joseph is described there. He also takes into account later Jewish burial customs.

John Van Seters, in “The Altar Law of Ex 20,24–26 in Critical Debate” (157–74), takes up an issue he also discussed in his monograph *A Law Book for the Diaspora* (2003). Although he shares with Schmitt the view that this text should be dated relatively late, he also is very critical with regard to the redaction-critical method used by Schmitt.

In “The Composition of Ex 32 within the Context of the Enneateuch” (175–89), Thomas B. Dozeman discusses the composition of Exod 32 as well as the relationship between Exod 32; Deut 9:7–10:11; and 1 Kgs 12:26–32. His conclusion that there are no less than six possible tentative answers concerning the authorship of Exod 32 will not add to the confidence of the reader in the usefulness to this way of approaching the text.

Eckart Otto, in “Das Ende der Toraoffenbarung. Die Funktion der Kolophone Lev 26,46 und 27,34 sowie Num 36,13 in der Rechtshermeneutik des Pentateuch” (191–201), starts by praising Schmitt for his contribution in freeing the study of the Pentateuch from its “*captivitas Babylonica* der Pentateuchforschung durch Urkunden- und Kompositionshypothesen” (191). He ends his interesting observations about the endings of the books of Leviticus and Numbers with some thought-provoking remarks that in all probability will go beyond Schmitt’s ideas about the right way to study the texts. After concluding that the classical historical-critical method “an ein Ende gekommen ist,” Otto states: “Die diachrone Arbeit an der Literaturgeschichte des Pentateuch wird in Zukunft nur dann

wieder Grund gewinnen, wenn sie die literaturhistorischen Signale, die der Pentateuch in antiker Leseweise enthält, zum Ausgangspunkt nimmt, also mit und nicht gegen den synchron gelesenen Pentateuch arbeitet” (200).

Thomas Römer’s “Mose in Äthiopien: Zur Herkunft der Num 12,1 zugrunde liegenden Tradition” (203–15) tracks the traces of traditions about Moses found in the margins and outside of the Old Testament (with Josephus and Artapanos), namely, about Moses (not Joshua) having led the people into the promised land and about Moses having fought for the Egyptians in Ethiopia and also finding a wife there. He suggests that these are more than extrabiblical tradition, as they may have influenced the canonical text during the Hellenistic period.

In “Mose und David: Ein überlieferungs- und redaktionsgeschichtliches Desiderat?” (217–30), Ernst-Joachim Waschke asks the interesting question about the relation between the biblical traditions about Moses and about David. He concludes that David took precedence over Moses in the final redactions. He would have been more convincing if he had taken into account not only the composition of the Pentateuch and the book of Samuel but also the books of Joshua and Judges.

Martin Beck, “Messiaserwartung in den Geschichtsbüchern? Bemerkungen zur Funktion des Hannaliedes (I Sam 2,1–10) in seinen diversen literarischen Kontexten (vgl. Ex 15; Dtn 32; II Sam 22)” (231–51), is not only (with von Rad and against Noth) of the opinion that the Deuteronomistic History ends with a positive outlook but even finds eschatological expectations concerning the king. This is based on his analysis of the song of Hannah and related poems within the Deuteronomistic History. It is remarkable that Beck pays hardly any attention to the poetic aspects of the text (cf. the work of Fokkelman or Labuschagne; see www.labuschagne.nl). Again, although Beck is one of the editors, he did not use the opportunity to enter into a discussion with another author writing about a similar subject, in this case Waschke, who like Beck (on 250) is interested in the relation between Moses and David within the Enneateuch.

Matthias Köckert’s “‘Gibt es keinen Gott in Israel?’ Zum literarischen, historischen und religionsgeschichtlichen Ort von II Reg 1” (253–71) takes up and confirms the remarks made by Schmitt in his dissertation of 1970 about a late date of the story of King Ahaziah. Especially important in his view is the close relation to the story of the healing of Naaman in 2 Kgs 5. He assumes a date for both stories in the late Persian period.

Gunther Wanke, in “Jeremias Gebet nach dem Ackerkauf (Jer 32, 16–25) und der Pentateuch: Eine Problemanzeige” (273–77), refers to his lengthy commentary on the book

of Jeremiah (second part published in 2003) to make some short comments on Jer 32:16–25 being dependent upon Deut 26:1–15 and perhaps also Gen 18:14.

Otto Kaiser does not explain what his article, “Hybris, Atē und Theia Dikē in Herodots Bericht über den Griechenlandfeldzug des Xerxes (Historien VII–IX)” (279–93), has to do with the study of the Old Testament in general and with the theme of this Festschrift in particular. One only finds a short reference (280 n. 6) to the supposed tragic aspect of the Deuteronomistic History, but his study cannot be regarded as an argument in favor of recent suggestions to read the Deuteronomistic History against the background or even influenced by Greek historiography. Kaiser does make some interesting philosophical observations, however.

In addition to what was said before about the lack of a bibliography, it has to be remarked that collections such as this book should at least have an index of biblical texts.