BibAn 3 (2013) 203-205

Bartosz Adamczewski, *Retelling the Law. Genesis, Exodus-Numbers, and Samuel-Kings as Sequential Hypertextual Reworkings of Deuteronomy.* (European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions 1; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2012). Pp 376. US$ 82,95. € 58,70. ISBN 978-3-631-63034-1

JANUSZ LEMAŃSKI

Faculty of Theology, Szczecin University
address: Papieża Pawła VI 2, 71-459 Szczecin, Poland; e-mail: lemański@koszalin.opoka.org.pl

It has been a few decades since Martin Noth published his thesis saying that the Book of Deuteronomy and the so-called Deuteronomic History present a literary work in every respect independent from Genesis-Numbers. Beginning in the late 1960-ties observations on the numerous connections between the classic Jahwist and the so-called Deuteronomic language and ideas were carried out and then fully developed in the 1970's. This resulted in new theories concerning the composition of the Pentateuch and the Genesis-Kings. On one hand, the classical model of four sources/traditions (J, E, D, P) was either rejected (E. Blum) or reconsidered a new post-D Jahwist (Ch. Levin, J. Van Seters). On the other hand, new theories were developed which, in a more complex way, tried to explain the composition of Genesis-2 Kings.

The monograph discussed here has been based on those new theories. The author describes the method as being based on the procedure of the "sequential hypotextual reworking of earlier writings in later ones" (p. 17). The author's main thesis states that the Book of Deuteronomy was used as a literary basis in the process of the composition of the Book of Genesis and then also of Exodus –Numbers and Samuel-Kings (pp. 17-19). This method uses a comparison based not so much on the "verbatim repetition of wording or of the study of literal use of a given earlier text in a later text but on looking for common, creatively transformed literary themes, ideas and motifs of both texts" (p. 20). The details of the method are presented on pages 21-22. In part this kind of methodology was criticized by W. Gross, "Ist biblisch-theologische Auslegung ein integrierende Methodenschritt?," F.-L. Hossfeld (ed.), *Wieviel Systematik erlaubt die Schrift? Auf der Suche nach einer gesamtbilischen Theologie* (QD 185; Herder 2001) 110-149.

The monograph consists of four chapters. Chapter one (pp. 25-33) presents the theory that Deuteronomy 1-3; 33-34 is an Israelite sequential hypertextual reworking of Ezekiel; chapter two (pp. 35-181) that Genesis is a reworking

of Deuteronomy; chapter three (pp. 183-223) that Exodus – Numbers is a reworking of Deuteronomy; chapter four (pp. 225-280) that Samuel-Kings is a Judean a reworking of Deuteronomy. Each chapter has its own conclusion (pp. 32-33, 175-181, 222-223, 272-280) and the whole study has general conclusions (pp. 281-283), a bibliography (pp. 285-315) and an index of ancient sources (pp. 316-376).

The general conclusions contain, apart from the proposal of sequential rewriting, two theses which are worth mentioning that "the theory of the existence of the so-called sources or traditions of the Pentateuch (J, E, D, P) and the distinction between the so-called Deuteronomic (or non-priestly) and priestly idea in the Pentateuch" … should be abandoned as it is "too simple if not purely artificial" (p. 282). While we can agree with the first statement, the second one gives rise to considerable doubts. The editorial reworking of the whole text never blurs the distinctions between the individual texts which differ from one another regarding ideology and theology. Most of all, the monograph lacks an introduction which would present *status quaestionis* in the current discussion on the composition of the Book of Deuteronomy and of the Deuteronomistic tradition (cf. E. Otto, R. Achenbach [ed.], *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2004; M. Witte *et al.* [ed.], *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke. Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur "Deuteronomismus"-Diskussion in Tora und Vorderen Propheten*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter 2006; M. Beck *et al.* [ed.], *Auf dem Weg zur Endgestalt von Genesis bis II Regum. Festschrift Hans-Christoph Schmitt zum 65. Geburtstag*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter 2006).

Current research on the Pentateuch is, also contributing to the research on the composition of the Book of Deuteronomy, the so-called Deuteronomic History and their later reception (cf. E. Otto, in: *ZAW* 119 [2007] 319-340). The author of the monograph does not refer to any current research on this topic. Moreover he does not outline any current research results on the composition of Genesis, Exodus-Numbers (except p. 35-36) or Samuel-Kings (e.g. M. Garsiel, "The Book of Samuel: Its Composition, Structure and Significance as a Historiographical Source," *JHS* [2010], 2-42).

Currently, Gen 1-11 is thought to have been a quite late composition. However, one can find various types of material there. Rejecting distinctions between priestly (e.g. Gen 1;5) and non-priestly (e.g. Gen 2-4) texts ignores the main differences between individual texts, differences which were not erased by the editorial work (cf. Gen 7:1-5).

Though the thesis that Deut 1-3 depends on Ezekiel (p. 25-33) seems to be interesting, it is still far too difficult to prove that, e.g., Gen 1-2 depends on

Deuteronomic motifs (p. 34-43), Gen 3 depends on Deut 1:26-2:1 (p. 44-49), Gen 12:9-20 on Deut 6:20-25 (p. 70-71), and Gen 16 on Deut 8 (p. 80-81). Gen 12; 16 are often read as an anti-Exodus polemic (T. Römer). These texts are usually dated to the pre-exilic period. Comparisons based only on the similarity of motifs, as the author mentions several times (e.g. p. 46-47, 80, 82, etc.), makes determining the chronology of those texts difficult. Consequently, statements such as *something is borrowed from* are not convincing as a method, and should be understood as just a hypothesis.

Often, however, the author's suggestions seem to be correct and inspiring. The structural dependence between the non-priestly tradition in Exodus and its presentation in the Book of Deuteronomy (esp. Deut 1-11) has been already noted. The Book of Numbers is considered now to be the youngest part of the Pentateuch (cf. R. Achenbach). Since the new Jahwist seems to have written his texts when many Deuteronomic concepts had been already corrected, the examples which confirm the thesis of the reworking of the Deuteronomistic tradition in these books are interesting. T. Dozeman has already made several such suggestions in his commentary to the Book of Exodus (2009). He successfully used the division into priestly and non-priestly texts, a division that was rejected by B. Adamczewski in his monograph. In conclusion, the author states that "the author of Exodus-Numbers, with the author of Genesis, reformulated the ideas of Deuteronomy in a very creative way which completely deconstructed the Deuteronomic idea of holy war, by reformulating it into those of a miraculous, but in itself, natural disaster (Ex 14:28 diff 7:20)" (p. 222-223). The commentaries by T. Dozeman (to Exodus) and Achenbach (to Numbers) suggest, however, the existence of several authors and the so-called final editor/redactor of those books. Moreover, the last chapter raises considerable doubts. The discussion on the Deuteronomic impact on 1-2 Samuel has not yet been resolved so the thesis that "Samuel-Kings were written at the beginning of the Hellenistic period, presumably c. 300 B.C." (p. 277) is highly questionable (cf. the contributions by T. Römer and E. Otto in *Die deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerke*, 45-70, 71-102). Undoubtedly, we need to think of an editorial work which looked at the redaction of Genesis-Kings and we need to look for it in the Judean *milieu*. We can also agree with the conclusion that "The Books of Samuel and Kings narratively suggest that the major prophetic and Deuteronomic traditions were (and should be) fulfilled in the Jerusalem temple and in the house of David" (p. 279). From this perspective the Judean parahistorical work, like earlier the Book of Deuteronomy, may be regarded as another, this time distinctively Jewish, New Testament narrative (cf. 2 Kgs 23:2-3:25). In our opinion, however, we should think of the Persian rather

than the Hellenistic period, when dating the editorial work of Genesis–2 Kings. As for the details we can discuss with the author of the monograph itself, whether his conceptions about the development of motifs are correct. As a whole, the monograph by Adamczewski represents a valuable contribution to the further discussion on the composition of Genesis-Kings.