

vidkänns brottet eller förnekar att vad som hänt vore fel. På samma sätt kan en ångerfull förövare förlåta sig själv när offret inte vill förlåta, trots att den som gjort fel gjort allt för att ställa till rätta. Bash framhåller dock att ensidig förlåtelse eller självförlåtelse inte kan bli lika mättad och fullständig som när två personer ingår i den.

Exemplet är belysande eftersom författaren i föreliggande bok, liksom i den mellanliggande boken *Just Forgiveness* (observera ordleken i denna titel: "endast", "bara", "inget annat än" förlåtelse, respektive "schysst", "rättfärdig", "rättmätig" förlåtelse), kritiserar förlåtelse utan moral: "... det finns många svårigheter kopplade till den omhuldade uppfattningen att det allmänt sett skulle vara ärbart att förlåta den obotfärdige" (44). Något chockerande för den mer oreflekterande (slappare?) uppfattningen om förlåtelse torde Bashes hantering av ämnet "Forgiveness and Repentance" (förlåtelse och ånger/botfärdighet) vara, att Jesus inte förlät obotfärdiga, inte ens då han på korset ber Gud förlåta sina plågare eftersom de inte visste vad de gjorde. Bash menar här, liksom beträffande stenandet av Stefanus och dennes slutord, att poängen är att Gud inte skall tillräkna vedersakarna vad de gjort. Hade de insett Jesu identitet, och att vad Stefanus predikade var sant, skulle de ha varit moraliskt skyldiga, vilket Paulus småningom kom att inse och därmed bli, med åtföljande ånger och botfärdighet (43).

Den stora poängen hos Bash är, att utan ånger (omvändelse, bekännelse) och bättring (gottgörelse, så långt det är möjligt) är förlåtelse teologiskt sett inte möjlig.

*Bo Krister Ljungberg, Knivsta*

JOSHUA A. BERMAN

*Inconsistency in the Torah: Ancient Literary Convention  
and the Limits of Source Criticism*

Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017, Hardcover, 320 pages,  
\$75, ISBN: 978-0-19065-880-9

Even if the documentary hypothesis explaining the growth of the Pentateuch, as formulated by H. Graf, A. Kuenen, and J. Wellhausen during the latter half of the nineteenth century, reigned supreme in biblical

scholarship during one century, there have always been dissenting voices and sceptics. Apart from the rejection of the whole methodology from people with fundamentalist inclinations of different kinds, some scholars of the historic-critical school have raised objections as well, among them J. Pedersen, F. Winnett, and I. Engnell. One of their main arguments against the hypothesis has been that the analytical procedure of its adherents, viz. to look for contradictions, different terminology, linguistic variation etc. and explaining them as due to the amalgamation of different, originally independent sources is based on a misunderstanding of what kind of literature the Torah book in fact is. The result is the embarrassing fact that after one century of intense discussion about the history of the Pentateuchal text glaring disagreements on central issues remain. J. Berman's (JB) argument in this volume is that the Pentateuch (and the rest of the Hebrew Bible as well) should be read as a specimen of Ancient Near Eastern literature where the kind of ideological and terminological consistency looked for by these scholars is irrelevant. "When biblicists hypothesize theories of textual development, they do so while situated in a distinctly modern textual culture, and are thus prone to project anachronistic attitudes and practices upon cultures at a great distance from them in time and place" (202).

The book is structured into three main parts with an introduction and a conclusion. Part I—"Inconsistency in Narrative"—takes the example of the report of the battle at Qadesh by Raamses II which exists in three quite diverging versions and compares it to the account of the crossing of the sea in Exod 14–15. According to JB, the differences between the two accounts assumed by traditional source criticism in the account of the crossing ("P" and "JE") are similar to those in the Qadesh text, and since there is no reason to assume that the latter is composed by different "schools" (all versions are assumed to have emerged from the chancellery of the Pharaoh), we could very well assume the same for Exod 14–15. There follows a comparison between the Hittite vassal treaties and the book of Deuteronomy. It is shown that the former often contain different versions of the historical background when a treaty is renewed.

In Part II—"Inconsistency in Law"—the often-noted discrepancy between the different law corpora in the Pentateuch (the "Book of the Covenant," the "Holiness Code," and the laws of Deuteronomy) are discussed. Instead of seeing them as competing law collections emerging from different schools, polemicizing against each other, JB wants sees them as revisions and updates of each other. Here, he makes a quite relevant comparison as he refers to modern-day constitutional laws like the American constitution from 1789. Since the date of its promulgation, the constitution has been continuously updated through thirty-three amendments, and this is done without any cancellation of the original text, the latter is still legally valid and plays an important role in the political rhetoric, despite the fact that several paragraphs are no longer implemented.

Part III—"Renewing Pentateuchal Criticism"—contains "a critical intellectual history of the historical-critical paradigm in biblical studies," which serves as a preamble to a critical analysis of traditional source criticism, as applied to passages about the rescue of Moses (Exod 2:1–10) and the flood story (Gen 6–9). The preamble, which is in many ways the most central part of this book, attempts to show how the very idea of source criticism, as practiced by the Kuenen-Graf-Wellhausen school and its successors is founded upon a specific view of historic testimony originating in the German romantic movement that ultimately uses intuition and imagination as the basic tools for source analysis. According to JB, this makes it impossible to agree on basic matters, such as a definition and dating of the posited documents. In light of this, JB stresses the necessity of developing empirical methods for textual analysis. A main tool for such a process would be the analysis of Ancient Near Eastern texts. By analyzing their narrative techniques and handling of historical evidence, one may be able to establish models that are not based on intuition and imagination but on the structures and characteristics of texts from the biblical world. JB illustrates his point by proposing that one should analyze how the author of 1 Chronicles has handled his main source viz. the books of Samuel and 1 Kings. Such an analysis would then provide empirical facts on which a model can be construct-

ed which, in turn, could be tested on 2 Chronicles without considering the corresponding parts of the book of 1–2 Kings. Last, one could then test such a model of the source of the Chronicler against the source itself (1–2 Kings), as it is documented.

JB illustrates the arbitrariness of interpretation exhibited by “historians” through an analysis of the story of the rescue of Moses. That the narrative is parallel to the Sargon legend, as documented in Neo-Assyrian sources, is obvious to everybody. But according to JB, the often proposed dating of the Exodus version to the seventh century that is a result of the identification of this parallel ignores a lot of other Egypt, the Hittites, and Old Babylonian evidence of this motif of the exposed child who is raised and becomes a hero. When all evidence into account, JB argues, the support for the above-mentioned dating is considerably weakened, since the story about Moses could have been told at any time.

Last, through an analysis of the flood account, JB tries to show that the composition of the story as it is preserved in the received text is a chiasmic composition which does not fit the traditional division into a J and a P source. Similar compositions are also found elsewhere in the Pentateuch, such as the story of Abraham (Gen 12–22) and the plague account (Exod 6–12). According to JB, the author is dependent on the Gilgamesh version of the flood and the division into two parallel accounts becomes unlikely, since both assumed sources adduce bits and pieces of the Gilgamesh version, and because the chiasmic structure becomes visible only if the story is read as one literary composition.

Berman’s book contains a lot of things worth thinking about. His criticism of the traditional documentary hypothesis and its prerequisites is definitely to the point. His call for empirically based models of analysis based on studies of other ancient literary texts to replace the intuitive methods so often encountered in traditional Pentateuchal studies is only to be applauded. Nevertheless, Berman must admit that the traditional P-layer in the flood account is in fact an almost completely coherent story, while the J-sections are not. In this case, then, the old supplementary hypothesis seems to be able to provide an account of the structure

of the text that goes well with the continuous revision and completion procedures he advocates for in the law corpora. One can only sympathize with his demand for empirically founded methodology, but why not look into a historiographic tradition that has so far been completely ignored by Old Testament scholar, both documentarians and their critics? I propose that the early Arabo-Islamic history writing can be seen as a laboratory where one can test all models suggested for the Pentateuch. There we find examples of all the well-known hypotheses, not as suppositions but verified black-and-white with source references and all which allows us to follow how tradition literature is handled during centuries. Much more than Graeco-Latin or Medieval historiography, the Arabo-Islamic tradition can give us crucial insights into these issues and provide a solid ground for the methodological renewal looked for by Berman.

*Jan Retsö, Göteborgs Universitet*

JOHN D. CURRID OCH DAVID W. CHAPMAN (RED.)

*ESV Archaeology Study Bible*

Wheaton: Crossway, 2018, Inbunden, 2048 sidor,

SEK 356, ISBN 978-1-43355-040-9

Den stora fördelen med *ESV Archaeological Study Bible* är att man löpande kan läsa en bibelbok och samtidigt få en exegetisk bakgrundsteckning ur ett arkeologiskt perspektiv. Upplägget är mycket robust och redan innehållsförteckningen vittnar om god ordning i de arkeologiska leden och gedigen redaktionell aktivitet av förlaget. De medverkande författarnas arkeologiska meriter presenteras med "biografiska skisser" samt vad de bidragit med. Dessa namnges även i samband med djuplodande specialartiklar.

Detta är förvisso en arkeologisk studiebibel men likafullt och samtidigt huvudsakligen en bibel. I ett förord positionsbestäms därför ESV-översättningen (English Standard Version) visavi en "klassisk huvudfåra" av engelska bibelöversättningar, såsom KJV, ASV och RSV. ESV:s översättningsfilosofi beskrivs, liksom hur dess översättningsprinciper förhåller sig till begreppet stil.