

SVENSK EXEGETISK ÅRSBOK
82



På uppdrag av Svenska Exegetiska Sällskapet
utgiven av Göran Eidevall

Uppsala 2017

Utgivare och redaktör: Göran Eidevall (goran.eidevall@teol.uu.se)
Redaktionssekreterare: David Willgren (david.willgren@altutbildning.se)
Recensionsansvarig: Rosmari Lillas-Schuil (rosmari.lillas@gu.se)

Redaktionskommitté:

Göran Eidevall (goran.eidevall@teol.uu.se)
Rikard Roitto (rikard.roitto@ths.se)
Blaženka Scheuer (blazenka.scheuer@ctr.lu.se)
Cecilia Wassén (cecilia.wassen@teol.uu.se)

Prenumerationspriser:

Sverige: SEK 200 (studenter SEK 100)

Övriga världen: SEK 300

Frakt tillkommer med SEK 50. För medlemmar i SES är frakten kostnadsfri.

SEÅ beställs hos Svenska Exegetiska Sällskapet via hemsidan eller postadress ovan, eller hos Bokrondellen (www.bokrondellen.se). Anvisningar för medverkande återfinns på hemsidan eller erhålls från redaktionssekreteraren (david.willgren@altutbildning.se). Manusstopp är 1 mars.

Tidskriften är indexerad i Libris databas (www.kb.se/libris/), samt ATLA Religion Database®, publicerad av the American Theological Library Association, 300 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 2100, Chicago, IL 60606; e-mail: atla@atla.com; webb: www.atla.com.

Omslagsbild: Del av 11Q19, ”Tempelrullen”, daterad till mellan första århundradet f.v.t och första århundradet v.t.

Svenska Exegetiska Sällskapet
c/o Teologiska institutionen
Box 511, S-751 20 UPPSALA, Sverige
www.exegetiskasallskapet.se



ISSN 1100-2298

Uppsala 2016

Tryck: Bulls Graphics, Halmstad

Innehåll

EXEGETISKA DAGEN 2016

<i>Eidevall, Göran</i> , 80 år senare: Exegetiska sällskapet, <i>SEÅ</i> och de exegetiska dagarna – tal vid exegetiska sällskapets 80-årsjubileum	1
<i>Crawford, Sidnie White</i> , Textual Growth and the Activity of Scribes.....	6
<i>Laato, Antti</i> , Rewriting Israel's History in the Apocalyptic Context: Animal Apocalypse in First Enoch	28
<i>Docherty, Susan</i> , Why So Much Talk? Direct Speech as a Literary and Exegetical Device in Rewritten Bible with Special Reference to Pseudo-Philo's <i>Biblical Antiquities</i>	52

ARTIKLAR

<i>Spjut, Petter</i> , Polemisk etikett eller saklig beteckning? En studie av svenskspråkiga opinionsbildares användning av termen "gnosticism" och dess implikationer för bibelvetenskaplig och kyrkohistorisk forskning	76
<i>Hedlund, Simon</i> , Who Are the ἀρσενοκόϊται, and Why Does Paul Condemn Them (1 Cor 6:9)?	116
<i>Kelhoffer, James A.</i> , Simplistic Presentations of Biblical Authority and Christian Origins in the Service of Anti-Catholic Dogma: A Response to Anders Gerdmar	154

REPLIKER

<i>Gerdmar, Anders</i> , The End of Innocence: On Religious and Academic Freedom and Intersubjectivity in the Exegetical Craft – A Response to James Kelhoffer	179
<i>Kelhoffer, James A.</i> , A Diverse Academy Recognizes No Boundaries for Critical Inquiry and Debate: A Rejoinder to Anders Gerdmar	210

RECENSIONER

Aichele, George, <i>Simulating Jesus: Reality Effects in the Gospels</i> (Joel Kuhlin)	223
Amos, Roger, <i>Hypocrites or Heroes? The Paradoxical Portrayal of the Pharisees in the New Testament</i> (Tobias Ålöw)	226
Collins, John J., <i>Encounters with Biblical Theology</i> (Stig Norin)	230
Dochhorn Jan, Susanne Rudnig-Zelt, and Benjamin Wold (eds.), <i>Das Böse, der Teufel und Dämonen – Evil, the Devil, and Demons</i> (Torsten Löfstedt)	235
Ehrman, Bart D., <i>Jesus Before the Gospels: How the Earliest Christians Remembered, Changed, and Invented Their Stories of the Savior</i> (Joel Kuhlin)	239
England Emma och William John Lyons (red.), <i>Reception History and Biblical Studies: Theory and Practice</i> (Mikael Larsson)	243
Fewell, Danna Nolan (ed.), <i>The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Narrative</i> (Josef Forsling)	245
Gordon, Robert P. and Hans M. Barstad (eds.), <i>“Thus speaks Ishtar of Arbela”: Prophecy in Israel, Assyria and Egypt in the Neo-Assyrian Period</i> (Magnus Halle)	249
Giuntoli Federico and Konrad Schmid (eds.), <i>The Post-Priestly Pentateuch: New Perspectives on Its Redactional Development and Theological Profiles</i> (Jan Retsö)	256
Hayes, Elizabeth R. och Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer (red.), <i>“I Lifted My Eyes and Saw”: Reading Dream and Vision Reports in the Hebrew Bible</i> (Stefan Green)	261
Heilig, Christoph, <i>Hidden Criticism? The Methodology and Plausibility of the Search for a Counter-Imperial Subtext in Paul</i> (Joel Kuhlin)	264
Kim, Yeong Seon, <i>The Temple Administration and the Levites in Chronicles</i> (Jan Retsö)	268
Klein, Anja, <i>Geschichte und Gebet: Die Rezeption der biblischen Geschichte in den Psalmen des Alten Testaments</i> (Lars Olov Eriksson)	272
Klink III, Edward W., och Darian R. Lockett. <i>Understanding Biblical Theology: A Comparison of Theory and Practice</i> (Bo Krister Ljungberg)	274
Knoppers, Gary N., <i>Jews and Samaritans: The Origins and History of Their Early Relations</i> (Cecilia Wassén)	278

Markschies, Christoph, <i>Christian Theology and Its Institutions in the Early Roman Empire: Prolegomena to a History of Early Christian Theology</i> (Carl Johan Berglund)	282
Mettinger, Tryggve N. D., <i>Reports from a Scholar's Life: Select Papers on the Hebrew Bible</i> (Cian Power)	285
Neusner, Jacob och Alan J. Avery Peck (red.); William Scott Green och Günter Stemberger (rådgivande red.), <i>Encyclopedia of Midrash. Biblical Interpretation in Formative Judaism. Volume I-II</i> (Tobias Ålöw)	289
Porter, Stanley E. och David I. Yoon (red.), <i>Paul and Gnosis</i> (Paul Linjamaa)	291
Smith, Geoffrey S., <i>Guilt By Association: Heresy Catalogues in Early Christianity</i> (Martin Wessbrandt)	295
Strauss, Mark L. och Paul E. Engle (red.), <i>Remarriage After Divorce in Today's Church</i> (Bo Krister Ljungberg)	299
Willgren, David, <i>The Formation of the 'Book' of Psalms: Reconsidering the Transmission and Canonization of Psalmody in Light of Material Culture and the Poetics of Anthologies</i> (Anja Klein)	302
Wright, Tom, <i>The Day the Revolution Began: Rethinking the Meaning of Jesus' Crucifixion</i> (Mikael Tellbe)	306

sources at hand, it is also a testament to the resilience of the view of the Hebrew Bible's "classical prophecy" as the original matrix of prophecy. In fairness, the brevity of the format (10–20 pages) does not allow for any extensive comparisons. No two contributors discuss the same biblical texts nor do they pursue identical themes or concepts within the texts discussed. This broad approach may be welcomed by some readers. In my view, it leaves us with a collection that seems more disparate than perhaps was necessary. Several authors note the need to contextualize prophecy within the broader category of divination. This is hopefully the next step in the comparative study of the texts discussed in this volume.

Magnus Halle, Lund University

FEDERICO GIUNTOLI AND KONDRAD SCHMID (EDS.)

*The Post-Priestly Pentateuch: New Perspectives on
its Redactional Development and Theological Profiles*

FAT 101, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015, Hardcover, viii + 351 pp., €114,
ISBN: 978-3-16-153121-7

One of the contributors to this volume (M. Köckert) mentions, not without a whiff of nostalgia "[jene glückliche Tage] als es in der Pentateuchforschung noch Gewissenheiten gab, die von den meisten geteilt wurden." Everyone familiar with the developments in the study of the Torah-book knows that since at least three decades those happy days are gone. The classic four-source hypothesis once so brilliantly presented by Julius Wellhausen has in the view of many crumbled with only ruins remaining.

The present volume, a collection of articles dedicated to Jean Louis Ska on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, deals with the aspect of dating, an issue which was put on the table once again by some of the iconoclasts in the seventies. The book contains 17 contributions, all by well-known names in the field. The introductory chapter by K. Schmid (1–18) gives a survey of the discussion about the "post-P" elements in the Pentateuch showing how the sections seen as additions or developments of the final P-layer tend to grow according to several scholars.

Schmid gives credit to one of the pioneers on this field, viz. Julius Popper, who already in 1862 presented arguments for postdating Exodus 36–39, especially pointing out linguistic similarities between this section and the Samaritan Pentateuch. Schmid's paper gives the basic perspective for the following contributions.

D. Carr (19–34) also refers to Popper. He discusses several passages which indicate harmonisations between D and P as well as material which is “mid-second Temple,” for example the so-called *mal'ak*-layer which consequently is later than the final priestly shape of the text. He is less convinced about the lateness of Genesis 14 and 15 as well as Joshua 24 as post-P. R. Achenbach (35–51) discusses the use of divine names in contexts where “heathens” acknowledge the Israelite god and identify their own *'elôhîm* with YHWH. In light of this Genesis 20 must be post-P. R. Albertz (53–74) belongs to those who assume a Hexateuch redaction encompassing Genesis-Joshua (Blum; Schmid; Römer; e.a.). Albertz' Hexateuch redaction is more comprehensive than assumed by many others, and appears almost identical with the old Elohist. Unlike Wellhausen & co. Albertz dates this layer after Nehemiah. B. Jackson (75–111) discusses the relationship between the levirate marriage law in Leviticus and the book of Ruth, marking the differences between institutionalized written law and local practice illustrated in the book. B. Levinson (114–23) deals with one of the most central texts in the discussion of the sources of the Pentateuch, viz. the Flood story in Genesis 6–8. He sees it as a redaction of a P-variant and a non-P-story by a post-P redactor whose ambition was to harmonize the differences. Chr. Levin (125–43) argues that the promises to the patriarchs outside the Priestly Code are literary additions to the patriarchal stories. Some are yahwistic and pre-P but most are post-P. J. Blenkinsopp (145–56) analyses Genesis 17, i.e. P's circumcision story, and arrives at the conclusion that 17:1–8 is original P, the rest is from late Achaemenid times. M. Köckert (157–76) analyses Genesis 20–22 and finds most of it post-P: most of the stuff in the section is *Bearbeitung* of the material in chapters 12–19 and at least chapter 22 is definitely a post-P composition. A. Rofé (177–84) deals with the admonitions not

to leave the Holy Land reflected in Genesis 24 and 26 and the related chapter 46 and adduces several quite convincing arguments that these texts are post-P. Th. Römer then tackles the Joseph story (185–201). His conclusion is that the Joseph story was not known to P, and that its content connects it with what is told in the book of Esther and Daniel. According to him it is a diaspora novella composed during the Persian period. F. Giuntoli gives a thorough analysis of Genesis 48, i.e. the chapter about the two sons of Joseph – Ephraim and Manasseh (203–32). According to Giuntoli, the two names represent the returning exulants from Babylonia, and the function of the chapter is to give legitimacy to the returnees over those who had remained in the land, reflecting conditions described in Ezra and Nehemiah. J. Chr. Gertz (233–51) argues that the linking of the Joseph novella and the Exodus story belongs to the Priestly text, thus a late redaction. L. Schmidt (253–75) analyses the passages about the rod of Moses, arguing that most of them belong to a post-P redaction. A pre-P layer is visible in Exodus 4, 17 and Numbers 20, which has been expanded by a post-P redactor to whom most of the other remarks about the rod belongs. H.-Chr. Schmitt (277–303) puts the “Sinai overture” in Exodus 19:3b–9 in a larger context, assuming an “enneateuch” layer that is traceable until 2 Kings, characterized among other things by the concept “listening to YHWH’s voice,” the purpose of which is to mediate between, or even amalgamate, the two separate theological strains of D and P. We are thus in a post-P stage. Chr. Nihan (306–29) studies Leviticus 26:39–46, i.e. the conclusion of the so-called Holiness Code, arguing that the section has a clear post-exilic character combining elements and concepts from D, P and also other layers. Like the Sinai overture it mediates between the main theological strains in the Pentateuchal tradition. Finally E. Otto (331–41) gives a lucid *exposé* of the discussion about the relationship between Deuteronomy and the Priestly Code. Like many others he claims the existence of a post-P redaction of the Torah book. And he is quite explicit that D including Joshua might be post-P additions to the work. Schmid’s and Otto’s articles are in fact excellent introductory and

concluding extensive surveys of central issues in the debate and provide a suitable framework for the intervening contributions.

Two remarks of a more comprehensive kind will be made, which actually represent two sides of the same problem. The first is the absence of linguistic considerations in the studies. Among the 17 contributions which all deal with the problem of dating – relative and/or absolute – only one (A. Rofé) adduces linguistic arguments as support for the suggested late dating of the text analysed (Genesis 24). The track suggested already by J. Popper, one and a half century ago, is not followed. But this creates a problem which should be tackled and which is noted by D. Carr (30). Since almost all contributors assume additions to the text after the final formulation of the Priestly Code, we end up with texts composed after Ezra-Nehemiah at the same time as Chronicles, and even later texts like Esther and Daniel. At the same time, almost all of these supposed late additions linguistically represent Standard Biblical Hebrew (SBH), whereas the late canonical texts just mentioned are in Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH). Only A. Rofé is able to point to LBH elements in Genesis 24, which support his late dating. A dramatic example of the contrary is Römer's analysis of the Joseph story where he quite convincingly shows its parallel to Esther and Daniel as far as thematic contents are concerned. But the problem is that that text is a paradigmatic example of SBH with no traces of LBH. In fact, both the Priestly Code and Deuteronomy seem to be good SBH, their language quite distinct from that of e.g. Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles, let alone Esther and Daniel.

A solution to this problem is the assumption that SBH and LBH were contemporary linguistic registers that could be used alternatively and that the difference has no importance for dating. This idea was launched a decade ago by a group of scholars led by I. Young. But several competent linguists have put their theses into serious doubts and it is obvious that the problem cannot be ignored. It seems clear that the claim by Young & co. is very problematic at best and possibly untenable.

This leads to the second remark. We are faced with a dilemma: many of the arguments of the present volume on the post-P additions to the Pentateuch make sense and often give elegant explanations of the passages treated. But what about the language-question? If it is unlikely that perfect SBH was written during the entire Achaemenid period and even into the Hellenistic age what do we do with the obvious post-P texts singled out in the present volume? Only one solution seems possible: if the additions are post-P and their language is impeccable SBH we have to ascribe an earlier date to P than the traditional one. This is clearly the implication of Otto's study in which he dates Deuteronomy after the Priestly Code. In fact, the studies collected in the present volume give strong support for an early date of P – perhaps against the intentions of many of the contributors. In fact, their arguments for the texts treated to be seen as post-P show that P must be older than assumed by them.

This means that some of the analyses may have to be adjusted. The Joseph novella definitely has an exilic perspective, but it does not follow that it must be almost contemporary with Esther and Daniel. There were Israelite exulants before that. The image of the sons of Joseph in Genesis 48 may well reflect an exilic perspective, but could it not refer to an exile before the time of Ezra and Nehemiah? Why are the forebears of the two Joseph tribes used as legitimization of returning exulants after 539 BCE? One would rather expect a story about Judah. It looks more as a legitimization of the return of the Israelites, i.e. the northerners.

It rarely happens that someone gets the final word in the discussion about the Pentateuch and these studies are no exceptions. But we have received fresh food for new thought.

Jan Retsö, Gothenburg University