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(p. 252) refers to “footnote 45 above,” which also cannot be found. Several lines of the list of spatial adverbs in paragraph 7.1 (p. 257) have been split and re-joined incorrectly with confusing results.

Despite these minor shortcomings, this grammar is an important contribution, giving a picture of a fascinating variety of NENA, and helping to fill out our knowledge of the Jewish dialects. One hopes that the author will continue his work on this dialect with comparative and historical discussion of some of the many interesting features of ANA.

SAMUEL ETHAN FOX
CHICAGO, IL
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This volume is a collection of papers given at an international symposium on the current state of Pentateuchal studies held on January 10–12, 2010, in Zurich, Switzerland. The current state is fragmented: The Graf-Wellhausen documentary hypothesis (JEDP) remains dominant in the United States when it comes to matters of composition history. Israeli scholars tend to focus their attention on refining the documentary hypothesis by using literary models to isolate complete sources and fewer redactions than was typical in source-critical studies of the mid-twentieth century. The Graf-Wellhausen paradigm is no longer dominant in Europe, where attention has turned to fragments and supplements alongside source documents, and scholars tend to work with only a P and a non-P version rather than four independent sources. The goal of this symposium was to bring together scholars from these three regions in an effort “to overcome the parochialization in the global academic landscape with regard to questions of the Pentateuch’s literary development” (p. xi). The editors acknowledge that the symposium did not create consensus but did help everyone realize the need for increased dialogue and cooperation.

A major strength of this work is its organization and coverage. The essays are divided into sections on Genesis; Exodus-Deuteronomy; P, H, and D; and Pentateuch in the Hebrew Bible and Its History of Reception, so readers can easily dip in based on their area of interest. Within each section, the coverage of literature and issues is fairly comprehensive. The Genesis section deals with the P creation narrative, the fall, the flood story, the connection between the primeval history and the patriarchal narratives, social conventions in the patriarchal narratives, and the Joseph story. The Exodus-Deuteronomy section includes treatments of itineraries, the Decalogue, how to identify blocks of material, post-P revisions, the formation of legal texts, and the relationship between Deuteronomy and the Tetrateuch. The section on P, H, and D treats questions of covenant and circumcision, the issues of how to distinguish P from H and whether P is source or redaction, the role of H in the final redaction of the Pentateuch, and the development of P and D law.

One misses only a treatment of the Covenant Code. The last section on the final formation of the Pentateuch includes essays on the relationship between Torah and prophets and between Torah and Deuteronomistic literature; the issue of how final redactions created a Pentateuch, a Hexateuch, and an Enneateuch; the role of scripturalization in the late stages of formation; and how versions (in this case,
Samaritan Pentateuch) might illuminate these late stages. Paired with a book like Ernest Nicholson’s *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century* to provide some of the backstory, this volume would be an excellent introduction to the current issues and methods in Pentateuchal studies.

The editors’ view that no consensus emerged from this symposium is certainly true when it comes to a model of composition history, and the essays in the volume illustrate the fractured state of the discipline. But we do see an emerging methodology in the essays comprising the first section on Current Issues in Methodology, and the following points are some of the most important insights in the volume: The study of composition history (*Literarkritik*) was conceived as a concern for the literary integrity of the text which also accounted for the places where it was thought to lack integrity, and we are reminded that any model of composition history needs to be judged on the basis of how well it solves the literary problems in the text (Schwartz, Kratz). As such, we should avoid splitting the text into different sources, fragments, or redactional layers where the text we have is coherent (Ska) and avoid positing a textual prehistory where we cannot demonstrate one (Kratz). Documented cases of transmission history should be used as a control so that we avoid developing models that involve anachronistic scribal procedures (Carr). Historical concerns should come into play only once we have isolated a text’s literary history (Schwartz), and we should avoid assuming an overly simplistic relationship with historical context in our effort to date texts (Sommer). A coherent methodology is arguably more important than consensus on a particular model of composition history and, if scholars could begin to employ all of these methodological principles consistently and rigorously, we would be well on our way to a more unified discipline.

Some essays in the volume illustrate hurdles that must be overcome if we expect our dialogue and cooperation to be of the highest, most productive quality. One such hurdle is the massive quantity of secondary literature. The literature cited in Blum’s essay on the Decalogue, for example, was virtually all written by European scholars, and perhaps this selection was made out of a desire to keep the essay focused. But we must actively engage one another—and show this in our footnotes—if we expect to have meaningful cooperation. Some essays fail to reckon with counterarguments. Levin, for example, cites Hupfeld (1853!) as evidence that the documentary hypothesis is “one of the most secure discoveries in the whole field of critique and literary history” (p. 226).

Productive dialogue must involve serious and thoughtful consideration of contemporary issues, not retrenchment. A few essays contain unstated warrants, unclear development, and in some cases inconsistencies (e.g., Krüger). But coherent, well-founded, and transparent arguments are essential if we are to get to the bottom of our points of contention as well as establish points of consensus. Finally, different approaches must be defined on their own terms. Stackert divides the world of Pentateuchal studies into Neo-Documentarians (source critics) and Non-Documentarians (redaction critics). Redactional approaches did originate as arguments against the documentary hypothesis, but they have come into their own and should be allowed to stand as such. Given the diversity of approaches currently used, categorizing scholars based on whether they assent to or dissent from a particular model will only serve to create deep polarization (evident in some of the essays in the volume) that hinders productive dialogue. To achieve the kind of cooperation the editors envision, we must learn to recognize those things that get in the way so we might work to overcome them, and for that reason I was glad to see these problems come to light in the volume.

A number of essays nicely illustrate what such cooperation could look like. Schwartz argues that the documentary hypothesis must stand if we come up with plausible readings of texts using it, which puts the documentary hypothesis in a dominant position in the conversation. But true cooperation requires a level playing field with equal investment from all parties. Schmid argues that we need to deal with documents, fragments, and supplements, and that we are best off to ask: Which model of composition history best explains the literary integrity of the text and accounts for the places where it lacks integrity? This way of framing the discussion would create a collaborative model rather than one characterized by offense and defense. Studies that apply one model of composition history to a text (e.g., Dozeman, Baden) are of more limited value to this conversation than studies that compare models (e.g., Hendel, Stackert), since the latter expose the strengths and weaknesses of different models.
Also helpful are studies that, while they loosely presume one model of composition history, offer insights that would remain useful in some fashion no matter what model one used (e.g., Shectman). Chavel’s study is worth highlighting because it does not presume a particular compositional model, but studies how specific features of the text serve different sets of literary goals and allows the model of composition to emerge from that discussion. Approaches like Shectman’s and Chavel’s may be the most productive ways to further the conversation, as they are focused more on explicating the text than proving the worth of a particular model.

One question that is not being asked aggressively enough (and is not asked at all in this volume) is this: What constitutes literary integrity, and how do we know where the text really lacks it? Ska rightly argues that we should not break up what is already coherent, but how do we know where the text is not coherent? Opponents of the historical-critical project have rightly alleged that the warrants for positing fractures or unevenness in the text are rarely acknowledged and often arbitrary. The essays in this volume provide important insights about the way toward a better understanding of the Pentateuch’s literary development. I would add that much greater engagement with literary theory is needed. Literary theory is often relegated to a different sector of biblical studies concerned only with synchronic questions, but appropriate theories must be more widely explored if we wish to create the strong foundation we need to write a literary history of the Pentateuch.
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After his extensive journeys throughout Asia Minor and the Greek peninsula, the apostle Paul sailed to Rome for a trial before the emperor. At the end of Acts of the Apostles he was still living in Rome as a preacher and a teacher. For the remainder of his life only legendary accounts survive. The most famous and most durable of these legends claimed that eventually Paul was beheaded as a martyr at Rome.

David Eastman has now provided an excellent overview of the development and significance of the cult of St. Paul in the western empire through the sixth century. Because Paul soon joined the apostle Peter as a patron saint of Rome, his cult was most prominent at the capital. The cult of St. Paul was furthermore honored in Gaul, Spain, and North Africa.

At Rome the cult of St. Paul was venerated at two principal sites a few miles outside the great walls. One site was south of the city near the Tiber River. As Eastman notes, over time the legends offered “an increasing level of precision about the details of Paul’s martyrdom” (p. 16). Eventually the legends identified the persecuting emperor as Nero and located Paul’s execution and burial on the road leading to Ostia. In the early fourth century the emperor Constantine constructed a church that included the saint’s tomb. According to Eastman, this church signified a new cooperative relationship. Now “the apostle and the emperor worked together as . . . protectors of this great city” (p. 27). A century later the emperor Theodosius replaced this small church with a much more extravagant building that was larger even than the Church of St. Peter on the Vatican. Subsequent bishops of Rome, including Leo in the mid-fifth century and Gregory at the end of the sixth century, modified the area around the tomb, and many pilgrims visited. The Church of St. Paul outside the Walls remains a pilgrimage destination today. Within the last decade archaeologists have discovered an ancient sarcophagus in this church, and Pope Benedict has recently asserted that it contains the saint’s remains (p. 38).