of D-like language in the Tetrateuch beyond Deuteronomy itself simply indicates the use of Dtr “Sprachklichesees” by later redactors (e.g., pp. 157, 343, 614, 645 n. 32); but that argument prodigally jettisons the very evidence at the disposal of the critic. Thus, ex hypothesi, Otto can find neither D nor P in Num 13–14 and must therefore invoke post-Dtr and post-P redactors, reusing D and P’s sources. But, if the argument about P6 above has force, then these restrictions are removed, and a much more economical theory is available. The essentially unitary material in Deut 1 provides a reminiscence of a Dtr story embedded in Num 13–14. The variations from Deut 1 in Num 13–14 are indeed to be accounted for by the work of a later editor in the latter. Otto identifies that later editor as “post-priestly”. But, once again, how does one distinguish between priestly material and subsequent reuse of that material (an issue noted on p. 427 n. 24)? The editorial procedures in Num 11–21 are recognizably similar to those in Exodus (reuse and transposition of older material; insertion of blocks of new material), where the hand of P can readily be recognized (as I have argued in FS Nicholson).

On Otto’s argument, every piece of writing is pulled out and strung along an extended timeline. Literary history is conformed to political history (the circular argumentation of which Otto accuses De Wette and his successors can thus only be intensified). Parallel materials have to be located at different points on that timeline. If Otto is really impressed by “external evidence”, then perhaps the literary conservatism of ancient Near Eastern writing, not least its legal compositions, should be borne in mind.15 This reviewer would espose the much simpler hypothesis that parallel materials come from the same source and that there are only two main streams in interaction. Oddly enough, Otto makes sounds in the same direction: “a critical discourse [took place] between D and P during the exile. Post-exilic Jewish scribes mediated these two exilic programmes and created the Pentateuch as the result of innerbiblical scribal exegesis of D and P” (p. 3). The disagreement arises from one’s account of the process and progress of this mutual critical discourse. Over against Otto’s maximalism, I should affirm minimalism: uniform D-version followed by P-edition of it. One wishes Otto well in the completion of his commentary which, every indication suggests, will be of epic proportions. It is, I suppose, too late to hope that the enterprise already well launched can be redesigned in slimmer, more manageable, form.

University of Aberdeen, Scotland, William JOHNSTONE 21 May 2010

* * *

15) Reviewed by Otto in ZAR 11 (2005), pp. (361-69) 364-66, not included in this collection (I thank Dr. R.B. Salters for obtaining me a photocopy of that review).

Even more interesting would be a discussion of his views from a Jewish perspective. As it is presented here, Yahwism primarily functioned as a preparation for a universal monotheistic religion. Is this the same as Christianity? Lemaire does not say so, but it seems to be the implication of his description of Yahwism as an evolutionary process, in which things are getting better all the time and in which the loss of the temple in Jerusalem is in this framework a positive development. Not everyone will agree with Lemaire’s picture of the origin of the synagogues and their relation to the temple cult. One can also question his use of the prophetic texts criticizing cult practices. Their condemnation of misuse can also be interpreted as a way of helping to restore the right temple cult in Jerusalem.

The book contains a number of illustrations. They seem to have been added to the book by someone other than the author, as can be derived from the lengthy and redundant marginal notes relating to these pictures.

The endnotes of chapter 13 are missing.

Kampen, January 2010

Klaas SPRONK