

The Question about the Hypertextual Relations in the Book of Genesis Still Open

Bartosz Adamczewski, *Genesis. A Hypertextual Commentary* (European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions 25; Berlin *et al.*: Lang 2020). Pp. 288. ISBN (Hardcover) 9783631837566

Wojciech Pikor

Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń
wojciech.pikor@umk.pl

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2656-152X>

ABSTRACT: The article is a critical review of the commentary by Bartosz Adamczewski – *Genesis. A Hypertextual Commentary*. After presenting the theses put forward by Adamczewski in his commentary on Genesis, the criteria of sequential hypertextuality implemented by Adamczewski and his method of delimiting literary units that remain in hypertextual relations are critically reviewed. The methodological weakness of the hypertextual commentary on Genesis cannot be covered up by the creativity of the commentator.

KEYWORDS: Sequential hypertextuality, the Book of Genesis, the Book of Deuteronomy, Samaria, Pentateuch

The monograph by Bartosz Adamczewski *Genesis. A Hypertextual Commentary* opens his Old Testament tetralogy, which includes the following monographs: *Exodus–Numbers*,¹ *Deuteronomy–Judges*,² and *Samuel–Kings*.³ The research on the phenomenon of hypertextuality in the Enneateuch, presented in four volumes, dates back to the monograph *Retelling the Law* published by Adamczewski in 2012.⁴ The titles of all monographs contain the adjective “hypertextual,” which, on the one hand, characterises the relationship between the Book of Deuteronomy and the other books included in the biblical Enneateuch and, on the other hand, defines the method used by the author to study intertextual relations.

1 B. Adamczewski, *Exodus–Numbers. A Hypertextual Commentary* (European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions 26; Berlin *et al.*: Lang 2020).

2 B. Adamczewski, *Deuteronomy–Judges. A Hypertextual Commentary* (European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions 27; Berlin *et al.*: Lang 2020).

3 B. Adamczewski, *Samuel–Kings. A Hypertextual Commentary* (European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions 28; Berlin *et al.*: Lang 2021).

4 B. 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: Lang 2012).

A reference is made to the classic work by Gérard Genette, *Palimpsestes*,⁵ who distinguishes five types of transtextual relations: intertextuality, paratextuality, metatextuality, hypertextuality and architextuality.⁶ Hypertextuality is understood by Genette as “any relationship unifying a text B (hypertext) to an earlier text A (hypotext), upon which it is grafted in a manner that is not that of commentary.”⁷ That thought of Genette becomes the basis for the concept by Adamczewski of “sequential hypertextuality,” which he proposed in his habilitation thesis *Q or not Q?*⁸ and used in his hypertextual commentaries on the canonical Gospels and New Testament letters afterwards (a total of eight monographs published in the period from 2010 to 2018). For more than a decade, Adamczewski has been investigating the phenomenon of hypertextual relations in the Bible, which are based on sequential repetitions, not only linguistic but also conceptual. Hence his model of “sequential hypertextuality”: “If two given works reveal conceptual and/or linguistic correspondences which follow a sequential pattern, it is reasonable to argue that the author of one of these works in a hypertextual way reworked the other work, preserving the basic sequence of its ideas, concepts, literary motifs, etc.” (p. 13).

1. Hypertextual Relations between the Book of Genesis and the Book of Deuteronomy

In the reviewed monograph, *Genesis. A Hypertextual Commentary*, Adamczewski tries to show that the Book of Genesis is the result of hypertextual reworking of the Book of Deuteronomy, which precedes it. The author expresses such an opinion based on nearly a thousand conceptual and partly linguistic relations established by him, which are arranged in the same order in the Book of Deuteronomy and the Book of Genesis. The enormous number of those relations (one relation per verse and a half in the Book of Genesis, on average) means that they not only concern large literary units but also often appear in single sentences or even individual words in a sentence. As a consequence, Adamczewski proposes a completely different perspective on the issue of creation in the Book of Genesis. The inconsistencies noted therein would be the result not so much of a compilation of various sources, layers or traditions, but rather of a homogeneous reworking of the Book of Deuteronomy. He considers incorrect the distinction in Genesis between the so-called priestly and non-priestly material, which, in contemporary research on the Pentateuch, is one of the few elements shared by specialists in that field. In his opinion, the changes in style and literary conventions noticeable in the Book of Genesis are the result of the auxiliary use of

5 For the review, I use the English edition of the work: *Palimpsestes. Literature in the Second Degree* (trans. C. Newman – C. Doubinsky) (Lincoln, NE – London: University of Nebraska Press 1997).

6 Genette, *Palimpsestes*, 1–5.

7 Genette, *Palimpsestes*, 5.

8 B. Adamczewski, *Q or not Q? The So-Called Triple, Double, and Single Traditions in the Synoptic Gospels* (Frankfurt am Main *et al.*: Lang 2010).

the motifs borrowed from other sources, such as the Book of Ezekiel (mainly in the material considered to be priestly) or the Book of Judges (mainly in the material considered to be non-priestly). The purpose of the hypertextual reworking of Deuteronomy in Genesis is to move away from the nationalist ideology and, consequently, to transform the Deuteronomistic idea of “holy war” into the ideology of peaceful coexistence of the Hebrews and the gentile inhabitants of Canaan.

In the Book of Genesis, Adamczewski also notices a hidden “Israelite (“northern”) rhetoric taken from and developed based on the hypertextually transformed Deuteronomy. That Israelite geographical-theological rhetoric is manifested in many positive statements and allusions to Shechem, Mount Gerazim, Joseph and Ephraim. In that context, Adamczewski draws particular attention to Mount Moriah (Gen 22:2) as the only place in the Book of Genesis where a burnt offering was made in accordance with the will of YHWH. The name Moriah “linguistically represents the ‘place’ of the name of Yah(weh) at Moreh, so on Mount Gerizim (Deut 11:29–12:27; Gen 12:6–7)” (p. 31). In this allusive way, the cult on Mount Gerazim would have been initiated by Abraham. Meanwhile, “Jerusalem, together with Samaria and Shiloh, is virtually non-existent in Genesis. Genesis contains only a few, mainly negative, allusions to Jerusalem (Gen 14:18; 35:21–22; 36:2)” (p. 34). Another important manifestation of allusive “Israelite rhetoric in the Book of Genesis is the figure of Abraham, whose presentation in several elements refers to Sanballat, the Israelite leader of the Persian province of Samaria, a contemporary of Nehemiah (second half of the fifth century BC) (pp. 32–33). One should mention, for example, the origin of Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees and his connection with Haran – places that were the centres of worship of the moon god Sin in the Neo-Babylonian empire. The name of the god can be found in the name of Sanballat, which means: “May Sin give him life.” Haran would also be the place of origin of Sanballat, assuming that the term *haḥōrōnî* found in Neh 2:19 describing him as a Horonite (from the town of Beth-Horon) needs to be re-localised to *haḥāranî*, i.e. Haranite (from the town of Haran). Abraham’s sacrifice on Mount Moriah (Gen 22:1–14) would be an allusion to the temple built by Sanballat on Mount Gerazim (c. 427–407 BC), which, later on, Josephus Flavius incorrectly dated to the end of the 4th century BC. Archaeological research by Yitzhak Magen on Mount Gerazim would confirm the presence of a temple dedicated to YHWH at that place as early as in the fifth century BC. All of this would mean “that Genesis was written in (northern) Israel, presumably in the territory of Ephraim” (p. 32). “The almost complete, evidently conscious absence of Jerusalem in Genesis points to the territory of the historical state of Israel, and more particularly the territory of Ephraim (centred on Shechem and Mount Gerizim), and not Judah, as the place of the composition of Genesis” (p. 34).

In the introduction to his hypertextual analysis of the Book of Genesis, Adamczewski also undertakes the dating of the composition of the Book (pp. 25–30). Given the relations between Mount Moriah and Mount Gerazim, he considers the end of the 5th century BC to be the *terminus a quo*, when a temple would have been built on Mount Gerazim during the reign of Sanballat. As for the *terminus ad quem*, Adamczewski excludes the Hellenistic

period and suggests the years 350–340 BC, i.e. the end of the Persian period, as the time when the Book of Genesis was written. Again, the argument follows the line of allusive relations between Sanballat and Abraham, this time through three subsequent descendants of Abraham: Isaac, Jacob and Joseph, of whom the latter would play a key role in the narrative of Genesis (Gen 37–50). A similar position should be occupied by the third governor after Sanballat, who was his descendant, which was the end of the Persian period in Samaria (pp. 26, 29).

2. Samaritans and the Creation of the Pentateuch

With his monograph *Genesis. A Hypertextual Commentary*, as well as his other hypertextual commentaries on the Enneateuch, Adamczewski argues for a change of the paradigm of Samaria. The negative image of Samaria and Samaritans was created by Josephus Flavius to a large extent, who, in *Antiquitates Iudaicae* (Book XI), presented the construction of a temple on Mount Gerazim by Sanballat III, ca. 332 BC, once he obtained the approval of Alexander the Great. This was to give rise to the Samaritan schism, which escalated into open hostility between Samaritans and Jews after the destruction of the temple on Mount Gerazim by John Hyrcanus at the end of the second century BC. The negative opinion about the Samaritans would also have its roots in the text of 2 Kgs 17:24–41, which presents the situation of Samaria after it was conquered by Assyria in 722 BC. One of the elements of Assyria's imperial policy was mass deportations, which resulted in the indigenous population being mixed with foreigners and the religion being subjected to syncretic influences. As a result, the conflict between the Samaritans and the Judeans returning from the Babylonian exile, described in the Book of Nehemiah, would not be only political but also religious in origin. Nehemiah's strict approach to mixed marriages resulted in some of the priests of Jerusalem, including one of the sons of the high priest Jehoiada married to the daughter of Sanballat I, finding refuge in Samaria (cf. Neh 13:28), thus laying the foundations for the cult of YHWH in the Persian province of Samaria.

A departure from that stereotypical perception of Samaritans in biblical studies was initiated by Hans G. Kippenberg in his doctoral thesis *Gerizim und Synagoge*,⁹ who saw the worship on Mount Gerazim in continuity with the religious traditions of northern Israel. In 1985, the Société d'Études Samaritaines was established in Paris, bringing together scholars who studied Samaritan literature, history, language and religion. Subsequent congresses of that association (there have been ten so far) brought the publication of further studies revising the traditional approach to the origin of the Samaritans, their works, history and religion. The first decade of the 21st century closed with a classic monograph

⁹ H.G. Kippenberg, *Gerizim und Synagoge. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur samaritanischen Religion der aramaischen Periode* (RVV 30; Berlin – New York: De Gruyter 1971).

by Magnar Kartveit *The Origins of the Samaritans*,¹⁰ who proved the continuity of Israel's religious traditions in Samaria after 722. The construction of the temple on Mount Gerazim was crucial for the formation of the Samaritans' identity, but the basis of their conflict with the Judeans was not religious but ethnic. A new impetus in the study of Samaria was the archaeological research on Mount Gerazim under the supervision of Yitzhak Magen in the years 1982–2006. The research results, along with their interpretation (which often changed in subsequent articles), were made available by him in two volumes of *Mount Gerizim Excavations* in 2004 and 2008, as well as in many papers. One of the key theses put forward by Magen was the presence of a temple on Mount Gerazim as early as in the fifth century BC. The shape of the temple erected at the initiative of Sanballat I could have been designed based on Ezekiel's vision of the temple (Ezek 40–42), the plans of which were brought to Samaria by the priests removed from Jerusalem by Nehemiah (Neh 13:28).¹¹ The scientists following Magen postulate the presence of the Yahwist cult on Mount Gerazim as early in as the 5th century BC, whose temple could have been in no way inferior to that in Jerusalem. Considering the works taking into account the results of research conducted by Magen, special attention should be given to the monograph by Gary Knoppers, *Jews and Samaritans*,¹² who proves that the Yahwistic religion was maintained and developed in northern Israel after the fall of Samaria in 722. Instead of discussing the rivalry between Jews and Samaritans in the Persian period, two currents of the same Yahwistic religion should be distinguished – northern and southern. The element connecting both religious communities would be the Pentateuch, from which they adopted the Deuteronomistic assumption of centralisation of the cult, differing however in terms of its location (*Gerazim versus Zion*).

The above-mentioned works give an idea of the changes in the approach to Samaria in biblical studies over the last twenty years. The change of the paradigm of Samaria is also supported by Adamczewski, what he proposed in his monograph *Retelling the Law* as early as in 2012. His first hypothesis of the Israelite (northern) – rather than Judean – origin of the Heptateuch (Genesis to Judges) can be found in that work. However, this was not a new hypothesis as such a thesis was put forward and justified by Etienne Nodet in his work *Essai sur les origines du judaïsme*¹³ in 1992. A summary presentation of his hypothesis can be found on pages 191–192 of the English edition of the monograph. Ingrid Hjelm proposes a similar thesis in her publications, starting with her PhD dissertation released in 2004. Let us just mention her article: “Samaria, Samaritans and the Composition of

10 M. Kartveit, *The Origins of the Samaritans* (VTSup 128; Leiden: Brill 2009).

11 Cf. Y. Magen, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*. II. *A Temple City* (Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority 2008) 149.

12 G. Knoppers, *Jews and Samaritans. The Origins and History of Their Early Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2013).

13 E. Nodet, *Essai sur les origines du judaïsme. De Josué aux Pharisiens* (Paris: Cerf 1992). I use the English edition for the review: *A Search for the Origins of Judaism. From Joshua to the Mishnah* (JSOTSup 248; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1997).

the Hebrew Bible.”¹⁴ In that context, the originality of Adamczewski’s research should be seen in his attempt to prove the “Israelite origin of the Heptateuch based on sequential hypertextuality. The question remains how successful that attempt is.

3. Question about the Criteria of Sequential Hypertextuality

After reading the monograph *Genesis. A Hypertextual Commentary* and the earlier work *Retelling the Law*, it is impossible to ignore certain methodological weaknesses of the hypothesis of sequential hypertextuality in the Book of Genesis. Although in the introduction to *Genesis* (pp. 13–16) the author presents the assumptions of his proposed model of sequential hypertextuality and points to certain methodological principles that could constitute a criterion for assessing what and to what extent is a transformation of the hypotext (Deuteronomium) in the hypertext (Genesis), this does not translate into any strictly defined research procedure. This turns out to be not necessarily relevant if “the crucial hermeneutical disposition for analysing hypertextual correspondences in the Bible consists in the use of the faculty of imagination in order to detect imaginative, creative, at times purely conceptual correspondences between various ideas, images, statements, and words in the biblical texts. In imagination, as is well known, the sky is the limit” (p. 16). “Faculty of imagination” may even be unlimited; however, as an exegetical tool, it requires a critical and verifiable procedure. Adamczewski sees the validity of his approach – arguing using a quote from *Apuntes de hermenéutica* by Luis Alonso Schökel: “A method confirms itself by its results” – in the results of his research (p. 16, n. 1). However, the Spanish biblical scholar starts with the statement – two sentences earlier – that “the methods we use have their own arch of life. They emerge or crystallise when the author gives them a form and convinces others of their validity.”¹⁵ The problem is that Adamczewski does not convince the reader of the validity of his concept of “creative hypertextuality,” precisely because of methodological shortcomings that make the results of his research subjective.

Their unverifiability is primarily due to the lack of clear criteria based on which the author states nearly a thousand times (p. 227) that a given “idea (statement/section [from the Book of Genesis]) conceptually and linguistically illustrates (sequentially illustrates/conceptually and linguistically, in a sequential way illustrates/illustrates) the subsequent Deuteronomic idea.” It is rather a game of associations and allusions available to Adamczewski’s imagination, not necessarily confirmed by actual transtextual relations between the sequentially juxtaposed fragments of Genesis and Deuteronomy. This is the case, for example, with the “hypertextual procedure of transsexuation (feminisation/masculinisation)

14 I. Hjelm, “Samaria, Samaritans and the Composition of the Hebrew Bible,” *Samaritans. Past and Present. Current Studies* (eds. M. Mor – F.V. Reiterer – W. Winckler) (Berlin – New York: De Gruyter 2010) 91–103 (especially 98–99).

15 A quote from the Italian edition: L. Alonso Schökel, *Appunti di ermeneutica* (Studi biblici 24; Bologna: EDB 1994) 162.

identified by Adamczewski seven times, which conceptually and linguistically illustrates” a specific Deuteronomic idea in the relevant text of the Book of Genesis (pp. 48, 49, 67, 95, 174, 178, 184). The term “procedure” assumes some established and thus verifiable mode of operation of creative hypertextuality, which should be detected at the linguistic and conceptual levels of hypertextually related texts. Let me mention the juxtaposition within that “procedure of transsexuation” of “the idea of a woman saying that humans are allowed to eat from the paradisiacal garden (Gen 3:2)” with “the Deuteronomic idea of Moses saying that the Israelites should go up and possess the promised land which was given to them (Deut 1:20–21e)” (p. 49). Based on a play of imagination, one might ask why a similar “transsexuation procedure” is not noticed by Adamczewski a bit further on in the juxtaposition of the tree tempting the eyes of a woman considered by her to be “good” (Gen 3:6a–c) with the tempting statement about sending scouts to the promised land considered “good” by Moses (Deut 1:23a) (p. 50). Such speculations can be multiplied indefinitely if the sky is to be the limit, but they will remain subjective, even arbitrary, in the absence of clear criteria for recognising hypertextual relations.

The above position may be considered too conservative by Adamczewski. In the introduction, he compiles (pp. 17–25) a list of scholars (Hans Ausloos, Joel S. Baden, Walter Bühner, Michael Carasik, David M. Carr, Stephen Germany, Gershon Hepner, Pekka Pitkänen, Konrad Schmidt, John Van Seters) who note literary relations between different texts in Genesis and Deuteronomy, yet none of them sees a sequential correspondence between them. Perhaps it is because “they understand literary dependence too conservatively,” as Adamczewski assesses the works of Walter Bühner (p. 21). It would therefore be conservatism to “limit ourselves methodologically [...] to the texts [Genesis and Deuteronomy] that exhibit a relatively high level of agreement in a form (vocabulary, style, and/or compositional features) and/or content (theological themes and concepts)” (p. 18), as is the case of Hans Ausloos. The Belgian exegete not only sets clear criteria for examining intertextual relations between Genesis and Deuteronomy,¹⁶ which he uses in his analysis of the Deuteronomic character of Exod 23:20–33, but also points to the importance of context in verifying such relations: “Where a word or expression are always used within a particular context, we are obliged to study this context and its structure.”¹⁷ Without taking the context of the texts under study into account, it is difficult to avoid subjectivity in the juxtaposed hypo- and hypertext sequences. This applies especially to parallel texts directly adjacent to each other. For example, in chapter 2 of Deuteronomy, prohibitions appear side by side to fight against the Moabites (2:9–18) and the Ammonites (2:19–23) when seizing the promised land. In both cases, the original inhabitants of those countries are recalled: the Rephaim and the Anakim (2:10b–11, 20–21a). Hypertextually, however, that parallelism is ignored by Adamczewski, who associates the first mention of the Rephaim and Anakim

16 Cf. H. Ausloos, *The Deuteronomist’s History. The Role of the Deuteronomist in Historical-Critical Research into Genesis–Numbers* (OTS 67; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2015) 289–297.

17 Ausloos, *The Deuteronomist’s History*, 309.

with the names of Metusheol and Lamech in Gen 4:18b (p. 62), and the second one – with the “prehistoric giants” from Gen 6:4, but identifies them only with the Anakim ignoring the Rephaim” (p. 68). How to explain such a different hypertextual lesson of the Rephaim and the Anakim in the Book of Genesis? Even more surprising is the hypertextual reworking of similar prohibitions against fighting the Moabites and the Ammonites. In the first case (Deut 2:9a–d), that prohibition is understood by Adamczewski as an expression of the “Deuteronomic idea of the land of Moab protected by Yahweh,” which, in the hypertextual reading of the Book of Genesis, corresponds to the name of Enoch (“consecrated, dedicated”; Gen 4:17d–18a) (p. 61). In the second case (Deut 2:19a–c), the ban on fighting the Ammonites would refer, according to Adamczewski, to the prohibition on marriages between Israelites and Ammonites, which, in the Book of Genesis, thanks to the use of “hypertextual procedure of transsexuation (in this case feminisation) is conceptually and linguistically illustrated” by the idea of the sons of God taking the daughters of men as wives (Gen 6:1–2) (p. 67). If one were to assume that the author of the Book of Genesis was consistent in the use of the “hypertextual procedure of transsexuation,” the question would arise why he failed to relate it to the earlier prohibition on fighting the Moabites since Deuteronomy forbids the Israelites to marry not only the Ammonites but also the Moabites (Deut 23:4).

4. Question about the Delimitation of Literary Units in Hypertextual Research

Methodological reservations concern not only the method and basis for identifying hypertextual relations but also the verification of their sequential correspondence. At the end of his monograph, Adamczewski emphasises that “much more important than these numerous but rarely specific linguistic signs of literary borrowing from *Deuteronomy* is the fulfilment of the criterion of order” the subject of which is “the conceptual and/or linguistic correspondences between Genesis and Deuteronomy” (p. 228). Already in the introduction, Adamczewski states that “the author of Genesis [...] used Deuteronomy as the main structure-giving hypotext” (pp. 29–30) and, at the end of his work, he claims that “the book of Genesis in its entirety is a result of one literary-theological project, a systematic reworking of the contents of the Book of Deuteronomy” (p. 229). It should therefore be assumed that the hypothetical author of the Genesis knew the whole structure of Deuteronomy and transposed it into Genesis. It is no longer about single words, phrases or verses in this case, but about literary units the boundaries of which are delimited based on formal and content criteria. In both books, Adamczewski distinguishes five corresponding “major sections”: Gen 1–3 // Deut 1:1–2:1; Gen 4–11 // Deut 2:2–5:33; Gen 12:1–22:19 // Deut 6–13; Gen 22:20–36:43 // Deut 14:1–23:9; Gen 37–50 // Deut 23:10–34:12. In the case of some of the identified “major sections” questions arise about the criteria used

by the author to delimit them. Those who are familiar with the structure of Deuteronomy may ask, for example, about the reasons for Adamczewski to decompose the Deuteronomic Code (Deut 12–26) and divide it into three “major sections” in his monograph (Deut 6–13; 14:1–23:9; 23:10–34:12), while ignoring, for instance, the delimiting introductions to the speeches in 12:1 and 27:1. The consequence of such a breakdown of the Deuteronomic Code is the creation of a completely new rhetorical unit, Deut 11:29–12:28, the hypertextual transposition of which is the narrative about the sacrifice on Mount Moriah (Gen 22:1–10). In this way, Adamczewski is able to conclude that “the enigmatic, previously unknown name Moriah (הַמְרִיָּה: Gen 22:2d) linguistically alludes to the Deuteronomic place called Moreh (מֶרֶה: Deut 11:30; cf. הַמֹּרֶה: Judg 7:1; מֹרֶה: Gen 12:6), which was located close to Mount Gerizim (Deut 11:29–30; cf. Gen 12:6; Shechem), contextually presented in Deuteronomy as the place where Yahweh chooses to put his name (cf. Deut 12:5.21 etc.)” (p. 124; similarly p. 36). However, if the principles governing the delimitation of rhetorical units are respected, the above “contextual” relation is unjustified.

Even more reservations arise regarding the delimitation of the smaller rhetorical units that make up the “sections” that constitute the “major sections” mentioned above. Let me limit myself to only one example indicated by Adamczewski at the end of his work, in which he notes that sometimes hypertextually related elements from Genesis and Deuteronomy differ in size: “Gen 23 illustrating Deut 14:1bc; Gen 24 illustrating Deut 14:2a; Gen 25 illustrating Deut 14:2b; Gen 32:2b illustrating Deut 16:18–19:21; etc.” (p. 227). The latter relation is part of the hypertextual relation of Gen 32:2b–33:17 and Deut 16:18–20:9. The section Deut 16:18–20:9, proposed by Adamczewski, does not correspond to the actual boundaries of rhetorical units in that part of the Deuteronomic Code. One can notice two separate rhetorical units there: the first one contains instructions concerning civil and religious institutions: judges, kings, priests and prophets (16:18–18:22), while the second one, which should be delimited within 19:1–21:9, mentions juridical and military instructions. Ignoring the boundaries between those units, Adamczewski concludes that the provisions concerning judges, kings, priests and prophets in Deut 16:18–19:21 are “conceptually and linguistically illustrated” with the idea of “messengers who, sent by God, encounter Jacob” (Gen 32:2b: “and when the angels of God encountered him”) (p. 154). On what “conceptual and linguistic” basis does Adamczewski assume the transposition of various offices: judges, kings, priests and prophets, into the figures found in the Book of Genesis called *malʾāḳê ʾēlōhîm*? Is it really possible in the case of the Deuteronomy passage under discussion to place an equal sign between the various entities of power in Israel in terms of the function they perform towards the people? How to explain the fact that the hypothetical author of the Book of Genesis did not notice that the element connecting all the provisions related to civil and religious leaders was their subordination to the Law? What do the *malʾāḳê ʾēlōhîm* in Gen 32:2b have in common with the law concerning cities of refuge (Deut 19:1–13), if a “systematic reworking of the content of the Book of Deuteronomy” in the Book of Genesis is assumed?

Adamczewski does not notice such issues in the sequentially ordered hypertextual relations in Genesis and Deuteronomy identified by him and assumes that the sequential hypertextuality in both works has nothing to do with their actual composition. This was already shown by the previously mentioned example of two parallel Deuteronomic prohibitions against fighting the Moabites (2:9–18) and the Ammonites (2:19–23), which Adamczewski hypertextually links to two texts in the Book of Genesis that are different in form and content (4:18 and 6:1–4, respectively). Similar examples of ignoring the structure of the book also apply to Genesis. Let me give just one of them that raises the question of the logic of hypertextual transposition that the hypothetical author of Genesis would have followed while reworking Deuteronomy. Biblical scholars agree that there are three type-scenes in the Genesis narrative using the “wife-sister” pattern, according to which the patriarch at the court of a foreign ruler presents his wife as a sister to save his life. That is the case of Gen 12:10–20; 20:1–18 and 26:8–11, where the first two stories concern Abraham and Sarah and the third one – Isaac and Rebekah. In the sequential hypertextual system identified by Adamczewski, only the first text is considered an independent rhetorical unit called a “section,” while the other two are assigned to larger “sections” linking Abraham and Sarah’s stay with the king of Gerar to the transgression of Lot’s daughters (Gen 19:30–20:18), and Isaac and Rebecca’s stay at the same court to the death of Sarah and Abraham (Gen 22:20–26:35). Each of those three stories using the “wife-sister” pattern is recognised by Adamczewski as a hypertextual illustration of various Deuteronomic “ideas” found in Deut 6:20–22, 11:9d–18 and 14:2c, respectively (pp. 94–96, 119–121, 137–138). I would add that it is not a question of some single leading or primary “idea” in those three Deuteronomic texts but about a number of different “ideas” that are supposed to be hypertextually reworked three times in the Book of Genesis based on the same type-scene. If, indeed, we are dealing here with a conscious and deliberate literary action resulting in a work addressed to specific readers with the relevant literary competence to discover that sequential imitation of Deuteronomy in the text of Genesis, this raises the question of the competence that the reader of Genesis would have to demonstrate to be able to notice the references to the Book of Deuteronomy identified by Adamczewski in those three type-scenes. Let us consider the hypertextual interpretation of the figure of the pharaoh in Gen 12:10–20, who, on the one hand, by taking Sarah to his court is supposed to be a “conceptual and linguistic illustration” of another, later pharaoh making the Israelites his slaves (Gen 12:14–16 // Deut 6:20–21b), while on the other hand, the pharaoh sending Abraham and Sarah out of Egypt is supposed to “conceptually and linguistically illustrate” YHWH leading the Israelites out of Egypt (Gen 12:17–20 // Deut 6:21c–22). Since the idea of leading the Israelites out of Egypt appears in that interpretation, let us also note the second story using the “wife-sister” pattern, which starts with the mention of Abraham and Sarah’s migration from Canaan to the Negev and their stay in Gerar that, in such a topographical arrangement, would be located on the border with Egypt.¹⁸

18 Cf. J. Lemański, *Księga Rodzaju. Rozdziały 11, 27–36, 43. Wstęp – przekład z oryginału – komentarz* (NKB.ST 1/2; Częstochowa: Edycja Świętego Pawła 2013) 422–423.

This information about the patriarch's arrival from Canaan to the "semi-desert Negev" (Gen 20:1a) is, according to Adamczewski, a hypertextual illustration of the Deuteronomic idea of the Israelites coming from Egypt to Canaan – the promised land abundant in water (Deut 11:9d–12) (p. 119). Remaining within the scope of the three stories using the same "wife-sister" pattern, one can only express amazement at Adamczewski's hypertextual creativity, which has little to do with the content and function of those narratives in the Book of Genesis. Obviously, it can be assumed that the purpose of his monograph was to demonstrate the sequential hypertextuality between Genesis and Deuteronomy, but this raises the question of why the author of Genesis, who systematically reworks Deuteronomy, uses the same typical scene in such a different way. The differences between the three stories based on the "wife-sister" pattern make the reader think not so much of their hypertextual dependence on Deuteronomy, but rather about their mutual formal and content interaction subordinated in Genesis to specific narrative (theological) purposes.¹⁹

5. Sequential or Rather "Creative" Hypertextuality?

Adamczewski's thesis about the Book of Genesis as a sequential hypertext based on the Book of Deuteronomy, different from previous studies on the creation of the Pentateuch, seems to be ignored in the world of science precisely because of the methodological shortcomings of the assumed "creative hypertextuality." One can admire Adamczewski's consistency in his research, but it is difficult to understand his ignoring the critical opinions concerning the methodology of sequential hypertextuality expressed in scientific reviews of his subsequent monographs, starting from those dealing with the sequential hypertextuality of the canonical Gospels,²⁰ to *Retelling the Law*, an extension of which is the reviewed hypertextual commentary on the Book of Genesis.²¹ Adamczewski had the opportunity to refer to those comments in his subsequent monographs, but he chose to ignore them, which is why his research remains self-referential. Moreover, Adamczewski published all his monographs on sequential hypertextuality (fourteen so far) with the same Peter Lang publishing house, ten of which – starting from *Retelling the Law* to the currently reviewed *Genesis* – were published in the series of monographs European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions, of which he is the scientific editor. The self-referential nature of the reviewed monograph is also manifested in Adamczewski's resignation from

19 Cf. W. Pikor, "Jaki paradygmat życia rodzinnego w narracji o Abrahamie?," *Biblica et Patristica Thoruniensia* 13 (2020) 105–126; also the list of literature on the subject there.

20 Cf. M. McLoughlin (*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 89 [2013] 463–464), S. Szymik (*Bib.An* 4 [2014] 195–202), B.A. Paschke (*Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 15 [2017] 347–349), J.W. Barker (*The CBQ* 81 [2019] 327–328), K. Mielcarek (*Bib.An* 9/4 [2019] 749–753).

21 Cf. L. Niesiołowski-Spanó (*Scripta Biblica et Orientalia* 4 [2012] 239–243), J. Lemański (*Bib.An* 3/1 [2013] 203–205), S. Jacobs (*JSOT* 27/5 [2013] 72), W. Linke (*Studia Theologica Varsoviensia* 52/1 [2014] 199–208), P.S. Evans (*JHebS* 15 [2015] <https://jhsonline.org/index.php/jhs/article/view/29441/21580> [access: 16.01.2024]).

the discussion on the presence of the priestly material in the Book of Genesis. The author resolves that issue with one sentence in the conclusion: “According to the analyses presented in this monograph, the division of the material of Genesis into Priestly and non-Priestly is misleading.” (p. 229). Nowhere in his work, however, he undertakes a critique of the editing of the texts examined by him. Moreover, he never refers to the arguments in favour of the presence of a priestly material in the Book of Genesis, which, on Polish ground, are presented by Janusz Lemański and Marcin Majewski, *inter alia*.²² In this context, let us add that Adamczewski is equally uncritical of the interpretation proposed by Yitzhak Magen of the excavations carried out by him on Mount Gerazim, especially when it comes to the assumption of the existence in that place of a temple already in the Persian period. That thesis is met with substantive criticism in many publications, of which let me mention a few. Menahem Mor demonstrates Magen’s mistakes in the dating of inscriptions and pottery, as well as the use of the C-14 carbon decomposition method.²³ Anne K.d.H. Gudme points out the flaws in Magen’s argument for interpreting the ruins dating to the 5th century BC as an implementation of Ezekiel’s temple design (Ezek 40–42).²⁴ Although Benedikt Hensel supports the existence of a temple on Mount Gerazim in the 5th century, he admits that it is currently impossible to determine the time of its construction based on the excavation documentation presented by Magen.²⁵ It remains regrettable that Adamczewski ignores those critical (or at least cautious – in the case of Hensel) voices, especially since he refers to Mor’s and Hensel’s articles in his monograph.

It is not the reviewer’s task to predict the future of the sequential hypertextuality hypothesis put forward by Adamczewski. However, Adamczewski’s mere belief in the validity of his theses and conclusions is a weak argument in the world of science. Leaving aside the issue of “creative hypertextuality,” it should be recognised that his commentary on the Book of Genesis is yet another voice in contemporary biblical studies that encourages reflection on the current paradigm of Samaria, which especially concerns the role of the Samaritans – with their cultural centre on Mount Gerazim – in the creation of the Pentateuch or, more broadly, Enneateuch.

22 Lemański, *Księga Rodzaju. Rozdziały 11,27–36,43, 69–85*; M. Majewski, *Pięcioksiąg odczytany na nowo. Przesłanie autora kapłańskiego (P) i jego wpływ na powstanie Pięcioksięgu* (Kraków: Uniwersytet Papieski Jana Pawła II w Krakowie 2018).

23 M. Mor, “The Building of the Samaritan Temple and the Samaritan Governors – Again,” *Samaria, Samaritans, Samaritans. Studies on Bible, History and Linguistics* (ed. J. Zsengellér) (SJ 66; Studia Samaritana 6; Berlin – Boston, MA: De Gruyter 2011) 91–95.

24 A.K.d.H. Gudme, “Was the Temple on Mount Gerizim Modelled after the Jerusalem Temple?,” *Religions* 11/2 (2020) 73.

25 B. Hensel, “Das JHWH-Heiligtum am Garizim. Ein archäologischer Befund und seine literar- und theologischeschichtliche Einordnung,” *VT* 68 (2018) 78.

Bibliography

- Adamczewski, B., *Q or not Q? The So-Called Triple, Double, and Single Traditions in the Synoptic Gospels* (Frankfurt am Main et al.: Lang 2010).
- Adamczewski, B., *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: Lang 2012).
- Adamczewski, B., *Deuteronomy–Judges. A Hypertextual Commentary* (European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions 27; Berlin et al.: Lang 2020).
- Adamczewski, B., *Exodus–Numbers. A Hypertextual Commentary* (European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions 26) (Berlin et al.: Lang 2020).
- Adamczewski, B., *Samuel–Kings. A Hypertextual Commentary* (European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions 28; Berlin et al.: Lang 2021).
- Alonso Schökel, L., *Apuntes de hermenéutica* (Colección Estructuras y procesos. Serie religión; Madrid: Trotta 1994). Italian edition: L. Alonso Schökel, *Appunti di ermeneutica* (Studi biblici 24; Bologna: EDB 1994).
- Ausloos, H., *The Deuteronomist's History. The Role of the Deuteronomist in Historical-Critical Research into Genesis–Numbers* (Old Testament Studies 67; Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill 2015).
- Barker, J.W., review of B. Adamczewski, *The Gospel of Matthew. A Hypertextual Commentary* (European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions 16; Frankfurt am Main et al.: Lang 2017), *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 81 (2019) 327–328.
- Evans, P.S., review of B. 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: Lang 2012), *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 15 (2015) <https://jhsonline.org/index.php/jhs/article/view/29441/21580> [access: 16.01.2024].
- Genette, G., *Palimpsests. Literature in the Second Degree* (trans. C. Newman – C. Doubinsky) (Lincoln, NE – London: University of Nebraska Press 1997).
- Gudme, A.K.d.H., “Was the Temple on Mount Gerizim Modelled after the Jerusalem Temple?,” *Religions* 11/2 (2020) 73, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel11020073>.
- Hensel, B., “Das JHWH-Heiligtum am Garizim. Ein archäologischer Befund und seine literar- und theologiegeschichtliche Einordnung,” *Vetus Testamentum* 68 (2018) 73–93.
- Hjelm, I., “Samaria, Samaritans and the Composition of the Hebrew Bible,” *Samaritans. Past and Present. Current Studies* (eds. M. Mor – F.V. Reiterer – W. Winckler) (Berlin – New York: De Gruyter 2010) 91–103.
- Jacobs, S., review of B. 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: Lang 2012), *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 27/5 (2013) 72.
- Kartveit, M., *The Origins of the Samaritans* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 128; Leiden: Brill 2009).
- Kippenberg, H.G., *Garizim und Synagoge. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur samaritanischen Religion der aramaischen Periode* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 30; Berlin – New York: De Gruyter 1971).
- Knoppers, G., *Jews and Samaritans. The Origins and History of Their Early Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2013).
- Lemański, J., review of B. 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: Lang 2012), *The Biblical Annals* 3/1 (2013) 203–205.

- Lemański, J., *Księga Rodzaju. Rozdziały 11,27–36,43. Wstęp – przekład z oryginału – komentarz* (Nowy Komentarz Biblijny. Stary Testament 1/2; Częstochowa: Edycja Świętego Pawła 2013).
- Linke, W., review of B. 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: Lang 2012), *Studia Theologica Varsoviensia* 52/1 (2014) 199–208.
- Magen, Y., *Mount Gerizim Excavations. II. A Temple City* (Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority 2008).
- Majewski, M., *Pięcioksiąg odczytany na nowo. Przesłanie autora kapłańskiego (P) i jego wpływ na powstanie Pięcioksięgu* (Kraków: Uniwersytet Papieski Jana Pawła II w Krakowie 2018).
- McLoughlin, M., review of B. Adamczewski, *Q or not Q? The So-Called Triple, Double, and Single Traditions in the Synoptic Gospels* (Frankfurt am Main et al.: Lang 2010), *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 89 (2013) 463–464.
- Mielcarek, K., review of B. Adamczewski, *The Gospel of Luke. A Hypertextual Commentary* (European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions 13; Frankfurt am Main et al.: Lang 2016), *The Biblical Annals* 9/4 (2019) 749–753.
- Mor, M., “The Building of the Samaritan Temple and the Samaritan Governors – Again,” *Samaria, Samaritans, Samaritans. Studies on Bible, History and Linguistics* (ed. J. Zsengellér) (Studia Judaica 66; Studia Samaritana 6; Berlin – Boston, MA: De Gruyter 2011) 89–108.
- Niesiołowski-Spanó, Ł., review of B. 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: Lang 2012), *Scripta Biblica et Orientalia* 4 (2012) 239–243.
- Nodet, E., *Essai sur les origines du judaïsme. De Josué aux Pharisiens* (Paris: Cerf 1992). English edition: E. Nodet, *A Search for the Origins of Judaism. From Joshua to the Mishnah* (trans. J.E. Crowley) (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 248; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1997).
- Paschke, B.A., review of B. Adamczewski, *Hypertextuality and Historicity in the Gospels* (European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions 3; Frankfurt am Main et al.: Lang 2013), *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 15 (2017) 347–349.
- Pikor, W., “Jaki paradygmat życia rodzinnego w narracji o Abrahamie?,” *Biblica et Patristica Thoruniensia* 13 (2020) 105–126.
- Szymik, S., review of B. Adamczewski, *Hypertextuality and Historicity in the Gospels* (European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions 3; Frankfurt am Main et al.: Lang 2013), *The Biblical Annals* 4 (2014) 195–202.