
Judaism in the Age of the Second Temple is a collection of fourteen articles by Reinhard Kratz, professor of the Old Testament at the Georg-August-Universität in Göttingen. Three of the articles appear here for the first time (articles 4-6), the others had previously been published in between 1992 and 2004.

“The Origin of Judaism: On the Controversy between E. Meyer and J. Wellhausen” (article 1), is the author’s inaugural lecture at Göttingen. Kratz compares the two opposing approaches and their methodological consequences—Meyer’s “Universalgeschichte” and Wellhausen’s “Literargeschichte”—and concludes that both have their place in modern exegesis. “Babylon in the Old Testament” (article 2) is a survey of biblical, i.e., primarily prophetic, references to Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus’s victory over Nabonidus. “Nabonidus and Cyrus” (article 3) examines the reign of the last Neo-Babylonian monarch as portrayed in ancient Near Eastern, Greek and biblical texts. In “The Second Temple in Yeb and in Jerusalem” (article 4), Kratz compares the rebuilding of the Second Temple with the building of the Jewish temple of Yeb in Elephantine. In “Zerubbabel and Joshua” (article 5) Kratz argues that the references to Zerubbabel and Joshua in the books of Haggai and Zech 1-8 stem from later redactors and therefore are of little historical, yet of great theological value. In “Governor, High Priest and Scribe in Judah of the Persian Period” (article 6), the author correlates the external evidence about these three offices of the Persian period with the information provided in the biblical texts. “Inner-biblical Exegesis and Redaction History in Light of the Empirical Evidence” (article 7) is the most recent and also one of the book’s foundational essays. Kratz compares examples of post-biblical exegesis, mostly from Qumran, with inner-biblical interpretation and finds many analogies. He concludes that inner-biblical exegesis was a driving force behind the production and transmission of the biblical text, and that through redaction criticism (“Redaktionsgeschichte”) one can best explain the successive growth of the biblical text. “Innerbiblische Exegese und die Redaktionsgeschichte der biblischen Bücher sind eins” (156). “The Search for Identity in the Post-Exilic History of Theology. The Hermeneutics of the Chronicler’s History and its Significance for Understanding the Old Testament” (article 8) examines strategies of identity formation in the Chronicler’s History and concludes that the interpretation of the received traditions (Torah, the Deuteronomistic History, the Prophets and Psalms) serves to create a continuity from pre- to post-exilic Israel. “The Kingdom of God and the Law in Judaism and in Emerging Judaism” (article 9) is a detailed study of the use of “kingship” and “law” in Daniel and the Chronicler’s History. In “The Visions of Daniel” (article 10), Kratz minutely reconstructs the successive stages in the growth of the book of Daniel. In “The Grace of Daily Bread. The Late
Psalms on the Way Towards the Lord’s Prayer” (article 11), the author traces direct lines of continuity from Ps 145-147 to the Lord’s Prayer. Jesus’ prayer is part of the “Auslegungs- und Rezeptionsgeschichte” that includes texts beyond the boundaries of the canon, such as Ps. Sol. 5 and rabbinic prayers. “The Torah of David: Psalm 1 and the Doxological Five-Part Structure of the Psalter” (article 12) proposes that the Psalter organizes the stages in the history of ancient Israel in form of the five parts of the Torah which it copies, only that these stages are no longer defined in political but in general humanistic and individualistic terms. “The Reception of Jeremiah 10 and 29 in the Pseudepigraphic Letter of Jeremiah” (article 13) interprets the apocryphal Epistle of Jeremiah as an early exegetical treatment of Jeremiah. In “Open his Mouth and Ears: How Abraham Learned Hebrew” (article 14), finally, Kratz examines the apocryphal Abaraham tradition, specifically the episode in Jub. 12, and argues in favor of studying the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha along with the canonical writings.

Taken together, the fourteen articles beautifully illustrate the great diversity and complexity of Second Temple Judaism. For Kratz, “Second Temple” means the late biblical period. Books such as Ezra, Chronicles and Daniel recur frequently in this collection and are critically important to advance the argument, whereas the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha are mentioned only sporadically (with the exception of articles 13 and 14) and the Hellenistic literature is missing altogether. The biggest gap, as Kratz himself remarks in the introduction (VII), is the absence of a study on the Dead Sea Scrolls.

It is significant that these articles come from a prominent German scholar. Derided for the longest time as of secondary or even tertiary importance for biblical scholarship, the Second Temple period has over the last half century emerged as an academic field in its own right. German scholarship has been somewhat reluctant to embrace this trend, and so Kratz’s scholarship plays an especially important role. It is all the more regrettable, therefore, that the reader looks in vain for references to the more recent publications in English. The article on Haggai and Zechariah (article 5), for example, refers in note 1 to the work of Sarah Japhet but otherwise fails to mention a single commentary (e.g., Meyers) or article in English. The concept of “innerbiblical exegesis” is frequently invoked (e.g., article 7); Kratz mentions Fishbane’s classic 1985 Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel, but neglects the literature that has come out ever since. Similarly, Kratz often uses the term “pesher,” yet without referring to modern Israeli scholarship. The question of what is “innerbiblical interpretation” or “pesher” is immensely complicated and would have deserved a fuller and more differentiated treatment, especially since both concepts figure so prominently in Kratz’s articles. The reluctance to engage with the more recent English-speaking scholarship is difficult to explain. Who exactly is the intended audience of these essays? Kratz’s strong preference for redaction criticism makes his work idiosyncratic and his exegetical findings somewhat arbitrary. It may also be