

inscriptions known as Coffin texts, modelled on Pyramid texts, were increasingly inscribed on the coffins of wealthy commoners 'to protect the dead person during the passage through the dangerous underworld and to ensure that he or she would enjoy an individual afterlife' (4. 66). The remainder of chapter four is dedicated to translating the Coffin text inscriptions found on the coffin boxes, canopic chest and statuettes found in the tomb. These spells, designed to protect the dead person during the passage through the dangerous underworld (4. 66), were included to ensure eternity for the deceased by naming the burial procedures, the particular strengths of gods and goddesses to be endowed upon the deceased, offerings to be made so that the deceased may continue to live in the afterlife, as well as naming the specific credentials of the deceased.

The remaining chapters focus on methods of mummification, scientific analysis of the wrappings of Khnum-Nakht and Nakht-Ankh as well as the medical conditions at death. Details of the unwrapping of these two mummies in 1907 and initial investigations by a team brought together by Dr. Margaret Murray are traced in chapter six. Further investigation using modern scientific methods yield further insights into the demise of these two brothers, their lung and heart condition, dental health and the presence of parasites help to bring them to life (7. 122–29). As Rosalie concludes 'The Two Brothers may still have much to tell us' (7. 134). In fact, Rosalie David tells us quite a lot!

It is evident that this volume speaks to both novice and expert. Her conclusions are well researched and invite the reader to follow her arguments, suggesting that sources be checked and reevaluated. It is to her credit that she does not deal with one specific aspect of the brothers' life but places their existence contextually within a historical, religious, environmental time frame. In doing this Rosalie David invites her readers to a Middle Kingdom discovery.

---

***The Realignment of the Priestly Literature: The Priestly Narrative in Genesis and Its Relation to the Priestly Legislation and the Holiness School***

Thomas J. King. Eugene: OR, Pickwick Publications, 2009.

ISBN: 978-1-55635-612-4. Pp. 180.

Reviewed by Amy Robertson, Emory University

---

King begins his book by offering a profound observation about the state of academic discourse on the P source: while scholars claim to be putting forth theories on a single body of literature, they are actually basing their assessments on two different bodies of literature. That is, some scholars focus on the *narrative* material that is

classically attributed to that source, found primarily between Gen 1 and Exod 6; others come to their conclusions about P by considering primarily the *legal* material found after Exod 6. It should come as no surprise, then, that scholarly conclusions about the composition, provenience, and theological outlook of the biblical author P fall fairly neatly into two groups—one stemming from studies based on P’s narrative in Gen 1–Exod 6, and one based on P’s legal material after Exod 6. Using this observation as a springboard, King proposes that these two blocks of “P literature,” the narrative and the legal, in fact, stem from two different sources.

King divides his book into three parts: The Composition, Provenience and Intent of the Priestly Legal Manual (which he calls P); The Composition, Provenience and Intent of a Northern Priestly component (which he calls P<sup>N</sup>); and the Composition, Provenience and Intent of H, whom he sees as a redactor who created links between these sources. The first section of the book, which is the most deeply engaged with academic discourse on all things priestly, offers a history of scholarship as an introduction to the realignment of the priestly literature that King will ultimately propose. Though his own voice is less pronounced in this section of the book than others, he ultimately argues that the P document is a legal manual, *not* a “history of origins,” as Norbert Lohfink has suggested.

In the second section of his book, King introduces his theory that the “priestly” material in Gen 1–Exod 6 is from a different source, P<sup>N</sup>, for which he uses the letter “P” only because it has traditionally been known that way. That is, for King, the Genesis material often attributed to P had no relationship at the time of its inception with the P (legal) document. About this source, King offers two conjectures. First, as evinced by its use of Elohim and El Shaddai, by its interest in the Joseph story, and by its interest in promises being made to “Israel” (Jacob/Israel in the narrative, but also implying Israel as opposed to Judah, in King’s estimation), King argues that P<sup>N</sup> is a Northern source. Secondly, King understands the emphasis that P<sup>N</sup> places on fertility blessings to be indicative of a “situation of homelessness and alienation” (115). In combination with the Northern characteristics King has identified, he uses this proposed historical situation to suggest the fall of Israel to Assyria as a likely setting for the composition of P<sup>N</sup>.

In the third section of his book, King addresses the connections between what he has identified as P<sup>N</sup> texts and what he has identified as P texts that have caused other scholars to attribute all of these texts to a single hand. Observing that every place where P texts carry forward the ideas of P<sup>N</sup>, they also demonstrate the literary characteristics of H, King argues that P texts have been connected to P<sup>N</sup> texts by the redactional work of H. He believes that this redaction took place during the reign of Hezekiah with the intention of integrating northern refugees into the dominant (southern) religious culture, both by integrating northern religious themes and terminology found in P<sup>N</sup> into P texts and by explicitly commanding the abandonment

of practices that would have been familiar to northerners that H viewed as a danger to the southern cult.

While the first portion of King's book is rich in its interaction with the history of scholarship, the latter portions of his book, where his contribution to the field really comes to the fore, do not engage a representative sample of the breadth of work that is applicable to the monumental task King undertakes in this book. Some of this scholarship is quite specifically relevant to King's theory—for example, while King makes a good case that his P<sup>N</sup> texts are not P texts, the possibility that some of these texts actually come from the hand of H (e.g., as suggested by Jacob Milgrom<sup>1</sup> with regard to Gen 1:1–2:4a) should have been engaged. Similarly, King's work would be stronger had he explicitly refuted some of the dominant theories about the provenience of the texts he is focused on, rather than simply suggesting a different one. Speaking more theoretically, King allows his assumptions about the nature of biblical sources to remain implicit, and given the considerable role these assumptions play in his conclusions, this is a significant oversight. For example, should we expect biblical authors to prioritize the fulfillment of a plot line? King suggests that H felt compelled to explicitly reflect the fulfillment of promises in P<sup>N</sup> (namely, fruitfulness and multiplication) by recalling these P<sup>N</sup> promises in places where they appear to have been fulfilled. Should we allow for the possibility that biblical authors may have unveiled themes over the course of their composition, or should we imagine that an evolution of themes reflects multiple authorial hands? King does not envision unveiling or evolution within a source document, and thusly finds evidence of a source split. His solution is appealing precisely because of this simplicity, but the underlying assumptions are certainly not universally held, and therefore warrant more explicit theoretical discussion.

While there are areas of this work that would be strengthened by additional discussion, King's theory certainly merits as much from scholars of the priestly material. I come to the end of the book wondering why nobody has suggested this solution before, and this is surely the sign of a valuable idea clearly presented.

---

1. Jacob Milgrom, "H, in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, ed. Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler with the assistance of Sarah Smith Bartel (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 24–40.