

series Gunkel has given us a sketch of what he conceives to be a proper literary history of Israel. But the two great monuments to the form-critical approach are his epoch-making commentary on the Book of Genesis [1901] and his equally notable commentary on the Book of Psalms. The first volume, *Einleitung in die Psalmen* [1933], comprises four hundred and fifty-eight closely-packed pages and is a superb exhibit of meticulous and detailed analysis of the formal features of each literary type.

When one considers the enormous influence on the form-critical approach upon Continental scholarship it is surprising that its impact upon American and English Biblical study has been relatively slight. In R. H. Pfeiffer's *Introduction to the Old Testament* [1941] only a few pages at the beginning are given to the subject; by contrast O. Eissfeldt in his *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* [1934, 1956] devotes a substantial section to the various *Gattungen* and in the analyses of the individual books is always careful to call attention to their presence. Similarly, the first volume of Aage Bentzen's *Introduction to the Old Testament* [1948] is almost entirely devoted to the forms of Hebrew literature. A work of particular attractiveness, one which Gunkel would no doubt have approved, is Johannes Hempel's *Die althebräische Literatur und ihr hellenistisch-jüdisches Nachleben* [1934], a history of Israel's literature, with many judicious literary reflections and many references to the cultural and social setting of the literary units. The salutary effects of the form-critical method are reflected most illuminatingly, however, in the commentaries. Entirely aside from the important contributions of the method to our understanding of the text, it has in many instances succeeded in infusing vitality and contemporaneity into the passage under discussion. The best illustration of a fascinating and exciting commentary is Gunkel's interpretation of the Book of Genesis; H. Gressmann's *Mose und seine Zeit*, despite many precarious critical judgments, bears the same stamp of vitality and creativity. The whole series in the Göttingen Bible, *Die Schriften des Alten Testaments*, is written from the form-critical point of view under the general supervision of Gunkel, Gressmann, Hans Schmidt, and others. Later series of commentaries make good use of form-critical methodology. One thinks of *Das alte Testament Deutsch* or the *Handbuch zum alten Testament* or the new series in the *Biblischer Kommentar*. Many monographs have been devoted to the study of special *Gattungen* or literary forms. W. Baumgartner has written on the laments of Jeremiah,¹ H. Jahnow on the dirge,² Begrich on

¹ *Die Klagegedichte des Jeremia* [1917].

² *Das hebräische Leichenlied im Rahmen der Völkergedichtung* [1923].

the priestly oracle of salvation,³ E. Balla on the invectives and threats of Amos,⁴ J. Lindblom on the literary forms in Micah, Hosea, and other books,⁵ J. Begrich⁶ and L. Kohler⁷ have examined the various literary forms in Second Isaiah, the former stressing particularly the oracle of salvation, the latter the *Botenspruch*, a literary form, incidentally, which requires further study since there is abundant evidence to show that the style of the herald's message has left its stamp not only on some of our earliest literary types but also on the oracles of the prophets.⁸

Form Criticism has also given rise to a very large number of special studies of individual literary units. This is not surprising since Gunkel's approach was in large measure a reaction to the historico-critical tendency to deal with blocs of material without any reference to the literary forms contained in them. An excellent illustration is the effect Form Criticism has had upon our understanding of the Priestly material in the second half of the Book of Joshua. A. Alt, M. Noth, and others have subjected the various pericopes to intense scrutiny, especially the boundary lists, with the results that they now require not merely fresh dating but a new historical and social context.⁹ In this connexion it is worth observing that Form Criticism has tended all along the line to allocate the Biblical materials to much earlier dates than were assigned to them by the historical critics. The early chapters of Joshua have also been studied in the light of Form Criticism, especially by Alt and Noth.¹⁰ Paul Humbert has written an illuminating article on 'La Relation de Genèse 1 et du Psaume 104 avec la liturgie du Nouvel-An israélite' and associates the Biblical passages with the celebration of the enthronement festival.¹¹ Whether the latter con-

³ 'Das priesterliche Heilsorakel', in *ZAW*, lii. [1934] 81-92.

⁴ *Die Droh- und Scheltworte des Amos* [1926].

⁵ *Die literarische Gattung der prophetischen Literatur* [1924]; *Hosea literarisch untersucht* [1927]; *Micah literarisch untersucht* [1929].

⁶ *Studien zu Deuteronesaja* [1938].

⁷ *Deuteronesaja (Jesaja 40-55) stilistisch untersucht* [1923].

⁸ Martin Noth, 'History and the Word of God in the Old Testament', in *BJRL*, xxxii. [1950] 194-206.

⁹ A. Alt, 'Judas Gaue unter Josia', in *PJB* [1927] 100-116; 'Das System der Stammesgrenzen im Buche Josua' in *Sellin-Festschrift* [1927], 13-24. M. Noth, in *Josua* in *HAT* [1938].

¹⁰ 'Josua', in *Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments*, ed. by Paul Volz, Friedrich Stummer, and Johannes Hempel [1936], 13-29. See also Noth's commentary on Joshua.

¹¹ *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuse* [1935], 1-27.