

Dear reader,

This is an author-produced version of an article published in The Book of Genesis. Composition, reception, and interpretation. It agrees with the manuscript submitted by the author for publication but does not include the final publisher's layout or pagination.

Original publication:

Schmid, Konrad

Genesis in the Pentateuch

The Book of Genesis. Composition, reception, and interpretation, 2012: 27-50

Leiden, Brill, 2012

URL:

https://brill.com/view/book/edcoll/9789004226579/B9789004226579_003.xml?rskey=IKENQq&result=1

Access to the published version may require subscription.

Published in accordance with the policy of Brill: <https://brill.com/>

Your IxTheo team

Liebe*r Leser*in,

dies ist eine von dem/der Autor*in zur Verfügung gestellte Manuskriptversion eines Aufsatzes, der in International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament erschienen ist. Der Text stimmt mit dem Manuskript überein, das der/die Autor*in zur Veröffentlichung eingereicht hat, enthält jedoch *nicht* das Layout des Verlags oder die endgültige Seitenzählung.

Originalpublikation:

Schmid, Konrad

Genesis in the Pentateuch

The Book of Genesis. Composition, reception, and interpretation, 2012: 27-50

Leiden, Brill, 2012

URL:

https://brill.com/view/book/edcoll/9789004226579/B9789004226579_003.xml?rskey=IKENQq&result=1

Die Verlagsversion ist möglicherweise nur gegen Bezahlung zugänglich.

Diese Manuskriptversion wird im Einklang mit der Policy des Verlags Brill publiziert:

<https://brill.com/>

Ihr IxTheo-Team



UNIVERSITÄTSBIBLIOTHEK

Konrad Schmid, “Genesis in the Pentateuch,” in: Craig A. Evans et al. (ed.), *The Book of Genesis. Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, VTSup 152, Leiden: Brill, 2012, 27–50.

Genesis in the Pentateuch

Konrad Schmid (Zürich)

I. Introduction

In the heyday of the Documentary Hypothesis it was a common assumption that most texts in Genesis were to be interpreted as elements of narrative threads that extended beyond the book of Genesis and at least had a pentateuchal or hexateuchal scope (J, E, and P). To a certain degree, exegesis of the book of Genesis was therefore tantamount to exegesis of the book of Genesis in the Pentateuch or Hexateuch. The *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, one of the major lexica in the German-speaking realm, has for example no entry for “Genesis” but only for the “Pentateuch” and its alleged sources. At the same time, it was also recognized that the material—oral or written—which was processed and reworked by the authors of the sources J, E, and P originated within a more modest narrative perspective that was limited to the single stories or story cycles, a view emphasized especially by Julius Wellhausen, Hermann Gunkel, Kurt Galling, and Martin Noth:¹ J and E were not authors, but collectors.² Gunkel

¹ Julius Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (3d ed.; Berlin: Reimer 1899); Hermann Gunkel, *Genesis* (6th ed.; HKAT I/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1964; repr. from the 3d ed., (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910); Kurt Galling, *Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels*. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1928; Martin Noth, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*

even went a step further: “‘J’ and ‘E’ are not individual writers, but schools of narrators.”³ But with the successful reception of Gerhard von Rad’s 1938 hypothesis of a traditional matrix now accessible through the “historical creeds” like Deut 26:5–9, which was assumed to have also been the intellectual background of the older oral material, biblical scholarship began to lose sight of the view taken by Wellhausen, Gunkel, Galling, and Noth. In addition, Gerhard von Rad saw J and E as “theologians,” rather than the collectors proposed by Hermann Gunkel, and von Rad’s view had an enormous impact on subsequent scholarship.⁴ His position dominated Pentateuchal research in the mid-twentieth century, and it was also predominately his view of the Documentary Hypothesis that was received in the English-speaking world.

The mid-seventies of the last century provided a caesura: scholars like Rolf Rendtorff⁵ and Erhard Blum drew attention to the pre-pentateuchal orientations of the texts now

(trans. with an Introduction by B. W. Anderson; Chico: Scholars Press, 1981), 2; trans. of *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (2d ed.; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1948).

² See also Ron Hendel, “Book of Genesis,” in *ABD* 2:933–41.

³ *Genesis*, LXXXV (English translation mine, original text: “‘J’ und ‘E’ sind also nicht Einzelschriftsteller, sondern Erzählerschulen.”).

⁴ Gerhard von Rad, “Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs,” in *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (TB 8; Munich: Kaiser, 1958), 9–86; trans. as “The Form Critical Problem of the Hexateuch” in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (trans. E. W. Trueman Dickens; London: SCM Press, 1984), 1–78.

⁵ Rolf Rendtorff, *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch* (BZAW 147; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977). See also idem, “Der ‘Jahwist’ als Theologe? Zum Dilemma der Pentateuchkritik,” in *Congress Volume Edinburgh 1974* (ed G. W. Anderson et al; VTSup 28; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 158–66; trans. as “The ‘Yahwist’ as Theologian? The Dilemma of Pentateuchal Criticism,” *JSOT* 3 (1977): 2–10, which is a direct conversation with von Rad’s notion of J as “theologian.”

contained within the book of Genesis.⁶ However, Blum, for example, still holds that the concept of the pentateuchal history is much older than its first literary formations, thereby seeming to overcome Gerhard von Rad's conception on a literary, but not on a tradition-historical level.⁷

Pentateuchal scholarship has changed dramatically in the last three decades, at least when seen in a global perspective. The confidence with which earlier assumptions about the formation of the Pentateuch no longer exists, a situation that might be lamented but that also opens up new—at least in the view of some scholars—apparently more adequate paths to understand its composition.⁸ One of the main results of the new situation is that neither

⁶ For a more detailed treatment of these processes, see Konrad Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story: Israel's Dual Origins in the Hebrew Bible* (Siphrut 3; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 7–16, 334–47; idem, “Has European Pentateuchal Scholarship Abandoned the Documentary Hypothesis? Some Reminders on Its History and Remarks on Its Current Status,” in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research* (ed. T. Dozeman, K. Schmid, B. Schwartz; FAT, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, forthcoming).

⁷ Erhard Blum, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (WMANT 57, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1984) 360–61; David M. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis: Historical and Literary Approaches* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 217–18.

⁸ See e.g. Georg Fischer, “Zur Lage der Pentateuchforschung,” *ZAW* 115 (2003), 608–16; Thomas Römer, “Hauptprobleme der gegenwärtigen Pentateuchforschung,” *TZ* 60 (2004), 289–307; idem, “La formation du Pentateuque: histoire de la recherche,” in *Introduction à l'Ancien Testament* (*MdB* 49; ed. T. Römer, J.-D. Macchi, and C. Nihan; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2004), 67–84; Tom Dozeman and Konrad Schmid, eds., *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Scholarship* (SBLSymS 34, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006); Eckart Otto, *Das Gesetz des Mose* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2007); idem, “Kritik der Pentateuchkomposition: Eine Diskussion neuerer Entwürfe,” in *Die Tora: Studien zum Pentateuch: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (ed. E. Otto; Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte 9; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009), 143–67; idem, “Die Tora im Alten Testament: Entstehung und Bedeutung für den Pentateuch,” *BK* 65 (2010): 19–23; Konrad Schmid, *Literaturgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2008), 37–41. The

traditional nor newer theories can be taken as the accepted starting point of analysis; they are rather at most possible ends. The following discussion therefore strives to base itself on textual observations and not on a specific theory of the formation of the Pentateuch.

II. The Book of Genesis as a Prologue to the Moses Story

On the level of the final shape of the Pentateuch,⁹ it is fairly obvious that the book of Genesis serves as a kind of introduction or prologue to what follows in Exodus through Deuteronomy.¹⁰ It narrates the pre-history in terms of the global beginnings (Gen 1–11) and the ancestry of Israel (Gen 12–50), whose story under the leadership of Moses until before the entry in the promised land is then told in the four latter books of the Pentateuch. Exodus begins and continues where Genesis ends; there is some connecting overlap between the fringes of the two books.

The narrative from Exodus through Deuteronomy is bound together as a presentation of the life of Moses, framed by the reports of his birth (Exod 2) and his death (Deut 34), covering the 120 years of his life. In addition, Exodus through Deuteronomy offer all the law

current situation is evaluated very critically by Joel S. Baden, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch* (FAT 68, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), who defends the basic tenets of the traditional Documentary Hypothesis while specifically emphasizing the separateness of J and E before D.

⁹ For a differentiated view on this notion see Erhard Blum, “Gibt es die Endgestalt des Pentateuch?” in *Congress Volume Leuven 1989* (ed. J. A. Emerton; VTSup 43, Leiden: Brill, 1991), 46–57.

¹⁰ Matthias Millard, *Die Genesis als Eröffnung der Tora: Kompositions- und auslegungsgeschichtliche Annäherungen an das erste Buch Mose* (WMANT 90; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2001). See also John Van Seters, *Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992) for his understanding of J.

collections of the Torah. The book of Genesis introduces this *vita Mosis* including the biblical law corpora by contextualizing it in the framework of global history, world chronology,¹¹ and the pre-history of Moses' people.

Nevertheless, the function of Genesis in the Pentateuch is apparently not exhausted by describing it as introduction to the Moses story. It is fairly obvious that Genesis introduces and discusses themes and topics which do not have a counterpart later on in Exodus – Deuteronomy and which cannot be described as merely introductory elements. This is for example true for the cosmological and the anthropological arguments of the Primeval History, although they also relate to some extent to the sanctuary and law texts in Exodus – Deuteronomy.¹² On the theological level, it needs to be noted that the promises to the ancestors in Genesis, concerning offspring and land possession, are fulfilled in the context of

¹¹ For the details of the chronology, also regarding the different textual versions, see Jeremy Hughes, *Secrets of the Times: Myth and History in Biblical Chronology* (JSOTSup 66; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990).

¹² This is for example discernible for the theological design of the sanctuary in Exod 25–40 (see especially the interconnections between Gen 1:31; 2:1–3 and Exod 39:32, 43; 40:33) as a “creation within creation” (see Erhard Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* [BZAW 189, Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990], 306–11; Peter Weimar, “Sinai und Schöpfung: Komposition und Theologie der priesterlichen Sinaigeschichte,” *RB* 95 (1988): 337–85; Bernd Janowski, “Tempel und Schöpfung: Schöpfungstheologische Aspekte der priesterschriftlichen Heiligtumskonzeption,” in *Schöpfung und Neuschöpfung* [ed. I. Baldermann et al.; *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie* 5; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990], 37–69; repr. in *Gottes Gegenwart in Israel: Beiträge zur Theologie des Alten Testaments* [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1993], 214–46) or the logical interconnection between Gen 6:5, 8:21 and Deut 30:6, see Thomas Krüger, “Das menschliche Herz und die Weisung Gottes: Elemente einer Diskussion über Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Tora-Rezeption im Alten Testament,” in *Das menschliche Herz und die Weisung Gottes: Studien zur alttestamentlichen Anthropologie und Ethik* (ATANT 96, Zürich: TVZ, 2009), 107–36; Konrad Schmid, “Die Unteilbarkeit der Weisheit: Überlegungen zur sogenannten Paradieserzählung Gen 2f und ihrer theologischen Tendenz,” *ZAW* 114 (2002): 21–39.

Exodus – Deuteronomy only with respect to the offspring (see explicitly Exod 1:7 on the literary level of P). The land promise remains unfulfilled until the conquest of Canaan narrated in the book of Joshua (see Josh 21:43–45), and it becomes unfulfilled again after the loss of the land described at the end of the book of Kings (see 2 Kgs 25:11–12, 21–22, 26).¹³ The promise theme is probably the most prominent element in Genesis which has a significance unto its own.¹⁴ In this respect, Genesis counterbalances the Moses story in Exodus – Deuteronomy, which completely takes place outside Israel’s land (except for the tribes settling east of Jordan in Num 32): The narrative scenery of Gen 12–50 is mostly in Canaan itself, and the promise of the land (Gen 12:7; 13:17; 15:18–21; 17:8; 28:13; 35:12 etc.) is a motif that compensates for Israel’s landless existence in Exodus – Deuteronomy within the overall context of the Pentateuch. It is therefore no surprise that this Genesis theme

¹³ See on these texts Christoph Levin, “The Empty Land in Kings,” in *The Concept of Exile in Ancient Israel and its Historical Contexts*, (ed. E. Ben Zvi and C. Levin; BZAW 404, Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 61–89.

¹⁴ In terms of redaction history, the promises in Genesis have to be seen on very different levels: There are probably quite ancient promises like the promise of a son in Gen 18:10, which belong to the substance of that narrative. However, most of the promises obviously are of redactional origins to connect the stories and story cycles in Gen 12–50 to a larger whole. Examples can be found in Gen 12:1–3; 13:14–17; 28:13–15; Gen 31:3, 13; Gen 46:2–4. Especially Rendtorff pointed to the fact that the promises usually are not integral parts of the narratives they are found in. Still, they have to be differentiated in terms of their literary genesis. Some of the earlier redactional promises might have originated after 722 B.C.E., compensating theologically for the fall of the northern kingdom, meanwhile the bulk of them also presuppose the destruction of Jerusalem and Judah in 587 B.C.E., see Matthias Köckert, *Vätergott und Väterverheißungen: Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Albrecht Alt und seinen Erben*, (FRLANT 142, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988); idem, “Verheißung,” *TRE* 34:697–704. Reinhard G. Kratz, *The Composition of the Historical Books of the Old Testament* (trans. J. Bowden; London: T & T Clark, 2005), 262–65 opts decidedly for a still preexilic setting for Gen 12:1–3 and 28:13–15, but after 722 B.C.E. Gen 12:1–3 and 28:13–15 bind the Abraham and the Jacob cycles together.

is taken up subsequently and regularly in the following books (Gen 50:24, Exod 32:12, 33:1, Num 32:11; Deut 34:4, see on these texts below IV. 2.).

III. Diachronic Perspectives

Although the transition from Genesis to Exodus is quite smooth and narratively plausible, it is apparent when viewed historically that neither was Genesis originally written in order to be continued in Exodus nor did Exodus necessarily presuppose Genesis as its introduction.¹⁵ Especially the Joseph story, which in the present shape of the Pentateuch serves as a bridge between Genesis and Exodus, contains different aims than just telling how Israel came to Egypt.¹⁶ In Gen 50, after already having moved *in toto* to Egypt, Israel returns to Canaan again, by means of only one verse (Gen 50:14), the people is transferred back to Egypt again.¹⁷ In addition, the image of the cruel and ignorant Pharaoh in Exod 1–15 is not well prepared for by the Joseph story, which itself offers a completely different image of the

¹⁵ For Exod 2 as the original opening of the exodus story, see Eckart Otto, “Mose und das Gesetz: Die Mose-Figur als Gegenentwurf Politischer Theologie zur neuassyrischen Königsideologie im 7. Jh. v. Chr.,” in *Mose: Ägypten und das Alte Testament* (SBS 189; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2000), 43–83; David M. Carr, “Genesis in Relation to the Moses Story,” in *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History* (ed. A. Wénin; BETL 155; Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 293–95; Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 122–44.

¹⁶ See Kratz, *The Composition of the Historical Books of the Old Testament*, 274–79; Konrad Schmid, “Die Josephsgeschichte im Pentateuch,” in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (ed. J. C. Gertz, K. Schmid, and M. Witte; BZAW 315; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 83–118.

¹⁷ See on Gen 50:14 especially Jan Christian Gertz, “The Transition between the Books of Genesis and Exodus,” in *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation* (ed. T. B. Dozeman and K. Schmid; SBLSymS 34; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 73–87, who attributes this verse to P.

Egyptian king. Neither is Israel's plight as forced laborers explained. The Israelites arrived as peaceful peasants in Egypt, how did they become slaves? Finally, the chronological adjustment between Genesis and Exodus is also spotty: According to Exod 12:40, Israel is said to have served for 430 years in Egypt, on the other hand, according to Exod 2:1, Moses seems to be Levi's grandson on his maternal side, which allows hardly for more than 100 years between Genesis and Exodus.¹⁸ These differences in chronology also provide a hint that the transition from Genesis to Exodus does not belong to the core narrative of either of those books.

Despite some important introductory functions for the following books, Genesis also shows, as we have already seen, clear signs of having existed as a stand-alone literary unit for some portion of its literary growth. Genesis is a special book within the Pentateuch: it is the most self-sufficient one.¹⁹ This is also corroborated by a comparison of its closing words to those of the other pentateuchal books, revealing the special status of Genesis within the Pentateuch. Exodus – Deuteronomy seem to be construed redactionally as a four-book series by their last verses, while the book of Genesis is not an integral part of that series (see the formulations “before the eyes of all [the house of] Israel” in Exod 40:38; Deut 34:12 and “these are the commandments . . . that YHWH commanded . . .”) in Lev 27:34; Num 36:13, which form an *inclusio*).²⁰

Consequently, it is not far fetched to conclude that the origins and the earlier formative stages of the book of Genesis do not yet show the awareness of neighboring texts

¹⁸ See Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 5.

¹⁹ See David L. Petersen, “The Genesis of Genesis.” in *Congress Volume 2007* (ed. A. Lemaire; VT.S 133. Leiden: Brill, 2010), 28: “Hence, I maintain that Genesis is not simply one portion of the larger Pentateuch; Genesis is a book of its own right.”

²⁰ See Ehud Ben Ben Zvi, “The Closing Words of the Pentateuchal Books: A Clue for the Historical Status of the Book of Genesis within the Pentateuch,” *BN* 62 (1992): 7–11.

and books, hinting at their original literary independence. It is a quite common and well-established assumption even within the Documentary Hypothesis that e.g., the Abraham-Lot stories, the Jacob cycle, and the Joseph story were separate literary units before being worked together into a proto-Genesis book and then incorporated into the “sources.”²¹

Therefore, the question arises: At what point in their literary history were the traditions now contained in the book of Genesis linked to the still growing Pentateuch? Put this way, the question opens up many possibilities for speculation. When dealing with the literary history of a biblical book, the danger of leaving the ground of safe assumptions cannot always be avoided. There are no copies of the book of Genesis of the 6th or 4th century B.C.E. by which some theories about its composition could be empirically verified or falsified. Only the final versions of the book—extant in the different textual witnesses of Genesis—are known.

Nevertheless, it is possible to identify and discuss some more or less clear textual elements in the book of Genesis that establish such links and that allow some conclusions. According to a quite common methodological consensus in diachronic biblical studies, it makes sense to start out with the allegedly later texts and then to proceed gradually to earlier texts.²² This methodology applies especially for section V. below, meanwhile the Priestly texts (section IV.) form a well defined literary corpus of their own.

²¹ See e.g. Werner H. Schmidt, *Einführung in das Alte Testament* (5th ed.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995), 63–75; John J. Collins, *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004), 86–88.

²² See e.g. Rudolf Smend, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (4th ed.; Theologische Wissenschaft 1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1991), 9–12.

IV. The Priestly Layer in Genesis and the following Pentateuchal Books

There is one set of texts in Genesis belonging to a prominent textual layer that runs at least through Genesis and Exodus, traditionally known as the “Priestly Code” (P), which are very well connected among each other.²³ Nineteenth-century scholarship believed P to be the foundational layer of the Pentateuch, which in some sense holds still true: P apparently established the main thread along which older, formerly independent text materials have also been arranged.²⁴

Despite all the uncertainties of pentateuchal research, P still remains a sufficiently safe assumption.²⁵ Its texts probably formed a once independent literary entity that might have been written at the end of the 6th century B.C.E.²⁶

²³ See the standard text assignments by Karl Elliger, “Sinn und Ursprung der priesterlichen Geschichtserzählung,” *ZTK* 49 (1952): 121–43; repr. in *Kleine Schriften zum Alten Testament* (ed. H. Gese and O. Kaiser; TB 32; Munich: Kaiser, 1966), 174–98; Norbert Lohfink, “Die Priesterschrift und die Geschichte” in *Congress Volume Göttingen 1977* (ed. J. A. Emerton; VTSup 29; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 183–225; repr. in *Studien zum Pentateuch* (SBAB 4; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988), 213–53; Eckart Otto, “Forschungen zur Priesterschrift,” *TRu* 62 (1997): 1–50. P probably originally ended in the Sinai pericope, see Thomas Pola, *Die ursprüngliche Priesterschrift: Beobachtungen zur Literarkritik und Traditionsgeschichte von P^g* (WMANT 70; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1995); Petersen, “Genesis,” 38; the traditional solution (P ends in Deut 34) is defended by Christian Frevel, *Mit dem Blick auf das Land die Schöpfung erinnern: Zum Ende der Priestergrundschrift* (Herders Biblische Studien 23; Freiburg: Herder, 2000).

²⁴ Theodor Nöldeke, “Die s.g. Grundschrift des Pentateuch,” in *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testaments* (Kiel: Schweser, 1886), 1–144.

²⁵ See e.g. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 221; Carr, *Fractures*, 43.

²⁶ P’s political theology presupposes Persian imperial ideology, which sets 539 B.C.E. as a *terminus a quo* (see Konrad Schmid, “Gibt es eine ‘abrahamitische Ökumene’ im Alten Testament? Überlegungen zur

In terms of P Genesis is therefore very well linked to the rest of the Pentateuch,²⁷ which of course also accords with P's basic theological perspective, which views the patriarchal period as the theological basis of Israel—not the Sinai events.²⁸

Nevertheless, the tight coherence between Genesis and Exodus in P still betrays the binding together of two divergent narrative blocks, as can be seen especially in Exod 6:3.²⁹ In the commissioning of Moses, God introduces himself as YHWH despite the fact that he appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as *El Shadday*. This gradual revelation of God has, of course, some function within P, but it also reflects the different theological profiles of Genesis and Exodus that result from their particular literary-historical backgrounds.

Furthermore, the Genesis portions of P show some signs of being self-contained. This results partly from the history of the material, partly with the theological focus of P on the covenant with Abraham (Gen 17), but in addition, notice should be taken of the incorporation

religionspolitischen Theologie der Priesterschrift in Genesis 17,” in *Die Erzväter in der biblischen Tradition* [A. C. Hagedorn and H. Pfeiffer eds., BZAW 400, Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009], 67-92). A *terminus ad quem* might be seen in the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses in 525 B.C.E., which is probably not reflected in P because Egypt seems to be excluded from P's vision of a peaceful world under God's rule (see Exod 7–11 and 12:12 and especially Albert de Pury, “P^s as the Absolute Beginning,” in *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l'Hexateuque et de l'Ennéateuque* [T. Römer and K. Schmid; BETL 203, Leuven: Peeters, 2007], 99–128, especially 123–28).

²⁷ To my mind, P is also the first author in the Pentateuch to have established a literary link between Gen and Exod and thereby also to have created the basic narrative outline of the Pentateuch. See in detail my *Genesis and the Moses Story* and below n. 72, 76, for opposing views see n. 71.

²⁸ See the still groundbreaking study of Walther Zimmerli, “Sinaibund und Abrahambund. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Priesterschrift,” *TZ* 16 (1960), 268-80, reprinted in idem, *Gottes Offenbarung. Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament* (TB 19, Munich, 1963), 205–217; see also Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 238–48.

²⁹ See W. Randall Garr, “The Grammar and Interpretation of Exodus 6:3,” *JBL* 111 (1992): 385–408

of the “toledot”-book in P, which covers the primeval and the patriarchal period of Genesis in two series of five “toledot.” Its redactional reception within P can best be observed in Gen 5:1–3: The original superscription of the “toledot”-book is still discernible (5:1a, 3), but it was adjusted in light of Gen 1:1–2:4a, especially with respect to “Adam” as designation for the species of human beings and as a proper noun of its first representative, which triggered the insertion of 5:1b, 2.³⁰

V. Further Links from Genesis to the Other Books of the Pentateuch

Some of the most strongest links from Genesis to the following books are provided by the Priestly layer. But it seems that also in the non-P material, especially in the post-P material, such connections can be discerned.³¹ Against the tenets of the Documentary Hypothesis it needs to be stressed that there is no reason to assume that “non-P” always equals “pre-P.” The following discussion starts with those texts that have in view the widest literary horizon and at the same time are allegedly the youngest ones, then proceeding backwards in time to supposedly older layers that, however, still all probably belong to the post-P history of Genesis.

³⁰ Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 236–37, see also David M. Carr, “Βίβλος γενέσεως Revisited. A Synchronic Analysis of Genesis as Part of the Torah,” *ZAW* 110 (1998): 159–172, 327–347, especially 169–70. A different explanation is offered by Christoph Levin, “Die Redaktion R^P in der Urgeschichte,” in *Auf dem Weg zur Endgestalt von Genesis bis II Regum* (ed. M. Beck and U. Schorn, Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 27–28. See also Claus Westermann, *Genesis, 1. Teilband: Genesis 1–11* (BKAT I/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1974), 481–82.

³¹ Eckart Otto, “Forschungen zum nachpriesterschriftlichen Pentateuch,” *TRu* 67 (2002): 125–55.

1. Redactional Portions in Genesis Embedding the Book in the Hexateuch (Gen 50:25)

As is well known, there is one set of texts in the sequence of Genesis through Joshua that explicitly belongs together. No element makes sense without the others, therefore they must be part of one and the same literary layer: the transfer of Joseph's bones from Egypt back to Canaan in Gen 50:25, Exod 13:19 and Josh 24:26.³² This is sufficient evidence to claim that at least at the stage of this series of statements, represented in Genesis by (at least³³) Gen 50:25, the book of Genesis was subject to a redaction comprising the Hexateuch (Genesis – Joshua). In addition, Joshua 24:2–4 looks back to Gen 11–12, introducing, however, a new idea contrary to the presentation of Abraham in Genesis with the reference to his and his father's idolatry in Mesopotamia. The location of Josh 24 in Shechem probably also refers back to Gen 12:6, 8 where Abraham is said to have erected the first altar in the land of Canaan.³⁴ Finally, Joseph and Joshua are paralleled by their ages of 110 years (Gen 50:26; Josh 24:32). However, neither Gen 12:6, 8 nor Gen 11:27–32 nor Gen 50:26 show any awareness of Josh 24, therefore it is rather implausible to assign these statements to the same layer: they are probably earlier texts that were taken up later by Josh 24.

³² See Markus Witte, "Die Gebeine Josefs" in *Auf dem Weg zur Endgestalt von Genesis bis II Regum* (ed. M. Beck and U. Schorn; BZAW 370; Berlin:de Gruyter, 2006), 139–56,

³³ As Erhard Blum, *Vätergeschichte*, 44–45, convincingly argues, the motif of Jacob's purchase of the plot (Gen 33:19) also belongs to the same layer of texts.

³⁴ The Septuagint places Josh 24 in Shiloh (Josh 24:1, 25), which is probably the result of an anti-Samaritan tendency in its *Vorlage*, see Christophe Nihan, "The Torah between Samaria and Judah: Shechem and Gerizim in Deuteronomy and Joshua," in *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding its Promulgance and its Acceptance* (ed. B. M. Levinson and G. N. Knoppers; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 187–223, esp. 197 n. 31

It is disputed whether this redaction aimed at establishing a stand-alone Hexateuch or whether this is a literary device to constitute only a “literary” Hexateuch³⁵ within an Enneateuch (Genesis – Kings).³⁶ A decision in this question is dependent upon how one understands Joshua 24, which will not be discussed here.³⁷

2. Redactional Portions in Genesis Embedding the Book in the Pentateuch (Gen 50:24; Gen 6:1–4; Gen 22:15–18; 26:3b–5)

Besides the Josh 24 network, there are also texts in Genesis that hint to redactional interests that strive to bind the five books of the Pentateuch together. Especially David Clines³⁸ and

³⁵ Erhard Blum, “Der kompositionelle Knoten am Übergang von Josua zu Richter: Ein Entflechtungsvorschlag,” in *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic Literature* (ed. M. Vervenne and J. Lust; BETL 133; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997), 181–212; Eckart Otto, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und im Hexateuch: Studien zur Literaturgeschichte von Pentateuch und Hexateuch im Lichte des Deuteronomiumrahmens* (FAT 30, Tübingen: Mohr 2000) 175–211; Reinhard Achenbach, “Pentateuch, Hexateuch, und Enneateuch: Eine Verhältnisbestimmung,” *ZABR* 11 (2005): 122 – 154; Thomas Römer and Marc Zvi Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch,” *JBL* 119 (2000): 401–19; Thomas Römer, “Das doppelte Ende des Josuabuches: Einige Anmerkungen zur aktuellen Diskussion um ‘deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk’ und ‘Hexateuch.’” *ZAW* 118 (2006): 523–48.

³⁶ Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 208–13; 342; Reinhard Gregor Kratz, “Der vor- und der nachpriesterschriftliche Hexateuch,” in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (ed. J. C. Gertz, K. Schmid, and M. Witte; BZAW 315; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 295–323.

³⁷ See the contributions in Thomas Römer and Konrad Schmid, eds., *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l'Hexateuque et de l'Ennéateuque* (BETL 203, Leuven: Peeters, 2007).

³⁸ David J. A. Clines, *The Theme of the Pentateuch* (rev. ed.; JSOTSup 10; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).

Thomas Römer³⁹ have pointed out that the notion of the promise of the land to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as oath—without the apposition *twb*) “fathers”—in Gen 50:24, Exod 32:12, 33:1, Num 32:11, and Deut 34:4 runs through the Pentateuch as a whole. It is especially noteworthy that this motif cannot be found in the subsequent books of Joshua – 2 Kings.⁴⁰ Apparently, the promise of land to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as an oath is indeed a topic binding the Pentateuch together.

This point can be buttressed in literary-historical terms by the observation that the five texts putting forward the notion of the land promise to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as an oath seem to presuppose P and D. Thus, they probably belong to the latest literary developments of the Torah. It seems that they have combined the motif of the land promise as oath that is prominent in the Deuteronomistic parts of Deuteronomy (see Deut 1:8, 35; 6:10, 18, 23; 7:13; 8:1; 9:5; 10:11; 11:9, 21; 19:8; 26:3, 15; 28:11; 30:20; 31:7, 20–21; 34:4) with the Priestly conviction that God’s acting towards Israel is rooted in the covenant with the ancestors (cf. Gen 17). The result is the notion of the promise of the land to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as an oath.⁴¹ Consequently, Gen 50:24 can be interpreted as an element of a redaction establishing the Pentateuch as a literary unit.⁴²

³⁹ Thomas Römer, *Israels Väter: Untersuchungen zur Väterthematik im Deuteronomium und in der deuteronomistischen Tradition* (OBO 99; Fribourg: Editions Universitaires / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 566.

⁴⁰ Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 271–79.

⁴¹ For detailed analysis, see Römer, *Israels Väter*.

⁴² For a discussion of the literary-historical relationship between Gen 50:24 and 50:25 see Erhard Blum, “Die literarische Verbindung von Erzvätern und Exodus: Ein Gespräch mit neueren Endredaktionshypothesen,” in *Abschied vom Jahwisten*, 145–46; Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 99–100, 214–15, 274–78. *Vice versa*, Deut 34:4 refers back to the beginning of the Pentateuch, to Gen 12:7 and 13:15 and thus forms an *inclusio*. First, Deut 34:4 quotes the promise of the land given in Gen 12:7. Second, there are clear interconnections

A second element needs to be taken into account when discussing literary elements in Genesis that might be elements of a Pentateuch redaction. Genesis 6:1–4 tells the somewhat difficult passage about the intermarriage between the Myhl) ynb and the daughters of mankind.⁴³ Within this text the limitation of human age to 120 years is mentioned (Gen 6:3). It has often been observed,⁴⁴ starting even with Josephus,⁴⁵ that this motif is recurrent in Deut 34:7, where Moses is said to have died at the age of 120 years. This life span is not unique in the ancient world,⁴⁶ so there is no need to postulate a specific link between Gen 6:3 and Deut 34:7 merely on the basis of the number. Nevertheless, there is a good argument within Deut 34 that shows that Deut 34:7 is alluding to Gen 6:3. Moses death' notice is followed by the amazing statement that he died in the best of health: "His sight was

between Deut 34:1–4 and Gen 13:10–15. The cross references between Deut 34:1–4 and Gen 12:7; 13:10–15 are especially remarkable, as Gen 12:1–3, 7 and 13:10–17 belong closely together and might be part of one and the same narrative arc, as Matthias Köckert has suggested in *Vätergott und Väterverheißungen: Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Albrecht Alt und seinen Erben* (FRLANT 142; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988), 250–55; cf. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 214 n. 35. Deut 34:1–4 seems to take up the promise network of Gen 12–13 as a whole and stresses the fact that the land promised to Abraham is still promised to Israel. But unlike the case of Gen 50:24, there is no indication that Deut 34:1–4 belongs to the same layer as the promise network in Gen 12–13.

⁴³ See Mirjam and Ruben Zimmermann, "'Heilige Hochzeit' der Göttersöhne und Menschentöchter," *ZAW* 111 (1999): 327–52; Helge Kvanvig, "Gen 6,1-4 as an Antediluvian event," *SJOT* 16 (2002): 79–112; idem, "The Watcher Story and Genesis: An Intertextual Reading," *SJOT* 18 (2004): 163–83; Andreas Schüle, "The Divine-Human Marriages (Genesis 6:1-4) and the Greek Framing of the Primeval History," *TZ* 65 (2009): 116-28.

⁴⁴ See e.g. Benno Jacob, *Das erste Buch der Tora: Genesis* (New York: Schocken, 1934) 176–77.

⁴⁵ Cf. already Josephus, *Ant.* 2.152; 3.95; 4.176–93; see Klaus Haacker and Peter Schäfer, "Nachbiblische Traditionen vom Tod des Mose," in *Josephus-Studien* (ed. O. Betz et al.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), 147–74, esp. 148.

⁴⁶ See Kvanvig, "Gen 6,1–4 as an Antediluvian Event," 99. Gunkel, *Genesis*, 58 points to Herodotus, *Hist.* 3.23 as a parallel to the life span of "120 years" (in this case of Ethiopians).

unimpaired and his vigor had not abated.”⁴⁷ This is especially striking because this statement also creates a contradiction to the text in Deut 31:1–2, where Moses complains he is no longer at his prime: he is no longer able to go forth and come home—i.e., most likely, he is no longer capable of military leadership. The emphasis on Moses’ health in Deut 34:7 tells the reader that Moses dies for no other reason than that his life span has reached the limit set by God in Gen 6:3. If Deut 34:7 takes up Gen 6:3, the opposite question may be asked: was Gen 6:3 written to prepare Deut 34:7? This seems indeed to be the case because Gen 6:3 and Deut 34:7 share the same theological profile. Deuteronomy 34:7 states that Moses is not allowed to enter the promised land simply because his life span has run out—not because of any sort of wrongdoing—, which is a third alternative explanation of why Moses may not enter the promised land in contrast to the “D” tradition (cf. Deut 1:34–37, 3:25–27)⁴⁸ on the one hand and the P tradition (cf. Num 20:12) on the other. The “Priestly” tradition (probably not “P^g”, but rather “P^s”) in Num 20:12 assumes that Moses went against God by *striking* the rock when God had ordered a *verbal* miracle (“speak with the rock”, Num 20:8) and possibly even doubted that striking the rock would bring forth water;⁴⁹ thus Moses became guilty of faithlessness. The “Deuteronomistic” tradition, on the other hand, includes Moses in the collective guilt of the people: “Even with me YHWH was angry *on your account*.”⁵⁰ Both “explanations” reckon with Moses’ guilt, be it on a personal level (as in accordance with Priestly thought), be it on a collective level (following Deuteronomistic thinking). In contrast,

⁴⁷ Otto, *Deuteronomium im Pentateuch*, 226, points to the antithetical composition of Isaac (Gen 27:1) and Moses (Deut 34:7), both connected by the term *κηη*, used only here.

⁴⁸ For a placement within redaction history see Otto, *Deuteronomium im Pentateuch*, 22–23; also Christian Frevel, “Ein vielsagender Abschied. Exegetische Blicke auf den Tod des Mose,” *BZ* 45 (2001): 220–21, n. 37.

⁴⁹ The statement—kept vague probably out of respect for Moses—in Num 20:10 would then be interpreted as follows: “Should we really be able to produce water from this rock?”

⁵⁰ See Deut 1:36 and 3:26 (“Yhwh got angry with me because of you”).

Deut 34:7 agrees with neither positions⁵¹. It instead offers its own interpretation: Moses is not allowed to enter the promised land because his life span of 120 years has just run out. Moses death east of the Jordan is not caused by personal or collective debt, but by fate, i.e. by the divinely ordained limitation of human life.

And interestingly, this theological profile of Deut 34:7—where Moses’ death has nothing to do with personal guilt, but rather with fate—matches the thematic thrust of Gen 6:3 within the framework of Gen 6:1–4.⁵² In its current literary position, the heavenly interference of divine sons with human daughters offers a (additional) reason for the flood.⁵³ The flood is not only solicited by human guilt (as Gen 6:5–8 states), but also by transcendent fate.

Responsibility for the mixing of the human and divine sphere, caused by the *Myhl* *ynb*, does not fall on the shoulders of humankind. It just occurred to them. Therefore, the literary *inclusio* between Gen 6:3 and Deut 34:7 seems to go back to one and the same hand: Gen 6:3 looks forward to Deut 34:7 and Deut 34:7 refers back to Gen 6:3.

Finally, mention should be made of the passages in Genesis portraying Abraham as a pious observer of the Torah (Gen 22:18b and 26:5b within their contexts Gen 22:15–18 and

⁵¹ Thomas Römer, “Deuteronomium 34 zwischen Pentateuch, Hexateuch und deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk,” *ZABR* 5 (1999): 167–78; Römer and Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34 and the case for a Persian Hexateuch,” 408.

⁵² See especially Manfred Oeming, “Sünde als Verhängnis: Gen 6,1–4 im Rahmen der Urgeschichte des Jahwisten,” *TTZ* 102 (1993): 34–50.

⁵³ David J. A. Clines, “The Significance of the ‘Son of God’ Episode (Genesis 6:1–4) in the Context of the ‘Primeval History’ (Genesis 1–11)” *JSOT* 13 (1979): 33–46; Ronald S. Hendel, “Of Demigods and the Deluge: Towards an Interpretation of Genesis 6:1–4,” *JBL* 106 (1987): 13–26; Andreas Schüle, “The Divine-Human Marriages (Genesis 6:1–4) and the Greek Framing of the Primeval History,” *TZ* 65 (2009): 116–28.

Gen 26:3b–5).⁵⁴ It is obvious that they reflect the inclusion of the book of Genesis in the Torah and therefore portray the ancestors in the book of Genesis as followers of the Torah.⁵⁵ Nevertheless, they are unable to hide the fact that the law was only given later on by Moses, giving rise to the explanation of the book of Jubilees, which deals with the question how Israel’s ancestors before Moses could be observant without the law. Its solution was a metaphysical one: By means of heavenly tablets the ancestors who came before Moses were already informed of the law.⁵⁶ Genesis 22:18b stands within 22:15–18, which is an addition to Gen 22:1–14, 19, a text probably of post-P origin.⁵⁷ Genesis 26:5b is closely interconnected with Gen 22:15–18 and is to be attributed to the same redactional layer.⁵⁸

It cannot be taken for granted that Gen 50:24; 6:1–4; 22:15–18; 26:3b–5 all stem from one and the same hand. They share the common interest to anchor the book of Genesis within the Pentateuch, but they might also have been inserted at different times.

3. Redactional Portions in Genesis Linking the Book to the Exodus story (Gen 15)

⁵⁴ Beate Ego, “Abraham als Urbild der Toratreue Israels: Traditionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu einem Aspekt des biblischen Abrahambildes,” in *Bund und Tora: Zur theologischen Begriffsgeschichte in alttestamentlicher, frühjüdischer und urchristlicher Tradition* (ed. F. Avemarie and H. Lichtenberger; WUNT 92; Tübingen: Mohr, 1996), 25–40.

⁵⁵ Blum, *Vätergeschichte*, 363–65, counted these texts among the D-redaction of Genesis, which he now dates post-P, see his “Die literarische Verbindungen,” 140–45.

⁵⁶ On this motif see Florentino García Martínez, “The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 243–60.

⁵⁷ See the discussion in Konrad Schmid “Die Rückgabe der Verheißungsgabe: Der ‘heilsgeschichtliche’ Sinn von Genesis 22 im Horizont innerbiblischer Exegese,” in *Gott und Mensch im Dialog* (vol. 1.; ed M. Witte; BZAW 345; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004), 271–300.

⁵⁸ See the detailed argumentation of Blum, *Vätergeschichte*, 362–64.

Genesis 15 involves the most prominent bridge text in Genesis that serves as a literary connection between Genesis to Exodus: Gen 15:13–16 contains a preview that explicitly speaks of a four hundred year sojourn (rwg) of Israel as slaves (db()) and oppressed (hn()) people in Egypt (15:13), of the judgment (Nyd) of Egypt (15:14a), and of the departure (icy) of Israel (15:14b, 16) lasting four generations.

It is, however, unclear how this piece fits within the literary history of the book of Genesis. Within the framework of the Documentary Hypothesis, Gen 15 has never been classified convincingly. The frequently presented idea that Gen 15 solemnly introduces “E,” was never fully accepted. Today it has been largely abandoned, even among the advocates of “E,” especially since Gen 15 only uses the Tetragrammaton, while Myhl) never appears. But even the segmentation of “J” and “E” that was often attempted did not succeed convincingly. Thus, it was not possible to classify Gen 15 within the framework of the Documentary Hypothesis.⁵⁹ As an alternative scholars sought to explain Gen 15 “as a Deuteronomistic *corpus separatum*.”⁶⁰ However, for various reasons, this option proved unsuccessful as well, especially the notion of covenant in Gen 15 hardly fits Deuteronomistic ideas. Recent proposals include those of Römer and Ha who theorize that Gen 15 represents a re-reading of Genesis 17 (P) so that Genesis 15 should therefore be dated after “P.”⁶¹ At least for the verses 15:13–16, this option has been accepted also among traditional scholarship especially

⁵⁹ For a full discussion, see Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 158–61.

⁶⁰ Shemaryahu Talmon, “‘400 Jahre’ oder ‘vier Generationen’ (Gen 15,13–15): Geschichtliche Zeitangaben oder literarische Motive,” in *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte* (ed. E. Blum et al.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990), 13.

⁶¹ See Thomas Römer, “Gen 15 und Gen 17: Beobachtungen und Anfragen zu einem Dogma der ‘neueren’ und ‘neuesten’ Pentateuchkritik,” *DBAT* 26 (1989/90): 32–47; John Ha, *Genesis 15: A Theological Compendium of Pentateuchal History* (BZAW 181; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989).

because v. 14 (#wkr) and v. 15 (h+bw hby#) use language otherwise especially known from P texts.⁶²

The overall post-Priestly dating of Gen 15 depends on how the literary integrity of the chapter is seen. This does not need to be decided here,⁶³ but at any rate, it is more or less obvious that the explicit links in Gen 15 presuppose P.

Other portions in Genesis have also been discussed as links to the book of Exodus. Genesis 12:10–20 offers clear associations to the Exodus story. The wording of this passage shows that these associations seem to be intended. Pharaoh is struck ((gn) with plagues, as in Exod 11:1. In 12:20, he sends (xl#š) Abraham and his entourage forth thereby echoing the leading word of Exod 5–11.⁴⁶ Even the commands to let Abraham and Moses go correspond to one another (Klw xq in Gen 12:17 and wklw wxq in Exod 12:32). “In many respects, the episode is accordingly shaped as a prefiguration of the later Exodus, as a piece of salvation history at the beginning of the history of Israel.”⁴⁷ How one should evaluate this prefiguration is by no means clear at first glance. One can consider throughout that this anticipation is suited to a critical note; Abraham does not prefigure Moses, but Moses is an epigone of

⁶² See Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 166–67 and 166 n. 5.

⁶³ For recent proposal see Jan Christian Gertz, “Abraham, Mose und der Exodus: Beobachtungen zur Redaktionsgeschichte von Gen 15,” in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (ed. J. C. Gertz et al.; BZAW 315. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 63–81; see also Konrad Schmid, “The So-Called Yahwist and the Literary Gap between Genesis and Exodus,” in *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation* (ed. T. Dozeman and K. Schmid; SBLSymS 34; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 38 n. 34.

⁴⁶ See Blum, *Vätergeschichte*, 309; Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 57–58; see also Wolfgang Oswald, “Die Erzeltern als Schutzbürger: Überlegungen zum Thema von Gen 12,10-20 mit Ausblick auf Gen 20; 21,22-34 und Gen 26,” *BN* 106 (2001): 79–89.

⁴⁷ Blum, *Vätergeschichte*, 309. See also the references to the predecessors in Blum, *Vätergeschichte*, 309, n. 14 and Ha, *Genesis 15*, 199–200.

Abraham. However one sees it, Gen 12:10–20 is not exactly a literary bridge between Genesis and Exodus that would connect the flow of events in these two books. The typological correspondence between Abraham and Moses is also quite conceivable between two literarily independent narrative works. The echoes of the exodus do not persuasively signify a presumed literary connection from Genesis to Exodus.⁶⁴

Yet another text often seen as a literary connection between Genesis and Exodus is Gen 46:1–5a.⁶⁵ God appears to Jacob and allows him to migrate to Egypt. A promise of fertility and a promise of a return then follow, along with the affirmation that Joseph will “close his eyes.” The Joseph story does not otherwise reckon with such direct revelations of God, and Gen 46:1–5a strongly recalls the language and content of the preceding ancestral narratives. Blum has worked out the connections from Gen 46:1–5a to the promises in Gen 31:11, 13; Gen 26:2–3; and Gen 12:1–2.⁶⁶ According to him, Gen 46:1–5 thus includes the Joseph story in the complex of ancestral transmissions and establishes 12–50 as a large “ancestral story.”

Genesis 46:4a (because of the usage of *hl()*) is often specified as a “anticipatory reference to Exodus.”⁶⁷ However, this understanding is neither required by nor suggested by the text. The explicit horizon of Gen 46:1–5a does not extend beyond Gen 50. The sequence of events that verses 3–4 delineate is as follows: YHWH will move with Jacob to Egypt (3b, 4a), in order to make him into a great people there (*lwdg ywg* in 3b), in order to lead him out again (4a),⁶⁸ and Joseph will close his eyes (4b). If one arranges this anticipatory sequence to

⁶⁴ Carr, “Genesis in Relation to the Moses Story,” 273–95.

⁶⁵ See Blum, *Vätergeschichte*, 246.

⁶⁶ See Blum, *Vätergeschichte*, 246–49, 297–301.

⁶⁷ See Blum, *Vätergeschichte*, 247.

⁶⁸ That the second person singular suffix should “relate collectively to Israel” (Rainer Kessler, “Die Querverweise im Pentateuch: überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung der expliziten Querverbindungen innerhalb des vorpriesterlichen Pentateuchs” [Ph.D. diss., University of Heidelberg, 1972], 164, n. 4; 317 in

the subsequent events, then one does not see beyond the Joseph story. Jacob moves to Egypt in Gen 46:5–7. Genesis 47:27b notes the multiplication of Israel (hrp; hbr), and Gen 50:7–13 specifies the return to Canaan as well as the burial of Jacob by Joseph.

Gen 46:3–4:	Themes:	Genesis 46–50
v. 3b, 4a	trek to Egypt	46:5–7
v. 3b	becoming a nation	47:27b
v. 4a	return	50:7–10
v. 4b	Jacob’s burial	50:13

Genesis 46:1–5a only looks forward to the return of Jacob to Canaan in Gen 50, but not to the return of Israel in Exodus – Joshua. However, that means that Gen 46:1–5a has been formulated just for the ancestral story encompassing Gen 12–50.⁶⁹

It might be helpful to corroborate this proposal of a late redactional connection between Genesis and Exodus by looking at the very beginning of the book Exodus. It is striking that the statement about Israel becoming a great people does not refer back to the prominent non-Priestly promises of increase at the beginning of the patriarchal narrative (e.g. Gen 12:2; 13:13). The comparison of the promise of descendants to Abraham in Gen 12:2

connection with Gerhard von Rad, *Das erste Buch Mose: Genesis* [12th ed.; ATD 2/4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987] 352), has little support. Rather, Gunkel correctly noted, “‘I will bring you back’ in the coffin, an announcement of the narrative of Jacob’s burial in Canaan” (Gunkel, *Genesis*, 440; Westermann, *Genesis 37–50*, 156, sees it differently).

⁶⁹This is also assumed in Blum’s conception (see *Vätergeschichte*, 360). Blum, however, differentiates. He believes that “the hearer/reader . . . [i.e., for the understanding of Gen 46:1–5a] does not (require) a literary context, but knowledge of the salvation historical outline to the conquest.” Blum has now modified his opinion, see idem, “Die literarische Verbindung,” 132–33, n. 63

and the statement of Pharaoh in Exod 1:9 illustrates the absence of a clear relationship between the two bodies of literature.

<p>Gen 12:2</p> <p>And I will make you to a great people (lwdg ywg).</p>	<p>Exod 1:9</p> <p>And he [Pharaoh] spoke to his people: Behold, the people (M()) of the children of Israel are more (br) and mightier (Mwc(w) than we.</p>
--	---

On the other hand it is all the more remarkable that the connections on the P-level are very tight.

<p>Gen 1:28</p> <p>Be fruitful (wpr), and multiply (wbrw), and fill (w)lmw) the earth (Cr)h t))</p> <p>Gen 9:7</p> <p>And you, be fruitful (wpr), and multiply (wbrw); increase abundantly (wcr#\$) in the earth, and multiply (wbrw) therein.</p> <p>Gen 17:2</p> <p>And I will multiply (hbr)w) you exceedingly (d)m d)mb).</p>	<p>Exod 1:7</p> <p>And the children of Israel were fruitful (wpr), and increased abundantly (wcr#\$yw), and multiplied (wbryw), and waxed (wmc(yw) exceeding mighty (d)m d)mb); and the land (Cr)hw) was filled (!lmtw) with them.</p>
---	--

If the non-Priestly substance of the patriarchal and exodus narratives was really written by the same author, telling parts of one and the same story in Genesis and Exodus, it would be very difficult to explain why he did not correlate the promise to become a great people with its

fulfillment, as it is done in P. Therefore, it is much more likely that Gen 12:2 and Exod 1:9 belong to different text layers rather than to assume that we have here a J bridge between Genesis and Exodus.

Beside Exod 1 and the P-links, explicit references back to Genesis found especially in the report on the commissioning of Moses in Exod 3 (see Exod 3:6, 13–16). Again, recent discussions have proposed that either the whole chapter⁷⁰ or at least these references⁷¹ are post-P, although others have argued to the contrary.⁷² A comparison of Exod 3 with its P counterpart in Exod 6:2–8 shows some striking features which might support the case for a post-P setting of Exod 3:1–4:17. Firstly, Exod 6:2–8 plays out in Egypt whereas Exod 3 is located on the mountain of God, i.e. holy territory. It is improbable that P would have secondarily profaned the place of Moses' commissioning. Secondly, Exod 3–4 seems to

⁷⁰ Eckart Otto, "Die nachpriesterschriftliche Pentateuchredaktion im Buch Exodus," in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction – Reception – Interpretation* (ed. M. Vervenne; BETL 126; Leuven: Peeters, 1996), 61–111; Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 172–93.

⁷¹ See Jan Christian Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung* (FRLANT 189; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 233–348; Blum, "Die literarische Verbindung"; Thomas Römer, "Exodus 3–4 und die aktuelle Pentateuchdiskussion," in *The Interpretation of Exodus* (ed. R. Roukema; Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 44; Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 65–79.

⁷² See Thomas B. Dozeman, "The Commission of Moses and the Book of Genesis," in *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation* (ed. T. B. Dozeman and K. Schmid; SBLSymS 34; Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 107–29; John Van Seters, "The Patriarchs and the Exodus: Bridging the Gap between Two Origin Traditions," in *The Interpretation of Exodus* (ed. R. Roukema; Contributions to biblical exegesis and theology 44; Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 1–15; Hans-Christoph Schmitt, "Erzväter- und Exodusgeschichte als konkurrierende Ursprungslegenden Israels – ein Irrweg der Pentateuchforschung," in *Die Erzväter in der biblischen Tradition* (ed. A. C. Hagedorn and H. Pfeiffer; BZAW 400; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 241–66; Graham I. Davies, "The Transition from Genesis to Exodus," in *Genesis, Isaiah and Psalms* (ed. K. J. Dell, G. I. Davies, and Y. Von Koh; VTSup 135; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 59–78.

secondarily integrate the problems that arise later on with Moses' mandate into the call of Moses itself in the context of P. Exodus 6:9 tells about Israel's unwillingness to listen to Moses after he has spoken with the people, and then Moses is to perform the signs before Pharaoh. In Exod 4:1, Moses complains about Israel's disobedience without ever having talked to the people. As a result, Moses receives the power to perform signs in front of his people (4:2–9) already at this point in the narrative, which anticipates the plagues of Egypt. Thirdly, there are some allusions in the wording in Exod 3:7, 9 (see especially the use of the root q(c) to P passages, especially Exod 2:24–25, which are difficult to explain in a pre-P setting of Exod 3–4.

To be cautious, Exod 3–4 does not, therefore, rule out the possibility that the literary connection between Genesis and the Moses story is a rather late phenomenon in the redaction history of the Pentateuch. To my mind, this took place in the wake of P, who was the first to formulate the basic narrative blueprint of the Pentateuch.⁷³

VI. Conclusions

In current scholarship, it is no longer possible to explain the composition of the book of Genesis from the outset within the framework of the Documentary Hypothesis. While the composite character of the book as such is undeniable, it is by no means clear or even probable that its literary history is to be described by the merger of layers that already extended in their earliest forms beyond the boundaries of Genesis, as was supposed for J and E. Rather, the opposite seems to be true. As especially Hermann Gunkel and Martin Noth noted, the legends in Genesis and also their collections into different cycles did not yet include a horizon of events reaching into the book of Exodus or even beyond.

⁷³ See on this especially de Pury, "P^g as the Absolute Beginning."

If P was not the first author to combine Genesis and the Moses story, then such a connection seems not to have been established much earlier than P.⁷⁴ In Exodus 6:2–3, an undisputed literary cornerstone of P,⁷⁵ it is still possible to observe the fact that the sequence of Genesis and Exodus was not an obvious or self-evident concept. The same seems to be true for the inclusion of themes of the books of Genesis and Exodus in the prophetic books (see especially Ezek 33:24) or the Psalms.⁷⁶ At least in the older portions of these literary works, there is little evidence suggesting that a literary link between Genesis and Exodus is already in place, as Albert de Pury, Thomas Römer, Reinhard G. Kratz, Jan C. Gertz, Matthias Köckert, Eckart Otto, Jean-Louis Ska, and others have suggested,⁷⁷ following some basic observations made especially by Kurt Galling and Martin Noth.⁷⁸

⁷⁴ Kratz, *The Composition of the Historical Books of the Old Testament*, 276, 79; Blum, “Die literarische Verbindung.”

⁷⁵ Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 241–42.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 70–80, see, however, differently Schmitt, “Erzväter- und Exodusgeschichte als konkurrierende Ursprungslegenden Israels,” 242–45. For Hos 12, which is especially important for Albert de Pury, “Erwägungen zu einem vorexilischen Stämmejahwismus: Hos 12 und die Auseinandersetzung um die Identität Israels und seines Gottes,” in *Ein Gott allein? JHWH-Verehrung und biblischer Monotheismus im Kontext der israelitischen und altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte* (ed. W. Dietrich and M. A. Klopfenstein; OBO 139; Fribourg: Editions Universitaires and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 413–39, see now the thorough treatment of Erhard Blum, “Hosea 12 und die Pentateuchüberlieferungen” in *Die Erzväter in der biblischen Tradition* (ed. A. C. Hagedorn and H. Pfeiffer; BZAW 400; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 318–319, who concludes that Hos 12 presupposes a Jacob story and a Moses story that conceptually belong into a sequence, but of which is not possible to determine whether or not they are connected in terms of a literary unit.

⁷⁷ See Römer, *Israels Väter*; Albert de Pury, “Le cycle de Jacob comme légende autonome des origines d’Israël,” in *Congress Volume Leuven 1989* (ed. J. A. Emerton; VTSup 43; Leiden: Brill, 1991), 78–96; Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung*, 381–88; Otto “Mose und das Gesetz,” 43–83; idem, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und im Hexateuch*; idem, *Mose: Geschichte und Legende* (Munich: Beck, 2006); idem, *Das Gesetz des Mose*; Kratz, *The Composition of the Historical Books of the Old Testament*; Jean-Louis-

The redaction-historical separation of Genesis and Exodus and the following books before P has wide-reaching consequences for the understanding of the history of religion and theology of the Hebrew Bible that can only be touched in a very preliminary way here. Firstly, it is obvious that this new perspective abandons the thesis so popular in the 20th century that the religion of ancient Israel is based on salvation history (*Heilsgeschichte*). That such a view can no longer be maintained has become more and more clear by recent results of literary analyses of the Pentateuch on the one hand and the numerous archaeological finds published in recent years on the other.⁷⁹ The historical religion of Israel looked differently than the biblical picture suggests. The polemics of the Deuteronomists are probably closer to the preexilic reality in ancient Israel than the normative-orthodox statements in the Bible that promulgate a salvation-history based monotheism. Therefore, the paradigm of a clear discontinuity between ancient Israel, who believed in its God revealing himself in history, and its neighbors, who venerated the cyclically returning phenomena of nature, can no longer be maintained. This paradigm of discontinuity was developed in the wake of Karl Barth's dialectical theology and can be explained as an extrapolation of its basic tenets into the history of ancient Israel's religion. It presupposes that Israel occupies a very special place in the ancient Near East from its very beginning. But if Genesis and the Moses story were not interconnected until the late exilic or early Persian period, if there was no early (i.e. Solomonic) or at least monarchic (Josiah) conception of a salvation history that begins with the creation and ends with the conquest of the land, Israel must be seen in religion-historical continuity rather than discontinuity with its neighbors. The paradigm of discontinuity is not a

Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 196–202; see also Petersen, "Genesis," 28–30.

⁷⁸ See n. 1.

⁷⁹ For an overview see Friedhelm Hartenstein, "Religionsgeschichte Israels—ein Überblick über die Forschung seit 1990," *VF* 48 (2003), 2–28.

peculiarity of ancient Israel but rather a characteristic feature of the Judaism of the Persian period, which projected its ideals back into the Hebrew Bible.

Over against the assumptions of the Documentary Hypothesis, Genesis and the Moses story in Exodus through Numbers and Deuteronomy stood next to each other as two *competing* concepts containing two traditions of the origin of Israel with different theological profiles. The different conceptions still remain visible behind the carefully crafted final form of the Pentateuch. Genesis is mainly autochthonous and inclusive, while the Moses story in the following books is allochthonous and exclusive. Of course such a polar opposition can only serve as a model, but it points nevertheless to a basic difference between the two blocks of tradition. To be more precise, the patriarchal narrative constructs a picture of the origin of Israel in its own land—a fact that is especially prominent in the specific formulations of the promises of the land, which do not presuppose that there will be several centuries between promise and fulfillment. At the same time the patriarchal story is both theologically and politically inclusive: the gods of Canaan can—without any problems—be identified with YHWH, and the Patriarchs dwell together with the inhabitants of the land and make treaties with them. In contrast, the story of the exodus stresses Israel's origin abroad in Egypt and puts forward an exclusive theological argument: YHWH is a jealous god that does not tolerate any other gods besides himself (Exod 20:3–5; 34:14; Deut 5:7–9), and the Israelites shall not make peace with the inhabitants of the land (cf. Exod 23:32–33; 34:12, 15; Deut 12:29–31; 16:21; 20:16–17; 25:19).

The Pentateuch therefore contains both concepts that also serve as arguments in modern discussions: inclusiveness and exclusiveness. However, this important inner-biblical difference regarding how Genesis and the Moses story determine both Israel's origins and its relation to its land and to other nations only becomes fully apparent by means of historical reconstruction. Seen from this perspective, it becomes evident that the Pentateuch is a

document of agreement between different positions. Although the debate over this issue continues, its formation seems to be interpreted within the context of Persian imperial policy.⁸⁰ Genesis is mainly a dissenting, but a most prominent voice in the Pentateuch that has been included in it and now constitutes an integral part of it bearing specific theological importance.

⁸⁰ See the discussion in James W. Watts, ed., *Persia and Torah: The Theory of Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch* (SBLSymS 17; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2001), and Konrad Schmid, “The Persian Imperial Authorization as Historical Problem and as Biblical Construct: A Plea for Differentiations in the Current Debate,” in *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance*, (ed. G. N. Knoppers and B. M. Levinson; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 22–38. For the redactional logic of the formation of the Pentateuch see Ernst Axel Knauf, “Audiatur et altera pars: Zur Logik der Pentateuch-Redaktion,” *BK* 53 (1998), 118–26.

Select Bibliography

- Blum, Erhard. *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 57. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1984.
- Blum, Erhard. "Die literarische Verbindung von Erzvätern und Exodus: Ein Gespräch mit neueren Endredaktionshypothesen." Pages 199–56 in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion*. Edited by J. C. Gertz, K. Schmid and M. Witte. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 315. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002.
- Carr, David M. *Reading the Fractures of Genesis: Historical and Literary Approaches*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996.
- Carr, David M. "Βίβλος γενέσεως Revisited. A Synchronic Analysis of Genesis as Part of the Torah," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 110 (1998): 159–172, 327–347
- Carr, David M. "Genesis in Relation to the Moses Story." Pages 293–95 in *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History*. Edited by A. Wénin. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum Lovaniensium 155. Leuven: Peeters, 2001.
- Clines, David J. A. *The Theme of the Pentateuch*. Rev. ed. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 10. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Davies, Graham I. "The Transition from Genesis to Exodus." Pages 59–78 in *Genesis, Isaiah and Psalms*. Edited by K. J. Dell, G. I. Davies, and Y. Von Koh. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 135. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Dozeman, Tom B. and Konrad Schmid, eds. *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Scholarship*. SBL Symposium Series 34. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

- Gertz, Jan Christian. *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten Testaments 189; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.
- Ha, John. *Genesis 15: A Theological Compendium of Pentateuchal History*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 181; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989.
- Kratz, Reinhard G. *The Composition of the Historical Books of the Old Testament*. Translated by J. Bowden. London: T & T Clark, 2005. Translation of *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments: Grundwissen der Bibelkritik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.
- Millard, Matthias. *Die Genesis als Eröffnung der Tora: Kompositions- und auslegungsgeschichtliche Annäherungen an das erste Buch Mose*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 90. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2001.
- Noth, Martin. *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*. Translated with an Introduction by B. W. Anderson. Chico: Scholars Press, 1981. Translation of *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*. 2d ed. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1948.
- Otto, Eckart. "Forschungen zum nachpriesterschriftlichen Pentateuch," *Theologische Rundschau* 67 (2002): 125–55.
- Petersen, David L. "The Genesis of Genesis." Pages 27–40 in Congress Volume 2007. Edited by A. Lemaire. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 133. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Pury, Albert de. "Le cycle de Jacob comme légende autonome des origines d'Israël." Pages 78–96 in Congress Volume Leuven 1989. Edited by J. A. Emerton. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 43. Leiden: Brill, 1991.

- Pury, Albert de. "P^g as the Absolute Beginning." Pages 99–128 in *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l'Hexateuque et de l'Ennéateuque*. Edited by T. Römer and K. Schmid. BETL 203. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- Römer, Thomas. *Israels Väter: Untersuchungen zur Väterthematik im Deuteronomium und in der deuteronomistischen Tradition*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 99. Fribourg: Editions Universitaires and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.
- Schmid, Konrad. *Genesis and the Moses Story: Israel's Dual Origins in the Hebrew Bible*. Siphut 3. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2010. Revised and Updated Translation of *Erzväter und Exodus: Untersuchungen zur doppelten Begründung der Ursprünge Israels in den Geschichtsbüchern des Alten Testaments*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und zum Neuen Testament 81. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1999.
- Schmitt, Hans-Christoph. "Erzväter- und Exodusgeschichte als konkurrierende Ursprungslegenden Israels – ein Irrweg der Pentateuchforschung." Pages 241–66 in *Die Erzväter in der biblischen Tradition*. Edited by A. C. Hagedorn and H. Pfeiffer. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 400. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- Ska, Jean-Louis. *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- Van Seters, John. "The Patriarchs and the Exodus: Bridging the Gap between Two Origin Traditions." Pages 1–15 in *The Interpretation of Exodus*. Edited by R. Roukema. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 44. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.