

## SOURCE CRITICISM: THE MIRACLE AT THE SEA

*Christoph Levin*

### DEFINITION OF THE METHOD

“Source criticism” is the name given to the analytical method that, starting from the (more or less) final form of the text as it can be reconstructed from transmitted textual versions, goes on to enquire about the preliminary literary stages. Strictly speaking, source criticism is not a single method, in the sense of a precisely defined text-analytical technique. It is an approach that scans the surface of today’s text in order to discover its historical deep structure, insofar as this has developed in the course of the literary transmission. Earlier oral stages are not necessarily excluded, but they are reconstructed in a different way, particularly on the basis of their genres and their *Sitz im Leben*.

Like all established exegetical methods, source criticism has a long history. At its beginning—as it is today—source criticism was prompted by the conspicuous phenomena in the text that inescapably demanded an explanation, such as unmotivated repetitions, irregular grammar, a change in linguistic usage, a sudden mingling of different genres, the interruption of one and the same speech through multiple introductions, and so forth. The variants in the transmitted text not infrequently reflect disturbances originating in its literary history that have been solved by the different textual traditions in various ways.

In the last 250 years, biblical scholars have learned with increasing clarity that a text that displays irregularities of this kind does not, as a rule, derive from a single author’s intention. Rather, such a text reflects a process of literary growth, in the course of which many hands worked on it from varying viewpoints until it arrived at its present form. Long before the critical thrust of modern times, there were indications that the traditional view that the Torah was written by Moses could not be

correct—any more than that the Psalms were written by David, the wisdom books by Solomon, and the prophetic books by the prophets under whose names they go.

In the book of Genesis, people became aware of literary incoherence because there are noticeably double accounts that use different names for God: two accounts of creation; double genealogies in Gen 4–5 and 10–11; two interwoven but opposing versions in the story of the flood; two great promises to Abraham in Gen 17–18; two accounts of the danger to Sarah (Gen 12; 20); and more. The initial explanation was a naïve one: it was suggested that Moses had had recourse to older sources—that is to say, that he had worked not just as an author but as an editor, too.<sup>1</sup> Though the initial explanation has not survived, the premise that Moses himself used written sources still lives on in the term “source criticism.”

Classifying texts based on the varying names given to God proved to be conclusive because texts separated on the basis of this criterion fit together into more or less coherent sequences. In this way the *Documentary Hypothesis* developed. According to this hypothesis, underlying the Pentateuch are at least two previously independent historical works. In spite of numerous attempts to replace it by other models, this hypothesis has held its ground for 250 years, down to the present day.

At the same time, there were good reasons for the alternatives that were put forward. The Documentary Hypothesis on its own is not sufficient. The text has far too many strata for it to be explained on the basis of only a few sources, and the comprehensive historical works are themselves based on sources of their own. Consequently, the *Fragmentary Hypothesis* can also claim to be correct to some degree. We can assume that in the historical works many short individual texts have been collected, many of which survive only in fragmentary form.

The basic presupposition of the literary analysis has to do with genre criticism: it is the presumption that the Old Testament as the traditional religious literature of the Jewish community of the Second Temple was not only transmitted and received but actually came into being as precisely that. Its beginnings were the holdings of the royal archives in Jerusalem, those texts that had survived the conquest of the city and had been preserved: relatively slim collections of prophetic sayings; cult poetry; wisdom sayings; collections of laws; annals; and stories that had been passed down at the court. In addition, soon after the downfall of the monarchy, the first two great compilations came into being as a way of coming to terms with the new situation. One, known today as the Deuteronomistic History,

was the historical work that constitutes the nucleus of the books Joshua to Kings and that propagandizes the return of the Davidic monarchy.<sup>2</sup> The other was the history that forms the basis of Genesis, Exodus, parts of Numbers, and the close of Deuteronomy. This work, known as the Yahwist's History, grapples with the experience of the exile and dispersion.<sup>3</sup>

With this as its basis, the Old Testament in its present form developed over the course of the Persian and the Hellenistic periods. The guiding concern was to relate the transmitted text, which was understood as the word of God, to the changing conditions in the ongoing history of Judaism. This concern found expression through an innertextual interpretation that overlaid the already-existing material with commentary and increasingly expanded the text. In this way the Old Testament is to a great extent its own interpretation—we might say, a great midrash. The hypothesis that best does justice to this literary fact is the *Supplementary Hypothesis*.

The aforementioned growth generally followed no rules. That was in accordance with the material: a sacred text is not “made”; it is received from tradition and interpreted only for the needs of the present time. Redactional interventions such as organization and rearrangement of the written material were the exception. Occasionally scrolls that had become too large were split up, and texts that belonged together were amalgamated into greater conglomerations. It was only from the Hellenistic period onward that the text gradually crystallized into fixed form, beginning with the Torah. The process out of which the Old Testament emerged forbids us from seeing the final shape that the text reached in one or another linguistic form (Hebrew or Greek) as anything more than a provisional result, one that awaits further interpretation and contemporary reference.

The tradition—which in each given case provides the foundation for the literary process—was fundamentally sacrosanct; consequently, the scholar can work on the text like an archaeologist. If one clears away later strata, one can in each instance expect to come upon an older, intact form of the text.

In all work in the humanities, argument is to a certain degree circular. If there is progress in what we know, it develops in the form of a spiral. Work on the literary history of the Old Testament also proceeds from the decisions at which the field has previously arrived. These decisions have developed in the course of our scholarly tradition and rest on the experience of many generations of biblical scholars, but they are not a dogma. In work on an individual text, the decisions are continually reexamined, and their validity has to be tested.

## THE MIRACLE AT THE SEA

The story about the miracle at the sea in Exod 14 is one of the traditional examples that shows that the pentateuchal narrative has been put together from several sources. “The lack of unity in the account of the sea event has been recognized for well over a hundred years.”<sup>4</sup> With the Documentary Hypothesis as a presupposition, from early on scholars generally accepted the separation of the narrative into two formerly independent strands of tradition. In 1869 Theodor Nöldeke summed up earlier research on this topic by indicating that Exod 14:1–4, 8, 9, 10 (in part), 15–18, 21 (in part), 22, 23, 26, 27 (in part), 28, 29 all belong to the “Basic Document,” which we today call the Priestly Code.<sup>5</sup> With some small modifications, this classification still holds today.<sup>6</sup> The rest of the text was assigned to what we today call the Yahwist (or J, from the German *Jahwist*), which was considered the later source in the period before Karl Heinrich Graf (1867), Abraham Kuenen (1869), and Julius Wellhausen (1876).

The story about the miracle at the sea is also a good example of the literary-critical approach because it shows that the separation into two sources is too simple a solution to do justice to the complex nature of the text. This, too, was already realized in the nineteenth century. Hermann Hupfeld believed that he had additionally identified the “Elohists” as a third document,<sup>7</sup> so Julius Wellhausen was able to reckon with *three* sources. From verse 21 onward, he assigned to this Elohist the text that until then had been allocated to the Priestly Code.<sup>8</sup> Rudolf Smend Sr. went further still and disputed that the story included any part of the Priestly Code; instead, he differentiated between two levels (J<sup>1</sup> and J<sup>2</sup>) within the Yahwistic text.<sup>9</sup> A three-source hypothesis would, of course, presuppose that the sources have been mutilated in the course of their amalgamation, since the number of repeated statements is not sufficient for three complete versions. This is a fundamental weakness of the three-source hypothesis; besides, there have always been good reasons for doubting the existence of the “Elohist.”<sup>10</sup>

In spite of the considerable evidence suggesting the separation of the two sources—the Priestly Code and the Yahwist—we must not overlook the fact that the amalgamation of such parallel accounts is exceptional in the highest degree. It probably took place only once in the whole history of the Old Testament literature.<sup>11</sup> Its goal was to bring together two hitherto separate accounts of God’s history with God’s people in order to make its unity visible in literary terms as well.<sup>12</sup> If some external occa-

sion was required for this literary synthesis, it could well be found in the development of the Jewish Diaspora. The religious community that had been dispersed throughout the world needed a common text to keep it together.<sup>13</sup>

The *normal* supposition about the literary history of the Old Testament, however, was the Supplementary Hypothesis. Abraham Kuenen already pointed to this with special emphasis. It also holds good for the Pentateuch. Literary additions can be found in almost every text. They can be brief explanations ad hoc, taking the form of marginal or inter-linear glosses, which are even occasionally encountered as catchword glosses that are provided with lemmas. Frequently, however, the literary additions go back to more or less purposeful revisions that can also include more extensive literary complexes. This can best be shown by the following example.

THE SUPPLEMENTARY HYPOTHESIS (1):  
LATE REVISIONS AND EXPANSIONS

In the form in which it has been passed down, the story about the miracle at the sea cannot simply be distributed between two sources; for the version that emerged through the amalgamation of the Yahwist and the Priestly Code was extensively revised. Before the narrative is analyzed on the basis of the Documentary Hypothesis, the later expansions must be cleared away.

As a rule, additions of this kind are the work of many hands and introduce varying standpoints. We also, however, come across revisions with a deliberate aim. In the story about the miracle at the sea in Exod 13:17–18a, 22; 14:2 (only one word: *wěyāšūbū*), 3, 11, (12), 14b, 19a, 25a, and 31, a shared tendency can be detected.<sup>14</sup>

13:17 When Pharaoh let the people go, God did not lead them by way of the land of the Philistines, although that was near, for God said, “Lest the people repent when they see war, and return to Egypt.” 18a But God led the people round by the way of the wilderness toward the Reed Sea. 22 The pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night did not depart from before the people.

14:2 that they turn back

3 Pharaoh will say of the Israelites, “They are wandering aimlessly in the land; the wilderness has shut them in.”

11 They said to Moses, “Was it because there were no graves in Egypt

that you have taken us away to die in the wilderness? What have you done to us, taking us out of Egypt? [12 Is not this what we told you in Egypt would happen, when we said, ‘Leave us alone; we will serve the Egyptians?’ For it is better for us to serve the Egyptians than to die in the wilderness.”]

14b Yet you may keep still.

19a The angel of God who went before the host of Israel moved and went behind them.

25a He <clogged><sup>15</sup> the wheels of their chariot so that they drove heavily.

31 When Israel saw the great work that YHWH had done against the Egyptians, the people feared YHWH and had faith in YHWH and his servant Moses.<sup>16</sup>

The reason for this revision is that the Israelites call YHWH’s promise into question and doubt his saving power.<sup>17</sup> This doubt has evidently befallen the contemporary Jewish community to whom the reviser addresses the revised text. Consequently, the reviser presents the event in such a way that the saving act that YHWH performed in early times proves that the doubt is unfounded: “When Israel saw the great work that YHWH had done against the Egyptians, the people feared YHWH and had faith in YHWH and his servant Moses” (v. 31). The intention is to strengthen the belief that YHWH is able to help in time of need. It is easy to see that this theological conclusion has been tagged on to the story at a later stage. Rudolf Smend Jr. notes that the beginning of this phrase (“When Israel saw”) already appeared at the beginning of verse 30b, this noticeable doublet leading to the plausible conclusion that verse 31 is a postscript.<sup>18</sup> The linguistic usage suggests a very late origin.<sup>19</sup> As in Num 21:5, 7, the divine demonstration goes hand in hand with the rehabilitation of Moses.<sup>20</sup> What is at stake is not only God’s power but also the credibility of his cultic and theological agents, who therefore comment on the text.

The doubts that are overcome by the end of the story are put into the mouths of the Israelites in verses 11–12. According to Erik Aurelius, “The complaint can be a later interpolation, inserted between v. 10 and 13; in this case vv. 13–14 would originally have been an answer not to ‘murmuring’ Israelites but only to fearful ones.”<sup>21</sup> The peoples’ complaint that Moses had led the Israelites out of Egypt so that they might die in the wilderness (*lāmût bammidbār*) does not refer to the immediate pursuit by the Egyptians but to the dangers of the march that are still to come: thirst and hunger (see 16:3; 17:3).<sup>22</sup> YHWH’s help now also has the aim of silencing this complaint: *wē’attem taḥrīšûn* “yet you may keep still” (v. 14b).

In verse 12 the objection is even intensified. Doubt is replaced by neg-

ative certainty: “It is better for us to serve the Egyptians.” That statement is tantamount to open rebellion, for the command “Let my people go that they may serve *me*” was given to Pharaoh again and again.<sup>23</sup> Now that the people have been freed, they are close to disclaiming the promise and returning to Egypt (see Num. 14:2–3). The verse is set apart as a further addition through the pointer *hālōʾ-zeh* “is not this” and the resumptive repetition *mimmutēnū bammidbār* “than to die in the wilderness.”

Yet God’s solicitous care for his people goes so far that he foresees their disobedience and prevents it. He does not lead them on the direct route, the Philistine road (*derek ʿereṣ pēlišṭīm*), which would have brought them into certain conflict with the Philistines; he takes them through the desert to the Reed Sea, that is, to the Gulf of Aqabah (*derek hammidbār yam sūp*, 13:17–18a). God knew that, if faced with the belligerent Philistines, the Israelites would have been tempted to return to Egypt. So God forced them to make a detour far away to the southeast. In this way, the reviser simultaneously presents himself and his readers with a solution to the question as to why the wanderings of the Israelites did not take them straight from Egypt into the (west Jordan) land of Israel. The theologian writing here even sees himself in a position to pass on God’s thoughts, word for word. The explanation, which begins with “a subordinate clause ... which ... serves as a connection,”<sup>24</sup> originally joined on to the departure described in Exod 12. It differs from the rest of the account in that it avoids the name of God (YHWH) and uses *Elohim* instead.

In order to combine the deviation with the events that follow, in 14:2 Moses has to be given the command to make the Israelites turn back again (*wēyāšūbū*). At the same time, God uses the Israelites’ detour as a way of deceiving Pharaoh, whose thoughts the reviser passes on in 14:3 in the same way as he does the thoughts of God in 13:17b.

In the same move, God’s help is underlined. The explanations in 13:22 about the function of the pillar of cloud and fire emphasize the unceasing presence of God among his people. The repetitions of what has been said in 13:21a show that the verse is a later addition. In 14:19a *Elohim*’s angel has been added in the same way. Finally, YHWH’s solicitude is also shown in 14:25a by the way he puts the Egyptian chariots out of action. Heinrich Holzinger contends that “14:25b joins on to 14:24; 14:27aβγb (from *wayyāšob* onwards) knows nothing about difficulties with the wheels but lets the Egyptians be driven to destruction in panic and wild flight.”<sup>25</sup> Martin Noth adds, “Within this closely knit sequence of events the observation in v. 25a has a disruptive effect.”<sup>26</sup>

The other late additions can less clearly be put down to a common thrust or intention:

13:18b And the Israelites went up out of the land of Egypt equipped for battle.

19 And Moses took the bones of Joseph with him, for Joseph had solemnly sworn the Israelites, saying, "God will visit you; then you must carry my bones with you from here."

21b That they might travel by day and by night.

14:5b The mind of Pharaoh and his servants was changed toward the people, and they said, "What is this that we have done in letting Israel go from serving us?"

7 He took six hundred choice chariots [and all the chariots of Egypt] with officers in charge of them all.

8b The Israelites were going forth defiantly.

20aβγ [And there was the cloud and the darkness.] And it gave light by night.

The explanation in 13:18b that the Israelites left Egypt *ḥāmūšîm* "in parties of fifty" "has the character of a commentary."<sup>27</sup> This can be seen from the syntax, too, which deliberately puts the phrase outside the *consecutio temporum*. The number given, 600,000 men, is taken up from 12:37b and explained, perhaps in the sense of a military order. The participial clause in 14:8b is comparable, where it is said that the Israelites went out *bēyād rāmā* "with raised hand." Further, the details about the strength of the Egyptian troops in verse 7 could also belong to this context. The verse is "parallel to verse 6"<sup>28</sup> and adds that the chariots were six hundred in number, each of them carrying a team of three. The size of the pursuing force makes the defeat of the Egyptians all the greater. A further addition in verse 7aβ involves the *whole* chariot power of the Egyptians in the downfall.

The asyndetic infinitive clause in 13:21b ("so that they might travel by day and by night") offers an explanation about the pillar of cloud and fire. The possibility of marching day and night is a subsidiary aspect that was not originally intended. Further explanations of this kind can be found in 14:20aβγ, which wrenches apart the connection between 14:20aα and b. The syntax of these marginal exegeses, which present interpreters with a puzzle, is faulty.

On the occasion of the departure in 13:19, the bones of Joseph are mentioned in order to make it clear that the Israelites fulfilled the oath



that they swore to Joseph in Gen 50:25. Moses, who is otherwise not mentioned, is the active subject. The factual continuation can be found in Josh 24:32.

Exodus 14:5b subsequently establishes a cross connection to the series of plagues.<sup>29</sup> That Pharaoh turns against the people is, according to Noth, “an extremely surprising statement after everything which we have been told up till now.”<sup>30</sup> We could agree with Rudolf Smend Sr. when he claims, “The real follow up to v. 5a is v. 6: after hearing the news about the Israelites’ flight, Pharaoh immediately sets out in pursuit.”<sup>31</sup>

#### THE DOCUMENTARY HYPOTHESIS: THE SEPARATION OF THE YAHWIST’S HISTORY AND THE PRIESTLY CODE

Given the occurrence of doublets and contradictions, the text of the narrative as we have it, after the various late additions have been separated out, rests on two independent versions that have been fused together into a single account at a later stage. Both these accounts have been retained complete.

The way in which the sources were bound together parallels the composition of the flood story.<sup>32</sup> Over against the practice of the redaction of the Pentateuch, which normally places the sources P and J one after another, section for section (e.g., Gen 1–3), the flood and the sea miracle are exceptions.<sup>33</sup> It is easy to see why. Since the Egyptians (and, in the flood, the whole of humanity) could not have been drowned twice successively, the redaction was compelled to dovetail the two versions into a single account. In the following text, the later additions already discussed are eliminated and indicated by bracketed ellipses. Italics mark additions by the redactor who united the two parallel narratives.

- J        13:20 And they moved on from Succoth and encamped at Etham, on the edge of the wilderness. 21a And YHWH went before them by day in a pillar of cloud to lead them along the way and by night in a pillar of fire to give them light. [...]
- P        14:1 YHWH said to Moses, 2 “Tell the Israelites, [...] that they encamp in front of Pi-hahiroth, between Migdol and the sea, in front of Baal-zephon. You shall encamp facing it, by the sea. [...] 4 Then I will harden the heart of Pharaoh so that he will pursue them, and I will gain glory over Pharaoh and all his host; and the Egyptians shall know that I am YHWH.” And they did so.

- J 5a When the king of Egypt was told that the people had fled, [...] 6 he made ready his chariots and took his army with him. [...]
- P 8a Then YHWH hardened the heart of Pharaoh, *king of Egypt*, and he pursued after the Israelites. [...] 9 The Egyptians pursued them and overtook them encamped by the sea, all the horses and chariots of Pharaoh, his horsemen and his army, by Pi-hahiroth, in front of Baal-zephon.
- J 10 *And Pharaoh drew near*. When the Israelites lifted up their eyes, behold, the Egyptians were pursuing after them, and they were in great fear. And the Israelites cried out to YHWH. [...] 13 But Moses said to the people, “Fear not! Stand firm and see the deliverance of YHWH, which he will work for you today; for as you see the Egyptians today, you shall never see them again. 14a YHWH will fight for you.” [...]
- P 15 YHWH said to Moses, “*Why do you cry to me?* Tell the Israelites to go forward, 16 and you, raise your rod and stretch out your hand over the sea and divide it, so that the Israelites may go on dry ground into the sea. 17 Then I will harden the hearts of the Egyptians so that they go in after them, and I will gain glory over Pharaoh and all his host, his chariots and horsemen. 18 And the Egyptians shall know that I am YHWH, when I have gained glory over Pharaoh, his chariots, and his horsemen.” [...]
- J 19b And the pillar of cloud moved from before them and stood behind them, 20 coming between the host of Egypt and the host of Israel. [...] And neither came near the other all night.
- P 21 Then Moses stretched out his hand over the sea.
- J And YHWH drove the sea back by a strong east wind all night and made the sea dry land.
- P And the waters were divided. 22 And the Israelites went into the sea on dry ground, the waters being a wall to them on their right hand and on their left. 23 The Egyptians pursued and went in after them, all of Pharaoh’s horses, chariots, and horsemen, right into the sea.
- J 24 At the morning watch, YHWH looked down upon the host of Egypt in the pillar of fire and cloud and threw the host of Egypt into panic. [...] 25b And the Egyptians said, “Let us flee from before Israel, for YHWH is fighting for them against Egypt.”

- P 26 YHWH said to Moses, “Stretch out your hand over the sea, that the water may come back upon the Egyptians, upon their chariots, and upon their horsemen.” 27 So Moses stretched out his hand over the sea.
- J And the sea returned to its normal course when the morning appeared, and the Egyptians fled before it, and YHWH shook the Egyptians into the sea.
- P 28 And the water returned and covered the chariots and horsemen that belong to the whole host of Pharaoh, those who had followed them into the sea, not one of them remaining. 29 But the Israelites walked on dry ground through the middle of the sea, the waters being a wall to them on their right hand and on their left.
- J 30 Thus YHWH delivered Israel that day from the hand of the Egyptians, and Israel saw the Egyptians dead upon the seashore. [...]

In the linking of the two sources, the Priestly Code provided the foundation, because its account is clearly structured through the three divine commands in 14:1, 15, and 26. The Yahwistic source was inserted into this sequence.<sup>34</sup>

The two sources divide most clearly at the crowning moment. The return of the water is described twice: “and the sea returned” (*wayyāšob hayyām*, 14:27 $\alpha^2$ ); and “and the waters returned” (*wayyāšūbū hammayim*, 14:28). In the J account, the Egyptians *flee* from the *sea*, which had been forced back during the night and returns in the morning. YHWH “shakes them off” into the waves. In the P account, the Egyptians *go through* the divided sea. When the *water* returns, they are overwhelmed by the waves.

The return of the water in 14:28 follows on the command that YHWH gave to Moses in 14:26: “YHWH said to Moses, ‘Stretch out your hand over the sea, that the water may come back upon the Egyptians, upon their chariots, and upon their horsemen.’ So Moses stretched out his hand over the sea. ... And the waters returned.” The other version, which is thereby passed over, is linked through the catchword *nūs* “flee” with what the Egyptians say in 14:25b: “And the Egyptians said, ‘Let us *flee* from before Israel; for YHWH is fighting for them against Egypt.’ ... And the sea returned to its normal course when the morning appeared, and the Egyptians *fled* before it, and YHWH shook the Egyptians into the sea.” Verse 24 also belongs to this version, since it mentions the terror of God that drives the Egyptians into the sea according to v. 27 $\alpha^2\beta$ b.

It is clear that the sequence of command and obedience belongs to the Priestly Code. We find the same sequence in the creation account Gen 1:1–2:4a as well as in the Priestly Code's version of the flood and in the story about the plagues in Exod 7:8–13, 19, 21 $\alpha^1$ , 21b–22; 8:1–3, 11 $\alpha\beta$ –15; 9:8–12. The sea miracle as told in the Priestly Code reads like another plague; the other version belongs to the Yahwist's History. The reasons will emerge below.

The interplay between command and obedience also comes out in 14:15–16 and 21 $\alpha^1$ , b. When YHWH orders, “raise your rod and stretch out your hand over the sea and divide it, so that the Israelites may go on dry ground into the sea,” Moses obeys: “then Moses stretched out his hand over the sea, ... and the waters were divided.” Here, too, the Yahwist's version is interpolated: “And YHWH drove the sea back by a strong east wind all night and made the sea dry land” (v. 21 $\alpha^2\beta$ ). Again there is the same contradiction: in the Priestly Code Moses divides the sea so that the Israelites can pass through; in the Yahwist's History YHWH drives the sea back through a wind during the night. In the morning the Egyptians think that the sea bed is dry land and flee into it. Between the command and its implementation stands the report in 14:19b–20 that the pillar of cloud placed itself between the armies, in order to protect the Israelites from the Egyptians during the night. This detail belongs to the Yahwist version, for it is only there that the night has to pass before the sea can retreat. In the Priestly Code the whole incident takes place by day.

YHWH's first command is given in 14:1–2, 4a. YHWH lets Moses set out and predicts the way the Egyptians will behave, just as they accordingly do in 14:4b, 8a, 9. This part of the story also belongs to the Priestly Code. If we put the three stages together, we have a complete, clearly structured progression. (1) YHWH orders Moses to make the Israelites start out, and they comply. The Egyptians pursue and catch them as they camp at the sea (14:1–2, 4, 8a, 9). (2) YHWH commands Moses to divide the sea and then to guide the Israelites through: these events occur as commanded. The Egyptians follow the Israelites through the divided sea (14:15–17, 21 $\alpha^1$ , b, 22–23). (3) YHWH commands Moses to let the water return; that, too, takes place, and the Egyptians drown (14:26–27 $\alpha^1$ , 28–29).

On the other hand, the verses that have been eliminated also form a complete account. It begins with the departure into the wilderness from Succoth (13:20–21a). The pillar of cloud and fire guides the Israelites on their way. When Pharaoh learns what has happened, he mobilizes his

army of chariots (14:5a, 6). The Israelites are overcome by fear and appeal to YHWH (14:10b). Moses proclaims to them the oracle of salvation and predicts the destruction of the Egyptians (14:13–14a). In the form of the pillar of cloud, YHWH protects the Israelites during the night (14:19b–20a $\alpha$ , b) and dries out the sea (14:21a $\alpha^2\beta$ ). In the morning, he causes terror to fall on the Egyptians out of the pillar of cloud and fire (14:24). The Egyptians flee in the direction of the returning sea and are destroyed (14:25b, 27a $\alpha^2\beta$ ). At the end comes the summing up: “Thus YHWH delivered Israel that day from the hand of the Egyptians, and Israel saw the Egyptians dead upon the seashore” (14:30). What Moses proclaimed in 14:13 has come to pass.

At three of the joints between the accounts, the redactor has intervened in order to harmonize the two versions. In 14:5 the Yahwist refers to the “king of Egypt” (*melek miṣrayim*), as he does elsewhere (see Exod 1:8, 15; 3:18). The Priestly Code, however, uses the title “Pharaoh” (14: 4, 8, 17, 18, 23, 28). In order to bridge the difference, in 14:8 the redactor has introduced the title *melek miṣrayim* “king of Egypt” into the Priestly Code’s account. Conversely, in 14:10a the redactor has added *Pharaoh* in order to make the concentration on his personality (which pervades the Priestly Code’s account) apply to the Yahwistic version as well. The addition can easily be detected because of the inversion *ûpar’ôh hiqrîb* “and Pharaoh drew near,” which disturbs the sequence of tenses. Finally, the question in 14:15a $\beta$  *mah tiṣ’aq ’elây* “why do you cry to me?” which disrupts the pattern of the Priestly Code (see 14:1–2, 26) and only finds support in the Yahwistic text (14:10), is also a harmonizing addition to be attributed to the redactor (R). It marks YHWH’s command to Moses in the Priestly Code as being an answer to the Israelite cry for help that the Yahwist relays in 14:10.

THE SUPPLEMENTARY HYPOTHESIS (2):  
SUPPLEMENTS WITHIN THE PRIESTLY CODE

After the Yahwist and the Priestly Code have been separated, numerous doublets still remain in the Priestly Code. That is why scholars assumed for a time that there was a third source and ascribed parts of the text to the so-called Elohist.<sup>35</sup>

However, the solution is not to be found in a second application of the Documentary Hypothesis but, once again, in the Supplementary

Hypothesis: the basic version of the Priestly Code (P<sup>G</sup>) was expanded by supplements (P<sup>S</sup>). In the text below, italics indicate these supplements. Still later additions are given in brackets. Bracketed ellipses indicate the non-Priestly text eliminated already above.

14:1 YHWH said to Moses, 2 “Tell the Israelites, [...] that they encamp before of Pi-hahiroth, between Migdol and the sea, in front of Baal-zephon. *You shall encamp facing it, by the sea.* [...] 4 *Then I will harden the heart of Pharaoh so that he will pursue them, and I will gain glory over Pharaoh and all his host, and the Egyptians shall know that I am YHWH.*” And they did so. [...] 8 *Then YHWH hardened the heart of Pharaoh,* [...] *and he pursued after the Israelites.* [...] 9 The Egyptians pursued them and overtook them *encamped by the sea* [all the horses and chariots of Pharaoh, his horsemen, and his army] by Pi-hahiroth, in front of Baal-zephon. [...] 15 YHWH said to Moses, [...] “Tell the Israelites to go forward, 16 *and you, raise your rod* and stretch out your hand over the sea and divide it, so that the Israelites may go on dry ground into the sea. 17 *And I, behold, I will harden the hearts of the Egyptians so that they go in after them, and I will gain glory over Pharaoh and all his host,* [his chariots and horsemen]. 18 *And the Egyptians shall know that I am YHWH* [when I have gained glory over Pharaoh, his chariots, and his horsemen].” [...] 21 Then Moses stretched out his hand over the sea. [...] And the waters were divided. 22 And the Israelites went into the sea on dry ground, *the waters being a wall to them on their right hand and on their left.* 23 The Egyptians pursued and went in after them [all of Pharaoh’s horses, chariots, and horsemen] right into the sea. [...] 26 Then YHWH said to Moses, Stretch out your hand over the sea, that the water may come back upon the Egyptians [upon their chariots, and upon their horsemen]. 27 So Moses stretched out his hand over the sea. [...] 28 And the waters returned and covered [the chariots and horsemen that belonged to the whole host of Pharaoh], those who had followed them into the sea, [not one of them remaining]. 29 *But the Israelites walked on dry ground through the middle of the sea, the waters being a wall to them on their right hand and on their left.* [...]

The expansion shapes the event into a historical proof of the universal power of God. Before all eyes, YHWH shows that he is the God who rules the world. The purpose of YHWH’s acts is clearly stated: “you shall know that I am YHWH” (14:18). This theologumenon is especially common in the book of Ezekiel,<sup>36</sup> and it is genuinely prophetic.

The proof of YHWH’s power develops in the sequence of prediction and fulfillment. The religious evidence is shown to the non-Israelites, who

are simultaneously the witnesses and the victims of YHWH's acts. This manifests the experience of the multireligious world in which Judaism was living in the Persian and Hellenistic periods. The same kind of proof is found in the stories about the plagues (Exod 7:5, 17; 8:6, 18; 9:14, 29). Since none of these instances goes back to the basic version of the Priestly Code, we probably see the same revision at work in all of them.

Strictly speaking, the Egyptians—and Pharaoh first and foremost—should have immediately converted to Judaism and ended their hostility to the Israelites. But that would have marred the sequence of events and would have deprived YHWH of the occasion for his victory. In order to avoid the contradiction to which this was bound to lead, the revision picks up the “hardness of heart” motif (14:4, 8, 17), which regularly comes into play in the plague narrative as well<sup>37</sup> (Exod 4:21; 7:3, 13, 14, 22; 8:11, 15, 28; 9:7, 12, 34–35; 10:1, 20, 27; 11:10).<sup>38</sup> Thus the text stresses a sharp distinction between Jews and non-Jews in relation to the God of the whole world (see Exod 8:19; 9:4; 11:7).

Right at the beginning of the narrative, it emerges that the theme of the proof of God's power did not belong to the basic version of the Priestly Code. Wellhausen writes, “Verses 3 and 4 are neither in substance nor formally a good continuation of what Moses is supposed to say to Israel; *wyśw kn* at the end of 14:4 rather joins directly on to 14:2.”<sup>39</sup> The comment “and they did so” refers solely to the command to set out in 14:2. Meanwhile, the prediction about what is going to happen to the Egyptians, which has been inserted in 14:3–4a, is fulfilled in verse 8. There is another noticeable doublet in 14:8–9: “he [Pharaoh] pursued them”//“The Egyptians pursued them.”<sup>40</sup> This, too, is extraneous to the strict structure of the original account.

YHWH's second command to Moses in 14:15–16 is again followed by a prediction (14:17–18). This corresponds exactly to 14:4. The two statements belong together and are the work of one and the same hand. This time the expansion can be detected from the prophetic *futurum instans*:<sup>41</sup> *wa'ānī hinēnī mēhazzēq* “and I, behold, I will harden.”

This speech form indicates the way in which the interpretive crux in 14:16a<sup>1</sup> should be understood: *wē'attā hārēm 'et maṭṭēkā* “and you, raise your rod.” Most exegetes recognize that the rod is an alien element that destroys the balance of the exact correspondence between the command 14:16a<sup>2</sup>b and the performance 14:21a<sup>1</sup>, 21b–22a. The only possible solution is that the rod is an addition. Moses uses the rod as he does in the case of the plague of blood (Exod 7:19–22) and in the miracle in which

he strikes water from the rock (Num 20:2–13). Apparently the detail is intended to emphasize that the real author of the miracle is YHWH.<sup>42</sup> The correspondence between *wa'ānī* “and I” and *wē'attā* “and you” is deliberate.<sup>43</sup>

Verse 29, at the end of the passage, stresses the marvelous character of the rescuing act and appears to be a gloss.<sup>44</sup> By way of the inverted verbal clause *ûbēnê yisrā'el hālēkû* (“And as for the Israelites, they went”), it purports to be an external reference to the course of events. Not only the Egyptians but the Israelites too—that is, the readers and hearers of the text—are intended to see and understand the saving power of their God. The verse refers back to 14:22a, but here verb *hlk* “go, walk” has taken the place of *bw'* “go in.” It is a sign of the miraculous rescue that the water forms *lāhem ḥômâ* “a wall to them” (14:29b). This nominal clause appears word for word in 14:22b and was perhaps subsequently added there by the same hand.

The description of the scene in 14:2bβ can probably be ascribed to this hand, too: “you shall encamp facing it.” This has an origin different from the rest of the verse, where YHWH talks about the Israelites in the third person, whereas in 14:2bβ YHWH speaks to the Israelites in the second person.<sup>45</sup> The description *ḥōnīm 'al hayyām* “encamped by the sea” in 14:9aα is apparently connected with this.

The lists in 14:9aβ, 17bβ, 18b, 23aβγ, 26bβ, 28aαβ (from *'et* onward), and 28b were probably added by a later hand still. They stress that YHWH destroyed the whole Egyptian army, “the chariots and the horsemen ... not one of them remaining” (14:28b), in order to manifest his glory (*kbd* 14:18b). This magnification of the concept of the YHWH war is highly reminiscent of the theology of Chronicles.

#### THE REDACTION HYPOTHESIS: THE NARRATIVE WITHIN THE YAHWIST'S HISTORY

The version of the narrative that is not part of the Priestly Code belongs to a second continuous source: the Yahwist's History. Earlier research rightly assumed that this was so. The proof is not merely negative, depending on a subtraction from the Priestly Code's text; on the contrary, there are positive criteria for the existence of this historical work. In recent times, it has become possible to identify an overriding redaction that under particular aspects selected a number of previously independent narrative cycles and amalgamated them into a new whole.<sup>46</sup> The work begins with Gen 2:5 and



probably ends with the death of Moses in Deut 34:5–6. The distinction between the source and the redactional text (here given in italics) is a special form of the Supplementary Hypothesis.

13:20 And they moved on from Succoth and encamped at Etham, on the edge of the wilderness. 21 *And YHWH went before them by day in a pillar of cloud to lead them along the way and by night in a pillar of fire to give them light.* [...] 14:5a *When the king of Egypt was told that the people had fled,* [...] 6 *he made ready his chariot and took his army with him.* [...] 10b When the Israelites lifted up their eyes, behold, the Egyptians were pursuing after them, and they were in great fear. *And the Israelites cried out to YHWH.* [...] 13 But Moses said to the people, “Fear not! *Stand firm, and see the deliverance of YHWH, which he will work for you today; for as you see the Egyptians today, you shall never see them again.* 14b YHWH will fight for you.” [...] 19b *And the pillar of cloud moved from before them and stood behind them, 20 coming between the host of Egypt and the host of Israel.* [...] *And neither came near the other all night.* [...] 21a<sup>2</sup> And YHWH drove the sea back by a strong east wind all night and made the sea dry land. [...] 24 At the morning watch, YHWH looked down upon the host of Egypt *in the pillar of fire and cloud* and threw the host of Egypt into panic. [...] 25b And the Egyptians said, “Let us flee from before Israel, for YHWH is fighting for them against Egypt.” [...] 27a<sup>2</sup> And the sea returned to its normal course when the morning appeared, and the Egyptians fled before it, and YHWH shook the Egyptians into the sea. [...] 30 *Thus YHWH delivered Israel that day from the hand of the Egyptians, and Israel saw the Egyptians dead upon the seashore.* [...]

Two different sources underlie the account. The one is the itinerary describing the wanderings of the Israelites through the wilderness (13:20), which continues in 15:23; the other is the story about the miracle at the sea. This derives from the Moses tradition.<sup>47</sup> The differing origin of the two sources emerges from the style, from the scenes of the action (the desert and the sea), which cannot simply be made to agree, and the actors themselves. Moses originally played no part in the wanderings through the wilderness.

Just as at other points in the Yahwist's History, here the editor puts at the center YHWH's assistance and the rescue he brings about. The assistance is given visual form in the pillar of cloud and fire.<sup>48</sup> It is the form in which YHWH hides himself (see Exod 34:5) and in which he, at the same time, reveals himself. As a pillar of cloud and fire, he guides his people on

their wanderings (13:21a) and protects them during the night from the pursuing Egyptians (14:19b–20aa, b), and as a pillar of cloud and fire he appears to the Egyptians in order to destroy them (14:24aγ). It can be seen from 13:21 that this motif has been added. The resumptive stative clause, *wëyhw hōlêk lipnêhem* (“but YHWH was going before them”), which picks up the pillar of cloud and fire and brings it into play for the first time, interrupts the *consecutio temporum*.<sup>49</sup>

The rescue that the miracle signifies is emphasized by the cry for help with which the Israelites articulate their fear in 14:10bβ. The repetition of the subjective (“the Israelites”) after the verb *wyṣʿqw* is evidence that the clause comes from a different hand than the earlier part of the verse.<sup>50</sup> A unified text would not have repeated the unchanged subject: the sequence that is brought about through the redactional addition is deliberate. It corresponds to the promise that the editor has put into YHWH’s mouth on the occasion of Moses’ call: “I have seen the affliction of my people who are in Egypt and have heard their cry, and I have come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians” (Exod 3:7–8). Here the overriding redactional cohesion of the work emerges. YHWH also reacts similarly to the cries that follow the murder of Abel (Gen 4:10) and also the atrocity in Sodom (Gen 18:20–21; 19:13).<sup>51</sup>

The cry for help is answered in Moses’ words. Here the editor has expanded the original reassuring formula “fear not”: “Stand firm and see the deliverance of YHWH, which he will work for you today; for as you see the Egyptians today, you shall never see them again” (14:13\*). Introduced in this way, the miracle at the sea becomes the proof of “YHWH’s deliverance” (*yěšûʿat yhw*). This is the editor’s message to his contemporary readers: Israel is promised deliverance from its enemies for all future time.

At the end of the story the editor establishes that the announcement to the Egyptians has been fulfilled: “Thus YHWH delivered Israel that day from the hand of the Egyptians, and Israel saw the Egyptians dead upon the seashore” (14:30).<sup>52</sup> The temporal interlocking *bayyôm hahûʿ* “on that day” shows that this summary sentence has been subsequently added. In the overall structure of the Yahwist’s History, the story about the miracle at the sea is parallel to the flood in Gen 6–8, as well as to the story about the destruction of Sodom in Gen 19.

## THE FRAGMENTARY HYPOTHESIS: THE TRANSMITTED SOURCES

As soon as the analysis of the Yahwist's account reaches the level that preceded the editorial work, the Fragmentary Hypothesis also comes into play. This is the third great hypothesis about the Pentateuch, and it was originally introduced by Alexander Geddes.<sup>53</sup> The sources that the editor has passed down have been extracted from narrative complexes that have only partially been preserved.

13:20 And they moved on from Succoth and encamped at Etham, on the edge of the wilderness. [...]

14:10b When the Israelites lifted up their eyes, behold, the Egyptians were pursuing after them, and they were in great fear. [...] 13 But Moses said to the people, "Fear not! [...] 14 YHWH will fight for you." [...] 21a<sup>2</sup> And YHWH drove the sea back by a strong east wind all night and made the sea dry land. [...] 24 At the morning watch, YHWH looked down upon the host of Egypt [...] and threw the host of Egypt into panic. [...] 25b And the Egyptians said, "Let us flee from before Israel, for YHWH is fighting for them against Egypt." [...] 27a<sup>2</sup> And the sea returned to its normal course when the morning appeared, and the Egyptians fled before it, and YHWH shook the Egyptians into the sea. [...]

One of the two sources is the itinerary of the march through the desert. The note at 13:20 belongs to the series of notes about the itinerary that begins when the Israelites set out from Rameses to Succoth in 12:37a. Its continuation is found in 15:22a<sup>β</sup>, 23: "And they went into the wilderness of Shur and came to Marah."<sup>54</sup>

The story about the miracle at the sea, which the editor of the Yahwist's History has interpolated, is the account of a YHWH war.<sup>55</sup> Compared with other examples of this genre, it appears as its positive prototype. The deity alone fights with the enemies and destroys them completely. Before the fight begins, Moses (who is here presented as priest, as he is in Exod 2–3 and 19–34) pronounces an oracle of salvation in the purest style of the genre: "Fear not! YHWH will fight for you" (14:13a<sup>1</sup>, 14a). The Egyptians are overcome by fear ("Let us flee from before Israel") and confess that the oracle has been fulfilled ("YHWH fights for them against the Egyptians," 14:25b). In headless flight, they turn toward the sea, which now flows back, "and YHWH shook the Egyptians into the sea" (14:27b). With the proof

that the remaining text still offers a meaningful unity, source criticism has completed its work and passes the baton on to genre criticism.

#### FOR FURTHER READING

- Carr, David M. "Controversy and Convergence in Recent Studies of the Formation of the Pentateuch." *RSR* 23 (1997): 22–31.
- Dozeman, Thomas B., and Konrad Schmid, eds. *A Farewell to the Yahwist: The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*. SBLSymS 34. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Kratz, Reinhard Gregor. *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament*. Translated by J. Bowden. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Levin, Christoph. *The Old Testament: A Brief Introduction*. Translated by M. Kohl. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.
- Nicholson, Ernest. *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century: The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Ska, Jean-Louis. *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006.

#### NOTES

1. The title of Jean Astruc's fundamental work reflects this assumption: *Conjectures sur les mémoires originaux dont il paroît que Moïse s'est servi pour composer le livre de la Genèse* (Brussels: Fricx, 1753).

2. Typically, the book of Deuteronomy is also assigned to it. It is, however, more probable that Deuteronomy was later interpolated between Numbers and Joshua; see Reinhard G. Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament* (trans. J. Bowden; London: T&T Clark, 2005), 115. Because the guiding intention of the Deuteronomistic History was the reinstatement of the monarchy, it must be assigned to the period after the monarchy's downfall. Many American scholars from Frank Moore Cross onward (see his *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973], 274–89) have maintained the view that the first version was written under Josiah, but this was refuted by Erik Aurelius, *Zukunft jenseits des Gerichts* (BZAW 319; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 39–57. What is correct in Cross's thesis is that the excerpt from the synchronistic annals that forms the basis of the books of Kings derives from the period of the monarchy. See Christoph Levin, "Die Frömmigkeit der Könige von Israel und Juda," in *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola* (ed. Juha Pakkala and Martti Nissinen; Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 95; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 129–68, esp. 131–38.

3. See Christoph Levin, "The Yahwist: The Earliest Editor in the Pentateuch," *JBL* 126 (2007): 209–30; idem, *Der Jahwist* (FRLANT 157; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck &

Ruprecht, 1993). Contrary to John Van Seters (*The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the 'Editor' in Biblical Criticism* [Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006]), it can be shown that the Yahwist worked as an editor. This does not necessarily refute the concept of the Yahwist as historian. However, this historian did not retell traditional material but compiled his work from written sources.

4. Brevard S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974), 218.

5. Theodor Nöldeke, "Die s. g. Grundschrift des Pentateuchs," in idem, *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testaments* (Kiel: Schwes, 1869), 1–144, esp. 45–46. Nöldeke agrees with August Wilhelm Knobel, *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus* (KEH 12; Leipzig: Hirzel, 1857), 137–39.

6. See Martin Noth, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (trans. B. W. Anderson; Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972), 19; and idem, *Exodus: A Commentary* (trans. J. S. Bowden; OTL; London: SCM, 1962), 105. The analysis maintained in what follows takes its own slightly deviating path only in regard to vv. 9–10.

7. Hermann Hupfeld, *Die Quellen der Genesis und die Art ihrer Zusammensetzung* (Berlin: Wiegandt & Grieben, 1853).

8. Julius Wellhausen, "Die Composition des Hexateuchs," *JDT* 21 (1876): 391–450, 531–602; 22 (1877): 407–79, esp. 545–47; later idem, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (4th ed.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963), 75–77. Adolf Jülicher, "Die Quellen von Exodus VII, 8–XXIV, 11: Ein Beitrag zur Hexateuchfrage," *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie* 8 (1882): 79–127, 272–315, esp. 119–24, takes over the three-source hypothesis from Wellhausen but reckons with a much greater share on the part of P. Abraham Kuenen, *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch* (London: Macmillan, 1886), 71–72, rejected a threefold division.

9. Rudolf Smend Sr., *Die Erzählung des Hexateuch auf ihre Quellen untersucht* (Berlin: Reimer, 1912), 137–43. This hypothesis provided the foundation for Otto Eißfeldt, *Hexateuch-Synopse* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1922), 133\*–37\*.

10. See already Nöldeke's objection to Hupfeld: "It would be much more difficult to assume that this Elohist and the Yahwist were independent of one another and were only integrated into a whole by an earlier redactor, and that this work was in front of the redactor of the pre-Deuteronomistic Pentateuch in addition to the Basic Document" ("Die s. g. Grundschrift des Pentateuchs," 3–4; unless otherwise noted, all translations of German works are my own). The criticism of Paul Volz and Wilhelm Rudolph, *Der Elohist als Erzähler: Ein Irrweg der Pentateuchkritik?* (BZAW 63; Gießen: Töpelmann, 1933), is fundamental.

11. Smend takes a quite different view: "This remarkable procedure was continually repeated in the history of the Hexateuch" (*Die Erzählung des Hexateuch*, 343).

12. For the theological presuppositions of the synthesis of these sources, see esp. Herbert Donner, "Der Redaktor: Überlegungen zum vorkritischen Umgang mit der heiligen Schrift," in idem, *Aufsätze zum Alten Testament* (BZAW 224; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), 259–85.

13. In recent times the hypothesis has been put forward that the amalgamation of the documents was intended to serve as legal argument for the official recognition

of the Jewish community by the Persian overlord, but analysis of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah has made this improbable. The biblical account probably dates from the Hellenistic period. The Jewish authorities cited the great Persian king in order to claim religious and legal privileges from the Ptolemaic and Seleucid kings.

14. See Thomas Krüger, “Erwägungen zur Redaktion der Meerwundererzählung (Exod 13,17–14,31),” *ZAW* 108 (1996), 519–33, who, however, attributes much more text to this revision and identifies it with redaction R<sup>1P</sup>. He at least admits: “It is quite conceivable that this redactional work was carried out in several stages” (524). If this is the case, a clear distinction should be made between redaction and revision!

15. Read *wayye’ēsōr* with Samaritanus, Septuagint, and Peshitta instead of Masoretic *wayyāsar* “he removed.”

16. Bible translations here and throughout the rest of the essay follow the Revised Standard Version with some alterations.

17. The revision was certainly not confined to Exod 13:17–14:31. Its extent could have been quite considerable. At the same time, it goes beyond what can be proved if it is identified with the so-called “Pentateuch redaction” or even the “Enneateuch redaction,” as Hans-Christoph Schmitt has proposed (“‘Priesterliches’ und ‘prophetisches’ Geschichtsverständnis in der Meerwundererzählung Exod 13,17–14,31: Beobachtungen zur Endredaktion des Pentateuch,” in idem, *Theologie in Prophetie und Pentateuch* (BZAW 310; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001), 203–20; idem, “Das spätdeuteronomistische Geschichtswerk Genesis I bis 2 Regum XXV und seine theologische Intention,” in *Theologie in Prophetie und Pentateuch*, 277–94.

18. Rudolf Smend Jr., “Zur Geschichte von *h’myn*,” in idem, *Die Mitte des Alten Testaments: Exegetische Aufsätze* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 244–49, esp. 246.

19. Ibid. In the context, the motif is also found in Exod 4:1–9, 31; 19:9; Num 14:11; 20:12; Deut 1:32; 9:23.

20. Pointed out by Erik Aurelius, *Der Fürbitter Israels: Eine Studie zum Mosebild im Alten Testament* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1988), 147, with reference to an observation by Martin Noth, *Numbers: A Commentary* (trans. J. D. Martin; OTL; London: SCM, 1968), 157.

21. Aurelius, *Der Fürbitter Israels*, 184 n. 238.

22. See also Num 11:20; 14:2–3; 16:13–14; 20:4–5; 21:5.

23. Exod 4:23; 7:16, 26; 8:16; 9:1, 13; 10:3, 7.

24. Noth, *Exodus*, 106–7.

25. Heinrich Holzinger, *Exodus* (KHC 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1900), 44.

26. Noth, *Exodus*, 117.

27. B. D. Eerdmans, *Alttestamentliche Studien III: Das Buch Exodus* (Gießen: Töpelmann, 1910), 40.

28. Jülicher, “Die Quellen von Exodus,” 121.

29. Fujiko Kohata, *Jahwist und Priesterschrift in Exodus 3–14* (BZAW 166; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986), 176–77.

30. Noth, *Exodus*, 111.

31. Smend, *Die Erzählung des Hexateuch*, 140.

32. See Nöldeke, “Die s. g. Grundschrift des Pentateuchs,” 45.

33. Contrary to Hermann Gunkel, *Genesis* (trans. M. E. Biddle; Macon, Ga.:

Mercer University Press: 1997), 139, (referring to the flood story): “The beginner can learn the proper way to distinguish the sources from this pericope.” This statement led the opinion about the Documentary Hypothesis astray.

34. This procedure is often viewed as being the general rule, but that is erroneous: between Gen 12 and Exod 5 the Yahwist’s History provides the basis of the source synthesis, the Priestly Code being complementary.

35. See Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, 75–77.

36. See Walther Zimmerli, “Erkenntnis Gottes nach dem Buche Ezechiël,” in idem, *Gottes Offenbarung: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (2nd ed.; Munich: Kaiser, 1969), 41–119.

37. See Franz Hesse, *Das Verstockungsproblem im Alten Testament* (BZAW 74; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1955).

38. These instances, too, do not belong to the basic version of the Priestly code (P<sup>G</sup>).

39. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, 75. Similarly, Wilhelm Rudolph, *Der “Elohist” von Exodus bis Josua* (BZAW 68; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1938), 29: “14:3 and 4a divide 14:4b from 14:2 in an unhappy way.”

40. See Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, 75.

41. See GKC §116p.

42. See Horacio Simian-Yofre, “הַטָּהַר,” *TDOT* 8:241–49, esp. 244.

43. As a rule, *wəʿattâ* is assigned to the basic text, the copula before *ûnētēh* being eliminated instead. But this separation, which does violence to the word, is inadmissible.

44. See Jülicher, “Die Quellen von Exodus,” 123.

45. Smend, *Die Erzählung des Hexateuch*, 140.

46. See Levin, “The Yahwist”; idem, *Der Jahwist*, 341–44.

47. The earliest tradition about Moses is otherwise to be found in Exod 2:1–23\*; 3:1–5\*; 4:20\* and Exod 19:2b–3a; 24:18b; Num 20:1b; Deut 34:5–6\*. An asterisk after a verse number indicates an earlier layer found in that verse.

48. In Gen 26:3, 28; 28:15; 31:3; 39:2–3, 21; Exod 34:9 the editor of the Yahwist’s History has also interpolated the motif of YHWH’s assistance into the older sources he has taken over.

49. Noth, *Exodus*, 109.

50. See Jülicher, “Die Quellen von Exodus,” 122.

51. In the further episodes that also tell of YHWH’s help in the wanderings in the wilderness, the editor of the Yahwist’s History has introduced the cry for help (Hebrew root *šʿq*); see Exod 15:25; 17:14; Num 11:2.

52. See Ps 98:3; Isa 52:10.

53. Alexander Geddes, *Critical Remarks on the Hebrew Scriptures, Corresponding with a New Translation of the Bible* (London: Davis, Wilks & Taylor, 1800).

54. The itinerary can be followed in Exod 12:37a; 13:20; 15:22aβb, 23, 27; 16:1\*, 13b, 14\*, 15a, 21, 31; 17:1aα\*; 19:2a; Num 10:12a\*; 11:31aα\*, 32aα\*, b; 20:1aβ; 25:1a.

55. See esp. Gerhard von Rad, *Holy War in Ancient Israel* (trans. Marva J. Dawn; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 88–90.