

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

Exodus in the Pentateuch

The Book of Genesis. Composition, reception, and interpretation, 2014: 27-60

Leiden, Brill, 2012

URL:

https://brill.com/view/book/edcoll/9789004282667/B9789004282667_003.xml?rskey=UupftB&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

Exodus in the Pentateuch

The Book of Genesis. Composition, reception, and interpretation, 2014: 27-60

Leiden, Brill, 2012

URL:

https://brill.com/view/book/edcoll/9789004282667/B9789004282667_003.xml?rskey=UupftB&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

EXODUS IN THE PENTATEUCH

Konrad Schmid

I. Introduction

John Durham opens his Exodus commentary with the sentence: “The Book of Exodus is the first book of the Bible.”¹ This is obviously meant to be a provocative statement that tries to lay more emphasis on the significance of the book of Exodus than on its placement after the book of Genesis. Indeed, it is striking that the exodus story introduced by the book of Exodus takes up four of the five books of the Pentateuch and that its foremost hero, Moses, even provides the name for the overall narrative in later Jewish and Christian tradition as the “Torah of Moses” or the “Five Books of Moses,” even though these titles also includes the book of Genesis.

In terms of the narrative logic, the story beginning in the book of Exodus seems to continue into (at least) the book of Joshua, as the exodus from Egypt finds its logical completion in the *eisodos* into the promised land as presented in the book of Joshua.² The book of Exodus

¹ John J. Durham, *Exodus* (WBC 3; Waco: Word, 1987), xxix, xxiii. Less provocative, but more correct is Thomas B. Dozeman, *Exodus* (ECC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 1: “The book of Exodus is the second book in the Hebrew Bible.” Dozeman offers a helpful discussion of the relationships of Exodus with Deuteronomy, Exodus with the Former Prophets, and Exodus with Genesis (10–20). On the historical origins of the book divisions in Genesis–Kings, see Konrad Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story: Israel’s Dual Origins in the Hebrew Bible* (Siphut 3; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 23–29; cf. also Menachem Haran, “Book-Size and the Thematic Cycles in the Pentateuch,” in *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte* (ed. Erhard Blum et al.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1990), 165–76.

² Wolfgang Oswald, “Die Exodus-Gottesberg-Erzählung als Gründungsurkunde der jüdischen Bürgergemeinde,” in *Law and Narrative in the Bible and in Neighbouring Ancient Cultures* (ed. Klaus-Peter Adam, Friedrich Avemarie,

apparently also includes literary elements that anticipate narrative and theological developments narrated still later in the book of Kings, most notably the episode of the golden calf (Exod 32), which alludes to and presuppose the account of Jeroboam's installation of the sanctuaries in Bethel and Dan with their calves (1 Kgs 12).³

If one would look for a designation for just the narrative covered by the books of Exodus through Deuteronomy, then it would be best called "Moses' story,"⁴ since these books match the life of Moses (except for Exod 1). It is, however, a matter of dispute whether such a story ever existed as an independent literary entity, or only formed an episode in a larger work.⁵

and Nili Wazana; FAT 2.54, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 35–51, especially 34–36, favors an "Exodus-Gottesberg-Erzählung," reaching from Exod 1–24*. See also his *Israel am Gottesberg: Eine Untersuchung zur Literargeschichte der vorderen Sinaiperikope Ex 19–24 und deren historischem Hintergrund* (OBO 159; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag, and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 114–49.

³ See below VI. 3. Cf. also the prominent link between Exod 19:3b–8 and 2 Kgs 18:12, see Erik Aurelius, *Zukunft jenseits des Gerichts: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zum Enneateuch* (BZAW 319; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003). Therefore, it is unwarranted to do pentateuchal studies without addressing Joshua–Kings, see Konrad Schmid, "The Emergence and Disappearance of the Separation between the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History in Biblical Studies," in *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch: Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings* (ed. Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Thomas Römer; SBL Ancient Israel and its Literature 8; Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 11–24.

⁴ See e.g. David M. Carr, "Genesis in Relation to the Moses Story," in *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History* (ed. André Wénin; BETL 155; Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 293–95; idem, "The Moses Story: Literary-Historical Reflections," *HeBAI* 1 (2012): 7–36; Eckart Otto, *Mose: Geschichte und Legende* (Munich: Beck, 2006); Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*. See also John Van Seters, *The Life of Moses: The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus–Numbers* (Louisville, Westminster John Knox Press, 1994).

⁵ See the considerations about a *vita Mosis* e.g. in Erhard Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990), 208–218, and Thomas Römer, "Transformations in Deuteronomistic and Biblical

Regarding the prominence of the exodus motif, it is also evident from a wider biblical perspective that it is much more significant and prominent in the Hebrew Bible than the primeval or patriarchal traditions from the book of Genesis. In the narrative books following the Pentateuch, there are many allusions to the exodus (see e.g. Josh 2:8–11; 5:1; 9:9; 24:2–8; Judg 2:1; 2:11; 6:8–9; 10:11; 11:13; 19:30; 1 Sam 4:8; 6:6; 8:8; 10:18; 12:6; 15:2; 2 Sam 7:6; 1 Kgs 8:16; 8:51; 9:9; 2 Kgs 17:7, 36).⁶ Other traditions of the Hebrew Bible, especially the book of Psalms, also place more weight on the exodus motive than on the Genesis traditions.⁷

In light of these very basic observations, it seems odd that in the last hundred years of critical scholarship the book of Exodus has been interpreted primarily within the framework of the Documentary Hypothesis, which prompted scholars to perceive the texts in Exodus foremost

Historiography: On ‘Book-Finding’ and other Literary Strategies,” *ZAW* 109 (1997): 1–11. For a different approach see Graham I. Davies, “The Composition of the Book of Exodus: Reflections on the Theses of Erhard Blum,” in *Texts, Temples, and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran* (ed. Michael V. Fox et al.; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns: 1996), 71–85. For methodological considerations about how to determine the extent of a literary work, see Erhard Blum, “Pentateuch—Hexateuch—Enneateuch? Or: How Can One Recognize a Literary Work in the Hebrew Bible?” in *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings* (ed. Thomas B. Dozeman, Thomas Römer, and Konrad Schmid; SBL Ancient Israel and its Literature 8; Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 43–71, esp. 54–57; trans. of “Pentateuch—Hexateuch—Enneateuch? Oder: Woran erkennt man ein literarisches Werk in der Hebräischen Bibel?” in *Textgestalt und Komposition: Exegetische Beiträge zu Tora und Vordere Propheten* (ed. Erhard Blum; FAT 69; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 375–404, esp. 387–90.

⁶ See also Uwe Becker, “Das Exodus-Credo: Historischer Haftpunkt und Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Glaubensformel,” in *Das Alte Testament—ein Geschichtsbuch?! Geschichtsschreibung oder Geschichtsüberlieferung im antiken Israel* (ed. Uwe Becker and Jürgen van Oorschot; ABG 17; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2005), 81–100.

⁷ See the assessment in Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 69–80.

as elements of narrative threads identified as the sources J, E, and P that started *before* the book of Exodus in the book of Genesis. Scholars therefore perceived the book mainly in light of, and as a second act to, the Genesis narratives.⁸ Of course, some acknowledgement of the self-contained nature of the exodus tradition was conceded within the documentary approach as well, but this was usually relegated to the stages of its oral prehistory. Especially Martin Noth in his *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* identified the exodus theme as one of the larger blocks of the Pentateuch that was originally independent—at least on a conceptual level.⁹ In fact, he considered it the most preeminent theme of the Pentateuch, but he went on to argue that already the alleged source G, from which J and E drew, had combined the different themes of the Pentateuch in a comprehensive narrative—Noth left open the question of whether this was an oral or written source.¹⁰

Why was the Documentary History and the interpretation of the book of Exodus that followed from it so dominant?¹¹ This was probably due to two main factors. First, it seemed

⁸ *Mutatis mutandis*, this is also true for Genesis, see Konrad Schmid, “Genesis in the Pentateuch,” in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation* (ed. Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David Petersen; VTSup 152, Leiden: Brill, 2012), 27–50.

⁹ Martin Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (2d ed.; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1948), trans. as *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (trans. with introduction by Bernard W. Anderson; Chico: Scholars Press, 1981); see also Udo Rütterswörden, ed., *Martin Noth—aus der Sicht der heutigen Forschung* (Biblich-theologische Studien 58; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2004).

¹⁰ Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*, 2.

¹¹ The commentaries of Martin Noth, *Das zweite Buch Mose: Exodus, übersetzt und erklärt* (ATD 5; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959); trans. as *Exodus: A Commentary* (trans. John S. Bowden; OTL; Philadelphia 1962), Josef Scharbert, *Exodus* (NEB 24; Würzburg: Echter, 1989); William H. C. Propp, *Exodus 1–18/19–40: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 2/2A; New York: Doubleday, 1999/2006, follow this

reasonable to identify the same basic sources in Genesis and Exodus because the observations leading to the source division were similar in these two books: there were doublets, contradictions, and the alternation between YHWH and Elohim. Second, Gerhard von Rad's 1938 hypothesis of the great antiquity of the so-called "historical creed" in Deut 26:5–9 seemed to corroborate this view: J, E, and P were not inventors of the hexateuchal scope of Israel's salvation history, instead they merely adapted a quite traditional creedal position which itself relied on corresponding historical realities.¹² In other words, this period of scholarship definitely viewed Genesis as the first book of the Bible.

Both factors, however, have lost much of their plausibility in the past forty years, at least in the eyes of a considerable group of scholars who no longer assume that the Documentary Hypothesis is a safe starting point for the exegesis of the Pentateuch (to be sure, it might be a possible result, but it cannot be a given presupposition).¹³ Regarding the first point, even

approach, as does Werner H. Schmidt, *Exodus 1–7* (BK 2.1, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1988), which, however, is not yet completed. A helpful summary of these approaches is offered by Peter Weimar, "Exodusbuch" in *Neues Bibel-Lexikon* 1:636–48. Recent commentaries often take a different approach, cf. Christoph Dohmen, *Exodus 19–40* (HTKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2004), Dozeman, *Exodus*; Georg Fischer and Dominik Markl, *Exodus* (NSKAT 2; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2009); Helmut Utzschneider and Wolfgang Oswald, *Exodus 1–15* (IECOT; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2013).

¹² 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.

¹³ See e.g. Rolf Rendtorff, *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch* (BZAW 147; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977); Erhard Blum, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (WMANT 57; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1984); Reinhard Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament* (London: T&T Clark, 2005); trans. of *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments* (UTB 2157, Göttingen:

pioneers of the Documentary Hypothesis like Gerhard von Rad noticed that the exegesis of the Pentateuch has unwisely been dominated by the results of the analysis of the book of Genesis.¹⁴ Martin Noth even admitted openly in the preface to his commentary on Numbers that he would not have interpreted the book in terms of the Documentary Hypothesis if he had focused on that book alone:

If we were to take the book of Numbers on its own, then we would think not so much of ‘continuing sources’ as of an unsystematic collection of innumerable pieces of very varied content, age and character (‘Fragment Hypothesis’). ... It is, therefore, justifiable to approach the book of Numbers with the results of Pentateuchal analysis elsewhere and

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000); Eckart Otto, *Das Gesetz des Mose* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2007); Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*; Schmid, “Genesis in the Pentateuch,” in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation* (ed. Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David Petersen; VTSup 152; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 27–50; Christoph Berner, *Die Exoduserzählung: Das literarische Werden einer Ursprungserzählung Israels* (FAT 73; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010); recent defenses of the Documentary Hypothesis are offered e.g. by Ludwig Schmidt, “Im Dickicht der Pentateuchforschung: Ein Plädoyer für die umstrittene Neuere Urkundenhypothese,” *VT* 60 (2010): 400–20; Joel S. Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012). For surveys on the present state of scholarship see Georg Fischer, “Zur Lage der Pentateuchforschung,” *ZAW* 115 (2003): 608–16; Thomas Römer, “Hauptprobleme der gegenwärtigen Pentateuchforschung,” *TZ* 60 (2004): 289–307; Römer, “La formation du Pentateuque: histoire de la recherche,” in *Introduction à l’Ancien Testament* (ed. Thomas Römer, Jean-Daniel Macchi, and Christophe Nihan; *MdB* 49; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2004), 67–84; and Römer, “Zwischen Urkunden, Fragmenten und Ergänzungen: Zum Stand der Pentateuchforschung,” *ZAW* 125 (2013): 2–24. See also the contributions in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research* (ed. Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch J. Schwartz; FAT 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012).

¹⁴ Gerhard von Rad, “Beobachtungen an der Moseerzählung Exodus 1–14,” *EvT* 31 (1971): 579–88.

to expect the continuing Pentateuchal ‘sources’ here, too, even if, as we have said, the situation in Numbers, of itself does not exactly lead us to these results.¹⁵

Regarding the second factor, it has become widely accepted that texts like Deut 26:5–9 are not traditional pieces from early times, but later theological syntheses that even seem to presuppose the Priestly texts in the Pentateuch.¹⁶

It is only the Priestly document that still enjoys broad acceptance in biblical scholarship globally.¹⁷ This hypothesis—it is still a theory, no more and no less—seems to be sufficiently well grounded, as the Priestly texts show both a specific language and an identifiable theological

¹⁵ Martin Noth, *Numbers: A Commentary* (trans. J. Martin; OTL; London: SCM, 1968), 4–5; trans. of *Das vierte Buch Mose: Numeri* (ATD 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966).

¹⁶ See, among others, Jan Christian Gertz, “Die Stellung des kleinen geschichtlichen Credos in der Redaktionsgeschichte von Deuteronomium und Pentateuch,” in *Liebe und Gebot: Studien zum Deuteronomium* (ed. Reinhard G. Kratz and Hermann Spieckermann; FRLANT 190; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 30–45.

¹⁷ See e.g. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 221; David M. Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis: Historical and Literary Approaches* (Louisville: Westminster / John Knox, 1996), 43. For the dating of P, see Albert de Pury, “P^s as the Absolute Beginning,” in *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l'Hexateuque et de l'Ennéateuque* (ed. Thomas Römer and Konrad Schmid; BETL 203; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 99–128, esp. 123–28. See also the overview of the debate in Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden, eds., *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions* (ATANT 95; Zurich: TVZ, 2009). For an argument against P as a source in Exodus, see Berner, *Die Exoduserzählung* (see, however, my review in *ZAW* 123 [2010]: 292–294); Rainer Albertz, *Exodus 1–18* (Zürcher Bibelkommentare 2.1; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2012), 10–26. Jakob Wöhrle, *Fremdlinge im eigenen Land: Zur Entstehung und Intention der priesterlichen Passagen der Vätergeschichte* (FRLANT 246; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), holds a similar position for Gen 12–50.

program, although there is some debate regarding its literary nature (source or redaction) and its original end.¹⁸

¹⁸ The end is seen either in Exod 29, thus Eckart Otto, “Forschungen zur Priesterschrift,” *TRu* 62 (1997): 1–50; Exod 40, thus Thomas Pola, *Die ursprüngliche Priesterschrift: Beobachtungen zur Literarkritik und Traditionsgeschichte von P^g* (WMANT 70; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1995); Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament*, 100–14; Michaela Bauks, “La signification de l’espace et du temps dans l’historiographie sacerdotale,” in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (ed. Thomas Römer; BETL 147; Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 29–45; Lev 9, thus Erich Zenger, “Priesterschrift,” *TRE* 27 (1997): 435–46; Zenger, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (8th ed.; ed. Christian Frevel; Studienbücher Theologie 1.1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2012), 193–209; Lev 16, thus Matthias Köckert, *Leben in Gottes Gegenwart: Studien zum Verständnis des Gesetzes im Alten Testament* (FAT 43; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 105; Christophe Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus*, (FAT 2.25; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 20–68, 379; or Num 27, thus Jean-Louis Ska, “Le récit sacerdotal: Une ‘histoire sans fin’?” in *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers* (ed. Thomas Römer; BETL 215; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 631–53, see also Ed Noort, “Num 27,12–23 und das Ende der Priesterschrift,” in *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers*, 99–119. A staggering of endings within the Priestly document between Exod 40 and Lev 26 is suggested by Jan Christian Gertz, ed., *Grundinformation Altes Testament* (2d. ed.; UTB 2745; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 236 (English trans. of Jan Christian Gertz et al., eds., *T&T Clark Handbook of the Old Testament: An Introduction to Literature, Religion and History of the Old Testament* [London: T&T Clark, 2012], 301). Christian Frevel, *Mit Blick auf das Land die Schöpfung erinnern* (HBS 23; Freiburg: Herder, 2000), supports the traditional conclusion in Deut 34, cf. also Ludwig Schmidt, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, (BZAW 214; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993), 271; Peter Weimar, *Studien zur Priesterschrift* (FAT 56; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008, 17). Joseph Blenkinsopp, “The Structure of P,” *CBQ* 38 (1976): 275–92; Norbert Lohfink, “Die Priesterschrift und die Geschichte,” in *Congress Volume Göttingen 1977* (ed. John Adney Emerton; VTSup 29; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 183–225, repr. in *Studien zum Pentateuch* (SBAB 4; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988), 213–53; Ernst Axel Knauf, “Die Priesterschrift und die Geschichten der Deuteronomisten,” in *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (ed. Thomas Römer; BETL 147; Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 101–18; Philippe Guillaume, *Land and Calendar: The Priestly Document from Genesis 1 to Joshua 18* (LHBOTS 391;

The Pentateuch shows clear signs of literary growth before and—what had often been neglected—after P,¹⁹ but serious doubts regarding the traditional description and evaluation of the pre-Priestly history of the Pentateuch have arisen. In current scholarship, the J and E sources can no longer be taken for granted as safe starting points for Pentateuchal criticism. Therefore, I will start discussion of the place of the exodus story within the Pentateuch by addressing P and then move to the more disputed non-Priestly elements.

II. The Priestly Layer in Exodus and its Interconnections within the Pentateuch

1. Priestly links to Genesis

Within the book of Exodus, the Priestly texts are especially prominent and extensive in the second half of the book. The instructions regarding the construction of the sanctuary (Exod 25–31) and the building report (Exod 35–40) are part of P (or its expansions). But P is also a prominent textual layer in Exod 1–24 and provides the basic structure for the exodus narrative as

London: T&T Clark, 2009), see the conclusion of P^s in Joshua. For a sketch of the land thematic in “P” see Matthias Köckert, “Das Land in der priesterlichen Komposition des Pentateuch,” in *Von Gott reden: Beiträge zur Theologie und Exegese des Alten Testaments* (ed. Dieter Vieweger and Ernst-Joachim Waschke; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner 1995), 147–62; Ludwig Schmidt, *Studien*, 251–74; Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 238–48. A discussion is provided by Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, 20–25.

¹⁹ See, e.g., Eckart Otto, “Forschungen zum nachpriesterschriftlichen Pentateuch,” *TRu* 67 (2002): 125–55; Reinhard G. Kratz, “Der vor- und der nachpriesterschriftliche Hexateuch,” in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (ed. Jan Christian Gertz, Konrad Schmid, and Markus Witte; BZAW 315; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 295–323, see also 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).

a whole.²⁰ At the same time, it is clear that P's exodus story is not a self-standing narrative. It presupposes and takes up P's storyline from Genesis, revealing very clear and undisputable links to Genesis texts.

One example can be found in Exod 1:7 (“But the Israelites *were fruitful* and prolific; they *multiplied* and grew exceedingly strong, so that *the land was filled* with them”). Exodus 1:7 is strongly reminiscent of several key passages from Genesis, all of which belong to P. First, it alludes to the divine commandment in Gen 1:28 (“*Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth*”). This commandment is repeated after the flood, where it is addressed to Noah and his family (Gen 9:1: “*Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth*”). In P the increase of the Israelites seems to be shaped as a partial fulfillment of the commands in Gen 1:28 and 9:1. Exodus 1:7 also uses the root שרץ “to be prolific” or “to swarm,” which the Bible normally only applies to animals, especially to worms. The only other instance in the Bible where שרץ is applied to human beings is Gen 9:7 (“Be fruitful and multiply and *be prolific*, and fill the earth”). This suggests that Exod 1:7 not only reflects upon Gen 1:28 and 9:1, but also on Gen 9:7. Why? In Gen 9:7, the root שרץ is probably used to stress the *almost explosive* multiplication of the human beings after the flood because only one chapter later, in Gen 10, the wide-reaching table of nations reporting the populating of the earth implies that the earth must already be fully populated.²¹ The use of שרץ in

²⁰ Peter Weimar, *Untersuchungen zur priesterschriftlichen Exodusgeschichte* (FB 9; Würzburg: Echter, 1973); Thomas Römer, “The Exodus Narrative according to the Priestly Document,” in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions* (eds. Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden; ATANT 95; Zurich, TVZ, 2009), 157–74; Albertz, *Exodus 1–18*, 50–52, regarding the narrative cohesion of Exodus 1–24 cf. also the proposal of Oswald, “Exodus-Gottesberg-Erzählung” (see n. 2).

²¹ Bernard Gosse, “Transitions rédactionnelles de l’histoire des clans à l’histoire des peuples en Ex 1,7; 2,24b,” *EstB* 51 (1993) 163–70; Gosse, “Moïse entre l’alliance des patriarches et celle du Sinaï,” *SJOT* 11 (1997): 3–15, esp. 4.

Exod 1:7 has a similar function: in Exod 1:5 the family of Jacob, comprising no more than 70 persons, is reported to have immigrated to Egypt. In the immediate context of P, this family needs to have multiplied into a full blown nation by the next verses (Exod 1:13–14). Apparently the Priestly Document saw a biological problem here, which it solves by introducing the root שרץ. This term indicates that the sudden increase of the Israelite people in Exod 1 is the result of an extraordinary divine agency.

Another strong link from Exodus to Genesis is provided in P by Exod 6:2–3.²² In the context of his commissioning as the leader of the exodus out of Egypt, God tells Moses: “... I am YHWH. And I appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as El Shadday. But by my name YHWH I did not make myself known to them.” Exod 6:2–3 explicitly refers back to passages like Gen 17:1; 28:3; and 35:11; and explains why God appeared as El Shadday to the ancestors in Genesis, but now to Moses and his generation as YHWH. While it is clear that Exod 6:3 links the Priestly Genesis material to the Priestly exodus story, it nevertheless becomes evident from this passage that P is also combining two traditions with different accentuations in its single overall account, as I have discussed elsewhere.²³

A third example of how Priestly Genesis and Exodus texts are connected can be found in Exod 14:22: “The Israelites went into the sea *on dry ground*, the waters forming a wall for them on their right and on their left.” In the crossing of the sea, the Israelites went on *dry ground*, in Hebrew: בִּישְׁבָה. The term יִשְׁבָה only appears once in the Priestly Document before Exod 14:22. This is the statement in Gen 1:9, in the Priestly account of the creation: “And God said, ‘Let the waters under the sky be gathered together into one place, and let *the dry ground* appear.’ And it

²² See William R. Garr, “The Grammar and Interpretation of Exodus 6:3,” *JBL* 111 (1992): 385–408.

²³ See Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*.

was so.” In the miracle at the Sea of Reeds something similar to the third day of creation happens: the *dry ground* can be seen. The Priestly Document apparently intends the presentation of this miracle to emerge from the same mold as the creational activity of God during the very first days of creation.²⁴ In addition, the wording of Exod 14:28a also shows a similar affiliation with God’s activity during the flood: “*The waters* returned and *covered* (יָכַסוּ) the chariots and the chariot drivers, the entire army of Pharaoh that had followed them into the sea.” Within the Priestly Narrative, this statement is quite similar in literary terms to the covering of the earth by the waters of the flood in Gen 7:19–20: “*The waters* swelled so mightily on the earth that all the high mountains under the whole heaven were *covered* (יָכַסוּ); fifteen cubits deep *the waters* swelled, and the mountains were *covered* (יָכַסוּ).” The destruction of the Egyptian army in the sea is tantamount to the eradication of the sinful creatures during the flood. Erasing the Egyptian army is thus another element in the establishment of God’s creational world order (which might reflect a date for P slightly before 525 B.C.E., before the Persian conquest of Egypt by Cambyses: P seems to reflect the peaceful world order of the Persian Empire at a point in time that it includes the whole ancient world—except for Egypt).²⁵

²⁴ See Konrad Schmid, “The Quest for ‘God:’ Monotheistic Arguments in the Priestly Texts of the Hebrew Bible,” in *Reconsidering the Concept of Revolutionary Monotheism* (ed. Beate Pongratz-Leisten; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 271–89.

²⁵ Cf. de Pury, “P^s as the Absolute Beginning,” 123–28. On the Persian setting of P see further Jacobus G. Vink, “The Date and the Origin of the Priestly Code in the Old Testament,” *The Priestly Code and Seven Other Studies* (ed. Jacobus G. Vink et al.; OTS 52; Leiden: Brill, 1969), 1–144, here 61; Knauf, “Die Priesterschrift und die Geschichten der Deuteronomisten,” 104–105; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, 383.

A final example pertains to the close links between the end of P’s creation account in Gen 2:1–3 and the completion of the sanctuary in Exod 39–40:²⁶

<p>Gen 1:31–2:3: “God <i>saw</i> everything that he had made, and <i>indeed</i>, it was very good. [...] Thus the heavens and the earth <i>were finished</i>, and all their multitude. And on the seventh day God <i>finished</i> the <i>work</i> that he had done. [...] So God <i>blessed</i> the seventh day.”</p>	<p>Exod 39:43a: “When Moses <i>saw</i> that they had done all the work <i>just as</i> YHWH had commanded, he <i>blessed</i> them.”</p> <p>39:32a: “In this way all the work of the tabernacle of the tent of meeting <i>was finished</i>.”</p> <p>40:33b: “So Moses <i>finished</i> the <i>work</i>.”</p> <p>39:43b: “[Moses] <i>blessed</i> them.”</p>
---	---

Creation apparently only comes to an end with the creation of the sanctuary (which in itself can be characterized as a “creation within creation”).²⁷

More examples of cross references between P texts in Genesis and Exodus could be added. Nevertheless, it is sufficiently clear that P provides some of the most prominent links between these two textual blocks.

²⁶ See Peter Weimar, “Sinai und Schöpfung: Komposition und Theologie der priesterschriftlichen Sinaigeschichte,” in *Studien zur Priesterschrift* (FAT 56; Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 269–317, see also Bernd Janowski, “Tempel und Schöpfung: Schöpfungstheologische Aspekte der priesterschriftlichen Heiligtumskonzeption,” in *Schöpfung und Neuschöpfung* (ed. Ingo Baldermann et al.; JBT 5; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1990), 37–69; repr. in *Gottes Gegenwart in Israel: Beiträge zur Theologie des Alten Testaments* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1993), 214–46.

²⁷ See Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 289–332, esp. 311.

The connections between the Genesis and Exodus materials in P follow a certain logic and are embedded in an overarching structure: For P there is a specific relation between the “world cycle” (Gen 1–9) and the “Abrahamic cycle” (Gen 11–Exod 1) in Genesis, and the “Israel cycle” (Exod 1–40) in Exodus. There is a concentric theological organization of the world in which the creator God is Elohim for the world (Gen 9:1), El Shaddai for the Abrahamic people (Gen 17:1), and YHWH for Israel (Exod 6:2). This logic highlights the prominence of the Exodus material within P (as is also evident from the *inclusio* between Gen 2:1–3 and Exod 39–40 shown above and the elaborate nature of the narrative in Exod 25–31 and 35–40).²⁸

2. *Links in the Priestly Tradition to Leviticus and Numbers*

If one follows Pola, Kratz, and others in determining the end of the original Priestly Document in Exod 40,²⁹ then no further literary links to the subsequent context are to be assumed.³⁰ Nevertheless, it is common to see the Priestly literature as a multi-layered textual body comprised of several updates to the original Priestly Document before it was combined with other non-Priestly materials in the Pentateuch.³¹ It is not possible to discuss this problem here in

²⁸ For a fuller discussion, see Konrad Schmid, “Judean Identity and Ecumenicity: The Political Theology of the Priestly Document,” in *Judah and Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context* (ed. Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Manfred Oeming; Winona Lake: 2011), 3–26.

²⁹ See above n. 18.

³⁰ See the discussion in Andreas Ruwe, “The Structure of the Book of Leviticus in the Narrative Outline of the Priestly Sinai Story (Exod 19:1–Num 10:10*),” in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* (ed. Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler; VTSup 93; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 55–78.

³¹ See Shectman and Baden, *Strata*, and above n. 17.

detail; I can only single out some important connections between Exodus and the following books in the Priestly layer(s) in broader terms.

First of all, Lev 1:1 (ויקרא) seems to take up Exod 24:16 (ויקרא) and “makes plain that Yahweh’s commanding and providing were not just mediated through Moses in forty days at the top of the holy mountain—God could and did continue to ‘convoke’ and ‘proclaim’ from within the new shrine.”³²

Lev 1–9 provides an especially close link to Exod 25–40: the establishment of the sanctuary is followed by the instructions for sacrifices (Lev 1–7) and the beginning of the sacrificial cult. Zenger, for instance, has argued that P would not be complete without the account of the start of the sacrificial cult, and he therefore proposed Lev 9:23–24 as the original end of P.³³ At any rate, the connection between Lev 1–9 and the preceding Priestly material in the book of Exodus is obvious enough, be it original or redactional.

The so-called “Holiness Code” (or “Holiness Legislation,” or “H”)³⁴ in Lev 17–26 is also closely related to the laws in the book of Exodus. One of the main interests of these texts is to

³² Graeme Auld, “Leviticus: After Exodus and Before Numbers,” in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* (eds. Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler; VTSup 93; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 41–54, 43. For a comparison between Lev 1:1 and Num 1:1, see Erich Zenger, “Die Bücher Leviticus und Numeri als Teile der Pentateuchkomposition,” in *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers* (ed. Thomas Römer; BETL 215; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 35–74, 53–55.

³³ Erich Zenger, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (8th ed.; KStTh 1.1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2012), 199. Zenger hints at links as Gen 17:3, 17/Lev 9:24 or Ex 16:2, 7–8/Lev 9:24. See also the chronological notice in Lev 9:1 which links up with Exod 19:1f, 40:17 (Ruwe, “Structure,” 61). Regarding Zenger, see the discussion in Römer, “Débat,” 16–17.

³⁴ See Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22* (AB 3A; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 1319–67, although suggesting a pre-exilic date for H (which nevertheless presupposes P).

combine profane and cultic laws, possibly in order to stress that there is no basic qualitative difference between them. This emphasis emerges from the “decalogue-like” subtext of Lev 17–26 (see e.g. Lev 19:3–4, 11–18):³⁵ the regulations in “H” include manifold allusions to the Decalogue. In addition, the exhortations to “do” (עשה) and/or to “keep” (שמר) God’s laws (18:4, 5, 26, 30; 19:19, 37; 20:9, 22; 22:31) also have counterparts in the book of Exodus by which they might have been influenced (cf. Exod 19:5; 23:13).³⁶ The notion of Israel’s exodus out of Egypt is also of crucial significance for “H”’s theological understanding, as Frank Crüsemann especially has stressed.³⁷ In “H” Israel is not defined by its land—the land is God’s possession (Lev 25:23)—but rather by its status as God’s people brought out of Egypt.

Vice versa, there are also texts in the book of Exodus that pave the way for specific regulations found in Lev 17–26. Some scholars attribute them to “H” as well. Exodus 12:14–20, for instance, is aware of and anticipates Lev 23:5–8 in order to combine P’s legislation on the Passover (Exod 12:1–13) with the celebration of the Unleavened Bread and align it with H’s calendar.³⁸ Another such passage is found in the Sabbath legislation in Exod 31:12–17, which shows close proximity with Lev 17–26 both in terminological and theological respects.³⁹

³⁵ Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, 467, 472, 479–80, 549, 555.

³⁶ Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, 548.

³⁷ Frank Crüsemann, “Der Exodus als Heiligung: Zur rechtsgeschichtlichen Bedeutung des Heiligkeitsgesetzes,” in *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte* (ed. Erhard Blum, Christian Macholz, and Ekkehard W. Stegemann; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1990), 117–29; cf. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, 557.

³⁸ Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, 565; see also, with further distinctions, Shimon Gesundheit, *Three Times A Year: Studies on Festival Legislation in the Pentateuch* (FAT 82; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 76–89.

³⁹ Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, 565–567, see Walter Gross, “‘Rezeption’ in Ex 31,12–17 und Lev 26,39–45: Sprachliche Form und theologisch-konzeptionelle Leistung,” in *Rezeption und Auslegung im Alten Testament und in*

Some of the closest links to P texts in the books of Exodus (but also in Genesis) appear in the blessings portion of the “Holiness Code” in Lev 26. As Norbert Lohfink has pointed out,⁴⁰ Lev 26:9, 11–13 adopts central promises from Priestly texts such as Gen 17, Exod 6:2–8, and Exod 29:45–46. However, Lev 26 reorients them by integrating them in the concluding blessings/curses section of the “Holiness Code,” which is introduced by “*if* you follow my statutes and keep my commandments and observe them faithfully” (Lev 26:3). Thus their fulfillment is made dependent on obedience to the law, which amounts to a certain “Deuteronomization” of Priestly theology.

<p>Gen 17:6–7: “I will make you exceedingly fruitful; and I will make nations of you, and kings shall come from you. <u>I will</u></p>	<p>Lev 26:3, 9–13: “If you follow my statutes and keep my commandments and observe them faithfully, (9) I will look with favor</p>
---	--

seinem Umfeld: Ein Symposium aus Anlass des 60. Geburtstags von Odil Hannes Steck (ed. Reinhard G. Kratz and Thomas Krüger; OBO 153; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 45–64.

⁴⁰ Norbert Lohfink, “Die Abänderung der Theologie des priesterlichen Geschichtswerks im Segen des Heiligkeitsgesetzes: Zu Lev. 26,9.11–13,” in *Wort und Geschichte* (ed. Hartmut Gese and Hans Peter Rüger; AOAT 18; Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1973), 129–36; repr. in *Studien zum Pentateuch* (SBAB 4; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988), 157–68, see also Christophe Nihan, “The Priestly Covenant, Its Reinpretation, and the Composition of ‘P’,” in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions* (ed. Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden; ATANT 95; Zurich: TVZ, 2009), 89–115, especially 104–15. A different interpretation is given by Jeffrey Stackert, “Distinguishing Innerbiblical Exegesis from Pentateuchal Redaction: Leviticus 26 as a Test Case,” in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research* (ed. Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch J. Schwartz; FAT 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 369–86, see esp. 376, who interprets Lev 26 as a supplement only to P and no connection to D or other non-Priestly sources in the Pentateuch. This approach is consistent with a pre-exilic dating of H.

establish my covenant between me and you, and your offspring after you throughout their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be God to you and to your offspring after you.”

Exod 6:4–7: “I also established my covenant with them . . . I will free you from the burdens of the Egyptians and deliver you from slavery to them. I will redeem you with an outstretched arm and with mighty acts of judgment. I will take you as my people, and I will be your God. You shall know that **I am YHWH your God, who has freed you from the burdens of the Egyptians.**”

Exod 29:45–46: “*I will dwell among the Israelites, and I will be their God.* And they shall know that **I YHWH their God, who brought them out of the land of Egypt** *that I might dwell among them; I am YHWH their God.*”

upon you and make you **fruitful** and multiply you; and I will maintain my covenant with you. . . . *I will place my dwelling in your midst,* and I shall not abhor you. And *I will walk among you, and will be your God, and you shall be my people. I am YHWH your God who brought you out of the land of Egypt,* to be their slaves no more; I have broken the bars of your yoke and made you walk erect.”

The “Priestly” laws in the book of Numbers seem to have a different, though special affiliation with the book of Exodus. The legal sections of Numbers seem especially to include laws that constitute, in diachronic terms, additions to the laws given at Sinai.⁴¹ The Sinai pericope had apparently already been “closed” at a specific point in the formation of the Pentateuch, and additional laws needed to be allocated to a different location than Mount Sinai.⁴² Blum and Nihan have pointed out that Num 1–10 are to be understood as a complement to Exod 25–40 rather than to Leviticus. This insight might, accordingly, hint to the diachronic order of these texts.⁴³ At any rate, there are close links both in terms of narrative continuity and supplementation of legal materials between Exodus and Numbers. These links demonstrate the interconnectedness of P’s exodus story with Priestly material in the subsequent books, although

⁴¹ For the notion of Sinai as a desert and as a mountain in P and post-P, see Konrad Schmid, “Der Sinai und die Priesterschrift,” in *“Gerechtigkeit und Recht zu üben” (Gen 18,19): Studien zur altorientalischen und biblischen Rechtsgeschichte, zur Religionsgeschichte Israels und zur Religionssoziologie* (eds. Reinhard Achenbach and Martin Arneith; BZAR 13; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009), 114–27, repr. in *Schriftgelehrte Traditionsliteratur: Fallstudien zur innerbiblischen Schriftauslegung im Alten Testament* (FAT 77; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 143–58.

⁴² See Thomas Römer, “Das Buch Numeri und das Ende des Jahwisten: Anfragen zur ‘Quellenscheidung’ im vierten Buch des Pentateuch,” in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (ed. Jan Christian Gertz, Konrad Schmid, and Markus Witte; BZAW 315; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 215–31, see also Thomas Römer, “De la périphérie au centre: Les livres du Lévitique et des Nombres dans le débat actuel sur le Pentateuque,” in *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers* (ed. Thomas Römer; BETL 215; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 3–34, esp. 22–32. Notable evidence for a late dating of at least prominent portions of Numbers is provided by Hans-Peter Mathys, “Numeri und Chronik: Nahe Verwandte,” in *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers*, 555–78.

⁴³ Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 301–305; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, 72–75.

the “Priestly” texts in Numbers should probably be seen as additions to the original P document.⁴⁴

III. A Pre-Priestly Moses Story?

1. *Genesis and the Moses Story as the Two Main Constituents of the Pentateuch*

Even viewed synchronically, the most decisive break within the narrative flow of the Pentateuch takes place between Genesis on the one hand, and Exodus through Deuteronomy on the other hand—not between Numbers and Deuteronomy.⁴⁵ 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 collections of the Torah. In terms of the final shape(s) of the Torah, the book of Genesis serves as an introduction to this *vita Mosis*, extending over a much longer time period of about 2200 years, beginning with the creation of the world.

It is quite likely that this synchronic caesura is also relevant for diachronic analysis, and virtually all scholars engaged in the historical interpretation of the Pentateuch assume a certain independence of the exodus story and maintain that the underlying exodus tradition once was an independent narrative entity, which was not originally introduced by any of the material now

⁴⁴ Cf. Reinhard Achenbach, *Die Vollendung der Tora: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Numeribuches im Kontext von Hexateuch und Pentateuch* (BZAR 3; Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 2003).

⁴⁵ See the discussion in Dozeman, *Exodus*, 18–20, and also Ehud 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. For the problem of the book division see above, n. 1.

extant in the book of Genesis. This conclusion was also accepted by early critical scholars such as Hugo Gressmann and Hermann Gunkel.⁴⁶

The question, however, is whether this independence is only to be posited for the oral prehistory of the material now preserved in the Pentateuch, or whether there was once a written exodus story that was not introduced by material from Genesis. Martin Noth left open the question of whether the basis of J and E, which he termed “G” (for “Grundlage”), was oral or written.⁴⁷ More important to him was the aspect that there were clear, conceptual precursor stages to J and E that were different in shape and profile than these later sources.⁴⁸

Noth discussed these so-called “major themes” of the Pentateuch, which G had already joined into a narrative sequence, in the main section of *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* in order of their importance, starting with the exodus from Egypt—not with the patriarchs. Noth was, therefore, of the opinion that the independence of the “major themes” should be relegated to the oral stages of the transmission. Yet he would not have conceded that this diminishes the significance of their original self-contained nature and the importance of the process by which they grew together. Building on Noth, in the present state of pentateuchal scholarship, it is necessary to check at minimum (1) whether the independence of the “major themes” did extend

⁴⁶ Hugo Gressmann, *Mose und seine Zeit: Ein Kommentar zu den Mose-Sagen* (FRLANT 18; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913), 5; Hermann Gunkel, “Mose,” in *RGK* (2d. ed.) 5:230–37; see most recently David M. Carr, “The Moses Story: Literary-Historical Reflections,” *HeBAI* 1 (2012): 7–36.

⁴⁷ See above n. 8 and Noth *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*, 41: “Die Frage, ob schriftlich oder mündlich, ist kaum noch mit einiger Sicherheit zu beantworten, aber auch überlieferungsgeschichtlich nicht so belangreich.”

⁴⁸ Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*, 41: “Die Tatsache selbst aber ist sehr wichtig, da sie ein der Abfassung der Quellenschriften J und E vorausliegendes Stadium im Werden in hinreichend sichtbare Erscheinung treten läßt.”

to significantly later periods than Noth had assumed and (2) whether this independence also occurred in their literary versions as well.

There are indeed strong arguments in favor of affirmative answers to these queries. The analysis of the connections between those “major themes” shows that these textual links are (1) literary in nature and (2) seem secondary with respect to the textual material they bind together.⁴⁹

This is especially obvious from Exod 1:8 (“Now a new king arose over Egypt, who did not know Joseph”), which is a secondary clamp—that is, a redactional formulation connecting two formerly independent texts.⁵⁰ Exodus 1:8 tries, of course, to mediate between the Joseph story and its positive view on the Egyptian Pharaoh on the one hand, and the Moses story with its very unfavorable image of Pharaoh on the other.⁵¹

⁴⁹ See the extended discussion of this in my *Genesis and the Moses Story* and the exchange on this issue between Joel S. Baden, “The Continuity of the Non-Priestly Narrative from Genesis to Exodus,” *Bib* 93 (2012): 161–86, and Konrad Schmid, “Genesis and Exodus as Two Formerly Independent Traditions of Origins for Ancient Israel,” *Bib* 93 (2012): 187–208.

⁵⁰ See Odil H. Steck, *Old Testament Exegesis: A Guide to Methodology* (2d. ed.; SBL Resources for Biblical Study 39; Atlanta: SBL, 1998), 54. The original German term is “sekundäre Verklammerungen” (Odil H. Steck, *Exegese des Alten Testaments: Leitfaden der Methodik* [14th. ed.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1999], 54). Joel S. Baden, “From Joseph to Moses: The Narratives of Exodus 1–2,” *VT* 62 (2012): 133–58, especially 136 n. 5, sees Exod 1:8 as an organic connection between the Joseph story and the exodus story. This is true for the function of the verse in the current form of the story, but not for its diachronic interpretation.

⁵¹ Pharaoh is a wise man in the Joseph story, but he has no connection whatsoever to God and does not seem to be in need of such a connection, according to the narrative. Pharaoh in the exodus story is the main antagonist to YHWH (Exod 5:2), and he is actually supposed to acknowledge YHWH. As many scholars have observed, Pharaoh in Exodus is portrayed as an antitype to Cyrus in Deutero-Isaiah (45:3; see Reinhard G. Kratz, *Kyros im Deuterocesaja-Buch: Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Theologie von Jes 40–55* [FAT 1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991], 104 n. 388).

It also becomes clear from this verse that the Joseph story does not fit smoothly as an introduction to the Moses story, and, *vice versa*, the Moses story is not a logical continuation of the Joseph story in many respects. Exod 1:8 becomes especially plausible as a redactional element that was needed to link together two different, literarily-fixed stories to construct an overall account of Israel's history that included both Genesis and Exodus materials.⁵²

Nevertheless, if this is correct, a basic question arises. Can a self-contained Moses story begin in Egypt without explaining how the Israelites got there? An answer informed by the biblical texts is affirmative. There is no need to postulate an *eisodos* exposition for an exodus story according to texts such as Deut 6:21–23; Ezek 20:5–26; Amos 2:10; Hos 2:17; 11:1–11; 12:10, 14; 13:4; Ps 78:12–72; 106:6–8; 136:10–15. These passages demonstrate that the Hebrew Bible can speak of the origins of the people of Israel in Egypt and the exodus without commenting on how they came to be there. Israel is Israel from Egypt, as many formulaic expressions in the Bible show. To assume that the exodus story is only understandable by referring to the Joseph story is shown

⁵² Another important link between the Egypt passages in Gen 37–50 and Exod 1–15 is the mention of the land of Goshen, where the Israelites dwell in Egypt. The overall distribution of the term “Goshen” shows that this name is anchored in the Joseph story (Gen 45:10; 46:28, 34; 47:1, 4, 6, 27; 50:8); there are only two instances in the Exodus story (Exod 8:18; 9:26). Especially Exod 9:26 shows that “Goshen” might be a secondary addition in the book of Exodus (see in detail Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung*, 124–26): It explains that there was no hail in the land of “Goshen.” However, according to 9:19, the Israelites were saved by means of going into their houses and not by living in a special region of Egypt that could have been spared from the hail. On the contrary, 9:22–25 explicitly states that “all the land of Egypt” was affected by the hail (of which “Goshen” is a part). The same seems to be the case with 8:18. According to 8:20 the swarms of flies affect “the whole land of Egypt,” so the Israelites seem to be spared while being amongst the Egyptians. The swarms enter the houses of the Egyptians and the ground on which they stand (Exod 8:17). The Israelites seem to be spared because they are Israelites, not because they dwell in a specific place.

to be false on the basis of P as well, which does not have a Joseph story, at least according to the usual delimitations of P in Genesis 37–50.⁵³

2. *Moses' Birth Story as Beginning of the Moses Story*

It is clear that the Moses story, covering the life and times of Moses, starts in the book of Exodus. But where exactly in the book of Exodus does the Moses story begin? This question can be narrowed down to the alternatives of Exod 1, as the beginning of the book, or Exod 2, as the introduction of the figure of Moses into the narrative. Many scholars hold that Moses' birth story in Exod 2 is inconceivable without the genocide narrative in Exod 1: it is Pharaoh's command to kill newborn Hebrew children that motivates the abandonment of Moses in the basket on the Nile. This appears convincing at first sight. Nevertheless, there are some hints in Exod 2:1–10 that support the theory that this story was originally independent and only later combined with the genocide theme in Exod 1.⁵⁴ First, the wording in Exod 2:1 does not necessarily mean that

⁵³ See on this in detail 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. Thomas B. Dozeman and Konrad Schmid; SBLSymS 34; Atlanta: SBL, 2006), 29–50. For an interpretation of the P passages in Gen 37–50 see Rüdiger Lux, "Geschichte als Erfahrung, Erinnerung und Erzählung in der priesterschriftlichen Rezeption der Josefsnovelle," in *Erzählte Geschichte: Beiträge zur narrativen Kultur im alten Israel* (ed. Rüdiger Lux; BThSt 40; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2000), 147–80.

⁵⁴ See on this 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* (ed. Eckart Otto; SBS 189; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2000), 43–83. In this respect, it is noteworthy that Schmidt in his Exodus commentary was unable to attribute the opening story in Exod 2:1–10 to one of the traditional sources of the Pentateuch, see Schmidt, *Exodus 1–7*, 63–64.

Moses is the offspring of a marital relationship. The text says that a man from the house of Levi “took” the daughter of Levi, but it doesn’t clarify whether he “took” her “as a wife.” Taken together with the fact that Moses’ parents remain nameless in Exod 2:1,⁵⁵ which is astonishing for a foundational figure like Moses, it is plausible to assume that, according to Exod 2:1, Moses is the product of an illegitimate relationship. This interpretation would, in addition, fit the profile of the Sargon birth myth, which stands in the background of Exod 2:1–10. Sargon says that he is the son of an *enitum* priestess, who was not allowed to marry and have children, and he does not know his father. Further hints can be found in the motif of the mother hiding her son for three months before abandoning him, because he was in “good” shape. This motif fits much better in a narrative where the mother decides for herself to abandon her son because of his illegitimate birth, than in the context of a genocide. Finally, the daughter of Pharaoh does not seem to know anything about her father’s command from Exod 1 when she picks up Moses out of the Nile and raises him like her own child.

Therefore, one may assume that the Moses story originally began with Exod 2, and Exod 1 formulates a later reconceptualization, where it is no longer Moses alone who is in danger, but the people of Israel as a whole.⁵⁶

3. *The Moses Story and the Book of Joshua*

⁵⁵ It is only P which in Exod 6:20 introduces “Amram” and “Jochebed” as the parent’s names. By determining Jochebed as Amram’s aunt, Exod 6:20 shows clear dependency from Exod 2:1, where a difference in generation regarding Moses’ parents can be perceived (“a man from the house of Levi” can be at best a grandson, “the daughter of Levi” is one generation up).

⁵⁶ For more detailed discussion of Exod 1 see Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 216–21.

In the present form of the Pentateuch, Israel's sojourn in the wilderness occupies most of the literary presentation in Exodus through Numbers. From Exod 19 to Num 10, Israel does not move from its location at Sinai, and most of the textual material pertaining to this stay consists of the Priestly legislation and its expansions (Exod 25–31; 35–40; Lev; Num 1–10).⁵⁷ Nevertheless, there is reason to believe that the pre-Priestly Moses story, starting with the exodus, did not end at the Mountain of God but included—given the push of the narrative flow towards this goal—an account of the conquest of the land.⁵⁸

Critical scholarship, at least prior to the publication of Noth's commentary on the book of Joshua in 1938 and his *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* in 1943 (which both disputed the possibility of attributing any texts in Joshua to J, E, and P), commonly assumed that Deuteronomy did not provide the end of the narrative sources in the Pentateuch except for P. They viewed the break between the books of Deuteronomy and Joshua as an artificial one resulting from the formation of the Torah.⁵⁹ In their understanding, it was only natural to assume

⁵⁷ See the contributions and discussions in Matthias Köckert and Erhard Blum, eds., *Gottes Volk am Sinai: Untersuchungen zu Ex 32–34 und Dtn 9–10* (VWGT 18; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2001).

⁵⁸ See e.g. Kratz, *Composition*, 279–93 (cf. “Shittim” in Num 25:1 and Josh 2:1, for a critique see Blum, “Pentateuch–Hexateuch–Enneateuch,” 54–57); Gertz et al., *T&T Clark Handbook*, 356–360. A different proposal is made by Oswald, “Exodus-Gottesberg-Erzählung” (see n. 2). Blum, *Komposition des Pentateuch*, 216–17 and Van Seters, *Life of Moses*, assume the end of the pre-Priestly Moses story in Deut 34.

⁵⁹ On this process see Konrad Schmid, “The Late Persian Formation of the Torah: Observations on Deuteronomy 34,” in *Judah and the Judaeans in the Fourth Century* (ed. Oded Lipschits, Rainer Albertz, and Gary Knoppers; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 236–45; and 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. Gary N. Knoppers and Bernard M. Levinson; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 22–38.

that an original Moses story narrates not only the exodus, but also the conquest of the land. Recent studies on this subject have tended to revise Noth's apodictic position and strive to identify material in the book of Joshua that can be interpreted as an earlier continuation of the storyline beginning in Exodus.⁶⁰ At this time, however, it is not possible to present a sufficiently well-founded hypothesis of the assignment of specific texts to particular sources for such a pre-Priestly account that includes both the exodus from Egypt and the conquest of the land.

IV. The Decalogue and the Covenant Code in the Book of Exodus and their Relation to Deuteronomy

The book of Exodus not only marks the beginning of the Moses story in the Pentateuch, it also provides the context for the first legal corpora in the narrative flow of the Pentateuch, the Decalogue (Exod 20:2–17) and the Covenant Code (Exod 20:22–23:33). Both have close connections to the book of Deuteronomy and are, therefore, of relevance when discussing the place of the book of Exodus in the Pentateuch.

1. *The Decalogue in Exodus and Deuteronomy*

⁶⁰ For discussions of an early or a late "Hexateuch," cf. Thomas Römer and Marc Z. Brettler, "Deuteronomy 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch," *JBL* 119 (2000): 401–19; Kratz, "Der vor- und der nachpriesterschriftliche Hexateuch," 295–323; Thomas Römer, "Das doppelte Ende des Josuabuches: einige Anmerkungen zur aktuellen Diskussion um 'deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk' und 'Hexateuch,'" *ZAW* 118 (2006): 523–48; Reinhard Achenbach, "Pentateuch, Hexateuch, und Enneateuch: Eine Verhältnisbestimmung," *ZAR* 11 (2005): 122–54; and Dozeman, *Exodus*, 16–18.

It is well known that the Decalogue appears twice in the Pentateuch, once in Exodus (Exod 20:2–17) and once in Deuteronomy (Deut 5:6–21). There is much discussion on which of the Decalogues preserves the more original formulation and which literary setting is earlier.⁶¹ It is probably not possible to provide easy answers to these queries because both formulations of the Decalogue show signs of literary growth and both sit uneasily in their respective narrative contexts.

It is, however, both important and possible to determine the literary function of the double presentation of the Decalogue in the Pentateuch. Why are there two presentations of the Decalogue? The most plausible answer arises from the fact that in both instances the Decalogue serves as an introduction to the two main legislative corpora in the Pentateuch, the Covenant Code and Deuteronomy. The two formulations of the Decalogue apparently aim to emphasize the legal and theological value of the Covenant Code and Deuteronomy. Because both of these corpora can be summarized and introduced by the Decalogue, the reader learns that they are meant to be identical in their substance. This narrative identification has become necessary because the storyline of the Pentateuch is arranged such that the Covenant Code is the law given to Moses on Sinai while Deuteronomy is the law that Moses passes on to Israel in the region of

⁶¹ Cf. Matthias Köckert, “Wie kam das Gesetz an den Sinai?” in *Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testaments: Beiträge zur biblischen Hermeneutik* (ed. Christoph Bultmann, Walter Dietrich, and Christoph Levin; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 13–27; Köckert, *Die Zehn Gebote* (Munich: Beck, 2007); and Erhard Blum, “The Decalogue and the Composition History of the Pentateuch,” in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research* (ed. Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch J. Schwartz; FAT 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 289–301. See also Dominik Markl, *Der Dekalog als Verfassung des Gottesvolkes: Die Brennpunkte einer Rechtshermeneutik des Pentateuch in Exodus 19–24 und Deuteronomium 5* (HBS 49; Freiburg: Herder, 2007). Consult also the essay by Dohmen in the present volume.

the Transjordan before entry into the land. Every reader can observe that these laws are different, even though the Covenant Code and Deuteronomy are related to one another through innerbiblical exegesis. Nevertheless, the question remains: how can Moses promulgate another law other than the one he receives from God himself (on Sinai)? The narrative arrangement of the Pentateuch provides a twofold answer. Firstly, Moses interpreted God's law when he passes it on to Israel, therefore Deuteronomy is cast in the form of an exegetical adaptation of the Covenant Code. Secondly, the double transmission of the Decalogue ensures that the very substance of the original law, given to Moses on Mount Sinai, and its Mosaic adaption, passed on to Israel by Moses on the plains of Moab, are presented as identical.

2. *Covenant Code and Deuteronomy*

It is a common and well-founded assumption that the laws in Deut 12–26, viewed diachronically, can be interpreted as an exegetical adaption of the Covenant Code in Exod 20–23. Scholars like Bernard Levinson, William Morrow, and Eckart Otto have made abundantly clear that the literary origins of Deuteronomy can be explained as a new edition of the Covenant Code, newly reinterpreted especially in light of cultic centralization.⁶²

⁶² Bernard M. Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997); William S. Morrow, *Scribing the Center: Organization and Redaction in Deuteronomy 14:1–17:13* (SBLMS 49; Atlanta: SBL 1995); and Eckart Otto, *Das Deuteronomium: Politische Theologie und Rechtsreform in Juda und Assyrien* (BZAW 284; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999). John Van Seters (*A Law Book for the Diaspora: Revision in the Study of the Covenant Code* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003]) has argued for a reversal of the traditional dependency and deems the Covenant Code to be an exilic reinterpretation of Deuteronomy, arguing for a de-centralization of the cult in the diaspora, but this proposal has not proven convincing. See Bernard M. Levinson,

Even the literary core of the law of centralization itself, found in Deut 12:13–14, is dependent literarily on the law for the altar in the Book of the Covenant in Exod 20:24 which it even seems to cite:⁶³

Deut 12:13–14: “Take care that you do not offer your burnt offerings <u>in every place</u> you happen to see. But only at the place that YHWH will choose in one of your tribes—there you shall offer your burnt offerings and there you shall do everything I command you.”	Exod 20:24: “You need make for me only an altar of earth and sacrifice on it your burnt offerings and your offerings of well-being, your sheep and your oxen; <u>in every place</u> where I cause my name to be remembered I will come to you and bless you.”
--	---

Many of the individual laws in Deuteronomy show close proximity to their *Vorlagen* in the Covenant Code as well, and a comparison demonstrates the process of legal innovation that took place between the laws in Exodus and those in Deuteronomy:⁶⁴

“Is the Covenant Code an Exilic Composition? A Response to John Van Seters,” in *In Search of Pre-exilic Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (ed. John Day; JSOTSup 406; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 272–325. Nevertheless, for certain pieces in the Covenant Code, this argument may be valid; see e.g. Thomas Römer’s interpretation of Exod 20:24–26 (*The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction* [London: T&T Clark, 2005]).

⁶³ See e.g. Levinson, *Deuteronomy*; Gertz et al., *T&T Clark Handbook*, 313–14.

⁶⁴ See Bernard M. Levinson, *Legal Revision and Religious Renewal in Ancient Israel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

Deut 15:12–18: “If a member of your community, whether a Hebrew man or a Hebrew woman, [sells himself or herself to you] and works for you six years, in the seventh year you shall set that person free. *And when you send a male slave out from you a free person, you shall not send him out empty-handed. . . .* But if he says to you, “I will not go out from you,” because he loves you and your household, since he is well off with you, then you shall take an awl and thrust it through his earlobe into the door, and he shall be your slave forever. You shall do the same with regard to your female slave.

Do not consider it a hardship when you send them out from you free persons, because for six years they have given you services worth the wages of hired laborers; and YHWH your God will bless you in all that you do.”

Exod 21:2–7: “When you buy a male Hebrew slave, he shall serve six years, *but in the seventh he shall go out a free person, without debt. . . .*

But if the slave declares, “I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out a free person,” then his master shall bring him **before God**. He shall be brought to the door or the doorpost; and his master shall pierce his ear with an awl; and he shall serve him for life.”

The reformulation of the slave law of Exod 21:2–7 in Deut 15:12–18 shows in exemplary fashion the way Deuteronomy updates the Covenant Code. Slavery as an institution is regarded as a matter of course in Exod 21 (“when you buy a male slave”); in Deuteronomy it is accepted but regarded critically (“sells himself or herself to you,” that is, “has to sell himself or herself to you”; “member of your community [lit.: ‘brother’]”). When the slave is set free, Deut 15 requires that she or he be equipped in such a way that the former slave can construct an independent existence and will not immediately fall back into slavery. However, if the slave wishes to serve in the master’s house for life, it is sealed by a ritual that was sacred in nature in Exod 21 (“before God”). In Deut 15 it appears in a “secular” form. Apparently the author of Deut 15 was not willing to tolerate religious acts outside the cultic center of Jerusalem; therefore, the ritual can no longer take place “before God.” Especially noteworthy, finally, is the closing passage in Deut 15, which on the one hand formulates a motivation for releasing the slave and on the other hand highlights the divine blessing that accompanying obedience to this commandment. The law in Deuteronomy apparently attempts to motive through empathy, not by executive power.

In terms of legal hermeneutics, the incorporation of both the Covenant Code in the book of Exodus and of the Deuteronomic law corpus in the Pentateuch is a quite noteworthy feature of the Torah. It includes both laws and their updated versions. As such, the dynamics of renewing legal traditions is anchored prominently in the Torah itself.⁶⁵

V. The Murmuring Stories in Exodus and Numbers

⁶⁵ The relation between Exodus and Deuteronomy is also relevant in terms of the shift of Israel’s liberation from the servitude to Egypt to the service of YHWH; see Wolfgang Oswald, “Auszug aus der Vasallität: Die Exodus-Erzählung (Ex 1–14) und das antike Völkerrecht,” *TZ* 67 (2011): 263–88; see also the earlier Georges Auzou, *De la servitude au service: Etude du livre de l’Exode* (Connaissance de la Bible 3; Paris: Editions de l’Orante, 1961).

It is well known that the wilderness stories in Exodus and in Numbers are closely related to each other (see especially Exod 15:22–17:7 and Num 11:1–20:13).⁶⁶ One major difference is that the stories in the book of Numbers, after the Sinai events, end with much more serious consequences than the stories in Exodus. The lawgiving at Mount Sinai appears to serve as a watershed event taking place between the wilderness stories. Murmuring before the giving of the law is tolerated; afterwards it is not.

The diachronic relationship between these stories is much debated. For our purpose here it suffices to remark that the wilderness stories in Exodus have counterparts in Numbers and accordingly balance the exodus story in the wider Pentateuch. It is interesting to note that the murmuring motif occurs earlier on, in the story of the miracle at the sea; to see this, compare Exod 14:11–12 with Exod 16:3; 17:3; Num 11:4–6; 14:2; 16:13; 20:5. The “murmuring” motif belongs, according to the authors of Exod 14, among the most basic elements of the exodus. The Israelites already murmured during their exceptional rescue from the Egyptians at the sea.

⁶⁶ Christian Kupfer, *Mit Israel auf dem Weg durch die Wüste: Eine leserorientierte Exegese der Rebellionstexte in Exodus 15:22–17:7 und Numeri 11:1–20:13* (OTS 61; Leiden: Brill, 2012); cf. David Frankel, *The Murmuring Stories of the Priestly School: A Retrieval of Ancient Sacerdotal Lore* (VTSup 89; Leiden: Brill, 2002); Thomas Römer, “Exode et Anti-Exode: La nostalgie de l’Égypte dans les traditions du désert,” in *Lectio difficilior probabilior? L’exégèse comme expérience de décloisonnement* (ed. Thomas Römer; BDBAT 12; Heidelberg: Wiss.-theol. Seminar, 1991), 155–72; Schmidt, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 179–207; and Zenger, “Bücher Leviticus und Numeri,” 57–61.

There is an additional close link between Exodus 32–34 and Numbers 13–14, as has often been seen:⁶⁷ both episodes recount the failure of Israel and God’s severe, but nevertheless limited, punishment. They also both include similar liturgical formulas (Exod 34:6–7/Num 14:18), the role of Moses as intercessor (Exod 32:9–14/Num 14:13–19), and the significance of God’s presence among Israel (Exodus 33/Num 14:42–43).

VI. Further Links between Exodus and the Other Books from Genesis to Kings

In what follows, I will briefly discuss passages in the book of Exodus that are likely part of literary layers that function to connect larger narrative blocks. These larger blocks may have, at some point, even existed as independent literary works (like a Hexateuch, a Pentateuch, or an Enneateuch). There are probably additional texts that could be mentioned here as well, but I will limit myself to a few examples.

1. Redactional Texts of Exodus That Embed the Book in the Hexateuch

The most obvious, albeit very short, text in Exodus that shows undeniable links to Genesis on the one hand, and Joshua on the other hand (and therefore can be deemed “hexateuchal in nature”), is Exod 13:19: “And Moses took with him the bones of Joseph, who had made the Israelites swear to him, saying, ‘God will surely take care of you, and then you must carry my bones with

⁶⁷ Blum, *Komposition des Pentateuch*, 190–191; Michael Widmer, *Moses, God, and the Dynamics of Intercessory Prayer: A Study of Exodus 32–34 and Numbers 13–14* (FAT 2.8, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 7–8; and Zenger, “Bücher Leviticus und Numeri,” 58–59.

you from here.” Exodus 13:19 refers explicitly back to Gen 50:25 where Joseph took an oath from his brothers; it also anticipates the burial of Joseph’s bones in Shechem as reported in Josh 24:32.⁶⁸ Exodus 13:19 testifies, therefore, to a redaction comprising the Hexateuch (Genesis–Joshua). It may or may not be that there are more texts in Exodus belonging to such a layer, but Exod 13:19 provides the best evidence for it. Traditional exegesis often assigned the statements in Gen 50:25 and Exod 13:19 to E, but given the narrative connection with Josh 24:32, an interpretation of Exod 13:19 just within the literary scope of the Pentateuch is not convincing, and the fragmentary nature of E remains an unsolved problem for its proponents. In addition, Josh 24 is a text that presupposes P, therefore Exod 13:19 can hardly be earlier.⁶⁹ It is disputed whether this redaction attempts to establish a stand-alone Hexateuch or whether this is a literary device to constitute only a “literary” Hexateuch⁷⁰ within an Enneateuch (Genesis–Kings).⁷¹ The

⁶⁸ See Markus Witte, “Die Gebeine Josefs,” in *Auf dem Weg zur Endgestalt von Genesis bis II Regum* (ed. Martin Beck and Ulrike Schorn; BZAW 370; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 139–56.

⁶⁹ See Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 197–213; Schmid, “Die Samaritaner und die Judäer: Die biblische Diskussion um ihr Verhältnis in Josua 24,” in *Die Samaritaner und die Bibel: Historische und literarische Wechselwirkungen zwischen biblischen und samaritanischen Traditionen / The Samaritans and the Bible: Historical and Literary Interactions between Biblical and Samaritan Traditions* (ed. Jörg Frey, Ursula Schattner-Rieser, and Konrad Schmid; SJ 7; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012), 21–49.

⁷⁰ Erhard Blum, “Der kompositionelle Knoten am Übergang von Josua zu Richter: Ein Entflechtungsvorschlag,” in *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic Literature* (ed. Marc Vervenne and Johan 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 Siebeck 2000), 175–211; Achenbach, “Pentateuch, Hexateuch, und Enneateuch”; Römer and Brettler, “Deuteronomy 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch”; and Römer, “Das doppelte Ende des Josuabuches.”

⁷¹ Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 208–13; 342; Kratz, “Der vor- und der nachpriesterschriftliche Hexateuch.”

answer to this question is dependent upon one's understanding of Josh 24, which will not be discussed here.⁷²

As mentioned above, there were likely earlier connections between the exodus story and the narratives about the conquest of the land. Exodus 13:19 differs from those in that it is embedded in a storyline comprising not only Exodus–Joshua, but Genesis–Joshua.

2. *Redactional Texts in Exodus That Embed the Book in the Pentateuch (Exod 32:13; 33:1)*

There are, as we have seen, many textual links from the book of Exodus to neighboring books in the Pentateuch. At this point, I will focus on a series of texts that seem to be especially interested in the formation of a Pentateuch as a closed textual unit. Exodus 32:13 and 33:1 speak of the promise of the land to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as an oath:

Exod 32:13: “Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, your servants, how you swore to them by your own self, saying to them, ‘I will multiply your descendants like the stars of heaven, and all this land that I have promised I will give to your descendants, and they shall inherit it forever.’”

Exod 33:1: “YHWH said to Moses, ‘Go, leave this place, you and the people whom you have brought up out of the land of Egypt, and go to the land that I swore to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, saying, ‘To your descendants I will give it.’”

⁷² See the contributions in Römer and Schmid, eds., *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l'Hexateuque et de l'Ennéateuque*.

As David Clines and Thomas Römer have observed, this notion of the promise of the land to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as an oath—without the apposition “fathers”—can be found also in Gen 50:24, Num 32:11, and Deut 34:4. It therefore runs through the Pentateuch as a whole.⁷³ Most notably, this motif cannot be found in the subsequent books of Joshua–2 Kings.⁷⁴ The promise of land to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as an oath apparently serves to bind together the Pentateuch and the Pentateuch alone.

How Exod 32:13 and 33:1 are interlinked with their relevant contexts and how these texts are to be dated in literary-historical terms is a matter of debate.⁷⁵ However, a conceptual observation might provide some guidance: The texts of Gen 50:24; Exod 32:13; 33:1; Num 32:11, and Deut 34:4, which advance the notion of the promise of the land 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 actions towards Israel are rooted in the covenant with the

⁷³ David J. A Clines, *The Theme of the Pentateuch* (rev. ed.; JSOTSup 10; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997); Thomas Römer, *Israels Väter: Untersuchungen zur Väterthematik im Deuteronomium und in der deuteronomistischen Tradition* (OBO 99; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 566.

⁷⁴ Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 271–79.

⁷⁵ See e.g. Jan Christian Gertz, “Beobachtungen zu Komposition und Redaktion in Exodus 32–34,” in *Gottes Volk am Sinai: Untersuchungen zu Ex 32–34 und Dtn 9–10* (ed. Matthias Köckert and Erhard Blum; VWGT 18; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2001), 88–106.

ancestors (cf. Gen 17; Gen 35:11–12). The result is the notion of the promise of the land to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as an oath.⁷⁶

3. *Redactional Texts in Exodus Linking the Book to the Enneateuch*

Genesis–Kings constitutes a continuous narrative from creation to the fall of Jerusalem. It is undisputed that this narrative is a composite and that several sub-units have been subsequently combined in order to form this larger narrative. Nevertheless, there are some clear textual links ensuring the overall redactional coherence of this composition. These texts also add some specific theological perspectives. I will limit myself to one example, the proximity of Exod 32 and 1 Kgs 12 and its redactional significance.⁷⁷ In fact, this link is not only relevant in terms of a specific motif that is shared by both texts (the “golden calf”), but also in terms of theological transformation and adaptation.⁷⁸

The statements in Exod 32:4b, 8b, “These are your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt!” are very similar to 1 Kgs 12:28b. However, unlike 1 Kgs 12, where

⁷⁶ For detailed analysis, see Römer, *Israels Väter*, 561–66.

⁷⁷ In terms of connections of the book of Exodus to other books of the Pentateuch, the links of Exod 32–34 to Deut 9–10 also need to be taken into account, but this issue cannot be addressed here. See, e.g., Norbert Lohfink, “Deuteronomium 9,1–10,11 und Exodus 32–34: Zu Endtextstruktur, Intertextualität, Schichtung und Abhängigkeiten,” in *Gottes Volk am Sinai: Untersuchungen zu Ex 32–34 und Dtn 9–10* (ed. Matthias Köckert and Erhard Blum; VWGT 18; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2001), 41–87.

⁷⁸ Cf. Michael Konkel, “Exodus 32–34 and the Quest for an Enneateuch,” in *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings* (ed. Thomas B. Dozeman, Thomas Römer, and Konrad Schmid; SBL Ancient Israel and its Literature 8; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 169–84.

two calves are fabricated, the plural in Exod 32 does not fit its context because Aaron produces only one calf. Exodus 32:4b, 8b appear to have been primarily shaped as an allusion to 1 Kgs 12:28b, pointing the reader to the source of Jeroboam's sin as narrated in 1 Kgs 12.⁷⁹ What, we might ask, prompted the biblical authors of Exod 32 to establish this link, even at the expense of a grammatical problem of subject-verb agreement in Exodus 32:4b, 8b? Exodus 32 seems to hold the entire people accountable for idolatry rather than merely the instigator, Aaron. By doing so, Exod 32 argues that the sin of Jeroboam, which is a recurrent motif in 1 Kgs 12 through 2 Kgs 17, is not only the responsibility of Jeroboam and his royal successors, but the people as a whole are complicit as well.⁸⁰

This link between Jeroboam's sin in the period of the kings, as presented in the books of Kings, is further highlighted by the expression "sinning a great sin," which occurs both in the reflection after the demise of the northern kingdom Israel in 2 Kgs 17:20–21 and in Exod 32:30–31:

2 Kgs 17:20–21: "YHWH rejected all the descendants of Israel; he punished them and gave them into the hand of plunderers, until he had banished them from his presence.

When he had torn Israel from the house of David, they made Jeroboam son of Nebat king. Jeroboam drove Israel from following YHWH and made them *sin a great sin*."

⁷⁹ See among many others, e.g., Lothar Perlitt, *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament* (WMANT 36; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1969), 208. For further discussion see Gary N. Knoppers, "Aaron's Calf and Jeroboam's Calves," in *Fortunate the Eyes that See* (ed. Astrid B. Beck et al.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 92–104; for 1 Kgs 12 see Uwe Becker, "Die Reichsteilung nach I Reg 12," *ZAW* 112 (2000): 210–29; see also the proposal of Juha Pakkala, "Jeroboam without Bulls," *ZAW* 120 (2008): 501–25.

⁸⁰ See Gertz, "Beobachtungen zur Komposition und Redaktion in Ex 32–34," 99.

Exod 32:30–31: “On the next day Moses said to the people: You have *sinned a great sin*. But now I will go up to YHWH; perhaps I can make atonement for your sin. So Moses returned to YHWH and said, Alas, this people *has sinned a great sin*; they have made for themselves gods of gold.”

Exodus 32:30 appears to stress that not only Jeroboam “sinned a great sin,” but the whole people at Mount Sinai had engaged in similar behavior during the period of Israel’s origins. The transfer of responsibility from the kings to the people seems to reflect the prior demise of both the kingdoms of Israel and of Judah. And the relative chronology in Exod 32, according to Jan Gertz, also suggests an “exilic” setting of its earliest layers “at the earliest.”⁸¹

It could also be conceivable that Exod 32 is alluding to 1 Kgs 12 and 2 Kgs 17, not as texts within one and the same work (which then would extend from Genesis or Exodus to Kings), and this possibility cannot be ruled out. At any rate, it seems plausible that Exod 32 is a reinterpretation of “Jeroboam’s sin,” and the new perspective that emerges in Exod 32 would be most effective if it was part of the same work as the texts from Kings.

4. *Redactional Portions in Exodus Linking the Book to Genesis (Exod 3:6, 13–16)*

⁸¹ See Konrad Schmid, “Deuteronomy within the ‘Deuteronomistic Histories’ in Genesis–2 Kings,” in *Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch, Hexateuch, and the Deuteronomistic History* (ed. Konrad Schmid and Raymond F. Person, Jr.; FAT 2.56; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 8–30; Gertz, “Beobachtungen zur Komposition und Redaktion in Ex 32–34,” 98.

Of course, the book of Exodus is also closely linked with the book of Genesis. This is especially true for the connections in the Priestly layers between both books, but there are other, non-P texts in Genesis that display such connects as well. Genesis 12:10–20 anticipates the plagues and the exodus from Egypt in the character of Abraham. Genesis 15:13–16 is similar, with its prediction of Israel’s centuries-long oppression in Egypt and its liberation from there. Finally, Gen 50 builds bridges into the book of Exodus.⁸²

In Exodus it is especially the first chapter that displays close links to the book of Genesis. But we have already seen that the pre-Priestly Moses story probably originally started in Exod 2. *Vice versa*, there are indications in Exod 1 that this chapter consists only of P and post-P elements, although this proposal remains contested.⁸³

Besides Exod 1 and the P-links, explicit references back to Genesis especially appear in the report of the commissioning of Moses in Exod 3 (see Exod 3:6, 13–16). Again, recent discussions have proposed that either the whole chapter or at least these references are post-P, although others have argued to the contrary.⁸⁴ A comparison of Exod 3 with its P counterpart in

⁸² On these texts, see the analyses in Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*; Schmid, “Genesis in the Pentateuch”; Thomas Römer, “Exodusmotive und Exoduspolemik in den Erzvätererzählungen,” in *Berührungspunkte: Studien zur Sozial- und Religionsgeschichte Israels und seiner Umwelt* (ed. Ingo Kottsieper, Rüdiger Schmitt, and Jakob Wöhrle; AOAT 350; Münster, Ugarit-Verlag, 2008), 3–19; Römer, “The Exodus in the Book of Genesis,” *SEÁ* 75 (2010): 1–20; and Jan C. 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. Thomas B. Dozeman and Konrad Schmid; SBLSymS 34; Atlanta: SBL, 2006), 73–87.

⁸³ Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 62–65, 216.

⁸⁴ On the the whole chapter as post-P, see: Eckart Otto, “Die nachpriesterschriftliche Pentateuchredaktion im Buch Exodus,” in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction – Reception – Interpretation* (ed. Marc Vervenne; BETL 126;

Exod 6:2–8 reveals some striking features that 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, that is, holy territory. It is improbable that P would have secondarily profaned the place of Moses’ commissioning. Secondly, Exod 3–4 seems to integrate the problems that arise later in the Priestly narrative with Moses’ mandate into the story of the call of Moses itself. Exodus 6:9 reports 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) at this early 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 קָטַע) to P passages, especially Exod 2:24–25, which are difficult to explain if one opts for a pre-P setting for Exod 3–4.

Leuven: Peeters, 1996), 61–111; Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 172–93. On these references alone as post-P, see: Jan C. Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung* (FRLANT 189; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 233–348; Blum, “Die literarische Verbindung”; and Thomas Römer, “Exodus 3–4 und die aktuelle Pentateuchdiskussion,” in *The Interpretation of Exodus* (ed. Reimer Roukema; CBET 44; Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 65–79. For contrary opinions, 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. Thomas B. Dozeman and Konrad Schmid; SBLSymS34; Atlanta, SBL, 2006), 107–29; John Van Seters, “The Patriarchs and the Exodus: Bridging the Gap between Two Origin Traditions,” in *The Interpretation of Exodus* (ed. Reimer Roukema; CBET 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* (eds. Anselm C. Hagedorn and Henrik Pfeiffer; BZAW 400; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 241–66; Graham I. Davies, “The Transition from Genesis to Exodus,” in *Genesis, Isaiah and Psalms* (eds. Katharine J. Dell, Graham I. Davies, and Yee Von Koh; VTSup 135; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 59–78.

Following these observations, Exod 3–4 might be judged a late, that is, post-P, literary connection between Genesis and Exodus. The first clearly recognizable literary layer in the Pentateuch that establishes the basic narrative blueprint of the Pentateuch is P.⁸⁵

VII. Conclusions

While the Pentateuch provides a quite coherent overall storyline from the creation of the world, the patriarchs, the exodus, the events at Mount Sinai, and the wilderness to Moses' farewell speech in the Transjordan, it is plausible that this storyline neither reflects the earliest conception of the literature now comprised in the Pentateuch nor denotes an actual sequence of historical events.

Despite its links to the book of Genesis and the following books, the Moses story in the book of Exodus (and in the continuing books, possibly originally until Joshua) was probably first an independent literary piece that was later combined with the Genesis material that precedes it in the canonical Pentateuch.

For the reconstruction of the pre-P redaction history of the Pentateuch, it has, at any rate, become difficult to explain the texts in the book of Exodus as an original continuation of the pre-Priestly material in Genesis. Apparently, P was the first author to combine Genesis and the Moses story.⁸⁶ In Exod 6:2–3,⁸⁷ P seems still to struggle with the sequence of Genesis and Exodus and the mediation of their different theological perspectives. Furthermore, the prophetic

⁸⁵ See on this especially de Pury, "P^g as the Absolute Beginning."

⁸⁶ If not, then such a connection was only established marginally before P, cf. Kratz, *The Composition of the Historical Books of the Old Testament*, 276, 79; Blum, "Die literarische Verbindung."

⁸⁷ Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 241–42.

books and the Psalms also, at least in their alleged earlier text portions, do not yet seem to presuppose the clear sequence of Genesis and Exodus or the material now contained in these books.⁸⁸

Scholars like Albert de Pury, Thomas Römer, Reinhard Kratz, Jan Gertz, Matthias Köckert, Eckart Otto, Jean-Louis Ska, and others,⁸⁹ following some basic observations made earlier by Kurt Galling and Martin Noth,⁹⁰ are therefore inclined to see Exodus not in every respect as the second book of the Bible, especially not from the beginning of the Bible's literary history.⁹¹

⁸⁸ Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 70–80; see, however, differently Schmitt, “Erzväter- und Exodusgeschichte als konkurrierende Ursprungslegenden Israels,” 242–45. For Hos 12, see 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. Walter Dietrich and Martin A. Klopfenstein; OBO 139; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 413–39 on the one hand, and Erhard Blum, “Hosea 12 und die Pentateuchüberlieferungen,” in *Die Erzväter in der biblischen Tradition* (ed. Anselm C. Hagedorn and Henrik Pfeiffer; BZAW 400; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 318–319, on the other.

⁸⁹ See Römer, *Israels Väter*; Albert de Pury, “Le cycle de Jacob comme légende autonome des origines d'Israël,” in *Congress Volume Leuven 1989* (ed. John 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; Otto, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und im Hexateuch*; Otto, *Mose: Geschichte und Legende* (Munich: Beck, 2006); Otto, *Das Gesetz des Mose*; Kratz, *The Composition of the Historical Books of the Old Testament*; and Jean-Louis-Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 196–202.

⁹⁰ Kurt Galling, *Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels* (Gießen: Töpelmann, 1928); Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*.

⁹¹ See n. 1.

Select Bibliography

- Berner, Christoph. *Die Exoduserzählung: Das literarische Werden einer Ursprungserzählung Israels*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 73. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- 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 Jan C. Gertz, Konrad Schmid and Markus Witte. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 315. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002.
- Blum, Erhard. "Pentateuch-Hexateuch-Enneateuch? Or: How Can One Recognize a Literary Work in the Hebrew Bible?" Pages 43–71 in *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings*. Edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, Thomas Römer, and Konrad Schmid. Society of Biblical Literature Ancient Israel and Its Literature 8. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- Carr, David. "The Moses Story: Literary-Historical Reflections." *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 1 (2012): 7–36.
- 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.
- Dozeman, Thomas B. *Exodus*. Eerdmans Critical Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Gertz, Jan Christian. *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten Testaments 189. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.
- . "The Transition between the Books of Genesis and Exodus." Pages 73–87 in *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*.

- SBL Symposium Series 34. Edited by Thomas B. Dozeman and Konrad Schmid. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Köckert, Matthias, and Erhard Blum, eds. *Gottes Volk am Sinai: Untersuchungen zu Ex 32–34 und Dtn 9–10*. Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 18. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2001.
- 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.
- Levinson, Bernard M. *Legal Revision and Religious Renewal in Ancient Israel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008
- 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.
- Oswald, Wolfgang. “Auszug aus der Vasallität. Die Exodus-Erzählung (Ex 1–14) und das antike Völkerrecht.” *Theologische Zeitschrift* 67 (2011): 263–88.
- Otto, Eckart. “Die nachpriesterschriftliche Pentateuchredaktion im Buch Exodus.” Pages 61–111 in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction – Reception – Interpretation*. Edited by Marc Vervenne. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 126. Leuven: Peeters, 1996.
- . *Mose: Geschichte und Legende*. Munich: Beck, 2006.
- Propp, William H. C. *Exodus 1–18/19–40: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 2/2A. New York: Doubleday, 1999/2006.

- 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 Thomas Römer and Konrad Schmid. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 203. Leuven: Peeters, 2007. Repr. from pages 13–42 in *Die Patriarchen und die Priesterschrift: Les Patriarches et le document sacerdotal: Gesammelte Studien zu seinem 70: Geburtstag: Recueil d'articles, à l'occasion de son 70e anniversaire*. Edited by Albert de Pury. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 99. Zurich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2010.
- Römer, Thomas. "The Exodus Narrative according to the Priestly Document." Pages 157–74 in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*. Edited by Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 95. Zurich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2009.
- Schmid, Konrad. *Genesis and the Moses Story: Israel's Dual Origins in the Hebrew Bible*. Siphut 3. Translated by James Nogalski. 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.
- Ska, Jean-Louis. *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- Utzschneider, Helmut, and Wolfgang Oswald. *Exodus 1–15*. International Exegetical Commentary on the Old Testament. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2013.