

# Exodus Material in the Book of Genesis

*Detlef Jericke*

## A. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

The transition from the book of Genesis to the book of Exodus marks the most distinct literary gap of the Torah/Pentateuch.<sup>2</sup> The book of Exodus opens the story of the life of Moses from his birth (Exod 2) to his death (Deut 34). It also narrates the beginnings of Israel as a people which develops from a fruitful family (Exod 1:7) into an extended camp in the plains of Moab (Num 33:48–49). On the other hand, the book of Genesis sets the history of Israel in the broader horizon of universal history (Gen 1–11) and presents the prehistory of Israel in the form of a family story (Gen 12–50). At the end of the ancestral narratives, the later Israel consists of no more than approximately seventy male members (Gen 46:27).<sup>3</sup> There is no mention of Moses as the subsequent leader of the people, contrary, for example, to the numerous references to Joshua as the successor of Moses from Exod 17 to Deut 34. The genealogical line from the Jacob family to Moses is weak. Exodus 2:1 states simply that Moses was “a man of the house of Levi” and that “he took a daughter of Levi” as his wife, suggesting that this Levi is identical with Levi, the son of Jacob/Israel (Exod 1:2). Only later in the Moses story<sup>4</sup> are the links between Levi and Moses stated in more detail (Num 26:58–59). The sons of Moses (cf. Exod 2:21–22; 18:2–4) are not mentioned in the genealogy of Levi, only the descendants of Moses’ brother Aaron (Num 26:60–61),<sup>5</sup> whereas the book of Genesis presents extended genealogies of the patriarchal families from Adam and Noah on to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, including

---

<sup>1</sup> I thank Kirsten Hupp (Heidelberg) for her thorough proofreading of my English manuscript. Nevertheless, I take full responsibility of all remaining errors.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. SCHMID, ‘Yahwist’; it is also called a “generation gap” (DAVIES, ‘Transition’, 67) or “Epochenübergang” (GERTZ, ‘Zusammenhang’, 238). DAVIES, ‘Transition’, 60–61 and GERTZ, ‘Zusammenhang’, 234–236, point to the Qumran scrolls: Some scrolls combine Genesis and Exodus; others have only one of the two books; cf. ULRICH et al., DJD 12.

<sup>3</sup> The number is difficult to interpret, particularly in comparison to Exod 1:5; cf. GREIFENHAGEN, ‘Pentateuch’, 114–115; BERNER, *Exoduserzählung*, 39–40; GERTZ, ‘Zusammenhang’, 243 n. 34.

<sup>4</sup> On the term “Moses story” cf. SCHMID, ‘Exodus in the Pentateuch’, 28, with further references.

<sup>5</sup> Only 1 Chr 23:14–15 list the sons of Moses; cf. GREIFENHAGEN, ‘Pentateuch’, 117.

lists of other family branches such as Nahor (Gen 22:20–24), the sons of Keturah (Gen 25:1–4), Ishmael (Gen 25:12–18) or Esau (Gen 36).<sup>6</sup>

Even in the heyday of the Documentary Hypothesis, which assumed that the narrative threads of the Pentateuch extended from Genesis to Deuteronomy, the differences between the ancestral narratives and the Moses story were noticed.<sup>7</sup> While Hermann Gunkel's commentary on the book of Genesis focused on the short literary units or on the supposed oral traditions underlying these units, Hugo Gressmann's critical study of the Moses story had no problems describing the constant elements of presumed larger works like the "Yahwist" or rather the "Jehovist".<sup>8</sup> Kurt Galling stated that the ancestral narratives and the Moses story were received in different ways in the prophetic books.<sup>9</sup> The basic principles of the Documentary Hypothesis were challenged when Rolf Rendtorff and Erhard Blum<sup>10</sup> postulated that in preexilic or pre-Deuteronomistic times, only independent units such as the Jacob cycle (Gen 25–36) or the exodus story (Exod 1–15) existed. Thomas Römer demonstrated that the term "fathers" in the book of Deuteronomy mostly designates the generation of the exodus, not the ancestors of the book of Genesis.<sup>11</sup> Albert de Pury and Konrad Schmid strengthened the theory that there was no literary connection between the book of Genesis and the Moses story before the Priestly writers constructed such a narrative bridge.<sup>12</sup> Since then, the discussion of these questions has been ongoing and controversial.<sup>13</sup>

These short remarks concerning the history of research demonstrate that the literary gap between the book of Genesis and the Moses story was always noticed, irrespective of one's particular methodological approach.<sup>14</sup> Nevertheless, the Jewish and Christian traditions consider the Torah/Pentateuch or

---

<sup>6</sup> SCHMID, 'Genesis in the Pentateuch', 47–48, speaks of "two competing concepts".

<sup>7</sup> DAVIES, 'Transition', also describes the differences, although he defends the main aspects of the Documentary Hypothesis.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. GUNKEL, *Genesis*; GRESSMANN, *Mose*.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. GALLING, *Erwählungstraditionen*.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. RENDTORFF, *Problem*; BLUM, *Komposition*; IDEM, *Studien*. BLUM differentiates between the postulated Deuteronomistic layers in the book of Genesis and in the Moses story: "Anders als in der Erzelterngeschichte, wo sich die Konturen älterer Kompositionen und Erzählungen vielfach noch deutlich im gegebenen Text abzeichnen und zu entsprechenden Rückfragen einladen, haben die Tradenten ihre Texte in Exodus und Numeri in einer Weise gestaltet, die zwar häufig eine Unterscheidung von 'Tradition' und 'Komposition' gestattet, seltener aber deren subtraktive Scheidung" (BLUM, *Studien*, 214–215). In a later study he presents further differentiations (BLUM, 'Verbindung').

<sup>11</sup> Cf. RÖMER, *Israels Väter*.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. DE PURY, 'Le cycle de Jacob'; SCHMID, *Genesis and the Moses Story*.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. the various contributions in the volumes of GERTZ et al., *Abschied*; DOZEMAN/SCHMID, *Farewell*; GERTZ et al., *Formation*, and BERNER, *Exoduserzählung*.

<sup>14</sup> For a detailed treatment of the history of research, see Konrad Schmid's contribution in this volume (part I, section 2.1).

“the five books of Moses” as a coherent unit with a special significance in the scriptural canon. Therefore, it seems reasonable to collect and to describe the textual units in the book of Genesis that show connections to the Moses story as thoroughly as possible in the hope of providing a basis for further and far-reaching discussions.

Of the four larger sections in the book of Genesis (Primeval History, Abraham story, Jacob story, Joseph novella), materials and motifs relating to the exodus story in particular (Exod 1–15) or to the Moses story as a whole (Exod–Deut) are found mainly in the Abraham story (Gen 11:27–25:18) and in the Joseph novella (Gen 37:2–50:26). On the other hand, the Primeval History (Gen 1:1–11:26) and the Jacob story (Gen 25:19–37:1) merely show literary ties to the Moses story as a whole in the form of structural similarities.

## B. The Primeval History

The structural parallels between Gen 1:1–2:4a and the Sinai theophany (Exod 24–40) have been described in detail.<sup>15</sup> The analogies concern the unique role of the seventh day (Gen 2:2–3; Exod 24:16) and the finishing of the tabernacle after exactly one year (Exod 40:17) just like the flood ended one year after its beginning (Gen 7:6). However, these parallels cannot be interpreted as Exodus material in the book of Genesis; rather, they are back-references from the book of Exodus to the Primeval History.<sup>16</sup> When reading Gen 2:2–3, one does not think of the Sinai theophany, but when reading Exod 24, the six-plus-one day scheme of Gen 1–2 immediately comes to mind. The same holds true for other isolated parallels, such as the notice of the Israelites’ fruitfulness (Exod 1:7), which evokes terminology from Gen 1:28 and Gen 9:7,<sup>17</sup> or the echo of the flood story in the story of Moses’ birth, emphasized by the use of the word תבה (“ark”) in each case.<sup>18</sup>

## C. The Jacob Story

The structural parallels between some narrative features in the Jacob story and the opening chapters of the Moses story are described in detail by Ronald

---

<sup>15</sup> GERTZ, ‘Zusammenhang’, 239, with further references.

<sup>16</sup> “... mit Hilfe eines vielschichtigen Referenzsystems auf die Urgeschichte ... zurückbezogen” (JANOWSKI, ‘Tempel’, 63).

<sup>17</sup> DAVIES, ‘Transition’, 63–64.

<sup>18</sup> DAVIES, ‘Transition’, 76.

Hendel:<sup>19</sup> the protagonists' special birth (Gen 25:21–26; Exod 2:1–10), their flight as a result of a “deed” (Gen 27; Exod 2), a theophany associated with a promise on the way to the exile (Gen 28:10–22; Exod 3–4), the meeting with the future wife at a well (Gen 29:1–14; Exod 2:16–21), a strange encounter with a numinous character on their way back from exile (Gen 32:23–33; Exod 4:24–26),<sup>20</sup> and the meeting with the brother shortly before arriving at the starting point of their flight (Gen 33; Exod 4:27–31). One could add the motif that both Jacob and Moses become shepherds in the land of their exile (Gen 30; Exod 3:1).<sup>21</sup>

In contrast to the back-references from the book of Exodus to the Primeval History, the structural analogies between Jacob and Moses found in Gen 25–33 can be interpreted as references to the exodus narrative in the book of Genesis.<sup>22</sup> A well-informed reader studying the Jacob story can remember the narratives of Exod 2–4. However, these cross-references do not really concern the exodus from Egypt, only the temporary digression of Moses into the land of Midian. And both “heroes” come back from their exile. In addition, there are other modifications to be made. Although in both cases the geographical setting is international – Jacob flees to Mesopotamia and Moses to the land of Midian – the reasons are different. Jacob must flee because of family quarrels, while Moses is engaged in public affairs. The difference corresponds to the diverging presentation of the ancestral narratives as family tales and the Moses story as the beginning of the history of Israel. Thus, the structural parallels between the Jacob story and the first chapters of the Moses story can be understood as Exodus materials in the book of Genesis only in a limited sense: as cross-references to the story of Moses' flight from Egypt, but not as references to the exodus of the people of Israel, the central theme of the last four books of the Torah/Pentateuch.

---

<sup>19</sup> HENDEL, *Epic*, 137–165. The aim of Hendel's study is to interpret the Jacob story within the context of ancient Near Eastern Culture. A critical discussion of this exegetical approach goes beyond the scope of my paper.

<sup>20</sup> KRATZ, ‘Reworked Pentateuch’, 506–511, points out that in 4Q158 the text of Gen 32:25–32 is inserted in Exod 4 before v. 27. This underscores that the “Rewritten Bible” texts tend to adjust the Genesis and Exodus traditions; cf. below in relation to Gen 12 and 13.

<sup>21</sup> Often the similarities are interpreted as the outcome of “folktale patterns” constitutive to stories of heroes; cf. DAVIES, ‘Transition’, 76, with further references.

<sup>22</sup> Also vice versa as cross-references from the Moses story to the book of Genesis.

## D. The Abraham Story

### 1. General remarks

Some commentators understand the Abraham story as a “prolepsis” of the later fate of Israel.<sup>23</sup> I have suggested to read parts of the Abraham story as a short variant of the early history of Israel.<sup>24</sup> If these observations are correct and if the Abraham story indeed evokes some stages of the history of Israel from its beginnings to the constitution of a diaspora (cf. Gen 25:1–4), then it is understandable that the references to the exodus are to be found in the first chapters of the Abraham narratives, especially in Gen 12–16.

### 2. Genesis 12 and 13

The tale of Gen 12:10–20, the first version of the story of the endangered ancestress – including the direct connection to Gen 13:1–2 – is reminiscent of the exodus story in many respects.<sup>25</sup> Some distinct verbal cross-references can be found at a glance. In both cases, the turning point of the account is marked by the root נגג (to beat, to plague; Gen 12:17; Exod 11:2). After YHWH has plagued the “house of the Pharaoh” (Gen 12:17), the king of Egypt reproaches Abraham for introducing Sarah as his sister (Gen 12:18). Then he gives her back to Abraham (Gen 12:19). In Exod 11:1, נגג designates both the last of the plagues and the plagues altogether.<sup>26</sup> After the last plague, the killing of the Egyptian firstborn, Pharaoh commands Moses and Aaron to lead Israel out of Egypt (Exod 12:31). Gen 13:2 defines Abraham’s wealth as “cattle, silver and gold”. Silver and gold are also demanded from the Egyptians by the Israelites before their departure from Egypt (Exod 3:22; 11:2; 12:35).<sup>27</sup>

In addition to the verbal cross-references, there are substantial narrative parallels between Gen 12:10–13:2 and the exodus story. Like Jacob’s children (Gen 42:5), Abraham and Sarah come down to Egypt because of a famine (Gen 12:10). At the end, they leave the land forever like the later Israelites. The text of Gen 12:10–13:2 is structured by the variation of the toponym “Egypt”. The expression מצרימה (“to Egypt”) can be found three times (Gen 12:10, 11, 14). When the elders leave the country, the term ממצרים (“from Egypt” or “out of Egypt”) is used once (Gen 13:1). The story never

<sup>23</sup> GESE, ‘Komposition’; SKA, ‘Essai’, 164 (“... une importante fonction proleptique pour le futur d’Israël”).

<sup>24</sup> “Kleine Frühgeschichte” (JERICKE, *Ortsangaben*, 161–162).

<sup>25</sup> The text “offers clear associations to the exodus story” (SCHMID, ‘Genesis in the Pentateuch’, 42).

<sup>26</sup> JERICKE, *Abraham*, 237–238.

<sup>27</sup> JERICKE, *Abraham*, 242–243.

mentions that Abraham and Sarah are “in Egypt” (במצרים). On the other hand, after the return from Egypt, Gen 13:12 states that Abraham settled “in the land of Canaan” (בארץ כנען). Before the digression into the land of the Nile, he was only on the way “into the land of Canaan” (ארצה כנען, Gen 12:5). Egypt is not a place of a long-lasting or enduring sojourn, in contrast to the land of Canaan. However, Canaan is defined as a permanent settling place only after the return from Egypt.<sup>28</sup> Therefore, the journey of Abraham and his family narrated in Gen 12 and Gen 13 has the same direction as the exodus of the later Israelites: out of Egypt and into the land of Canaan. In both cases, there is no return.

The same is true for the following chapters of the Abraham story. Hagar is on the “way to Shur”, that is, on the way to Egypt (Gen 16:7). However, the messenger of YHWH orders her to return to Sarah (Gen 16:9). In geographical terms, this means back to the trees of Mamre near Hebron (cf. Gen 13:18), i.e., back to Canaan. After the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 18–19), Abraham moves further south and settles at a place “between Kadesh and Shur” (Gen 20:1). If the toponym “Shur” designates the eastern frontier of Egypt,<sup>29</sup> Abraham’s new camp is still some distance from Egypt. When another famine arises in the land of Canaan, Isaac is strictly forbidden by YHWH to leave Canaan for Egypt (Gen 26:1–2). Only Jacob, under the same circumstances, namely a famine, gets YHWH’s special permission to go down to Egypt (Gen 46:1–4).

The exodus motifs found in Gen 12:10–13:2 are underscored by the following text of Gen 13. Like the exodus of the Israelites, the return of Abraham’s family from Egypt leads to a process of settlement. The topographic description of Gen 13:3 “between Bethel and Ai” (cf. Gen 12:8) is reminiscent of the same formulation in Josh 8:9 (cf. Josh 8:12). Afterwards, the land is distributed between Abraham and Lot (Gen 13:5–13) similarly to the partitioning of the land under Joshua (Josh 13–19).<sup>30</sup>

Nevertheless, the exodus of Abraham’s family narrated in Gen 12 and 13 differs in important ways from the exodus of the Israelites under Moses and Joshua. Abraham has no problems entering or leaving Egypt. In both directions, he chooses the shortest way. He comes from the Negeb (Gen 12:9) and returns to the Negeb (Gen 13:1).<sup>31</sup> There are no dramatic events like the miracle at the Sea of Reeds (Exod 14–15), the exhausting journey through the wilderness (Exod 15–Num 20) or the detour into the regions east of the Jor-

<sup>28</sup> Cf. JERICKE, *Ortsangaben*, 162–165.

<sup>29</sup> JERICKE, *Ortsangaben*, 145–146.

<sup>30</sup> JERICKE, *Abraham*, 238; IDEM, *Ortsangaben*, 161.

<sup>31</sup> It is irrelevant whether the Hebrew term נגב is interpreted as a toponym or as a geographic direction (“the south”); cf. JERICKE, *Ortsangaben*, 100–103. What is important is that both verses use the same word.

dan River (Num 20–Deut 34). The exodus of Abraham’s family is unspectacular in every way. After the plagues, Pharaoh reacts promptly (Gen 12:17–19), and his men escort Abraham to the frontier. They do not act like Pharaoh’s troops in the Moses story. The story in the book of Genesis does not mention any discussion between the king of Egypt and Abraham, in contrast to the long-lasting negotiations between the Pharaoh of the exodus and Moses reported in Exod 7–13. Moreover, the settlement process of Abraham and Lot is far from the military conquest of the land of Canaan narrated in Josh 1–12. Therefore, the exodus of the Abraham family cannot be understood adequately as a “prolepsis”<sup>32</sup> or a “prefiguration”<sup>33</sup> of the exodus of the Israelites under Moses and Joshua. Thomas Römer has interpreted the story of Gen 12:10–13:2 as a sort of “anti-exodus” or a contrasting program to the exodus of the Israelites,<sup>34</sup> a thesis with which I previously agreed.<sup>35</sup> Now it seems more reasonable to me to understand the story in the book of Genesis as an “alternative model” of an exodus from Egypt.<sup>36</sup> The “alternative” character is evident: the exodus is uncomplicated; all participants act in concert.

The reason for this “alternative” exodus can be found in Gen 11:27–12:5. These verses describe an exodus from Mesopotamia into the land of Canaan. Abraham’s journey into and out of Egypt should be read in light of the preceding exodus out of Mesopotamia. Thus, one should interpret the Abraham-exodus-story in Gen 12:10–13:2 as relating to the situation of the deportees living in Babylonia after 587/586 B.C.E.<sup>37</sup> Such an assumption is supported by the fact that Abraham and Sarah are mentioned together elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible only in Second Isaiah (cf. Isa 51:2), which undoubtedly reflects the situation of the Judeans in Babylonia.<sup>38</sup>

### 3. Rewritings of Gen 12 and 13

The exodus motifs in Gen 12:10–13:2 are expanded in two rewritings from the Hellenistic period: the book of Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon. The book of Jubilees (Jub 13:10–16) presents an abridged version of Gen 12:10–13:2.<sup>39</sup> All of the narrative elements reflecting Abraham’s ambiguous role are eliminated. At the same time, additions underlining the chronological interests of the book of Jubilees can also be found. At the beginning of the story, Abraham reaches the city of Hebron before he arrives in the Negeb

<sup>32</sup> Cf. n. 23 above.

<sup>33</sup> BLUM, ‘Verbindung’, 122–123 (“Präfiguration”).

<sup>34</sup> RÖMER, ‘Isaac’, 167 (“un exode à l’envers”); cf. IDEM, ‘Recherches’, 196–198.

<sup>35</sup> JERICKE, *Abraham*, 240–241.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. GERTZ, ‘Abraham’.

<sup>37</sup> DIEBNER, ‘Erwägungen’; AMIT, ‘Travel Narratives’.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. RÖMER, ‘Genèse 15’, 113; SCHMID, *Erzväter*, 266–270.

<sup>39</sup> VANDERKAM, *Jubilees*, 76–78; VAN RUITEN, *Abraham*, 73–80.

(Jub 13:10). Then his arrival in Egypt is noted, followed by the statement that he lived there for five years (Jub 13:11). Compared to the version in the book of Genesis, this variant aligns Abraham with the later Israelites of the Moses story: they all live “in Egypt” for a given time. Jubilees 13:12 then cites the text of Num 13:22: the Egyptian city of Tanis was built seven years after Hebron. Although this additional note corresponds mainly to the chronological interests of the book of Jubilees, it also establishes a closer connection between Abraham and the Israelites wandering in the wilderness on their journey from Egypt to Canaan.

The Genesis Apocryphon (1QapGen 19–20) presents an expanded version of Gen 12:10–13:2.<sup>40</sup> Although most of the additions seem to be introduced for the purpose of guarding Abraham and Sarah from possible accusations,<sup>41</sup> the substantial additions likewise strengthen the literary assimilation of the figure of Abraham to the Israelites of the exodus story and to the sons of Jacob/Israel in the Joseph novella, respectively: Abraham hears that there is wheat in Egypt (1QapGen 19:10) like Jacob and his sons (Gen 42:1–3); he has a dream (1QapGen 19:14–17) and can interpret it (1QapGen 19:18–21) like Joseph (Gen 37; 40–41); he has a conversation with the nobles of the pharaoh (1QapGen 19:24–30) like Moses and Aaron in Exod 2–12; the pharaoh seeks to kill Abraham (1QapGen 19:19; 20:9); the affliction on the pharaoh and his house are described as highly dramatic; and Abraham can heal the pharaoh and his subjects, in contrast to the wise men of the king (1QapGen 20:17–30; cf. Exod 7–13). Of special interest are the toponyms at the beginning of the story in 1QapGen 19:9–13. Abraham does not come from Hebron (1QapGen 19:9) into the region of the Negeb as in the versions of Gen 12 and Jub 13, but to a river named Karmon (כרמוֹנָא; 1QapGen 19:11). Karmon is one of the seven “heads” (שבעת ראשי) of a nameless river (1QapGen 19:12). Abraham passes all of the seven heads on his way into Egypt (1QapGen 19:12). The identity of the Karmon River is disputed. Most commentators propose that one of the heads of the Nile is meant, because Greek geographers such as Diodorus Siculus (1.33.7) or Strabo (17.1.18) report seven στόματα of the Nile.<sup>42</sup> Thus, the passage in 1QapGen could be interpreted as Abraham crossing the eastern border of Egypt and entering the Nile Delta like the later sons of Jacob/Israel.<sup>43</sup> However, there are some problems with such an interpretation, since none of the usual Greek names of the arms of the Nile Delta corresponds to the toponym Karmon. The difficult text of 1QapGen 19:13 that follows Abraham’s crossing of the Karmon River can

<sup>40</sup> MACHIELA, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 69–78; VAN RUITEN, *Abraham*, 95–113.

<sup>41</sup> VAN RUITEN, *Abraham*, 109–112.

<sup>42</sup> FITZMYER, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 182–183.

<sup>43</sup> On the location of the land of Goshen where the Israelites settle (Gen 45–47; Exod 8–9) cf. JERICKE, *Ortsangaben*, 238–240.

be understood in such a way that all seven heads enter into the “Great Sea of Salt”.<sup>44</sup> Therefore, the toponymic construction of 1QapGen 19:11–13 may be ascribed to a literary combination of several biblical traditions: the geography of the Garden of Eden in Gen 2:10–14 (cf. the term רֵאשׁוֹת 1QapGen 19:12 and Gen 10:2) representing the idea of four rivers spreading from one nameless river;<sup>45</sup> the variation of that tradition in Ezek 47, where the rivers go out from the temple mount in Jerusalem and flow into the Dead (“Salt”) Sea;<sup>46</sup> and the so-called table of nations (Gen 10), where Ham is the father of Egypt (מצרים; Gen 10:6), since 1QapGen 19:13 states that Abraham and his family reach “the land of the sons of Ham, the land of Egypt” (לְאֶרֶץ חָם לְאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם).

To sum up, the rewritings of the first story of the endangered ancestress extend the cross-references to the Moses story. Thus, they strengthen the similarities between the Abraham story and the exodus narrative. The rewritings no longer present an “alternative” exodus by Abraham’s family. Rather, the versions in the book of Jubilees and in the Genesis Apocryphon cast Abraham’s journey to and from Egypt as a “prolepsis” or “prefiguration” of the later exodus of the Israelites.

#### 4. Genesis 14

If the references to the early history of Israel found in Gen 12 and 13 are continued, Gen 14 should be read as a parallel to the anecdotes in the book of Judges. Indeed, Gen 14 is the sole chapter in the Abraham story that narrates military conflicts. However, in contrast to the regional conflicts in the book of Judges, Gen 14 describes an international affair. Abraham fights against four kings of Mesopotamia. He defends not only his relatives, but the whole land of Canaan. Four of the five residences of his allies (Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboiim; cf. Gen 14:2, 8) are described as border towns of Canaan (Gen 10:19).<sup>47</sup> Abraham reaches the northern border of the later Israel – the city of Dan (Gen 14:14; cf. Judg 20:1; 1 Sam 3:20; 2 Sam 3:10; 24:2; 1 Kgs 5:5) – and even the region of Damascus (Gen 14:15), the frontier of the former Egyptian province of Canaan during the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium B.C.E.<sup>48</sup> He rules over Canaan. On the other hand, the route of the four Mesopotamian kings is

<sup>44</sup> FITZMYER, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 98–99; MACHIELA, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 70.

<sup>45</sup> This assumption is strengthened by the fact that the rewriting of Gen 13:14–18 in 1QapGen 21:14–19 introduces the river Gihon as one of the borders of the promised land (21:15, 18). In the biblical texts, Gihon is the name of one of the rivers flowing from paradise (Gen 2:13). Karmon and Gihon both function as border rivers in 1QapGen. Thus, it seems plausible that 1QapGen 19:11–13 also refers to the so-called “paradise geography”.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. ZWICKEL, ‘Tempelquelle’.

<sup>47</sup> JERICKE, *Ortsangaben*, 75–78. The function of Gen 10 as a literary map is described in IDEM, ‘Weltkarten’.

<sup>48</sup> SIMONS, ‘Table of Nations’; JERICKE, *Ortsangaben*, 77.

marked by some toponyms also mentioned in the narratives of Israel's sojourn through the wilderness: the mountains of Seir (Gen 14:6; cf. Deut 1), (El-)Paran (Gen 14:6; cf. Num 10–13), Kadesh (Gen 14:7; cf. Num 13–14; 20), the country of the Amalekites (Gen 14:7; cf. Exod 17) and the area of the Amorites (Gen 14:7; cf. Num 21 and Deut 1).<sup>49</sup> The rulers of Mesopotamia play the role of the escaping Israelites of the Moses story. Abraham, on the other hand, takes over the function of the pharaoh pursuing his enemies and defending his "province of Canaan". Thus, Genesis 14 does not construct an "alternative" exodus like Genesis 12 and 13 but rather a "subversive" version of the Moses story.<sup>50</sup>

### 5. Genesis 15

Genesis 15 has been characterized as "the most prominent bridge text in Genesis that serves as a literary connection between Genesis and Exodus".<sup>51</sup> The cross-references between the Abraham story and the exodus or Moses story are found in the second part of the chapter, mainly in Gen 15:11–17. The allusion to the exodus is underscored by the fact that vv. 13–16 are presented in the form of a divine speech announcing future events to Abraham. Genesis 15:13 foretells that Abraham's offspring will experience a sojourn of four hundred years in a foreign land, associated with forced labor and oppression. The terms used for "forced labor" (עבד) and "oppression" (ענה) are found in the exodus story (Exod 1:11, 13; 6:5). The reference to the "fourth generation" that YHWH will "bring back" (Gen 15:16) seems to correspond to the genealogy of Moses (Num 26:58–59). Nevertheless, there are some difficulties in connecting these passages readily to the exodus story:

a) Exodus 12:40 refers to a sojourn of 430 years in Egypt, not of four hundred years as in Gen 15:13.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Cf. JERICKE, 'Bergland'.

<sup>50</sup> JERICKE, *Ortsangaben*, 175.

<sup>51</sup> SCHMID, 'Genesis in the Pentateuch', 41–42.

<sup>52</sup> Both numbers are highly symbolic. Perhaps the "four hundred years" in Gen 15:13 result from a wordplay with the number four in Gen 15 (RÖMER, 'Genèse 15', 117; ZIEMER, *Abram*, 213, 234). The 430 years of Exod 12:40 correspond to the regnal years of the kings of Israel and Judah. Thus, the time span before and after the erection of the temple under Solomon is identical. For further discussion see KREUZER, '430 Jahre', and KOENEN, '1200 Jahre'. Both numbers (400/430) are evidently too high for the time of the sojourn in Egypt, and they correspond in no way to the idea of the four generations in Gen 15:16. Therefore, the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch understand the 400/430 years as the whole period of time from Abraham to the exodus; in Exod 12:40, both textual witnesses read "in the land of Canaan and in the land of Egypt" instead of "in Egypt" in the Masoretic version; cf. KREUZER, 'Priorität'. Here we find the same phenomenon as in the rewritings of Gen 12:10–13:2: the narrative materials of Genesis and the Moses story concerning the exodus events are aligned gradually.

b) The land of oppression remains nameless in Gen 15. It is simply qualified as “not theirs”. The offspring of Abraham shall live there as “foreigners” (Hebr. גֵּוֹר). In the texts of the Torah/Pentateuch, such a way of life is restricted to the time of the ancestors (cf. Exod 6:3–4). When the exodus story uses the root גֵּוֹר, this designates the status of non-Israelites (cf. Exod 12:28–49).

c) Moses as a member of a “fourth generation” is counted from Jacob, not from Abraham: Jacob, Levi, Amram, Moses and Aaron (Num 26:58–59).

d) The phrase “I have lead you out of Ur in Chaldea” in Gen 15:7 is sometimes understood as a reference to the introduction of the Decalogue in Exod 20:2.<sup>53</sup> However, Exod 20:2 reads “out of the land of Egypt”. Rather, Gen 15:7 is reminiscent of Gen 11:27–32.<sup>54</sup>

e) Finally, the offering scene in Gen 15 has no comparable counterpart in the Moses story.<sup>55</sup> At best, the expression כָּרַת בְּרִית “to make a covenant” (literally “to cut” a covenant, Gen 15:18) has a parallel in the Sinai pericope (Exod 24:8; 34:27).

Summing up, Gen 15 shows fewer direct cross-references to the exodus story than is sometimes assumed. Verbal parallels are restricted to the terms of oppression (עֲבָדָה, עֲבָדָה) in v. 13, and, to a lesser degree, to the concept of a “covenant” in v. 18. Some narrative elements (four hundred years, the liberated fourth generation) are similar to, but not completely congruent with, motifs in the Moses story. Other details, such as the idea of a life as foreigners or the reference to Ur, should be understood as cross-references to different parts of the book of Genesis.<sup>56</sup> At best, one can interpret some passages of Gen 15 as a foreshadowing that is partially comparable to the later exodus of the Israelites. Perhaps the differences from the exodus story stem from the function of Gen 15 as a late text with either the whole Torah/Pentateuch<sup>57</sup> or a supposed Hexateuch<sup>58</sup> in view. In any event, it should at least be asked why the authors of Gen 15 formulated very allusively, why they did not call the land of oppression by its name (Egypt), or why they did not adjust the years of the former oppression. These questions, however, are beyond the scope of this paper.

---

<sup>53</sup> RÖMER, ‘Genèse 15’, 118; GERTZ, ‘Abraham’, 65–66.

<sup>54</sup> BLUM, ‘Verbindung’, 142–145.

<sup>55</sup> In contrast to RÖMER, ‘Genesis 15’; GERTZ, ‘Abraham’.

<sup>56</sup> The book of Jubilees strengthens these intratextual references. Jubilees 14:19–20 (VANDERKAM, *Jubilees*, 86) compare the covenant in Gen 15 to the one made with Noah, although the Masoretic text formulates the Noah-covenant using the term קוּם בְּרִית (Gen 6:18; 9:9, 11), in contrast to the phrase כָּרַת בְּרִית in Gen 15:18. The interpretation given by Jub 14:19–20 seems in line with the rest of the book, since all covenants are understood as renewals of the first covenant with Noah; cf. VAN RUITEN, *Abraham*, 127–136.

<sup>57</sup> RÖMER, ‘Genèse 15’; GERTZ, ‘Abraham’.

<sup>58</sup> GREIFENHAGEN, ‘Pentateuch’; SCHMID, ‘Yahwist’; IDEM, ‘Genesis in the Pentateuch’.

6. *Genesis 16*

Thomas Römer has shown that Gen 16 includes another variant of the exodus.<sup>59</sup> Hagar, Sarah's Egyptian maidservant, plays the role of the oppressed Israelites. The Hebrew root *נָגַע* describes Hagar's situation (Gen 16:6, 9, 11). Thus, her fate is equated to that of the Israelites in Egypt (Exod 1:11; cf. Gen 15:13).<sup>60</sup> Sarah takes the part of the oppressing pharaoh. She plays an active role, in contrast to the story in Gen 12:10–13:2: "Hagar préfigure le destin d'Israël, tandis que Sarah joue le rôle de l'opresseur égyptien".<sup>61</sup> Römer lists some more parallels: the encounter with the messenger of YHWH is situated in the desert (Gen 16:7); Hagar is on the "way to Shur" (Gen 16:7), comparable to the Israelites wandering from the Sea of Reeds into the desert of Shur (Exod 15:22); the toponyms in Gen 16:14 (Kadesh and Bered) describing the location of the encounter ("Beer-lahai-roi") are also prominent stations of Israel's wilderness wanderings;<sup>62</sup> and the messenger announces an act of liberation.<sup>63</sup> The last argument is not convincing, since the messenger sends Hagar back into her former situation of oppression (Gen 16:9). Nevertheless, the references to the Moses story are evident in Gen 16. Similar to Abraham in Gen 14, Sarah plays the part of the pharaoh, even if her antagonist is a member of her household, not an alliance of kings. In addition, the toponymic setting of Gen 16 resembles that of the wilderness journeys of Israel. The story could be interpreted as a sort of "anti-exodus". At the least, Gen 16 shows that the exodus from Egypt (cf. Gen 12) is irreversible. There is no way back to Egypt, even in a situation of oppression. All members of Abraham's family should find a suitable place in the land of Canaan, including his firstborn Ishmael (Gen 16:11–12). In this respect, Gen 16 anticipates the later quarrels between Moses and the Israelites, who desire to return to Egypt (cf. Num 14:3–4).

The story of Sarah and Hagar in Gen 16 with the allusions to Israel's wilderness itinerary is reinterpreted in the New Testament. A passage in the epistle to the Galatians describes Abraham's two sons as examples for a different handling of the law (*νόμος*). In this context, Hagar is equated with Mount Sinai in Arabia (Gal 4:24–25), the most prominent station on Israel's

---

<sup>59</sup> RÖMER, 'Isaac'.

<sup>60</sup> The tendency to connect Gen 15 and 16 is strengthened by the book of Jubilees. The greatly shortened story of Gen 16 – the whole passage of the expulsion of Hagar by Sarah (Gen 16:4b–14) is omitted – takes place in the same "week" as the events narrated in Gen 15 (cf. Jub 14:1 and 14:24); cf. VAN RUITEN, *Abraham*, 121–125, 130–134.

<sup>61</sup> RÖMER, 'Isaac', 168.

<sup>62</sup> Whether the toponym Bered means the brook Zered marking the border between Edom and Moab (Num 21:12; Deut 2:13–14) as RÖMER, 'Isaac', 168, presumes, is an open question; cf. Jericke, *Ortsangaben*, 146–148.

<sup>63</sup> RÖMER, 'Isaac', 169. Hagar "ressemble à un Moïse féminin" (RÖMER, 'Isaac', 168).

way from Egypt to Canaan. This short notice reinforces, to a certain degree, the interpretation of Gen 16 in the preceding paragraph.

## E. The Joseph Novella

### 1. General remarks

The Joseph novella in Gen 37:2–50:26 has many cross-references to the exodus narrative. The land of Egypt is the scenery for the stories around Joseph, his brothers and the pharaoh on the one hand, and for the narratives concerning Moses, the Israelites and the pharaoh on the other. The social setting, in contrast, is different.<sup>64</sup> In the Joseph novella, the interactions between Joseph – including his relatives – and the Egyptian ruler are mostly peaceful. The text mentions no forced labor or other forms of oppression as in the exodus story. Joseph becomes a high official, and his brothers live undisturbed in the land of Goshen, i.e., in the eastern part of the Nile delta.<sup>65</sup> Thus, the cross-references between the Joseph novella and the exodus narrative should be described in a differentiated manner. The initial sections of the Joseph novella present Joseph's social advancement in Egypt (Gen 37–41) and the reunification with his brothers (Gen 42–45). These chapters show few significant links to the exodus narrative. Rather, the cross-references are concentrated in the second part of the Joseph novella, from Gen 46 onwards. There are three types of relevant materials: place names (2.), particular phrases or motifs (3.) and an alternative exodus story in Gen 50:1–14 (4.).

### 2. Place names

After their *eisodus* into Egypt, Joseph's brothers settle in the land of Goshen (Gen 45:10). The region seems to be situated far from the center of Egypt so that the Egyptians do not notice the "abhorrent" customs of the strangers (Gen 46:34). Even when Joseph's relatives bring Jacob's corpse into the land of Canaan, they leave their children and their herds in Goshen (Gen 50:8) until their return to Egypt (Gen 50:14). In this respect, the land of Goshen is described as an area of permanent settlement (cf. Gen 46–47). Goshen is also mentioned twice in the stories of the plagues as the place where the Israelites live (Exod 8:18; 9:26). However, the topographical construction in the relevant texts is more differentiated. At the beginning of the exodus story, the Israelites do not live in a border area of Egypt, but near the royal residences. As forced laborers they build the cities of Pithom and Rameses (Exod 1:11).<sup>66</sup>

<sup>64</sup> SCHMID, 'Genesis in the Pentateuch', 31–33.

<sup>65</sup> On the location of Goshen cf. JERICKE, *Ortsangaben*, 238–240.

<sup>66</sup> On the location of Rameses cf. JERICKE, *Ortsangaben*, 240–242.

This situation is the reason for their groaning and for Moses' mission to bring them out of Egypt. Consequently, they start their flight at Rameses (Exod 12:37). The twofold reference to Goshen in the exodus story seems to be an attempt to adapt the topographical setting of Exod 1–15 to the Joseph novella. The same applies to the unique mention of Rameses in the Joseph novella. Genesis 47:11 states that Pharaoh instructs Joseph to have his relatives settle “in the land of Rameses”. Apparently, the verse does not correspond with the idea of a permanent settlement in Goshen.<sup>67</sup> In this respect, Gen 47:11 represents a substantial reference to the exodus story, even if the verse should be considered as a later addition.

The unique expression “the land of the Hebrews” in Gen 40:15 can be interpreted in a similar way.<sup>68</sup> The term “Hebrew” designates both Joseph (Gen 39:14; 41:12) and the Israelites in Egypt (Exod 2:11, 13). It is mostly used as an epithet for YHWH, “the god of the Hebrews” (Exod 3:18; 5:3; 7:16; 9:1, 13; 10:3). In this respect, the term “land of the Hebrews” can be understood as a reference to the exodus story. This interpretation is supported by the observation that Joseph uses the topographical expression during his time as a prisoner in Egypt. Thus, he foreshadows the fate of the later Israelites. Nevertheless, the term “land of the Hebrews” has its own function within the Joseph novella. It suggests that the land of Canaan that was controlled by Egypt in the late 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium B.C.E. as well as in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.E. has become the land of Joseph's relatives.<sup>69</sup>

Summing up, the basic topographic scenario of the Joseph novella in relation to the exodus narrative seems to be as follows: The sons of Jacob settle in the land of Goshen, a border area of Egypt, whereas in the exodus narrative they are in the vicinity of the city of Rameses, i.e., in the center of Egypt. In this respect, the topographical setting of both stories is different. Nevertheless, in the process of each text's formation, editors attempted to adjust the topographical ideas. They used some genuine terms from the exodus narrative (Rameses, Hebrews) to build unique topographical expressions (“land of the Hebrews”, “land of Rameses”), thus constructing references to the exodus narrative within the Joseph novella.

---

<sup>67</sup> The problem is often solved by the assumption that Gen 47:11 belongs to the Priestly source or to a Priestly redaction; cf. WÖHRLE, *Fremdlinge*, 145; JERICKE, *Ortsangaben*, 254. On the other hand, it is disputed whether the Joseph novella contains passages of Priestly origin at all; cf. RÖMER, ‘Joseph Story’.

<sup>68</sup> The toponym is another name for the land of Canaan; cf. JERICKE, *Ortsangaben*, 235–236.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. JERICKE, *Ortsangaben*, 245–246.

### 3. Isolated cross-references

The evidence concerning the isolated cross-references between the Joseph novella and the exodus story is ambiguous. Some of them cannot be understood as “exodus material” in the book of Genesis either because a supposed “exodus horizon” is not compelling or because the direction of dependence runs in the other direction (e.g., back-references to the Joseph novella in the book of Exodus). The latter case holds true for Gen 46:1–5 in comparison to Exod 3, Gen 46:27 in comparison to Exod 1:5, Gen 47:27 in comparison to Exod 1:7, and Gen 50:26 in comparison to Exod 1:6. However, other texts such as Gen 50:24–25 are distinct “exodus materials”.

YHWH’s encounter with Jacob/Israel at Beersheba (Gen 46:1–5) includes the promise to bring Jacob/Israel up again into the land of Canaan (Gen 46:4). There is an ongoing discussion whether this promise means the exodus of the Israelites under Moses<sup>70</sup> or the transfer of Jacob’s corpse from Egypt into Canaan narrated in Gen 50:1–14.<sup>71</sup> Recent studies propose a compromise: YHWH’s promise originally referred to Jacob (Gen 50), although at a later stage of composition it could also refer to Moses and Israel, especially to Exod 3.<sup>72</sup> In any case, it is undisputed that the promise in Gen 46:4 can be understood independently of any reference to the exodus story. This assumption is underlined by the central function of the place name Beersheba (Gen 46:1, 5) within the ancestral narratives.<sup>73</sup>

Gen 47:27 is usually brought in connection with Exod 1:7. Both verses describe the growth of the sons of Jacob/Israel by the same terms, פרה and רבה.<sup>74</sup> The cross-reference cannot be interpreted as “exodus material in the book of Genesis”. Rather, it is a back-reference from Exod 1:7 to Gen 47:27.<sup>75</sup> The verse in the Joseph novella can be understood without any knowledge of the exodus story. The same holds true for the difficult number seventy that indicates all members of Jacob’s offspring (Exod 1:5; Gen 46:27).<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> GERTZ, *Tradition*, 273–277; EBACH, *Genesis 37–50*, 694–695; DOZEMAN, ‘Commission’, 124–127.

<sup>71</sup> BLUM, ‘Verbindung’, 131–132; SCHMID, ‘Josephsgeschichte’, 94; IDEM, ‘Genesis in the Pentateuch’, 42–43; ALBERTZ, ‘Josephsgeschichte’, 28–29.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. GERTZ, ‘Zusammenhang’, 237–238. In accordance with BLUM, ‘Literarkritik’, Gertz differentiates between “innertextual” and “intertextual” references; cf. DAVIES, ‘Transition’, 65, who differentiates between “the original assurance to Jacob in 46:4 and its later use in relation to the exodus”.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. JERICKE, *Ortsangaben*, 250–252.

<sup>74</sup> Sometimes Exod 1:7 is also paralleled to Gen 50:20, but the latter verse does not show the combination of פרה and רבה.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. GERTZ, ‘Zusammenhang’, 241; DAVIES, ‘Transition’, 63.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. n. 3 above.

The text of Gen 50:24–25 has many direct allusions to the exodus narrative. The predicted death of Joseph is reported in both Gen 50:26 and Exod 1:6. The combination of the term  $\text{פקד}$  with the names of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob has its counterpart in Exod 3:16.<sup>77</sup> The idea of the promise of the land as an oath sworn by YHWH to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob/Israel is found in the context of the Moses story (Exod 32:13; 33:1).<sup>78</sup> Joseph's request to have his bones carried up "from here" (Gen 50:25), i.e., out of Egypt, opens a wider horizon extending into the conquest narratives in the book of Joshua. The fulfillment of Joseph's request is reported in Exod 13:19 and Josh 24:32. Therefore, most commentators distinguish here a comprehensive redaction with a hexateuchal horizon.<sup>79</sup> The short passage in Gen 50:24–25 is difficult to interpret solely within the narrative logic of the Joseph novella. Within the Joseph novella, Joseph becomes a real Egyptian: He marries the daughter of an Egyptian priest (Gen 41:45; cf. Gen 41:50; 46:20), he dies in Egypt and he is embalmed and placed in a coffin according to Egyptian customs (Gen 50:26). Therefore, there seems to be no motivation for his request to come back to Canaan. Thus, the two verses in Gen 50:24–25 cannot be understood adequately without the knowledge of the exodus narrative. Indeed, they are a "prolepsis"<sup>80</sup> of the exodus or even the "announcement of the exodus and entry into the land".<sup>81</sup>

Although some commentators postulate a close connection between Gen 50:26 and the two preceding verses (vv. 24–25),<sup>82</sup> the notice of Joseph's death and his subsequent treatment according to Egyptian customs is in line with the whole Joseph novella, where Joseph gradually becomes a "real" Egyptian. Gen 50:26 functions very well without the knowledge of an exodus from Egypt into Canaan.<sup>83</sup> The mention of Joseph's death in Exod 1:6 is at best a back-reference to the end of the Joseph novella.<sup>84</sup>

<sup>77</sup> BLUM, 'Verbindung', 133.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. BLUM, 'Verbindung', 141; SCHMID, 'Genesis in the Pentateuch', 37–40.

<sup>79</sup> "Hexateuchbearbeitung" (BLUM, 'Verbindung', 151); "Hexateuchrahmen" (BERNER, *Exoduserzählung*, 42–43); "Hexateuchhorizont" (SCHMID, 'Genesis in the Pentateuch', 35–36).

<sup>80</sup> BLUM, 'Verbindung', 151 ("Prolepse").

<sup>81</sup> BERNER, *Exoduserzählung*, 41–42 ("Ankündigung von Exodus und Landnahme"). He points to Gen 48:21, a verse that has some parallels in Gen 50:24; however, the verbal references to the exodus narrative are not as clear as in Gen 50:24.

<sup>82</sup> GERTZ, 'Transition', 79–82; IDEM, 'Zusammenhang', 244–245, with further references.

<sup>83</sup> The embalming of Joseph, for example, is foreshadowed by the embalming of Jacob (Gen 50:2).

<sup>84</sup> Exod 1:8 is often cited in close connection to Exod 1:6 as further proof of the cross-references between Gen 50:24–26 and Exod 1. However, Exod 1:8 says nothing of Joseph's death; it merely presupposes that he is no longer present.

#### 4. An alternative exodus

Gen 50:1–14 can be read as the story of an alternative exodus. In accordance with Jacob's request (Gen 50:5; cf. Gen 48:21), his corpse is transferred into the land of Canaan. The starting point is the land of Egypt (Gen 50:7). The final destination, the land of Canaan (Gen 50:13), is reached through two intermediate stations. The first is the land of Goshen, where Joseph's brothers leave their children and their herds (Gen 50:8). The second stop is a place that seems to be located in the Egyptian-Canaanite border region. The site is called Goren-Atad ("the threshing floor of Atad", Gen 50:10–11) or Abel-mizraim ("mourning of Egypt" or "brook of Egypt", Gen 50:11). The toponyms are unique in the Hebrew Bible.<sup>85</sup> If the toponym Abel-mizraim has some connection<sup>86</sup> to the "brook of Egypt" at the southern border of Canaan (cf. Num 34:5; Josh 15:4),<sup>87</sup> the place is imagined to be on the normal route from Egypt to Canaan, the so-called way of Horus along the northern shore of the Sinai peninsula and the Mediterranean coast of Palestine.<sup>88</sup> It means that there is no detour through the wilderness or through the region east of the Jordan as in the Moses story.

The sole indication of a connection to the Moses story is the statement that Goren-Atad/Abel-mizraim is "beyond the Jordan" בעבר הירדן (Gen 50:10–11). The formula is often used in the book of Numbers and in Deuteronomy.<sup>89</sup> In Gen 50, the phrase presumably describes the land west of the Jordan, i.e., the land of Canaan.<sup>90</sup> Joseph, his relatives and the dead Jacob move freely, without any obstacle, from Egypt into the land of Canaan. In this respect, the "exodus story" of Gen 50 is a continuation of the toponymic construction of the entire Joseph novella. At the beginning, Joseph comes as a slave from Canaan (cf. Gen 37:1) into Egypt (Gen 37:25, 28). His brothers travel three times unhindered from Canaan into Egypt (and back) until they settle down in the land of Goshen. At the end, Joseph and his brethren undertake the journey once more as free men from one country to the other and back. The story in Gen 50:1–14 is structured by the use of the verbs עלה ("to go up") and שוב ("to come back"). Joseph cites Jacob's request to go up into the land of Canaan; at the same time, Joseph asserts that he himself will come back (Gen 50:5). Pharaoh allows them to go up (v. 6) and they go (עלה) twice

<sup>85</sup> JERICKE, *Ortsangaben*, 242–243.

<sup>86</sup> It has at least a sort of homonymous permeability.

<sup>87</sup> The "brook of Egypt" can be identified with *Wādī Ġazze* north of Rafia or with *Wādī el-'Arīš* running south of Rafia; cf. JERICKE, *Ortsangaben*, 143–145.

<sup>88</sup> OREN, 'Way of Horus'; JERICKE, *Ortsangaben*, 152–153. It is the "way of the land of the Philistines" (Exod 13:17). In post-biblical times, the route was called *via maris*.

<sup>89</sup> The meaning is ambiguous. "Beyond the Jordan" can describe the region to the east or to the west of the river Jordan; cf. JERICKE, 'Ort'.

<sup>90</sup> JERICKE, *Ortsangaben*, 85–87.

in v. 7). In the end, Joseph comes back together with his brothers “who had gone up with him” (Gen 50:14). There is a constant “to and fro” between Egypt and Canaan.<sup>91</sup>

The story in Gen 50:1–14 shows some analogies to the story of the alternative exodus of Abraham and Sarah (Gen 12:10–13:2). In both cases, Egyptian officials escort the ancestral families. However, whereas Gen 12:20 mentions only the pharaoh’s “men”, in Gen 50 nearly the whole royal court is listed (Gen 50:7), including chariots and horsemen (v. 9). Together, they perform “a very great and sorrowful lamentation” at Goren-Atad/Abel-mizraim (Gen 50:10). The major difference between Gen 12 and Gen 50 is that the alternative exodus in Gen 50 concerns Jacob/Israel alone.<sup>92</sup> In Gen 12, all members of Abraham’s family abandon Egypt forever, while in Gen 50 it is only the dead Jacob/Israel who rests in Canaan, where he is buried in the family tomb at Machpelah (Gen 50:13). His sons come back to Egypt (Gen 50:14).<sup>93</sup> In this respect, Gen 50:1–14 corresponds to the narrative aim of the Joseph novella, opting for a lasting residency in the Egyptian diaspora.

In light of the alternative exodus story in Gen 50:1–14, one should reinterpret Gen 50:24–25. The cross-references between Gen 48:21, 50:5 and 50:24 presented above suggest that Joseph’s words are meant in the sense of an action similar to Jacob’s funerary cortège described in Gen 50:1–14. It is difficult to imagine that Gen 50:24–25 refer to an exodus like that of the Israelites under Moses, so long-standing, intricate, dangerous and full of obstacles. Thus, nearly all of Gen 50 presents the story of an alternative exodus without the difficulties of the later exodus of the Israelites.

The early reception in post-biblical times tries to establish a closer link between the traditions of Gen 50 and the Moses story or the subsequent conquest narratives in the book of Joshua. Eusebius of Caesarea (early 4<sup>th</sup> century C.E.) localizes the place of the funeral service, named Goren-Atad or Abel-mizraim in Gen 50:10–11 and Ἰακώβ Ἀτάδ by Eusebius himself (Ono-

---

<sup>91</sup> The close connection of עֵלָה and שׁוּב underscores the character of the Joseph novella as a diaspora novella encouraging the Jews of Persian or Hellenistic times to live in Egypt. On the characterization of the Joseph novella as a diaspora novella see now RÖMER, ‘Joseph Story’, with older bibliographic references; cf. also GREIFENHAGEN, ‘Pentateuch’.

<sup>92</sup> If one includes the initial reference to Canaan (Gen 50:5), then the topographic setting in Gen 50 depicts both an *eisodus* into Egypt and an exodus from there; cf. JERICKE, *Ortsangaben*, 246–248.

<sup>93</sup> SCHMID, ‘Josephsgeschichte’, 103–104, has argued that the verse, together with v. 7b and v. 8b, should be regarded as a secondary addition to an originally independent pre-Priestly Joseph story. WÖHRLE, *Fremdlinge*, 129–130, demonstrates that such an assumption is not necessary; cf. JERICKE, *Ortsangaben*, 256–257; see also the discussion of the status of Gen 50:14 by GERTZ, ‘Transition’, 77–79, and BERNER, *Exoduserzählung*, 18–20.

masticon 8:17–19), near Jericho at the bank of the Jordan River.<sup>94</sup> He equates the place with Beth-hoglah (Βηθαγλα), a site that is considered to be located on the western bank of the Jordan near the confluence of the river into the Dead Sea (Josh 15:6; 18:19, 21).<sup>95</sup> The mosaic map of Madaba shows the same location of Ἰαλὼν Ἀτάθ ἢ νῦν Βηθαγλα (6/7<sup>th</sup> century C.E.).<sup>96</sup> Thus, both documents from Byzantine times transfer the location of Gen 50 to the area where the Israelites under Joshua crossed the Jordan (Josh 1–5). Eusebius was possibly aware of the translocation, since he locates Beth-hoglah in Josh 15:6 between Eleutheropolis and Gaza, not far from the Mediterranean coast (Onomasticon 48:18–20).<sup>97</sup> It is in this region where the place mentioned in Gen 50:10–11 can be assumed to be. Although Eusebius' translocations could be interpreted as examples of confusion of biblical traditions, they very closely combine the “original” location of Gen 50:10–11 and the area of the conquest narratives in the book of Joshua. Thus, both the Onomasticon of Eusebius and the mosaic map of Madaba demonstrate that in early Christian times the story of Gen 50 was understood as a real exodus- and conquest narrative.

## F. Conclusion

The exodus materials in the book of Genesis are mainly found in the Abraham story and in the Joseph novella. There are two alternative exodus stories: the first story of the endangered ancestress (Gen 12:10–13:2) and the story of Jacob's funeral cortège (Gen 50:1–14). Their alternative character is determined by the fact that Israel's ancestors come from Egypt into Canaan with the active help of the pharaoh and without any obstacle, in contrast to the intricate exodus of the later Israelites under Moses. There are also other variants of the exodus theme: a “subversive” exodus story (Gen 14) and an atypical exodus narrative (Gen 16). Furthermore, several isolated cross-references seem to construct verbal links between the ancestral narratives and the exodus story: the “four hundred years” and the reference to the “fourth generation” in Gen 15, some place names in the Joseph novella and some phrases in Gen 50:24–25. Nevertheless, usually these cross-references are slightly modified in the book of Genesis. Therefore, one can conclude that the

<sup>94</sup> Cf. NOTLEY/SAFRAI, *Place Names*, 9–10, no. 11 (“three miles from Jericho and about two miles from the Jordan”).

<sup>95</sup> Presumably near the spring of 'Ain Ḥaglā (Palestine Grid 1985.1373); cf. KELLERMANN et al., ‘Palästina’; JERICKE/SCHMITT, ‘Palästina’.

<sup>96</sup> DONNER, *Mosaic Map*, 46.

<sup>97</sup> At a village named Agla (cf. NOTLEY/SAFRAI, *Place Names*, 50, no. 221). The place can be found at Ḥirbet 'Aḡlān (Palestine Grid 1238.1089); cf. JERICKE/SCHMITT, ‘Palästina’.

authors of the ancestral narratives had their own conceptions of an exodus from Egypt into Canaan. They used selective narrative elements from the Moses story but constructed new and “alternative” tales, in contrast to the Moses story and the conquest traditions of the book of Joshua. In particular, the authors of Gen 11:27–50:26 present the idea of a peaceful exodus in strong cooperation with the court of the pharaoh. Whereas the cooperation between Abraham and “his” pharaoh ends with his return to Canaan, the Joseph novella opts for both a peaceful exodus and a long-standing residency in Egypt.<sup>98</sup>

---

<sup>98</sup> These variations point to different dates of origin for the Abraham story and the Joseph novella; cf. my proposals concerning the Abraham story (Persian period) and the Joseph novella (Hellenistic) in JERICKE, *Ortsangaben*, 178–179, 258–259.