

Genesis 5: Priestly Redaction, Composition, or Source?

Jan Christian Gertz

1. Introduction

Studies of the origins and development of the Pentateuch consider that the difference between the Priestly and non-Priestly texts are a secure minimum result of a debate in scholarship that is characterized by large differences.¹ In fact, Theodor Nöldeke's almost 150-year-old delineation of what belongs to the Priestly texts in a broad sense enjoys general agreement, although much controversy remains in discussions over the

The (German edition of this) paper was prepared while I was part of the group "Convergence and Divergence in Pentateuchal Theory" at the Israel Institute for Advanced Studies in Jerusalem, whom I would like to thank for their generous support. For my analysis of the entire Primeval History, see now Jan Christian Gertz, *Das erste Buch Mose (Genesis): Die Urgeschichte Gen 1-11*, 2nd ed., ATD 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2021).

1. See only the authors of the present volume: Erhard Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, BZAW 189 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1990), 221; Christoph Levin, *Der Jahwist*, FRLANT 157 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 437 (with less emphasis); Jan Christian Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung: Untersuchungen zur Endredaktion des Pentateuch*, FRLANT 186 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 9-10; Christophe Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus*, FAT 2/25 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 20; Eckart Otto, "Forschungen zur Priesterschrift," *TRu* 62 (1997): 1-2; Thomas Römer, "The Exodus Narrative according to the Priestly Document," in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*, ed. Sarah Shectman and Joel S. Baden, ATANT 95 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009), 157-58; rather casually in Christoph Berner, *Die Exoduserzählung*, FAT 7 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 2.

problems' details.² Though the consensus over the basic delineation of the Priestly texts is widespread, the internal literary differentiations within the Priestly texts are all the more contested. There is, admittedly, a principle agreement over the fact that the Priestly texts do not come from one author and that they have a specific history of development. Nevertheless, the arguments for differentiation in individual cases are based less on linguistic or literary-critical arguments that can gain a consensus than on considerations of plausibility, which are based on overarching theses about the Priestly texts and the literary character of the Priestly *Kernbestand* (core collection). And this is where the consensus ends. The thesis that a more or less strongly reduced *Kernbestand* formed a previously independent Priestly literary work still appears to have the majority support among scholars.³ However, the scholars who begin with an extensive *Kernbestand* including text passages that, without question, presuppose a connection with the non-Priestly texts—and then consider the Priestly texts from the start to be redactional- or compositional layers—are equally significant and persistent.⁴

In taking up the discussion anew here, it is to be affirmed from the outset that the thesis of an originally independent Priestly literary work has been remarkably stable. It has been maintained as a feature in various forms of the Documentary Hypotheses as well as in most forms of the Supplementary Hypothesis and various combination models—and thus

2. Theodor Nöldeke, "Die s. g. Grundschrift des Pentateuchs," in *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testaments* (Kiel: Schwers'sche Buchhandlung, 1869), 1–144.

3. See from "the cloud of witnesses": Thomas Pola, *Die ursprüngliche Priesterschrift: Beobachtungen zur Literarkritik und Traditionsgeschichte von PG*, WMANT 70 (Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener Verlag, 1995); Reinhard Gregor Kratz, *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments: Grundwissen der Bibelkritik*, UTB 2157 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 224–48; Jan Christian Gertz, "Tora und Vordere Propheten," in *Grundinformation Altes Testament: Eine Einführung in Literatur, Religion, und Geschichte des Alten Testaments*, ed. Jan Christian Gertz et al., 6th ed., UTB 2745 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019), 237–48, Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*.

4. To mention a few: Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), 293–25; John Van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition* (New Haven, 1975), 279–95; Rolf Rendtorff, *Das Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch*, BZAW 147 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1977), 112–42; Erhard Blum, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte*, WMANT 57 (Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener Verlag, 1984); Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*; Berner, *Die Exoduserzählung*.

in all models discussed in pentateuchal studies apart from in the Fragmentary Hypothesis, which is hardly consistently applied anyway. This goes without saying for the beginning of historical-critical research on the formation of the Pentateuch. This stage of research was characterized by the search for documents used by Moses or other biblical historians, and the material that later became known as the Priestly document or Priestly code, the “*Elohim* epic,” belongs to the first results of this investigation. The thesis that the Priestly texts belong to an originally independent literary work has only been so broadly accepted because these texts were at the same time characterized as a *Grundschrift* of the Pentateuch. Already Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette had described what later became known as the Priestly document as “a type of epic poem,” which is supplemented by Jehowistic sections and which represented the “foundation” of Genesis and the beginning of Exodus.⁵ As far as I know, it was characterized as the *Grundschrift* of the Hexateuch for the first time by Friedrich Tuch in his commentary on Genesis.⁶ Tuch himself advocated for a Supplementary Hypothesis. The presentation of a *Grundschrift* corresponding to this model also survived through the emergence and prevailing of the New Documentary Hypothesis. It was reformulated redaction-critically, in that this Priestly document (*Priesterschrift*)—as it has been called since Abraham Kuenen—was seen to have served as the literary foundation for the redactor connecting the pentateuchal sources.⁷ This widely accepted view, however, has not remained without opposition. So, for example, Christoph

5. Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette, *Kritik der Mosaischen Geschichte*, vol. 2 of *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Halle: Schimmelpfennig, 1807), 28–29.

6. Friedrich Tuch, *Kommentar über die Genesis* (Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1838), LI, with reference to Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette and Heinrich Ewald, states, “therefore we call it the *Grundschrift*—because the plan and organization (viz. of the Pentateuch) are conditioned on it, the legislative parts were taken from it, and in the historical parts the basic principles, and in larger parts also the whole realization, belong to it alone.”

7. Abraham Kuenen, “Dina en Sichem,” *TT* 14 (1880): 257–81, who was the first to use the siglum P. Hermann Hupfeld (*Die Quellen der Genesis und die Art ihrer Zusammensetzung* [Berlin: Wiegandt & Grieben, 1853]), in his division of the material into two *Elohistic* works, speaks of the “*elohistic Urschrift*,” which is usually called the “*Elohim* document” or “*Grundschrift*” (43). See primarily Martin Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1948), 11, and already Julius Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, 4th ed. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963), 15; Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 6th ed. (Berlin: Reimer, 1905), 330, “it is as if P were the red thread on which the pearls of JE are strung.”

Levin assesses the situation as follows, with view to the structure of the present form of the patriarchal narratives: "In the conceptualization of the Priestly document as a '*Grundschrift*,' the New Documentary Hypothesis carried over a relic from the older Documentary Hypothesis, which is out of place due to the late dating of the Priestly document."⁸ Can the same be argued for the presumption of a previously independent Priestly literary work? The early positions on the late dating of the Priestly texts, among which also Karl Heinrich Graf's assessment belongs, show that this question is not far-fetched: "the so-called *Grundschrift* of the Pentateuch is not the foundation of the narrative of the Pentateuch, but it rather consists of additions added later to the 'Jahwistic' work."⁹

2. Arguments against an Originally Independent Priestly Literary Work Based on the Example of Genesis 1–11

We will utilize a text from the biblical Primeval History to test Graf's thesis of a Priestly redactional layer that would have had considerable redactional portions of its own. Therein the discussion returns to a certain extent back to its beginnings.¹⁰ In this section of text, the notoriously difficult but significant question of internal differentiation of layers within the Priestly texts, which has important consequences for the overall model, only plays a subordinate role. Since the thesis of a previously independent Priestly literary work is surprisingly persistent, so also do the arguments for and against this thesis persevere across different models. I will therefore begin with an extensive criticism of the Supplementary Hypothesis as advocated by Tuch:

8. Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 438 n. 12. In return, Levin however establishes his Jahwist as a new *Grundschrift* (cf. 151 [for Gen 12–50], 315 [for Gen 50–Exod 6], 436 and 438 [for the overall outline]).

9. Karl Heinrich Graf, "Die s. g. Grundschrift des Pentateuchs," in *Archiv für wissenschaftliche Erforschung des Alten Testaments*, ed. Adalbert Merx, vol. 1 (Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1869), 474.

10. According to Eckart Otto, a deficiency in pentateuchal research results from the fact that it always begins from Genesis, but the starting points of research need not be played off against one another—provided that it is remembered that the results in the individual books of the Pentateuch are quite different; cf. Eckart Otto, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch: Studien zur Literaturgeschichte von Pentateuch und Hexateuch im Lichte des Deuteronomiumrahmens*, FAT 30 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), VII.

If one compares however the texts assigned to the *Grundschrift*, then after the removal of the texts derived from a supplementer, the “original plan and coherence” [viz. as proposed by Tuch] is often completely missed. It is an erroneous assertion (by Tuch) to say that only the supplementer goes back partially to his own document, and partially to the *Grundschrift*, and presupposes its existence, whereas the *Grundschrift* only refers back to itself. On the contrary, also the narratives of the *Grundschrift* frequently refer back to sections of the supplementer, necessarily presupposing them to be understood themselves; without them the book would have gaps, would be without a plan, and would be disjointed and incomprehensible. The critics have not succeeded in proving that the *Grundschrift* is a coherent connected whole, despite the abundant and hackneyed palliative medicine like the assumptions of interpolations and later editing of certain passages.¹¹

The quote comes from an *Introduction to the Old Testament* by Karl Friedrich Keil that is concerned with proving the “unity and authenticity” of the Old Testament writings. For Keil, Tuch’s Supplementary Hypothesis epitomized rationalistic biblical criticism. As for the “gaps” of the reconstructed *Grundschrift* in the area of the Primeval History, he accounts for the first gap with the seamless transition from Gen 2:3 to the toledot of Adam in Gen 5 as follows:

without the fall the corruption of all flesh and the whole world (Gen 6:11, 13) would be a mystery, because God had created everything good and very good (1:9, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31), and even the origins of the Theocracy would be incomprehensible.¹²

11. Carl Friedrich Keil, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen und apokryphischen Schriften des Alten Testaments*, 2nd ed. (Frankfurt: Heyder & Zimmer, 1859), 64, my translation (with reference to the quotation from Tuch’s commentary on Genesis noted above and a chart listing the differences between the *Grundschrift* and the supplementary layer according to Tuch’s commentary). In the third edition of the book Keil refrains from a detailed examination of Tuch’s Supplementary Hypothesis. Instead, he addresses in more detail the New Documentary Hypothesis and the emerging of a late dating of the Priestly texts by Vatke and Graf. Keil concludes his overview of the history of research with the remark that the “much praised historical critique failed . . . to prove the post-Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch.” See Keil, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen und apokryphischen Schriften des Alten Testaments*, 3rd ed. (Frankfurt: Heyder & Zimmer, 1873), 72–94. Unless otherwise noted, subsequent references are to the second edition.

12. Keil, *Lehrbuch*, 64, with reference to Benedikt Welte, *Nachmosaisches im Pentateuch* (Karlsruhe: Herder’sche Verlagshandlung, 1841), 157–60, and Johann Heinrich

This indicates that for Keil the important Christian doctrine of the fall belongs to the indispensable base form of the *Grundschrift* and thus to the blueprint of the Pentateuch. The absence of the preparation for the flood narrative within the Priestly narrative that is constantly brought up in present discussions only has a subordinate role. It comes into view only in light of a further gap between Gen 5:32 and 6:9, insofar as “without 6:1–8, the universality of the corruption (also of the line of Seth) and thus the universality of the flood, are without rationale.”¹³ Keil identified references from the *Grundschrift* to sections of the Jehowistic supplementer in Gen 5:29 and Gen 5:3. The reference to the cursing of the soil at the naming of Noah in Gen 5:29 alludes to the pronouncement of punishment against Adam in Gen 3:17, and the notice regarding Adam’s son Seth presupposes the birth notice in Gen 4:25.¹⁴

The argument regarding the gaps within the *Grundschrift*, or what became the Priestly narrative thread, and the approach of a critical examination of the results of reconstructions in the mode of literary-critical crosschecking have formed a precedent. Since Graf’s late dating of the *Grundschrift* and its new characterization as a “Priestly redactional layer”¹⁵ of the Pentateuch, references to the conceptual inconsistency of the reconstructed sources are also found in works which were by no means concerned with the “origins, unity, authenticity, and trustworthiness” of the Pentateuch in the sense of Keil’s work.¹⁶ Only a few observations need

Kurtz, *Beiträge zur Vertheidigung und Begründung der Einheit des Pentateuchs*, Nachweis der Einheit von Genesis I–IV (Königsberg: Gräfe & Unzer, 1844), 69–73.

13. Keil, *Lehrbuch*, 64, with reference to Johann Heinrich Kurtz, *Die Einheit der Genesis: Ein Beitrag zur Kritik und Exegese der Genesis* (Berlin: Justus Albert Wohlgemuth, 1846), 35–36.

14. Keil, *Lehrbuch*, 66, with reference to Kurtz, *Beiträge*, 129–30, 132.

15. The expression is not found exactly stated in Graf, but is present in content (cf. Graf, “Die s. g. Grundschrift des Pentateuchs,” 475–77).

16. Graf, “Die s. g. Grundschrift des Pentateuchs,” preface. On the argument regarding the missing rationale for the flood within an isolated Priestly writing, see Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 306–7; Rolf Rendtorff, “L’histoire biblique des origines (Gen 1–11) dans le contexte de la redaction ‘sacerdotale’ du Pentateuque,” in *Le Pentateuque en question: Les origines et la composition des cinq premiers livres de la Bible à la lumière des recherches récentes*, ed. Albert de Pury and Thomas Römer, MdB 19 (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1989), 83–94, 91; Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 280. On the assessment of the Priestly writing in Gen 1–11 as insufficient in form and content, see also Carmino Joseph de Catanzaro, *A Literary Analysis of Genesis I–XI* (MA thesis; University of Toronto, 1957). Usually the argument is made

to be added: Already Graf recognized a doublet in the immediate sequence of the toledot formulae in Gen 2:4a and 5:1–3 and argued for a redaction-critical solution, according to which a link was formed from Gen 5 back to the Priestly creation account after the interruption by the non-Priestly sections using the technique of *Wiederaufnahme*.¹⁷ According to Erhard Blum, the situation is comparable to the mention of the age of Noah and the births of his three sons at the end of the genealogy of Adam in Gen 5:32, and the repetition of this information at the beginning of the genealogy of Noah in Gen 6:10, as well as the mention of Noah's age at the time of the beginning of the flood in Gen 7:6 and 7:11.¹⁸ These verses would have followed more or less immediately after one another in an independent Priestly document. References from the Priestly texts to non-Priestly passages are recognized by Blum also in the mentions of the walking of Enoch and Noah before God in Gen 5:22, 24, insofar as these notices draw associations to the concepts of the garden of Eden narrative and the walking of Yahweh-Elohim in the garden (each with הלך in the *hithpael*).¹⁹ Also the Priestly promise of a ברית עולם in Gen 9:1–17 corresponds with the divine promise at the end of the non-Priestly composition of the flood narrative in Gen 8:21–22.²⁰ Finally, already Graf noted a point that was further developed by Sven Tengström in the sense of supporting the view of a Priestly redactional layer: the toledot formula is always used as a heading to introduce material, and therefore in Gen 2:4a it is compiled for the opening of the non-Priestly garden of Eden narrative in Gen 2:4b–7.²¹

However, this latter argument has recently been used as evidence for the thesis that the non-Priestly passages of the Primeval history represent a supplement to the Priestly *Grundschrift*.²² A comparable ambiguity in

from the example of the dispersed Priestly passages in the Patriarchal narratives. On this, see below.

17. Graf, "Die s. g. Grundschrift des Pentateuchs," 470. See also Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 280.

18. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 280–81.

19. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 291.

20. Rendtorff, *L'histoire*, 91; cf. also Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 289–90, 293.

21. Graf, "Die s. g. Grundschrift des Pentateuchs," 470–71; Sven Tengström, *Die Toledotformel und die literarische Struktur der priesterlichen Erweiterungsschicht im Pentateuch*, ConBOT 17 (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1981).

22. See, for example, Eckart Otto, "Die Paradieserzählung Genesis 2–3: Eine nachpriesterschriftliche Lehrerzählung in ihrem religionshistorischen Kontext," in

the evaluation of the observations on textual details—shared by all models of the formation of the Pentateuch—is also to be noticed with regard to the function of the Priestly structural markers in their present contexts and the obvious tensions in the juxtaposition of Priestly and non-Priestly sections. I consider these two points only briefly here, because they do not have an important role in the discussion of Gen 5.

Already August Klostermann concluded in his foundational critique of the New Documentary Hypothesis that the Priestly texts “were composed from the outset like a frame around the underlying older texts.”²³ This assumption was based on the structure of the final form of the Pentateuch and the function of the isolated Priestly texts within it. He understood the Priestly redactor to be aligning the earlier traditions “with pious harmonizing, into the framework of a genealogical-chronological and itinerary-calendrical structure.”²⁴ Many followed him in this assessment or brought forward similar arguments.²⁵ However, Klostermann himself confessed that the evidence could also be explained from the perspective of the New Documentary Hypothesis that he was contesting, that is, in the sense of a redactional process of connecting the Priestly with the Jahwistic document. He added: “Whether these two theories are in so severe incongruity, that based on common recognition no crossing over from one to the other is possible in the favor of my view, must be judged by readers themselves.”²⁶ In any case, one must ask whether the starting observation is coherent.

‘Jedes Ding hat seine Zeit...’: Studien zur israelitischen und altorientalischen Weisheit: Festschrift für Diethelm Michel zum 65. Geburtstag, ed. Anja A. Diesel et al., BZAW 241 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1996), 167–92.

23. August Klostermann, *Der Pentateuch: Beiträge zu seinem Verständnis und zu seiner Entstehungsgeschichte* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1893), 59.

24. Klostermann, *Der Pentateuch*, 185–84 with regard to the author of the “pre-Josianic Pentateuch” in Gen 1–Num 36; Deut 31:14–34:9; Josh 1–24.

25. See de Catanzaro, *Literary Analysis of Genesis I–XI*, 25–74, 244 (with regard to the flood narrative, which according to de Catanzaro differs from the Priestly creation account in that the Priestly supplementer formulated an independent text in Gen 1:1–2:4a and placed it before the garden of Eden narrative, while in the flood narrative he worked as a supplementer); Rendtorff, *L’Histoire*, 89; Jacques Vermeylen, *La formation du Pentateuque: Bref historique de la recherche et essai de solution cohérente, pro manu scripto* (Brüssel: CETP, 1990), 99–100.

26. Klostermann, *Der Pentateuch*, 59. In view of Klostermann’s tone of voice, which is usually offended, this statement seems surprisingly irenic. It is certainly based on a quite imprecise rendering of the picture of the redactional process drawn by Wellhausen.

As in the reconstructed Priestly document, the creation account in Gen 1:1–2:3 in its current position does indeed serve as a prologue before a history of humanity introduced with the toledot formula (Gen 2:4a resp. 5:1), whose most notable characteristic is this toledot formula (cf. Gen 6:9; 10:1, 33; 11:10, 27); however, deviations from the Priestly structure are also noted. In the flood narrative, framed by a twofold prologue and epilogue (Gen 6:5–8; 8:20–22 [non-P] and 6:9–22; 9:1–17 [P]), a non-Priestly section forms the prelude, while the beginning of the toledot of Noah in Gen 6:9 only marks a new section within the flood narrative. This deviates from the usual use of the toledot formula, and it does not correspond with the other genealogical notices about Noah and his sons, with which the Priestly document marks the flood as the central event within the toledot of Noah (cf. Gen 7:6; 9:28; 10:1, 32; 11:10). On the other hand, the flood narrative ends with a Priestly section, while the non-Priestly finale in Gen 8:20–22 marks an important internal cesura. It appears that in the flood narrative, two versions with different structuring principles were combined. This finding is not favorable for the view of a classic Supplemental or *Fortschreibung* Hypothesis—regardless of whether the Priestly or non-Priestly materials are understood to have the primary position.²⁷

With regard to the tensions in the juxtaposition of obviously parallel traditions, these have always been the strongest arguments for the thesis of a redactional combination of originally independent literary works. This applies particularly for the Primeval history, since here the “non-Priestly

27. For a detailed statement, see Jan Christian Gertz, “Beobachtungen zum literarischen Charakter und zum geistesgeschichtlichen Ort der nichtpriesterschriftlichen Sintfluterzählung,” in *Auf dem Weg zur Endgestalt von Genesis bis II Regum: Festschrift Hans-Christoph Schmitt*, ed. Martin Beck and Ulrike Schorn, BZAW 370 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2006), 41–57, in dispute with the thesis that the non-Priestly texts of the flood narrative are a redactional supplement to the Priestly account. On the renewed interest in the thesis first advanced by Tuch (*Kommentar über die Genesis*, LXVII, 137–95), cf. Jean Louis Ska, “The Story of the Flood: A Priestly Writer and Some Later Editorial Fragments,” in *The Exegesis of the Pentateuch: Exegetical Studies and Basic Questions*, FAT 66 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 1–22; Erich Bosshard-Nepustil, *Vor uns die Sintflut: Studien zu Text, Kontexten und Rezeption der Fluterzählung Genesis 6–9*, BWANT 165 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2005); Andreas Schüle, *Der Prolog der hebräischen Bibel: Der literar- und theologiegeschichtliche Diskurs der Urgeschichte* (Gen 1–11), ATANT 86 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2006), 247–301; Martin Arneith, *Durch Adams Fall ist ganz verderbt ...: Studien zur Entstehung der alttestamentlichen Urgeschichte*, FRLANT 217 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 169–200.

and Priestly traditions [evince] comparable content.”²⁸ In the context of the Documentary Hypothesis, the “discontinuous composition” (*diskontinuierliche Fügung*, Blum) and remaining tensions can be explained usually by proposing that the redaction was conservative in the preservation of material. Also, one must strongly distinguish between the critical view of an analysis oriented at the history of origins and development and the understanding of the text that begins with the concept of redaction and is practiced over centuries. Such a redaction, which perceives the texts in a complementary and harmonizing way, can combine them into a new unity.

It is likely that a pure redactional layer would have had more freedom for literary design and correspondingly would leave behind less tensions in the text in comparison to a process of redactional combination of preceding texts, but this view can also be contested. Thus Paul Volz, in his refutation of the thesis of an originally independent Priestly document, considered the proposal as problematic that two versions of the flood narrative have been combined, because too many contradictions were left standing in the text.²⁹ Volz explains the literary record with a theory of a redaction of the non-Priestly flood narrative in the spirit of Gen 1 for a “liturgical usage in New Year’s liturgy.” Genesis 1 and the flood narrative, which had been edited for this purpose, were read together at the New Year’s festival. This redaction led to three changes: the flood became a “cosmic event, the destruction of the world ... a return to chaos”; chronological data was added, which was connected with the liturgical sequence; and the number of animals was corrected, with a view to the pending cultic legislation. Volz does not present a detailed analysis of the text. Instead, he confesses:

The manner of redaction and the way it was carried out is no longer apparent to us in all its details. One can ask for example, why the redactor did not carry out the tendential corrections (time length, number of animals) so consistently that the original data (40 days, 7 and 2 etc.) was completely removed. However, one may presume that the original wording was fixed at the time of the redactor, and that he was not able to completely abandon it. Such questions of detail are not the decisive issue, but rather the thesis that an independent P Flood narrative did not

28. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 279, who correctly notes in this context also the “unique position of the Primeval history in the history of research” (278).

29. Paul Volz, “Anhang: P ist kein Erzähler,” in *Der Elohist als Erzähler: Ein Irrweg der Pentateuchkritik an der Genesis erläutert*, ed. Paul Volz and William Rudolph, BZAW 64 (Gießen: Töpelmann, 1933), 140–41 (the following citations also from there).

exist; there was only the original single [non-Priestly] narrative that was edited over [by P].

Thus, according to Volz, a redaction that edits a *Vorlage* would have much greater tolerance for the tensions that come to be in the present context of the text than a redaction that connects two previously independent literary works. This premise is not persuasive. If the thesis of an originally independent Priestly literary work is to be rejected, in any case the view that the Priestly redaction would also have incorporated its own traditional material in the flood narrative with its redaction of the non-Priestly tradition³⁰ is more plausible than the claim of a pure Supplementary Hypothesis.

3. Evaluation of the Arguments with regard to Genesis 5

Some of the arguments presented here have already been considered in passing. In the following we will consider the textual details of Gen 5 and their evaluation. The reference to the association from the walking of Enoch and Noah before God to the scenery of the garden of Eden has a rather dec-

30. A corresponding approach which seeks to combine the insights of the Documentary and the Supplementary Hypothesis has been proposed by Blum with his thesis of a "Priestly Compositional layer." On this, see Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 281–85 (on the flood) and 333–60 (on the model and its anchoring in the history of institutions). Blum speaks of the Pentateuch as a "singular composition-structure" (cf. the critical objections by Konrad Schmid, "Der Abschluss der Tora als exegetisches und historisches Problem," in *Schriftgelehrte Traditionsliteratur*, FAT 77 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011], 177–78), which is solely to be explained as the result of external influences, namely, the pressure to form an inner-Judean consensus imposed by the Persian government. See Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 358, 360; Blum, "Esra, die Mosetora und die persische Politik," in *Religion und Religionskontakte im Zeitalter der Achämeniden*, ed. Reinard G. Kratz, VGT 22 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2001), 235–46. In accordance with Blum, hypotheses on the formation of the Pentateuch, which assume the compilation of highly profiled literary works or even just blocks of compositions, must determine the historical circumstances of this redactional process, which differs clearly from the scholarly activity of scribes—regardless the discussion about the so-called imperial authorization of the Torah (see on this, the contributions in James W. Watts, ed., *Persia and the Torah: The Theory of the Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch*, SymS 17 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2001]; as well as Konrad Schmid, "Persische Reichsautorisation und Tora," *TRU* 71 [2006]: 494–506; and most recently, Kyong-jin Lee, *The Authority and Authorization of Torah in the Persian Period*, CBET 64 [Leuven: Peeters, 2011]).

orative character. The phrase הלך *hithpael* + NN + את האלהים that occurs only in Gen 5:22, 24; 6:9 can be derived also from the Priestly occurrences of the phrase הלך *hithpael* + (אלהים/יהוה) לפני (Gen 17:1; cf. 1 Sam 2:30), whereas the formulation with את האלהים in Gen 5 and 6 expresses a special nearness to God in the time before the flood.³¹ A derivation of Gen 5:22, 24; 6:9 from Gen 3:8 is thus not necessary. More important, however, are the observations on doublets within the isolated Priestly texts and the question of a rationale for the flood and the return to chaos.

3.1. On the Text Sequence of Genesis 2:3–4a and 5:1–3

I begin with the issue of the toledot of Adam in Gen 5 following directly after the Priestly creation account that is considered problematic. Much depends on the redaction-critical assessment of the toledot formula in Gen 2:4a. Up to the printed image of the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, which differs from the *Codex Leningradensis* on this point,³² it has become customary to see Gen 2:4a as a subscript of the Priestly creation account. In favor of this view of division of the text, it is noted following initial indications by Wilhelm Friedrich Hezel and Werner Carl Ludwig Ziegler that the toledot formula belongs to the characteristic markers of P and that it clearly relates to the preceding text, while the subsequent text is clearly of post-Priestly origins.³³ The immediate sequence of the two toledot formulae, as a concluding notice (Gen 2:4a) and a heading (Gen 5:1–3), could be understood within an originally independent Priestly literary work as a structuring marker,³⁴ which would hardly satisfy the aesthetic sense of the

31. See most recently Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 62–63, with reference to Gerhard von Rad, *Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch untersucht und theologisch bewertet*, BWANT 65 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934), 171 n. 6; Erich Zenger, *Gottes Bogen in den Wolken*, SBS 112, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1987), 107 n. 17; Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 293.

32. The Leningrad Codex leaves an empty line between Gen 2:3 and Gen 2:4. Cf. also the *Biblia Hebraica Quinta*, which no longer suggests a separation within Gen 2:4.

33. Wilhelm Friedrich Hezel, *Ueber die Quellen der Mosaischen Urgeschichte* (Lemgo: Meyer, 1780), 25; Werner Carl Ludwig Ziegler, “Kritik über den Artikel von der Schöpfung nach unserer gewöhnlichen Dogmatik,” *Magazin für Religionsphilosophie, Exegese und Kirchengeschichte*, ed. Heinrich Philipp Conrad Henke, vol. 2 (Helmstedt: Fleckeisen, 1794), 13, 50.

34. See Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*, 17 (with n. 41); Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972), 22;

critics of this thesis. The observation that the toledot formula is elsewhere exclusively found as a heading is more significant.³⁵ Moreover, the Priestly creation account has its own summary in Gen 2:3 that corresponds with Gen 1:1. The toledot formula in Gen 2:4a is therefore to be considered as the heading to the following garden of Eden narrative.³⁶ As such, it forms a bridge between the Priestly creation account and the garden of Eden narrative by taking up the content and formulations of the preceding text section and at the same time anticipating what is to follow.³⁷

But how are the details to be interpreted from a redaction-historical perspective?

There is a widespread presumption that Gen 2:4a originally stood before Gen 1:1 in an independent Priestly Primeval History and was only secondarily placed in its current location as a connection between the creation account and the garden of Eden narrative as a redactional transition and heading.³⁸ Yet this is hardly plausible, because Gen 1:1 already constitutes a full heading, and by suggesting that there was an additional heading before it one would create a new problem. It is likely, therefore, that Gen 2:4a was already composed as a redactional transition to the garden of Eden narrative. We will not look further at the redaction-historical conditions within the prelude of the garden of Eden narrative in Gen 2:4–7 at this point.³⁹ In any case, it is certain that the toledot formulae in Gen 2:4a and 5:1 never followed one another within a previously independent

Odil Hannes Steck, *Der Schöpfungsbericht der Priesterschrift*, FRLANT 115, 2nd ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 242–43; Zenger, *Gottes Bogen in den Wolken*, 143; Peter Weimar, “Die Toledotformel in der priesterschriftlichen Geschichtsdarstellung,” in *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, FAT 56 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 163–64, n. 43; Pola, *Die ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, 82 n. 134, 343 n. 144; Kratz, *Komposition*, 230, 233–35; Arneht, *Fall*, 24–27.

35. Gen 5:1; 6:9; 10:1; 11:10, 27; 25:12, 19; 36:1, 9; 37:2. Cf. David Carr, “Βίβλος γενέσεως Revisited: A Synchronic Analysis of Patterns in Genesis as Part of the Torah,” *ZAW* 110 (1998): 164–65.

36. See above.

37. See Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, 320.

38. So most recently Markus Witte, *Die biblische Urgeschichte: Redaktions- und theologiegeschichtliche Beobachtungen zu Genesis 1,1–11,26*, BZAW 265 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1998), 55 (with n. 14, with additional references).

39. See Jan Christian Gertz, “The Formation of the Primeval History,” in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, ed. Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David L. Petersen, VTSup 152 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 115–18.

Priestly literary work. Additionally, there are strong indications that both notices are not from the same author. The unique mention of the “Book of the Toledot” in Gen 5:1 suggests that the series of toledot originally began with Adam. The LXX already recognized a problem here and therefore inserted the ἡ βίβλος from Gen 5:1 into 2:4a. Also, it should not be overlooked that the toledot formula in a Priestly context otherwise never portrays the origins account of something mentioned in the genitive construct but always treats the subsequent family history of a certain person. In short, the toledot formula in Gen 2:4a is redactional, and it never was part of a previously independent literary work.

By excluding Gen 2:4a, the complaints of an ill-fitting text-sequence within an independent Priestly document are not fully invalidated, insofar as Gen 5:1–3 immediately following on Gen 1:1–2:3 would repeat “awkwardly that which was developed broadly a few lines before.”⁴⁰ Some advocates of a previously independent Priestly literary work share this assessment and assign the allegedly disruptive repetitions from Gen 1:27–28 in 5:1b–2 to the final redaction of the Pentateuch or at least post-Priestly glosses.⁴¹ The literary-critical differentiation is then grounded in the observation that in Gen 5:1a, 3 אָדָם is used as a proper name and thus in a way that corresponds to the scheme of the subsequent genealogy. By contrast, 5:1b–2 uses the term as a species label for “humanity,” which would contradict the other schema and could result from the *Wiederaufnahme* of Gen 1:27–28. However, the consideration of either Gen 5:1b–2 or 5:1–3 as a *Wiederaufnahme*, depending on which model is chosen, overlooks the compositional function of the verses, which lead from the creation of the species of humans as the image of God (Gen 5:1b; cf. 1:26a, 27a), their sexual differentiation (Gen 5:2b; cf. 1:27b), and creator’s blessing (Gen 5:2b; cf. 1:28) to the history of individual humans (Gen 5:1a) in whom the blessing is realized (Gen 5:3). The text describes the process

40. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 280.

41. Heinrich Holzinger, *Genesis*, KHC 1 (Freiburg: Mohr, 1898), 58–59; Weimar, *Toledotformel*, 165–71; Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 99–100; Horst Seebass, *Genesis I: Urgeschichte (1:1–11:26)* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1996), 180. Considerations according to which P has taken up an earlier toledot book and integrated it into his work (Gen 5:1–32*; 10:1–32*; 11:10; 26:27–32*) are on a different redaction- and tradition-historical level. See among others Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*, 17 (with n.41); Steck, *Der Schöpfungsbericht der Priesterschrift*, 145; David Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis: Historical and Literary Approaches* (Louisville: John Knox, 1996), 71–73.

of individuation, which is essential for the development of humanity, in which the naming of the species by God (Gen 5:2b) corresponds to the naming of Seth by Adam (Gen 5:3b). Likewise, the remark that deviates from the schema, that Adam fathered Seth “in his likeness, according to this image” (וַיֹּלֵד בְּדַמּוֹתָיו כְּצַלְמוֹ; Gen 5:3a), points beyond Gen 5:1b to the creation of humanity in Gen 1:26–27. In a significant way the concept of fathering and giving birth takes the place of divine creation from this point on, realizing the blessing promised in Gen 1:28. The transition from the creation of humanity to the sequence of generations is carried out in the naming of the first descendant and—logically preceding that—in the birth of the subsequent generations. As part of this chain, these subsequent generations have a share in the divine image of the first human as part of the human species. At first glance, the section may give the impression of redundancy; however, in its connection with Gen 1:1–2:3 the thorough construction of the verses is obvious.⁴² As a redactional *Wiederaufnahme*

42. See also Witte, *Die biblische Urgeschichte*, 123–26. It is often claimed, that the use of בַּיּוֹם + inf. cstr. in Gen 5:1a links back to the non-Priestly text of Gen 2:4b (cf. among others Weimar, *Toledotformel*, 168 n. 56). However, the phrase is not necessarily dependent on the non-Priestly context (cf. the Priestly materials in Lev 6:13; 7:16, 36, 38; Num 6:13; 7:10; 9:15, etc.), especially since in Gen 5:1 בַּיּוֹם means a particular day, while in Gen 2:4b the term is simply used as a temporal determination for “when.” Moreover, Gen 2:4b uses the verb עָשָׂה for creation instead of בָּרָא, which also speaks against an intentional backreference. Recently Benjamin Ziemer has argued differently in “Erklärung der Zahlen von Gen 5 aus ihrem kompositionellen Zusammenhang,” *ZAW* 121 (2009): 1–18. According to Ziemer, the end-compositional Priestly text of Gen 5:1 dates the events of Gen 3:5, 22 to the day of Gen 1:26. With reference to Ps 90:4, Ziemer understands Gen 1:26 along with the other six days of creation as “divine days” lasting thousand years each. If Gen 2:17 announces death to the one who transgresses the prohibition to eat from the tree of knowledge, then in the end-compositional context this is to be referred to the (sixth) day as a “divine day.” According to Ziemer this explanation solves the problem that Adam survives the day of transgressing the prohibition (according to human-astronomical time calculations). The events in the garden and with Cain and Abel as well as the remaining lifetime of Adam all occurred during the day of the creation of humanity that lasts one-thousand years, with Adam dying toward the end of the day at the age of 930. This harmonizing reading is found already in the early Jewish literature (cf. Jub. 4.30; Ber. Rab. 22:1). However, it does hardly correspond to the original intentions of the end-compositional text of Gen 1–5 and its *Vorlagen*: The formulation of Ps 90:4 does not develop a concept of a “divine day,” but mentions the shortest (a “night watch”) and longest (“thousand years”) conceivable periods of time, to describe God’s external perspective on the course of created time. Likewise, Gen 1 is not calculating time with “divine

after Gen 2–4, Gen 5:1–3 or 5:1b–2 would be clearly underestimated. This is particularly the case because within a redactional passage formulated in light of the non-Priestly texts the transition to Adam and his descendants would come too late. After all, Adam already appeared as a personal name (Gen 4:25), and events involving him and his descendants have already been described.⁴³ Furthermore, within a classic *Wiederaufnahme*, the thread would typically resume at the point where it had left off due to the insertion, which, in our case, would be the notice on the completion of creation with the sanctification of the seventh day.

3.2. On the Text Sequence Genesis 5:32 and 6:9–10

The toledot of Adam concludes in Gen 5:32 with the age of its last member Noah, and a remark on the begetting of his sons including their names. In the isolated Priestly document this would immediately be followed by the toledot of Noah (Gen 6:9–10), which after the heading again notes the births of the three sons Shem, Ham, and Japheth. For critics of the thesis of an originally independent Priestly literary work, this is considered a “blatant doublet ... which no source critic would tolerate in the transmitted text.”⁴⁴ Together with a few suspicious formulations, this assessment has led Christoph Levin to remove the remark about the birth of Noah’s sons in Gen 5:32 from the Priestly text.⁴⁵ The literary-critical reasons used

days,” which is seen from the fact that the establishment of the categories of time on the first day of creation results from the distinction between light/day and darkness/night. Only the combination of both biblical texts that is not indicated anywhere in the Priestly creation account leads to the conception of a “divine day” that has been read into the text of Gen 1–5 since early Jewish interpretation. See already Hermann Gunkel, *Genesis*, HKAT 1.1, 9th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 106.

43. Compare also Witte, *Die biblische Urgeschichte*, 125–26; Blum, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte*, 451–52 also notes this but explains it with the view that the “Priestly Composition” links back to a preceding toledot book. However, in that case it remains unexplained, why after the use of אָדָם as a proper name in Gen 4:25, in 5:1b–2 אָדָם is used again as an appellative, especially since precisely these verses have hardly belonged to the preceding toledot book.

44. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 280.

45. So Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 100. See for a critical discussion of this view extensively Witte, *Die biblische Urgeschichte*, 114–16 as well as Jan Christian Gertz, “Hams Sündenfall und Kanaans Erbfluch: Anmerkungen zur kompositionsgeschichtlichen Stellung von Gen 9:18–29,” in *‘Gerechtigkeit und Recht zu üben’ (Gen 18:19): Studien zur altorientalischen und biblischen Rechtsgeschichte, zur Religionsgeschichte Israels und zur*

for this are interesting for our question, because an analysis shows that the sequence of the aforementioned notices in an isolated Priestly document is by no means objectionable. The starting point for the removal of Gen 5:32a from P is the deviation from the usual genealogical schema of the Priestly writing, while for Gen 5:32b an “unwarranted . . . repetition of the subject נח”⁴⁶ is cited as a reason. Both observations are explained by the assumption that the redaction connects the Priestly thread from Gen 5:31 with a scattered fragment of a (pre-)Jahwistic genealogy in 5:32b. It is beyond debate, that the formulation ויהי + PN + בן + XY שנה varies the genealogical schema that is usually formed without בן (mostly: ויהי + PN + XY שנה). There are, however, parallels (Gen 25:20) and similarly designed formulations (Gen 7:6; 11:10; 37:2) within Priestly literature. It is hardly a coincidence that the mention of Noah’s age in the Priestly flood narrative (Gen 7:6) is among these parallels. The picture becomes clear when Gen 5:32 is seen in connection with the toledot of Noah in Gen 6:9–10, the next text assigned to P. The example of a concluding formulation of one toledot that already points to the following toledot is seen in Gen 11:26 and 11:27. In view of the extensive elaboration of the toledot of Noah by the flood narrative, such an anticipation is not unusual and is even to be expected. Seen in connection with the fourfold mention of Noah in Gen 6:9–10, the repetition of his name in Gen 5:32b is no longer surprising. In any case, it is more important for the understanding of the supposed doublet that here at its particular place in the toledot the necessary segmenting of the genealogy of Noah carries forth in three lines with a view to the coming events.⁴⁷ Accordingly, after the birth of his firstborn, Noah’s remaining lifespan is not mentioned. This is given only at the conclusion of the toledot of Noah in Gen 9:28–29. In summary, the sequence of the toledot of Adam and Noah is deliberate, the *prima facie* redundant style

Religionssoziologie; Festschrift für Eckart Otto zum 65. Geburtstag, ed. Rinhard Achenbach and Martin Arneht, BZAR 13 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009), 86–90.

46. Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 100.

47. See Thomas Hieke, *Die Genealogien der Genesis*, HBS 39 (Freiburg: Herder, 2004), 76. Also in this regard we can point to Gen 11:26–27, where the conclusion of the genealogy refers to the three sons of Terah (Gen 11:26), while they are mentioned again in the immediately following toledot of Terah (Gen 11:27). As with Noah, after the birth of the firstborn, reference to the births of the further sons and daughters as well as the dates for the remainder of the years of his life is missing. This latter information is added, as with Noah, at the end of the toledot as an indication over the whole lifetime (Gen 11:32).

can also be observed elsewhere, as in Gen 11:26–27 where two toledot stand in a connecting position, and the deviations from the schema can be explained by the expansion of the toledot of Noah by the flood narrative.⁴⁸

3.3. On the Question of the Transition from the Good Creation to the Corrupt World within an Isolated Priestly Document

Within an isolated Priestly thread, the creation account would be followed by the toledot of Adam and then Noah, including the flood narrative. This was seen already by Keil and his companions as an intolerable gap. It appears to me that his view is motivated by unease about a *Grundschrift* of the Pentateuch that would not contain the texts about the fall that are important for Christian doctrine. For sure, modern critics of the thesis of an originally independent Priestly work do not share this concern. Yet behind the statement that “in an isolated ‘P-thread’ the corruption of the good creation by violence (חמס) is stated (6:11–13) but is not narratively developed,”⁴⁹ there is an unstated assumption that the Priestly thread must be exactly like the non-Priestly text in its narrative sequence in order to be considered an independent literary work. However, already Erich Zenger considered this presupposition as unproven and unlikely, particularly because it is assumed that the Priestly document does not have independent narrative interests.⁵⁰ According to Zenger, the Priestly texts characterize the sin as a “structural disruption of the creation- and life-order.” That the sin understood in this way triggers God’s judgment, is one of the most prominent themes of the Priestly document. As such, P would not necessarily describe processes but would rather focus on a definition-like statement of the violence as the expression of the disruption brought about by sin (cf. Gen 6:11, 13; Exod 1:13–14). Markus Witte has taken up this thought and pointed to the fact that the prelude of the Priestly

48. In the flood narrative, the sequence of the age data of Noah in Gen 7:6 and 7:11 is discussed as a further doublet within the isolated Priestly document (cf. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 280). For the sake of completeness, this should at least be dealt with briefly: Gen 7:6 marks a new beginning, referring back to Gen 5:32 (the age of Noah) and Gen 6:17 (the announcement of the flood), whereas Gen 7:11a mentions the precise date of the beginning of the flood and is connected with the dating in Gen 8:4, 5, 13, 14. See Witte, *Die biblische Urgeschichte*, 135–36.

49. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 280, following Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 302.

50. See Zenger, *Gottes Bogen in den Wolken*, 33.

flood narrative in Gen 6:9–13 “attempts to form a contrasting image to the sevenfold **כי טוב** of the first creation account by juxtaposing the righteous Noah and the corrupt world, the fourfold use of the term **שחת** (vv. 11–13), the repeated emphasis on the fact that the whole earth is filled with violence (**חמס**, vv. 11–13), as well as with the twofold repetition of the statement that ‘all flesh’ (**כל בשר**) is corrupt in vv. 12, 13.”⁵¹

Regarding the textual evidence Witte concludes: “The section of 6:9–13 is sufficient to function as an introduction to the flood narrative based on the repeated emphasis of the universal corruption of the earth and on the direct references to 1:1–2:3*⁵²; it is not reliant on a preceding narrative of a fall.” If, on the other hand, the section were understood as a redactional link to Gen 1:1–2:3 that intends to integrate a narrative that is necessary to understand the theme of the corruption of the good creation, then in light of the effusive and redundant style the question would remain as to why allusions to Gen 2:4–4:26 and 6:1–4 are missing. Critics of the thesis of an originally independent Priestly literary work must, however, insist on a narrative introduction. For their part, they might respond to the objection that there are no allusions to the non-Priestly narratives in Gen 6:9–13, a section that is considered redactional by them, by pointing to an associative connection of Noah’s “walking with God” and the basic mood and scenery from Gen 2–3. But then again, this proposal will hardly convince opponents of the view of a Priestly redaction.

4. Text-Historical Evidence for a Flood Narrative without a Narrative Introduction?

By mutually contesting what is indispensable for an originally independent literary work or for a redactional layer as well as what is not compatible with the respective thesis, the debate boils down to plausibility judgements that are more or less convincing. The significant role given to historically-grounded expectations for a literary work in the reconstruction of the historical development of a text, especially of traditional literature, is common in historical studies and is not to be objected to. Given the condition of the source material, only in a few cases one can attain more certainty through text-historical evidence. In the final part of this contri-

51. Witte, *Die biblische Urgeschichte*, 131.

52. Witte, *Die biblische Urgeschichte*, 131.

bution, I want to consider whether this is the case in Gen 5 by discussing a thesis of Karl Budde.⁵³

The widely accepted proposal that the genealogical notes in Gen 4 and the toledot of Adam in Gen 5 are two compositions based on one common genealogy was made for the first time by Philipp Buttmann.⁵⁴ Though the non-Priestly notes in Gen 4 distinguish between a Cain- and Seth-line and regardless of small deviations in the spelling and some changes in the order, all members in both lines with the exception of the descendants of Lamech are also found in the Priestly text of Gen 5. Before evaluating this finding in terms of redaction-history, the present context must first be dealt with. The toledot formula in Gen 2:4 introduces a section that extends to 4:26. It reports the fate of both the first human couple and the first generation of their descendants. Actually, the children and grandchildren of the first human couple already belong to the toledot of Adam, which only follows in Gen 5:1. The slight anachronism, however, does not hinder a coherent reading of the present text sequence.⁵⁵ If one reads the toledot formula in 5:1 as a heading that links back with its variable elements to the immediately preceding events, then on the level of the present text the subsequent notices about Seth in Gen 5:3 and the conception of Enoch in Gen 5:6 are to be understood as references back to the concluding section of Gen 4 (compare Gen 5:3 with Gen 4:25 and Gen 5:6 with Gen 4:26). The toledot of Adam that extends to Noah in Gen 5 thus provides a direct link to the line of descendants: Adam–Seth–Enoch. For the present form of the text, the following overall model results: due to the fratricide of Cain and the violent outbreaks of Lamech, the Cainites are characterized negatively. Their genealogical line in Gen 4:17–24 is not carried forward in the present text. Instead, a new genealogical line begins in Gen 4:25 with Seth, who replaces the murdered Abel and is the third

53. Karl Budde, *Die Biblische Urgeschichte (Gen 1–12,5)* (Gießen: Ricker, 1883), 89–116. I have presented the following considerations already previously, however with different intentions and in a slightly different form, in Gertz, *Formation of the Primeval History*, 118–24. See also Martin Rösel, *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung: Studien zur Genesis-Septuaginta*, BZAW 223 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994); Seebass, *Genesis I*, 177–82. See there also for the following.

54. Phillip Buttmann, *Mythologus oder gesammelte Abhandlungen über die Sagen des Alterthums*, vol. 1 (Berlin: Mylius, 1828), 171.

55. Hieke, *Die Genealogien der Genesis*, 80–90.

son of the first human couple. He is characterized positively in contrast to the Cainites. If the toledot of Adam in Gen 5 is added into the line of descendants of Adam–Seth–Enoch in Gen 4:25–26, it presents a genealogy that no longer includes the Cainites, notwithstanding the overlaps between Gen 5 and Gen 4:17–24. Consequently, Noah as the hero of the flood narrative is not a descendant of Cain but rather stands in the line of descendants of Seth, who had taken the place of Abel, whose offering YHWH had accepted (Gen 4:4), and Enosh, during whose lifetime the worshipping of YHWH begins (Gen 4:26).⁵⁶

Additionally, Noah's family tree of the righteous is characterized by the fact that the line from Seth and Enosh to Noah leads through a series of ancestors, who all enjoyed a truly biblical lifespan and passed away peacefully before the flood. Two exceptions emphasize this. Enoch walks with God and is taken up at the age of 365, and, although Methuselah dies in the year of the flood, he nevertheless had the longest lifespan among the ancestors.

This, however, only applies for the ages given in the Masoretic Text (MT) and not for those in the Samaritan Pentateuch (SamPent). The notices on the age of the ancestors in the MT and the SamPent agree for the first five generations from Adam to Mahalalel. But not only does the age data in these two textual traditions clearly differ from one another in the following five generations from Jared to Noah, but so also does the year of the flood calculated from the data.⁵⁷ The MT dates the beginning of the flood to the year 1656, but the SamPent to 1307. We will not discuss

56. This is also the reason for the fact that with the combination of the Priestly and non-Priestly texts, the birth notice for Noah from the non-Priestly primeval history is omitted, since there Noah is seen as a son of Lamech and thus as a descendant of Cain.

57. A synopsis is presented by Rösel, *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung*, 131. See there also on the following as well as for the chronology of the Septuagint, which according to Rösel presents an intentional new calculation which is oriented toward the year 5000 of the history of the world as the date of the consecration of the Second Temple. On the question of how the chronology of the Septuagint can contribute to the reconstruction of the original chronology, see below. The different dates found in the book of Jubilees and Josephus can be left out of consideration for our purposes. With view to the book of Jubilees, which coincides with deviations of up to three years with the SamPent, we can still affirm that the conception of the premature deaths of the impious patriarchs is less important, because the dates of the deaths remain unmentioned with the exception of Adam.

the overarching chronological concepts that govern each text here.⁵⁸ For our question it is only of interest that different fates and evaluations of the ancestors can be derived from the differences in the chronologies. The SamPent in Gen 5 clearly distinguishes between the first five generations and the following five generations; this differs from the Masoretic design. While the death dates for the first five generations are clearly before the year of the flood, Methuselah, who is significantly younger in the SamPent, perishes in the year of the flood along with Jared and Lamech. Aside from Noah, of all the ancestors of the second half of the genealogy, only Enoch survives, who is taken up in the year 887 (SamPent). The conception of the SamPent is clear. With the exception of Enoch and Noah, the lives of the ancestors of the sixth to tenth generations end in the year of the flood. Because the genealogy has a general life expectancy of about 900 years, the deaths of Jared at 847 years, Methuselah at 720, and Lamech at 653 each occur prematurely. As such, they are characterized as sinners compared to their two younger contemporaries Enoch and Noah; their righteousness, however, is mentioned explicitly, and they do not fall victim to the flood. The comparison is also apparent with the ancestors of the first to the fifth generations, who peacefully passed away at an old age. The case of Enoch is especially interesting. He would have only lived to be 780 when the deadly flood struck. However, since he walked with God, he was preserved from death and was, according to the tradition, taken away by God. The significance of Enoch's special fate is further emphasized by the fact that, according to the SamPent, all the ancestors were witnesses of him being taken up. In contrast, according to the MT, Adam had already died (930 MT) by the time that Enoch was taken up (987 MT) and Noah had not yet been born (1056 MT). Since, according to the SamPent, the lifespans of the ancestors who died in the year of the flood gradually decreased,

58. The point of orientation for the longer chronology of the MT is most likely the rededication of the Second Temple by the Maccabees in the 4000th year of the history of the world. See on this, Rösel, *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung*, 135, with reference to A. E. Murtonen, "On the Chronology of the Old Testament," *ST* 8 (1954): 133–37; Klaus Koch, "Sabbatstruktur der Geschichte: Die sogenannte Zehn-Wochen-Apokalypse (I Hen 93,1–10; 91,11–17) und das Ringen um die alttestamentlichen Chronologien im späten Israelitentum," *ZAW* 95 (1983): 403–30, as well as similar considerations in Jeremy Hughes, *Secrets of the Times: Myth and History in Biblical Chronology*, JSOTSup 66 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1990), 237–38. The SamPent however is oriented to the establishment of the sanctuary on Mount Gerizim, dated to year 2800 of the world. Cf. Alfred Jepsen, "Zur Chronologie des Priesterkodex," *ZAW* 47 (1929): 253.

the reverse conclusion is likely: sin increased from generation to generation up to the contemporaries of Noah (cf. Gen 6:9). Thus the genealogies evince a clear trajectory leading to the divine judgment over the wickedness of all flesh (cf. 6:12). In this way, the SamPent does not present a *narrative* development of the theme of the corruption of the good creation but does so in *genealogical* form. On the other hand, the data of the MT agrees with the overall conception of the present text, according to which the genealogy of the Cainites did not survive the flood, whereas the line of Seth is regarded positively.

Should this result be considered an indication of the fact that the briefer chronology of the SamPent preserves the older form of a previously independent Priestly document, while the MT has used the details of the present sequence of texts in the interpretation of its longer chronology?⁵⁹ Naturally, this form of external evidence for the existence of an originally unbroken sequence of the Priestly texts in Gen 1:1–2:3 and 5:1–32* is burdened with considerable uncertainties; these uncertainties increase when further textual witnesses and the toledot of Shem in Gen 11:10–26 are also considered. In any case, a few details support the priority of the Samaritan chronology in Gen 5. For example, the MT significantly raises the ages for the conception of the first son from Jared onward. While the SamPent and MT begin with an average age of 92 years at procreation for the first five ancestors, the procreative age for Jared, Methuselah, and Lamech increases to 177 according to the chronology of the MT in contrast to an average age of 61 in the SamPent. This in turn fits well with the information on Enoch in both the SamPent and the MT (Gen 5:21: 65 years MT and SamPent) and also corresponds to the ages in the MT seen throughout Gen 11.⁶⁰ Furthermore, the personal acquaintance of Noah with Enoch, which would be possible according to the SamPent, accords with the intentions of the text. Additionally, the names of the ancestors Jared (“descent”) and Methuselah (“man of the spear”) suggest violent connotations. Like the violence (traditionally?) associated with Lamech, this would accord well with their deaths in the year of the flood per the Samaritan chronology.⁶¹

59. The SamPent takes up the necessary adjustments for its chronological conception in Gen 11, whereas the MT in Gen 11 has preserved the older chronology.

60. See Rösel, *Übersetzung*, 130. The exception in Gen 11:10–26 (MT) is Shem, who is mentioned first. As in the SamPent and the LXX, he is one hundred years old at the time of procreation.

61. See Budde, *Urgeschichte*, 96, 99–100.

Ronald S. Hendel has proposed another solution.⁶² He advances the thesis that the chronological data of the MT and the SamPent, as well that of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX are a later correction of the so called "Genesis archetype." The correction was necessary, because according to the Genesis archetype the three ancestors Jared, Methuselah, and Lamech would have lived long after the date of the beginning of the flood, which is incompatible with the flood narrative. The starting point for this thesis are the details of the LXX, according to whose chronology Methuselah continued to live fourteen years after the flood. The chronological disagreements within the Genesis archetype came about because the dates of the ancestors come from a previously independently transmitted Book of the Generations of Adam (Gen 5:1–31*), which was only secondarily connected with the flood narrative: "When the P writer or redactor integrated this work into the narrative context, he may not have perceived (or may have been unconcerned with) the implicit chronological conflicts. It remained for later scribes to detect the problems and to incorporate their textual solutions."⁶³

Hendel's reconstruction of the chronology of the Genesis archetype is based on the LXX and a scheme developed from the comparison of MT and SamPent with the example of the first five ancestors and Enoch, with which the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX had edited the Genesis archetype.⁶⁴ The LXX raised the age of each of the ancestors at the time of their first son's conception by one hundred years in contrast to the Genesis archetype and correspondingly reduced their remaining lifespans by one hundred years, so that the timespan before the flood is significantly extended. On the other hand, both the MT and SamPent have preserved the chronology of the Genesis archetype for the first five ancestors as well as for Enoch. For the reconstruction of the chronology of the Genesis archetype with regard to Jared, Methuselah, and Lamech, Hendel uses the data of the LXX as his foundation. In the case of these three ancestors he proceeds from

62. See Ronald S. Hendel, *The Text of Genesis 1–11: Textual Studies and Critical Edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), following Ralph W. Klein, "Archaic Chronologies and the Textual History of the Old Testament," *HTR* 67 (1974): 255–63; Hughes, *Secrets of the Times*; Donald V. Etz, "The Numbers of Genesis V:3–31: A Suggested Conversion and Its Implications," *VT* 43 (1993): 171–89.

63. Hendel, *Text of Genesis 1–11*, 63.

64. The schema was already recognized by Budde and is not itself a matter of debate. See Budde, *Urgeschichte*, 112–13.

corresponding changes in the data of the first son's conception and the remaining lifespan thereafter. This results in a brief chronology for the Genesis archetype by which in connection with Gen 7:6 the flood can be calculated to begin in the year 1342 (MT 1656; SamPent 1307; LXX 2242). Interestingly, the reconstructed dates of the Genesis archetype are partially confirmed by the SamPent or MT. The dating for the conception of the first son by Jared and Methuselah agrees with the SamPent, and the lifespans of Jared and Methuselah agree with the MT. The congruencies and deviations between the MT and SamPent, on the one hand, and the LXX, on the other, as well as the absence of congruence between the MT and SamPent over against the LXX (disregarding the schematic changes) can be explained according to the proposed model in which the LXX has preserved the Genesis archetype (except for its systematic changes), while the MT and SamPent deviate occasionally.

Although this solution seems obvious on a first glance, the difficulties are in the details and in the basic assumptions necessary for this reconstruction. First, regarding the details: the deviations between the MT and SamPent pertain to the ancestors Jared, Methuselah, and Lamech. For Jared and Methuselah, the reconstruction of a Genesis archetype according to the described manner seems possible; the data from the LXX would be confirmed partially by the MT and partially by the SamPent. The case of Lamech is completely different. Here the reconstructions do not lead to a persuasive result, because the reconstructed dates are not supported by the MT or SamPent. In particular, the thirty-five-year difference regarding the date of Lamech's first procreation between the SamPent (53rd year) and that of the Genesis archetype reconstructed from the LXX (88th year = 188th year according to the LXX minus one hundred years), remains inexplicable, because the SamPent otherwise basically presents the data of "LXX minus 100 years." It is also notable that the MT raises the date of the first procreation of Jared, with the LXX and against the SamPent, by one hundred years; then, compared to the reconstructed Genesis archetype, decreases the remaining lifespan by one hundred years. The same can be observed in the case of Methuselah, save that it is 120 years there. Should LXX and MT have come up with the same idea completely independently of one another in handling the underlying Genesis archetype? Usually, a shared deviation from the text that is recognized as original is considered to be an indication for a common textual foundation shared by the deviating texts. Furthermore, Jared's remaining years of life after his first procreation differ between the MT and LXX (800 years) and SamPent (785

years), and his whole age differs correspondingly by fifteen years. Hendel explains this by suggesting that the SamPent wanted to avoid the idea that Jared survived the flood, unlike the postulated Genesis archetype.⁶⁵ If, however, one takes as a foundation Hendel's reconstruction of the Genesis archetype (the text of the LXX without its schematic changes), then the SamPent would not have needed to intervene with Jared. A correction of the data regarding the life of Methuselah and the date of Noah's conception would have been quite sufficient.

The explanation of the differences in the case of Jared in the SamPent, on the one hand, and the MT and LXX, on the other hand, as a secondary adjustment of the preflood chronology to the flood narrative by the SamPent also draws attention to Hendel's problematic premises: the observation that, according to the LXX, Methuselah survives the flood, leads to the conclusion of the existence of a toledot book. This toledot book then had been connected secondarily with the Priestly flood narrative, but its chronology was incompatible with that of the Priestly writing. However, the assumption of an originally independent toledot book must, after long discussion, be considered uncertain.⁶⁶ But if such a book is to be considered, then a revision by the Priestly writing with the integration of this book is to be assumed. This is seen from the cross-references in the toledot of Adam to passages of the Priestly text which clearly could not have belonged to the toledot book (cf. Gen 5:1b, 2, 3 with Gen 1:26–28; Gen 5:22 with Gen 6:9). In the context of such a reworking, it seems that at least the chronology of Noah's age at the procreation of his three sons (in one year!), which deviates strongly from the other patriarchs, and the

65. See Hendel, *Text of Genesis 1–11*, 64. Hughes, *Secrets of the Times*, 12–14; Hendel, *Text of Genesis*, 66, brought forward a similar proposal for the MT in the case of Methuselah, where in comparison with the LXX the age of the conception of the first son is raised by 120 years instead of 100 years in relation to the SamPent. Thereby, the beginning of the flood were postponed with the result that all patriarchs die before the flood. This is in principle seen correctly, but the calculation operations of the MT are caused by other requirements. For this, see the following.

66. The thesis of a toledot book developed prominently by von Rad (see *Priesterschrift*, 33–40), has been recently taken up, with a clearly reduced extent of this source, among others by Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 279–81; Carr, "Βίβλος γενέσεως Revisited," 169–70; and Schüle, *Der Prolog der hebräischen Bibel*, 44–46. The agreements with the genealogical data in Gen 4 speak in fact for the view that the Priestly document in these points cites from a preceding text and does not just refer to a fictional source (so also Seebass, *Genesis I*, 185–86)—more can hardly be said.

chronology of the flood narrative (Noah was 600 years old at the beginning of the flood; cf. Gen 7:6), and the toledot of Shem (Shem was 100 years old in the second year after the flood; cf. Gen 11:10) have been adjusted. Hendel's supposition, that the author of the Priestly document, who is otherwise very interested in such questions, had overlooked that the lifespans of three ancestors extended far beyond the flood (Jared 80 years; Methuselah 214 years; Lamech 65 years), while it was noticed by the scribes of the MT, the SamPent, and the *Vorlage* of the LXX only later and independently of one another (?), seems unlikely. The burden of proof for this proposal is on the assumption that the error assumed for P has been preserved in the LXX, although the latter has changed the chronology in order to avoid precisely this issue. Hendel's explanation for this observation states: "This mishap may be an unintended consequence of a systematic application of the revision. For Methuselah to have died at or before the flood, a scribe would have had to alter the system, and this may have seemed too radical for a systematizing scribe."⁶⁷ Such a proposal seems to be an ad hoc thesis. Moreover, the principle faithfulness of the LXX to the transmitted dates in the case of Lamech cannot be substantiated.

A possible alternative with fewer presuppositions emerges: the SamPent has preserved the Priestly chronology of the toledot of Adam associated with the flood narrative. The question of the existence of an originally independent Book of the Toledot of Adam and some kind of editing of this book with its integration into the Priestly document can be left out of the reconstruction of the textual history. It must be explained separately.

Unlike the SamPent, the MT and the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX are based upon a multistaged adjustment of the Priestly chronology in the process of an initially shared but later largely independent textual history. Based on its overall chronology, the MT has extended the time before the flood by raising the conception dates of the firstborn by 100 years for Jared, 120 years for Methuselah, and 129 years for Lamech. At the same time the MT has prolonged the lifespans of these ancestors by the years thus gained in the interests of a longer chronology. The Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX has widely followed it.⁶⁸ But then the Hebrew *Vorlage* (or the translator) has also adjusted the data of conception of the first son for all

67. Hendel, *Text of Genesis 1-11*, 64.

68. For Gen 11, the case is different. Since here the SamPent and the LXX agree in all data for the ages of the births of the firstborn sons against the (more original) chronology of the MT, "the presumption of a common source text is inevitable" (Rösel,

patriarchs to the higher ages of Jared and Methuselah in the interests of an even longer overall chronology. In these cases, it also reduced their remaining lifespans.

It remains to be explained why Methuselah's age at the conception of his first son differs by twenty years between the MT and the LXX even though there is agreement over against the SamPent regarding his whole lifespan. It is conceivable that, after the separation of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX from the common text-tradition, which would later become the MT, the age of Methuselah at the conception of Lamech in the MT was increased twenty years (without impacting the overall lifespan). According to the MT, through this change Lamech reached the age of 777 years before the beginning of the flood, as an allusion to Gen 4:24.⁶⁹ Following from this, another explanation can be considered carefully: the MT might have simply deducted twenty years from the age of Lamech's conception of Noah in order to preserve the absolute chronology and the flood date of 1656. In this case, one could use the LXX for the reconstruction of a common precursor (V* from the German *Vorstufe*) of the MT and the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX for all the dates of Methuselah. As for Lamech, at least the data on the remaining years after the conception of Noah could be transferred from the LXX.

Therefore, the chronology of the common precursor (V*) of the MT and the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX and its developments can be reconstructed with necessary caution as follows: On the level of the common precursor (V*), the ages of Jared and Methuselah at their first procreation is raised by one hundred years in comparison with the original chronology found in the SamPent. After the branching of the textual history of the MT and the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX, the MT raised the age of Methuselah at the first procreation by twenty years and correspondingly reduced his remaining lifespan. In agreement with the LXX, for the common precursor (V*) we can consider an age of 167 years for the first procreation. As with Jared, this corresponds to raising the data of the SamPent by one hundred years, which preserves the original chronology. If the MT simply removed twenty years from the age of Lamech at his procreation of Noah in order to preserve the absolute chronology and the date of the flood in 1656 in the precursor (V*), then this results in a calculated age of 202 years

Übersetzung, 224), which does not however rule out the possibility of later redactions in each textual history.

69. See Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, 309.

for Lamech at the procreation of Noah within V*. This means an increase of 149 years in comparison to the original data of the SamPent, which has fifty-three years. This increase was necessary, because the chronology for the beginning of the flood threatened to become inconsistent due to the prolonged ages for Jared and Methuselah.⁷⁰ The raising of Lamech's age at the procreation of his first son by 149 years could have been oriented to the number seven, which is connected closely with Lamech, insofar as the increase by forty-nine years in comparison to the one hundred years of Jared (MT; LXX; V*) and Methuselah (LXX; V*) is the result of seven times seven (cf. likewise Gen 4:24). Such considerations may even have been in the background for the 188 years that the LXX gives as the age of Lamech at the procreation of Noah. Beginning from the fifty-three years, which the SamPent has for the age at the conception of the first son, the 188 years result from the usual raise by one hundred years and an additional thirty-five years. In this case, the multiplier of five has been the decisive factor for the scribe.⁷¹ Regarding the chronological data on Lamech, there is a large uncertainty, because here the MT, SamPent, and LXX each have different data. It appears to be plausible that the SamPent has preserved the original age concerning the firstborn's procreation for Lamech, as well as for the other ancestors,⁷² and that the MT is guided by Gen 4:24 in its calculation of Lamech's age.

In any case, the contradictory data on Lamech is a clear indication that the original chronology experienced a multi-staged development.⁷³ And it is also a clear indication that this process must have developed differently and was directed by different premises in different textual traditions.

5. Summary

Regardless of whether or not the differences between the MT and the SamPent in Gen 5 can bear the burden of proof placed upon them, the

70. Also according to the *Vorstufe* (V*), none of the patriarchs survived the flood.

71. The considerations on the derivation of the 100 + 49 years (*Vorstufe* [V*]) and 100 + 35 years (LXX) from the connection of Lamech with the number seven are from a conversation with Martin Rösel.

72. With Hughes, *Secrets of the Times*, 19–20.

73. The harmonization of a series of Greek textual witnesses with the MT regarding Methuselah's age at the conception of Lamech (see the apparatus of the Göttingen LXX) is along these same lines.

reexamination of well-known arguments speaks in favor of the existence of an independent Priestly thread in the Primeval History. Its conceptual connection with Priestly texts outside the Primeval History is beyond question for me. For the Exodus narrative, I essentially adhere to a two-source model. The arguments brought forth most recently against the existence of P as an independent source in Exod 1–15 have not convinced me. The situation is different, however, with the Priestly texts in the patriarchal narratives, not to mention those in the Joseph narratives. Perhaps the findings from each individual textual unit should be evaluated differently. It may well be that Blum's proposal that P is neither exclusively a source nor a redaction but rather a compositional layer, which integrates its own textual units and has these first and foremost in view in the overall composition, is fitting for the major thematic blocks. I can, however, only repeat my old opinion in this regard:

Due to the sparse Priestly texts in Gen 12ff., it remains to be considered whether in this area P has already integrated the non-Priestly texts. P would in this case have to be understood for Gen 12ff as a redactional layer. Following an independently formulated Priestly Primeval History, this redactional layer would have integrated the patriarchal and Joseph narratives, and then would have continued with an again independent presentation of the origins of Israel in Egypt and the time of Moses.⁷⁴

6. Appendix: Charts on the Chronology in Genesis 5

The chart on the facing page illustrates (1) the common textual history of the MT and the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX after the separation from the SamPent, as it results from the reconstruction we have described above, and (2) the continuation of the separated textual history of the MT and the LXX. Additionally listed are (3) the dates according to the SamPent, which preserved the original chronology. The dates for the ancestors from Adam to Mahalalel are listed for comprehensiveness. They agree wholly in the MT and the SamPent; here, the LXX dates the conception of the first sons one hundred years later for each and reduces the remaining lifespan by one

74. Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung*, 389. See now Jakob Wöhrle, *Fremdlinge im eigenen Land: Zur Entstehung und Intention der priesterlichen Passagen der Vätergeschichte*, FRLANT 246 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012).

	Anno mundi	Age at the birth of the firstborn son			Remaining lifespan			Total age		
		V*/MT*	LXX	SP	V*/MT	LXX	SP	V*/MT	LXX	SP
Adam	1-930	130	230	130	800	700	800	930	930	930
Seth	130-1042	105	205	105	807	707	807	912	912	912
Enosh	235-1140	90	190	90	815	715	815	905	905	905
Kenan	325-1235	70	170	70	840	740	840	910	910	910
Mahalalel	395-1290	65	165	65	830	730	830	895	895	895
Jared	460-1422	162	162	62	800	800	785	962	962	847
Enoch	622-987	65	165	65	300	200	300	365	365	365
Methuseleh MT	687-1656	187	167	67	782	802	653	969	969	720
Methuseleh V*	687-1656	167	167	67	802	802	653	969	969	720
Lamech MT	874-1651	182	188	53	595	565	600	777	753	653
Lamech V*	854-1621	202	188	53	565	565	600	767	753	653
Flood MT/V*	1656 (six hundredth year of Noah)									

* The dates of the common *Vorstufe* [precursor] (V*) of the MT and the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX agree up to Methuseleh and Lamech and are listed for reasons of space in one column. Deviations of the MT compared with the (reconstructed) *Vorstufe* (V*) are especially noted.

hundred years, so that the ages of the ancestors remain unchanged, but the absolute chronology is extended by four hundred years. It remains to be noted that also according to the chronology of the reconstructed common precursor (V*) of the MT and the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX, none of the ancestors survives the flood. This problem appears to have already been solved in the Priestly document. It is only in the LXX that Methuselah dies fourteen years after the flood, which has erroneously occurred because of the repeated changes. The information on Lamech in V* cannot be supported by the corroborating witnesses and is thus uncertain.

The second chart shows the lifespans of the ancestors according to the calculated absolute chronology for the MT, SamPent, LXX, and V*. Usually it is presumed in the calculations that the year of the conception falls together with the year of the birth of the respective ancestor. If on the basis of Gen 18:14, a rounded-out year for the time between conception and birth is calculated, the absolute chronology would be correspondingly extended.⁷⁵

	MT	SP	LXX	V*
Adam	1-930	1-930	1-930	1-930
Seth	130-1042	130-1042	230-1142	130-1042
Enosh	235-1140	235-1140	435-1340	235-1140
Kenan	325-1235	325-1235	625-1535	325-1235
Mahalalel	395-1290	395-1290	795-1690	395-1290
Jared	460-1422	460-1307	960-1922	460-1422
Enoch	622-987	522-877	1122-1487	622-987
Methuselah	687-1656	587-1307	1287-2256	687-1656
Lamech	874-1651	654-1307	1454-2207	854-1621
Beginning of the flood	1656	1307	2242	1656

75. See Ziemer, "Erklärung," 2-4.