The Pentateuch and Its Readers

Edited by
JOEL S. BADEN
and JEFFREY STACKERT

Forschungen zum Alten Testament
170

Mohr Siebeck

Forschungen zum Alten Testament

Edited by

Corinna Körting (Hamburg) · Konrad Schmid (Zürich)
Mark S. Smith (Princeton) · Andrew Teeter (Harvard)

170

The Pentateuch and Its Readers

Edited by

Joel S. Baden and Jeffrey Stackert

Mohr Siebeck

Joel S. Baden, born 1977; 2007 PhD in Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations (Hebrew Bible) from Harvard University (Cambridge, Massachusetts); Professor of Hebrew Bible at Yale University.

Jeffrey Stackert, born 1977; 2006 PhD in Near Eastern and Judaic Studies (Bible and Ancient Near East) from Brandeis University (Waltham, Massachusetts); Professor of Hebrew Bible at the University of Chicago.

ISBN 978-3-16-160820-9 / eISBN 978-3-16-160821-6
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-160821-6

ISSN 0940-4155 / eISSN 2568-8359 (Forschungen zum Alten Testament)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

The book was typeset by Martin Fischer in Tübingen using Minion typeface, printed on non-aging paper by Gulde Druck in Tübingen, and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

Preface

In the academic world, a legacy can be built in a variety of ways: important publications; generative ideas and arguments; and a lineage of students. The honoree of this volume, Baruch J. Schwartz, has established his legacy in all three ways.

From his dissertation and first book, *The Holiness Legislation: Studies in the Priestly Code* (1999), a work on the priestly writings that in its insights into the relationship of P and H was well ahead of its time, to his essay on the sources of the Sinai pericope, "The Priestly Account of the Theophany and Lawgiving at Sinai" (1996), which since its publication has formed the basis for virtually every discussion of that material, to his revolutionary reading of Ezekiel, in "Ezekiel's Dim View of Israel's Restoration" (2000), and beyond, Baruch's publications have marked watershed moments in the field's understanding of the biblical text. Those of us who have had the privilege of observing Baruch's writing process can confirm what any reader can clearly see: Baruch writes with enormous care and craft, generating scholarly works that are as pleasurable to read as they are informative and inspiring. Each article is a jewel: crystal clear, multi-faceted, and of lasting value, rewarding anew each time it is read. Baruch, it sometimes seems, has produced no minor works. His scholarly oeuvre is practically a greatest hits collection in its entirety.

In terms of ideas, Baruch has contributed significantly to multiple areas of biblical studies. As already noted, his work on Ezekiel has revolutionized the understanding of that book's theology, and his work on the priestly source of the Pentateuch, both in its laws and its narratives, is fundamental for virtually everyone who works in those materials. It is no surprise, however, that Baruch's most extensive contribution to the field has been in his work on the composition of the Pentateuch. Over the past few decades, Baruch has distinguished himself as the world's foremost proponent of the Documentary Hypothesis for the composition of the Pentateuch. He has championed what has come to be known as the Neo-Documentarian approach, a theory that at one point may have been confined exclusively to Baruch's own thinking, teaching, and writing, but that has, in the wake of his work, become the dominant model in North America for the Pentateuch's literary history. Even when scholars and students may not have read Baruch's writings on this topic directly, whenever one encounters a reference to the Documentary Hypothesis, or to P, J, E, and D, in contemporary scholarship, Baruch is there on the page. He is, without question, the father of an entire school of thought, and one of the true giants in pentateuchal studies.

And though it may be the least obvious to the outside observer, the area in which Baruch has made the greatest contribution is – certainly for those of us who have been lucky enough to benefit from it – in his instruction of and dedication to his students. Baruch is not only a magnificent scholar in his own right; he is an extraordinarily generous one. Baruch has always displayed an uncommon devotion to developing young scholars – both those at his home institution, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and at many others around the world. He has invested his time, energy, and tenacity – *himself* – in so many of us, training us in the exacting practices that are the hallmark of his own scholarship. He has also offered unfailing and liberal support at every turn. It is no surprise, then, to observe the pride with which Baruch's students – and even some colleagues – identify themselves as his pupils.

Given who Baruch is, it is difficult to imagine a more fitting tribute to him than one that comes from his students, and that highlights the many ways that his work and pedagogical dedication has contributed to their own work over the many decades of his career. This volume is just such a tribute, filled with essays from those whom Baruch has taught, both formally and informally. As reflects Baruch's own wide-ranging interests, this collection contains essays on the literary history of the Pentateuch, on the Priestly writings, on Ezekiel, on Jewish interpretation, and more.

As we offer this volume to and for Baruch, we do so not as a gift, but as an expression of gratitude. We would not be where we are without him and his unflagging support, as we were starting out as scholars and in every season thereafter. Baruch has been a model of scholarship, of intellect, and of pedagogy, and will continue as such for the rest of our careers. We are thrilled and honored to be able to present this volume to our teacher, and our friend, Baruch Schwartz.

Joel Baden and *Jeffrey Stackert*

Table of Contents

Introduction

Joel Baden and Jeffrey Stackert

The essays in this volume cluster around several, partially overlapping nodes, each of which showcases the influence of Baruch Schwartz.

The first section's essays address specific problems in pentateuchal source criticism, each in a documentary mode. In "Despoiling the Egyptians," Joel Baden offers a new argument for assigning the despoiling texts in Exod 3:21–22, 11:2–3, and 12:35–36 to the Yahwistic source. Assigning this plot detail to J creates a story link with Exod 33:1–6; it also helps to clarify the contours of the fragmentary E material preserved around the plagues. David Ben-Gad HaCohen's contribution, "ויקרא לו, אל אלהי, ישראל: And [Jacob] Named Himself, El (is) My God – Israel (Gen 33:20)," offers a creative reconstruction of the Jacob traditions in Gen 32–33, arguing for their ascriptions to the J and E sources and proposing a history of their composition and combination. In her essay, "Misplaced Places: Redaction and the Priestly Wilderness Itinerary," Liane Feldman traces the complicated history of Israel's wilderness travel in P and shows how its itinerary notices now found in Num 21–22 were relocated by the pentateuchal compiler from their original position in the Phineas story now found in Num 25.

Rounding out this section are the essays by Ariel Seri-Levi and Dodani Orstav. Both take up the accounts of Israel at the mountain. Seri-Levi's contribution, "The Yahwistic Account of the Theophany at Sinai: The Establishment of the Divine Presence," traces the J account from Exod 19–34 and shows that its chief concern in this section is divine immanence. With this argument, Seri-Levi identifies a similarity between the J and P sources that sets them against E and D. In "The Second Ascent of Moses for the Inscription of the Tablets: A Case of Literary Development," Orstav treats the E mountain account, giving special attention to Exod 34. He argues that in the original E story, the second set of tablets were delivered at the Tent of Meeting, not as part of a second mountain ascent. He then traces the development of this tradition in the formation of the compiled Pentateuch.

The volume's second section of essays treats issues of priesthood, cult, and Priestly texts. Guy Darshan, Ariel Kopilovitz, and Itamar Kislev each address questions of cult and priestly writing outside of the pentateuchal Priestly source. In "The Tent of Meeting in Samuel and Kings," Darshan considers the possibility that the idea of the Tent of Meeting as a sanctuary was known beyond P. To do so, he examines its two appearances in Samuel and Kings (1 Sam 2:22;

1 Kgs 8:10–11). Darshan concludes that both instances are secondary additions, albeit from different hands. Kopilovitz also treats the Former Prophets, arguing that the same authors may have been responsible for pentateuchal Priestly texts as well as some material incorporated into the Deuteronomistic History. In service of this claim, Kopilovitz offers a detailed analysis of 2 Kgs 11–12, the account of Jehoash's enthronement and temple renovations, and highlights there distinctive ideology and legal details otherwise known only from P. Kislev sets his sights on Chronicles. His study, "A Sanctuary without the Ark: The Cultic Shrine at Gibeon according to Chronicles," observes the Chronicler's attempt to legitimate Solomon's sacrificial activity at Gibeon by underscoring Gibeon's validity as a cult site. This legitimation effort, Kislev suggests, also created an ancient precedent for the circumstances of the Second Temple, which was understood to be a locus of divine presence but existed without the First Temple's ark.

The essays of Raanan Eichler and Naphtali S. Meshel, Adiv Hadar, Yedidya Jesselsohn, Yael Leokumovich, Hananel Shapira, Omri Shareth, Doren G. Snoek, Julia Tuliakov, and Daniel Zohar address stylistic features in P. In "3s Verbs with Indefinite Subjects in the Tabernacle Pericopes of Exodus," Eichler argues that the use of the third person singular verbal form with indefinite subject is common in P and shows its import for understanding the content and transmission history of the Tabernacle instructions and their implementation narrative. Meshel, Hadar, Jesselsohn, Leokumovich, Shapira, Shareth, Snoek, Tuliakov, and Zohar do not address issues of grammatical style but styles of logical and chronological organization in P's law and narration. Specifically, they identify in "Cross-Reference and 'Borgesian' Slippage in Leviticus 1–5" cross-referencing as a basic feature of P's laws on sacrifice and purity and what they term the "elephant-in-the-car effect," namely, a slippage or confusion between the temporalities and organizing logic of a social world of cultic-legal practice beyond P's narrative and the sequence of P's narrative presentation itself.

Sarah Shectman, Jeffrey Stackert, and Benjamin D. Sommer each address specific issues in pentateuchal Priestly thought. In her essay, "'She Shall Be Burned with Fire': Femininity and Intersectionality in the Bible's Priestly Source," Shectman explores the complex interplay between gender and power in the laws governing women in priestly families in Lev 21. She shows that these laws have implications for social hierarchies beyond priestly families, for both women and for men. Stackert's essay, "Creation, Sanctuary, and the Priority of the Priestly Story," argues against the well-endorsed view that there is a fundamental link between creation an sanctuary building in P and that the latter is the completion of the former. Stackert shows that a basic discontinuity between creation and sanctuary building is assumed in P's plot and that this discontinuity undergirds P's pure/impure and sacred/profane dichotomies. Sommer's study, "Tradition and Change in Priestly Law: On the Internal Coherence of the Priestly Worldview," offers a more global assessment of P. It argues two main points: first, that P

conceives of its law as dynamic and thus subject to change over time; and second, that P's religious thought, with its thorough internal coherence, can ultimately be labeled a systematic theology.

The third section of contributions includes two insightful essays that treat major religious ideas in the Hebrew Bible. Simeon Chavel's "Intergenerational Punishment: A New History" traces the development of the idea that Yahweh punishes one generation for the faults of its precedessor(s) across its biblical manifestations. Chavel details the remarkable transition in perceptions of this notion – from one established on principles of divine patience and mercy and grounded in notions of the family to one derided as unfair to individuals to one unrecognizable and thus set aside altogether. In "What is *Tôrâ*?," David Lambert works to understand *tôrâ* both in its various biblical usages and as a larger idea, especially in the early reception of pentateuchal materials in late biblical texts. He argues that, whatever its development over time, *tôrâ* did not lose its spoken valence – a sense well-captured in its rendering as "instruction." Among other things, this understanding helps to explain the dynamism of pentateuchal texts for early interpreters, who harnessed these texts' "iconic value" to imagine (and reimagine) the speech acts to which they testified.

The volume's final section, which focuses on biblical reception, comprises three essays and treats examples of biblical interpretation ranging from the Second Temple period to the modern era. Tova Ganzel's contribution, "4Q385 (*Pseudo-Ezekiel*) in the Context of Ezekiel's Restoration," focuses on the revision of Ezek 37 in 4Q385. Ganzel argues that the 4Q385 authors reoriented what Schwartz termed Ezekiel's "dim view of restoration" in a consolatory message that highlights when and how restoration would be accomplished. In "Impurity without Danger: A Mishnaic Reading of the Priestly *ḥattat*," Mira Balberg considers how the rabbis transformed P's *ḥattat* offering and the attendant notions of sin and impurity to which it is directed in P. Showing that the rabbis appreciated many of the same problems that modern interpreters identify in P, she argues that Mishnah Shevu'ot offers explanations for the various dualities related to the Priestly *hattat*: impurity and sin, sanctuary and persons, and individual and collective. In the volume's final essay, "The Author of the Book of Job in the Jewish Tradition Throughout the Ages," Eran Viezel examines the claim, found in the famous list of biblical authors in b. B. Bat. 14b–15a, that Moses wrote the book of Job. He shows that, whether endorsing the baraita's view, rejecting it, or setting its claim aside, interpreters across the centuries paid special attention to this Mosaic ascription. This is likely because the ascription of Job to Moses was hardly self-evident. Yet instead of challenging the list in b. B. Bat., most interpreters sought to buttress its claim regarding Job.

Despoiling the Egyptians

Joel Baden

In Exodus, three references are made to the despoiling of the Egyptians:

Exod 3:21–22

ונתתי את חן העם הזה בעיני מצרים והיה כי תלכון לא תלכו ריקם: ושאלה אשה משכנתה ומגרת ביתה כלי כסף וכלי זהב ושמלת ושמתם על בניכם ועל בנתיכם ונצלם את מצרים:

I will dispose the Egyptians favorably toward this people, such that when you go you will not go empty-handed. Each woman will request from her neighbor and from the woman living in her house for objects of silver and objects of gold and clothing. You will place them on your sons and your daughters, and you will thus strip the Egyptians.

Exod 11:2–3

דבר-נא באזני העם וישאלו איש מאת רעהו ואשה מאת רעותה כלי-כסף וכלי זהב: ויתן יהוה את-חן העם בעיני מצרים

Tell the people that each man should ask his neighbor, and each woman her neighbor, for objects of silver and objects of gold.

Exod 12:35–36

ובני-ישראל עשו כדבר משה וישאלו ממצרים כלי-כסף וכלי זהב ושמלת: ויהוה נתן את-חן העם בעיני מצרים [וישאלום][1] וינצלו את-מצרים:

The Israelites had done as Moses instructed: they had asked the Egyptians for objects of silver and objects of gold and clothing. Yahweh had disposed the Egyptians favorably toward the people, and they had stripped the Egyptians.[2]

These passages are almost identical in their wording. The language of requesting (שאל), the references to silver and gold (כלי-כסף וכלי זהב), and the disposing the Egyptians favorably toward the people (נתן את-חן העם בעיני מצרים) are common

[1] The hiphil form of שאל here is awkward, and rare. The only other place the hiphil form of שאל appears is 1 Sam 1:28. It is most likely that this is a case of vertical dittography, especially as the previous verse has the sequence וישאלו ממצרים and this verse has the sequence מצרים וישאלום. In that case the hiphil form here would be a secondary attempt to make sense of the consonantal text.

[2] For the purposes of this study, the precise valence of the scenario, or of the word נצל, "strip," is of no particular relevance. See the detailed, if probably futile, attempt to pin down a specific meaning for the term by Th. C. Vriezen, "A Reinterpretation of Exodus 3,21–22 and Related Texts," *Jaarbericht Ex Oriente Lux* 20 (1967–68): 389–401.

to all three. Other aspects are common to two out of the three passages: the specific reference to the women (אשה, 3:22 and 11:2), the language of stripping (נצל, 3:22 and 12:36), and the role of Moses (דבר, 11:2 and 12:35). Where the three differ, it is in their timeframes: Exod 3:21–22 predicts the despoiling ("I will dispose," ונתתי), 11:2–3 narrates the despoiling, or at least part of it ("Yahweh disposed," ויתן יהוה), and 12:35–36 refers back to the despoiling as something that has already happened ("Yahweh had disposed," ויהוה נתן). In other words, this difference is really no difference at all, but the natural progression of the story. It hardly requires any effort to make the case that all three of these passages should be read together, and that whatever else we say, they can hardly come from multiple different pentateuchal sources.

Of course, no one ever has made that claim. For the vast majority of documentary critics of the past century-plus, the despoiling of the Egyptians has been happily assigned to E.[3] The consistent rationale given for this assignment is that the reference in 3:22 to "neighbors" (משכנתה ומגרת ביתה) is sensible only within the narrative world of E. In J, they correctly point out, the Israelites live isolated in Goshen (see Gen 45:10; 46:28–29, 34; 47:1, 4, 6b; 50:8; Exod 8:18; 9:26).[4] How, then, could there be any Egyptian neighbors from whom they could make such a request?

This argument, however, rests on fairly unsteady ground. The word for "neighbor" here, שכנה, appears only one other time in the Bible, in Ruth 4:17; similarly, the phrase גר הבית occurs only one other time in the Bible, in Job 19:15. There may not be any particularly strong reason to think that the words do not

[3] See, e.g., Julius Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963), 70; Benjamin W. Bacon, *The Triple Tradition of the Exodus* (Hartford: Student Publishing Co., 1894), 18; J. Estlin Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby, *The Hexateuch According to the Revised Version* (New York: Longmans, Green Co., 1900), 2:84, 95–96; H. Holzinger, *Exodus*, KHAT II (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1900), 8–9, 31, 34; Bruno Baentsch, *Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903), 26–27, 85, 104; A.H. McNeile, *The Book of Exodus*, 2nd ed. (London: Methuen, 1917), 20–21, 60–61, 74; Edgar Brightman, *The Sources of the Hexateuch* (New York: Abingdon, 1918), 149, 151–52; S.R. Driver, *The Book of Exodus* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1918), 26, 84–85, 99–100. And myself included: Joel Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis*, AYBRL (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 122–23.

[4] The one exception to the consistent attribution of Goshen to the J narrative is in 47:27, a P text: "Thus Israel settled in the land of Egypt, in the region of Goshen." There is good reason to believe that the mention of Goshen here is spurious. This verse is the direct continuation in P of 47:11, which narrates Joseph settling his family "in the land of Egypt, in the choicest part of the land, in the region of Rameses, as Pharaoh had commanded." Pharaoh's command, to settle Israel in the choicest part of the land, is found in turn in 47:6a; the identification of that part of the land as Rameses conforms to P's departure notice in Exod 12:37. In principle, we should expect 47:27 to read "Thus Israel settled in the land of Egypt, in the region of Rameses," in line with the rest of P's story. It is also possible that there was no specifying phrase here originally, and it read, simply, "Thus Israel settled in the land of Egypt," and the words "in the land of Goshen" were added by a reader familiar with the canonical account.

mean what they have always been taken to mean; this is, however, quite a lot of analytical weight being placed on two exceptionally rare terms. In other words, this is a relatively skimpy foundation on which to base the assignment of these three passages to E.

There is, however, seemingly equally little basis for attributing these passages to J.[5] Propp "tentatively assign[s] all three texts to J, noting the explicit prediction of Israel's departure with 'much property' in Gen 15:14 (J?)."[6] But, as he admits, "this is not much to go on." This is especially the case since, to my knowledge, the attribution of Gen 15:14 to J – which Propp himself marks with a doubtful question mark – is not held by any other contemporary pentateuchal critic, whether of the documentary persuasion or otherwise.[7]

It seems safe to say that there are relatively few strong or explicit indicators in these passages as to which source they might be assigned to. In such cases, what are our options? The most natural procedure would be to look then at the context in which these passages are found: most importantly, what comes before each passage, either immediately or in whichever source we putatively assign the passages to? Here again, however, we run into some analytical difficulties, at least in the history of scholarship.

In Exod 3, the immediately preceding verses, 3:19–20, predict Pharaoh's refusal to let the Israelites go, and Yahweh's need to smite Egypt with the plagues. For some scholars, these verses are also from E – thus we would have a continuous E section here.[8] For some others, these verses are basically E, though they have been amplified by R^{JE}.[9] What is common to all of these earlier documentary analyses is the division of the plagues narrative, to which these verses allude, into three sources, J, E, and P, rather than two, as has become standard since Moshe

[5] This is the distinctly minority position in the historical of scholarship. See, e. g., W. H. Addis, *Documents of the Hexateuch* (London: David Nutt, 1892), 1:112, 125–26; Martin Noth, *Exodus*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962), 93–94; George W. Coats, "Despoiling the Egyptians," *VT* 18 (1968): 450–57; William H. C. Propp, *Exodus 1–18*, AB 2 (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 194.

[6] Propp, *Exodus 1–18*, 194. Much of Propp's source analysis in this part of Exodus is idiosyncratic, resulting in some almost ironic situations: of Exod 11:2–3 and 12:35–36 he says that they "seem more like insertions into Elohistic material" (ibid.). In this sense, Propp has simply reversed the older position: finding these verses to be disruptive in their contexts, and those contexts being E, these passages are therefore given to J.

[7] The literary-historical analysis of Genesis 15 is much debated. It is my opinion that virtually the entire chapter belongs to E, with the exception of precisely the part to which Propp refers: 15:13aβ–14, the prediction of the enslavement in Egypt through the mention of their leaving with "great wealth," which, in its combination of concepts and terms from multiple pentateuchal sources, fits all the criteria for being a post-compilation addition to the text. For further detail, see my article, "From Joseph to Moses: The Narratives of Exodus 1–2," *VT* 62 (2012): 133–58, at 150 n. 51.

[8] See, e. g., Holzinger, *Exodus*, 8–9.

[9] So Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *Hexateuch*, 2:84; McNeile, *Exodus*, 20.

Greenberg's *Understanding Exodus*.[10] When there is no plagues narrative in E, it becomes far more difficult to see the proleptic reference to the plagues as E. If, rather, the non-priestly plagues narrative is entirely J, then these verses must be as well.[11]

When 3:19–20 are correctly assigned to J, rather than E, then we may ask how the despoiling in 3:21–22 would connect with what precedes it in either of the two sources. What precedes in J we have just determined: it would follow directly on 3:19–20. If it were from E, however, it would come immediately after the previous E verses: the declaration of the divine name in 3:14–15.[12] Neither is impossible; one is superior. There is a story being told here about what will happen when Moses comes to Egypt. The E story, if we were to take it as such, would have Moses coming to the Israelites and proclaiming that the god of their fathers sent him to them, revealing the divine name, and then declaring that Yahweh will dispose the Egyptians favorably toward the Israelites and the Israelites will despoil them (3:13–15, 21–22). It's a story of sorts, but a rather strange one. The J story, by contrast, and far more sensibly, would have Moses going to the Israelites with Yahweh's message, then going to the king of Egypt with the message, then Pharaoh refusing to listen, then the plagues, then Pharaoh allowing the Israelites to go, and then – and only then – the despoiling of the Egyptians, as the Israelites are on their way out of town (3:16–22).

Let us look at the other two despoiling passages in the same way. Unfortunately, the immediate context of the passage in Exod 11 is also controverted. In 11:1, Yahweh tells Moses that he will be bringing one further plague upon the Egyptians, after which Pharaoh will let the people go, once and for all. Again, for those who thought that there was an E plagues narrative, this could sensibly

---

[10] Moshe Greenberg, *Understanding Exodus*, 2nd ed. (Eugene: Cascade, 2013), 147–54. See also the analysis of Erhard Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, BZAW 189 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990), 242–56.

[11] In support of the attribution of Exod 3:19–20 to J, one may note a number of linguistic and thematic elements. These include in 3:19 the combination of נתן and הלך with the meaning "allow to leave," found elsewhere in the Pentateuch only in Num 22:13 (where we find the same irregular infinitival form להלך); the phrase "strong hand," יד חזקה, with reference to Yahweh's might in the Exodus events, as in Exod 6:1. In 3:20 we find a play on the word שלח, "send" – Yahweh sends out his hand, and the king of Egypt will in turn send out Israel – a term that is perhaps the central theme of the J plagues narrative (especially in the repeated phrase שלח עמי ויעבדני, "let my people go that they may worship me," and its variants: Exod 7:16, 26; 8:4, 16, 24–25; 9:1, 13; 10:3, 7); the verb נכה, "strike," is also used throughout the J plagues cycle, from Moses and Aaron striking water or the ground (7:17, 20, 25; 8:12–13) to Yahweh striking the Egyptians with pestilence (9:15) to the killing of the firstborn (12:29); and the term בקרב, "in the midst of," referring to Yahweh's acts or location, is the thematic key to the entire J Exodus and wilderness narrative: Exod 8:18; 10:1; 17:7; 33:3, 5; 34:9; Num 11:4, 20–21; 14:11, 14, 42.

[12] A rough source division of the relevant portions of Exodus 3 results in three main blocks: 3:7–8 J; 3:9–15 E; 3:16–20 J. These can be distinguished by both duplication (7:7//7:9, e. g.) and contradiction (3:10//3:16, e. g.), as well as by different characterizations of the rescue of the Israelites (3:8//3:10, e. g.) and how Moses is to present himself to them (3:15//3:16, e. g.).

be assigned to E; if we no longer think so, however, this is a more tenuous conclusion. The other major reason for thinking that this verse should be E – or at least not J – is that it seems to uncomfortably interrupt the continuity of 10:29 to 11:4: in 10:29, Moses says "you will not see my face again," which implies that there can be no return to Pharaoh for further communication. 11:4, then, when read continuously, is not a message delivered later, but a continuation of the same speech from 10:29, with the ויאמר functioning, as it often does, to indicate a shift in topic within a single speech.[13] But if 11:1 interposed between these two speeches of Moses to Pharaoh, then there would seem to be a departure and return, at least implicitly: nowhere else in the J plagues account does Moses receive a message from Yahweh while still in Pharaoh's presence.

Thus there is a reasonable case to be made that 11:1 is not J. On the other hand, however, this verse is utterly suffused with J concepts and language. The word נגע is used in P and D to refer specifically to skin afflictions (Lev 13–14, passim; Deut 24:8), or to physical assault (Deut 17:8; 21:5), and does not appear in E, but is used to refer to a plague more generally in J, in Gen 12:17. The use of the hiphil of בוא to describe the bringing of a plague occurs elsewhere in J (Exod 10:4). The idea that the plagues strike both Pharaoh and his people or his nation is familiar from J (Exod 10:6). The word שלח for the sending out of the people is typically J (see n. 11 above). Indeed, the entire phrase אחרי-כן ישלח אתכם is verbatim from, of all places, Exodus 3:20. The adverbial use of כלה appears elsewhere in the entire Bible only in J, in Gen 18:21. And the use of גרש, "drive out," hearkens back to Yahweh's proleptic statement to Moses in J in Exod 6:1. Indeed, there is practically no aspect of this verse that is not purely J in content, concept, and style; when taken all together, it would be remarkable if another author, even a later editorial hand, were capable of producing such a consistently and uniformly J assemblage of words, phrases, and ideas.

The most likely explanation, then, is that this verse is indeed from J – but may well be from a later layer of J.[14] We can put forth a reasonable explanation as to why it would have been added it here. When Moses speaks to Pharaoh, at the end of chapter 10 and continuing in 11:4, he announces the last plague, that of the death of the firstborn. In the entire J cycle, however, this is the only time when Moses announces a plague without any preceding communication from Yahweh

[13] Bacon, *Triple Tradition*, 48, wonderfully exclaims, "The supposition that xi. 1–3 was originally intended to interrupt the absolutely necessary connection of xi. 4–8 with x. 28 f. involves absurdities greater than which it is almost impossible to conceive."

[14] Here we have a fairly good example of the type of evidence required to suggest a secondary insertion within a source, rather than to the already compiled text: concepts and language that conform entirely to one source, with no clear influence from any other. For contrast, see the discussion of Exod 10:1–3 in the following note; for a more thorough example, see my article, "Source Stratification, Secondary Additions, and the Documentary Hypothesis in the Book of Numbers: The Case of Numbers 17," in *Torah and the Book of Numbers*, ed. Christian Frevel, Thomas Pola, and Aaron Schart, FAT II/62 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 233–47.

whatsoever. In fact, in almost every other case, J does not even narrate Moses's declaration of the coming plague, but rather embeds it in Yahweh's instructions to Moses; that Moses delivers the message is simply presumed.[15] In other words, reading Moses's speech without 11:1 it would be possible to think that Moses took the decision to bring this last plague entirely on his own authority. One can imagine that for someone, even someone in the J scribal circle, this was too much initiative to ascribe to Moses, and inserted this verse – still a J verse, but a secondary one – to mitigate the ostensible theological difficulty.

This still leaves us with the question of how the despoiling in 11:2–3 fits into its potential contexts. Without any E plagues story, there is a significant gap between the previous E verse and this one. Indeed, we would have to go all the way back to 4:18 to find the immediately preceding E text: Jethro sending Moses back to visit his kinsmen in Egypt.[16] As there is certainly some E material missing here in almost any analysis, one could well speculate that the despoiling passage here followed originally on something else. There is another problem as well, though, which we will encounter again soon: there is no E material that follows on this, either. Aside from the other despoiling notice in 12:35–36, E will not rear its head again in the narrative until the departure of the Israelites in Exod 13:18b–19.[17]

The potential E sequence would thus look like this:

---

[15] Cf. Exod 7:14–18; 26–29; 8:16–19; 9:1–5, 13–19. The ostensible exception to this rule is Exod 10:3–6, in which it seems that, while Yahweh did instruct Moses to go to Pharaoh in 10:1, Moses (with Aaron) was responsible for announcing what the plague would actually be. This difficulty is resolved when it is recognized that 10:1b–3a (through ויאמר אליו) is a secondary addition, as is evident from the mixture of J-like language (כבד, בקרב) with P concepts (Yahweh hardening Pharaoh's heart, the purpose of the plagues being for Yahweh to show off his power) and even D language (אתת, signs). The required adjustment for reading original J, then, is simply to read Yahweh's speech as continuing from "Go to Pharaoh" in 10:1a directly into "Thus says Yahweh" in 10:3, with an assumed original ואמרת אליו, "and say to him," having been replaced by ויאמרו אליו. So already Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *Hexateuch*, 2:94.

[16] The identification and role of Jethro as Moses's father-in-law is a consistent and unique element of E. See Exod 3:1 (where the phrase "the priest of Midian" should probably be seen as secondary) and the whole of Exodus 18.

[17] This passage is identifiable as E on two grounds. In Exod 13:18b, the notion that Israel went out of Egypt חמשים, generally understood as "armed" (NJPS) or "prepared for battle" (NRSV), does not agree particularly well with the preceding passage (13:17–18a), in which there is an effort to have the Israelites avoid armed conflict, and which is most likely to be attributed to J; moreover, in E the Israelites do, quite soon hereafter, engage in armed conflict against the Amalekites (Exod 17:8–16), and later on against the Amorites (Num 21:21–32). In 13:19, we have explicit and nearly verbatim reference back to Gen 50:25, which despite ardent efforts by some scholars to argue otherwise (cf., e. g., Jan Christian Gertz, "The Transition between the Books of Genesis and Exodus," in *A Farewell to the Yahwist?*, ed. Thomas B. Dozeman and Konrad Schmid; SBLSym 34 [Atlanta: SBL, 2006], 73–87, at 79–82) is from E. Of course, should one disagree, and consider Exod 13:18b–19 to be entirely secondary – a not totally untenable position, in my opinion – then the gap is even larger, and the next E verse would be Exod 15:20–21, the song of Miriam, and the same difficulties would present themselves.

Index of Ancient Sources

Deuterocanonical Literature

Apocrypha

New Testament

Dead Sea Scrolls

Index of Authors

Index of Subjects