

source-critical fragmentation. The use of the name Elohim from 17:3 onward has nothing to do with the proposal that now we have narratives emanating from E and P, rather it marks the pivot point of the Cycle as highlighted also by the patriarch's name change. Higher critics would have a difficult time explaining how J uses Abram in those sections ascribed to him in 11:27–16:16 but Abraham in those sections ascribed to him in 17:1–22:24. The name change in 17:5 supposedly stems from P (presumed by every critic to be post-J); thus how is it that J just happened to use Abram in, for example, the story of Ishmael's birth, but Abraham in, for example, the story of his negotiations with Yahweh to save Sodom and Gomorrah from destruction? These are questions which are not faced by most conventional exegetes; the answers to them bring down the Documentary Hypothesis.

This does not mean that all of Genesis is the work of one author,⁷ for there clearly remain different sources and variant traditions. The author of 1:1–2:4a must clearly be someone different than the author of 2:4b–3:24. The tradition which makes Cain a nomad in 4:12–16 is certainly at variance with the one which depicts him building a city in 4:17. But, we must posit one compiler or collator for the Primeval History, one for the Abraham Cycle, one for the Jacob Cycle, and one for the Joseph Story. Whether these four compilers are the same person—in which case we can posit a single editor for the whole book of Genesis⁸—or not, is a question which cannot be answered. But given the systematic working of the entire redactional structure, this would not be a difficult conclusion to reach.⁹

⁷ Compare the view of DiMarco, "Der Chiasmus in der Bibel, 1. Teil," 28: "Alle diese wiederholten Chiasmen und Symmetrien [in Gen 1–11] legen nahe, dass es sich um nur einen Autor handelt."

⁸ For a parallel see P. W. Skehan, "A Single Editor for the Whole Book of Proverbs," in *Studies in Israelite Poetry and Wisdom*, 15–26 (revised version of CBQ 10 [1948] 115–30).

⁹ Also pointing to this conclusion are the many excellent points raised by R. L. Cohn, "Narrative Structure and Canonical Perspective in Genesis," *ISOT* 25 (1983) 3–16.

VII

THE DATE OF GENESIS

The major goal of this monograph—to describe the literary technique of the redactor of Genesis—has already been accomplished. But in a work entitled *The Redaction of Genesis*, it seems appropriate to include some information on the date of that redaction, and thus this final chapter. The question, when did Genesis receive its final edited form, has consumed modern biblical scholarship from the outset. The various views are well-known and will not be reviewed here. Moreover, we will progress quite independently, except to refer to the seminal article of Benjamin Mazar, "The Historical Background of the Book of Genesis," in which the Israeli savant proposes the Davidic empire for the period of Genesis' original, and more or less complete, written form.¹ This conclusion, which is by no means Mazar's alone,² is accepted here, and evidence to substantiate it will be presented in systematic (though not always detailed³) fashion.

The clearest evidence pointing to a Davidic–Solomonic redaction of Genesis are the historical allusions

¹ B. Mazar, "The Historical Background of the Book of Genesis," *JNES* 28 (1969) 73–83.

² Even source critics who accept the JEP division would agree to some extent, since the "Yahwistic" material presumably dates from the 10th century.

³ I realize that much of what I shall say has been pointed out innumerable times, but no attempt is made to cite secondary literature with any consistency or completeness. Also, each point raised could be discussed for pages on end; for economy's sake, however, discussion is kept to a minimum.

present. Clearest of all is 15:18 where the expression "from the river of Egypt to the Great River, the River Euphrates," can only refer to the Davidic boundaries (cf. 1 Kgs 5:1). In the following verses (15:19–21) occur a number of peoples who were not vanquished until David's time. Most important for our present task are the Jebusites, whose city of Jerusalem was captured by David in 2 Sam 5:6–9. The Kenites appear as a distinct ethnic group as late as Saul's time (see 1 Sam 15:6; 27:10). In 1 Sam 30:29 they are associated with David already, after which they disappear from the biblical record. Reference to the Kenizzites cease after Josh 14:14. If they retained any ethnic identity down to the Davidic–Solomonic period, they were certainly subsumed by the empire at that time. The question of the Rephaim is complicated, but we may point out that four individual Rephaim fell to David's forces in 2 Sam 21:15–22. Of Kadmonites, Perizzites, and Girgashites, virtually nothing is known, and exactly who is meant by Hittites, Amorites, and Canaanites is subject to debate, but regardless, subjugation of all these peoples refers clearly to the early monarchy.

The relationship between Jacob and Esau in Genesis is plainly a reflection of Israelite–Edomite affairs during the early monarchy. The oracle to Rebekah that of the two sons "the older shall serve the younger" (25:23), and the blessing of Isaac to Jacob, "you shall be your brothers' master" (27:29), describes Israel's subjugation of Edom under David (2 Sam 8:14). Isaac's words to Esau, "you shall throw off his yoke from your neck" (27:40), refer to the Edomite revolt at the end of Solomon's reign (1 Kgs 11:14–25).

Jacob and Esau are depicted as twins, which is significant in that there appears to have been a closer link between Israel and Edom than, by comparison, between Israel and other nations conquered by David. 2 Sam 8:2 and 8:6 mention tributary exacted from Moab and Aram–Damascus respectively and thus we infer that their kings were allowed to rule as subjects of David. 2 Sam 12:30

states that David merely took the actual crown from the king of Ammon, but it does not imply that the Ammonite king was ousted. In contrast we have reference to the incorporation of Edom as an Israelite province under David (2 Sam 8:14), and of the flight of Edomite royalty to Egypt at the time of the conquest (1 Kgs 11:14–18). The rule of David and Solomon over Edom was firmer,⁴ thus Edom was considered more closely linked to Israel, and thus Jacob and Esau are pictured as twins.

The other countries just mentioned also appear in Genesis. Moab and Ammon occur in 19:37–38, where they are genealogically linked to the family of Abraham. This too implies a connection with Israel, and we are to see here a reflection of Davidic–Solomonic rule over the two countries (2 Sam 8:2; 10:6–14). Aram appears throughout the patriarchal stories but the one occurrence which most likely mirrors events of the Davidic period is the agreement between Laban, the Aramean, and Jacob, eponymous ancestor of Israel, at Gilead in 31:45–54. The peaceful resolution of an Aramean–Israelite conflict in the general area of Gilead⁵ occurs in 2 Sam 10:19, thus prompting the link between the two episodes.⁶

Returning to Edom for a moment, we naturally should refer to 36:1–43 with its detailed material on Esau's descendants and the Edomite kings. Such a list, most certainly of Edomite origin or at least based on material of Edomite origin, would have been incorporated

⁴ Presumably, David and Solomon wished to control the important part of Ezion-geber–Elath and therefore rule over Edom was more direct.

⁵ For locating Helam in the general area of Gilead, see H. G. May, ed., *Oxford Bible Atlas* (London, 1962) 65, 127; and Y. Aharoni and M. Avi-Yonah, *The Macmillan Bible Atlas* (New York, 1977) 66–67, 179. Both atlases accept the identification with 'Alma.

⁶ In this instance, I differ slightly with the view of Mazar ("The Historical Background of the Book of Genesis," 78–79) that the Jacob and Laban pact "is an enlightening portrayal of the relationship between Aram and Israel before the beginning of David's war against the kingdom of Aram-zobah and her allies in Transjordan."

into Israelite literature at a time when Israel had domain over Edom, again during the Davidic–Solomonic empire. Furthermore, 36:31 (“these are the kings who reigned in the land of Edom before a king reigned over the Israelites”) suggests that the list originates from the period of the early monarchy. If it were from an earlier period, such a statement would be impossible. If it were from a later period, we would expect an Edomite king list beyond that of the time before 1000, i.e., “before a king reigned over the Israelites.”

It may be apposite to quote the theory of A. M. Honeyman⁷ who identifies Hadad of 36:39 (as per LXX and 1 Chr 1:51) with the Hadad who revolted against Solomon, Baalhanan of 36:38 with David based on 2 Sam 21:19 where the slayer of Goliath is Elhanan, and Saul of 36:37 with Saul king of Israel (cf. 1 Sam 14:47). There are problems with Honeyman’s proposal, e.g., the patronymics of Baalhanan ben Achbor, David ben Jesse, and Elhanan ben Yaare-oregim are all different, and Saul of 36:37 comes from Rehoboth-on-the-River, not Gibeah, but the theory is attractive. If we accept it, we have actual confirmation of 36:31–39 originating in Davidic–Solomonic times. If we do not accept it, we still have the argument of the preceding paragraph which points to the Edomite material’s provenance in the period of the United Kingdom.

Another nation common to both the Genesis stories and the Davidic period is the Philistines. I wholeheartedly endorse the theory of Y. M. Grintz and others which holds that the Philistines of the patriarchal narratives are different from the later Philistines of Saul’s and David’s time.⁸ The former is an earlier wave of Aegean emigration, while the latter are among the Sea Peoples who

⁷ A. M. Honeyman, “The Evidence for Regnal Names Among the Hebrews,” *JBL* 67 (1948) 23–24 and n 44.

⁸ Y. M. Grintz, “The Philistines of Gerar and the Philistines of the Coast,” in *Studies in Memory of Moses Schorr* (Hebrew; New York, 1945) 96–112; C. H. Gordon, “The Rôle of the Philistines,” *Antiquity* 30

reached the Levant in the early 12th century. But the appearance of Philistines in the Abraham and Isaac stories (21:32, 21:34, 26:1, 26:8, 26:14, 26:15, 26:18) and in 1–2 Samuel is not coincidental. The Philistines of the patriarchal narratives may have been used in Davidic times to show that even in Israel’s ancient past there were differences between the two peoples. Alternatively, the friendly relationship between Isaac and Abimelech in 26:26–31 may have been used to justify David’s peaceful relations with Achish in 1 Sam 27:1–28:2.

We may also see a connection between 14:1–24, especially 14:18–24, and the era of David and Solomon. The identifications of Salem in 14:18 and Jerusalem seems virtually certain.⁹ Since the city gained its prominence during the early monarchy, we can see in 14:18–24 an attempt to connect the new capital with Hebrew traditions and with worship of Yahweh already in patriarchal times. By post-Solomonic times it would have been unnecessary to defend the choice of Jerusalem as Yahweh’s holy city; the deed would have been a *fait accompli*. Thus it is harder to argue that 14:18–24 was authored or incorporated into Hebrew literature at a later date. The episode in 14:1–24 also connects Abraham with Damascus (14:15; see also 15:2), perhaps to establish patriarchal links with the city in light of David’s occupation of it (2 Sam 8:6).

Other cities associated with the Patriarchs also appear in the stories of David and Solomon. Dan is mentioned in 14:14, and Beersheba in 21:14, 21:31–33, 22:19 (bis), 26:23, 26:33, 28:10, 46:1, 46:5. The two cities form the northern and southern extents of Israel proper during the United Kingdom (2 Sam 24:2, 1 Kgs 5:5). While it is true that the expression “from Dan to Beersheba” occurs as early as Judg 20:1, it ceases to be meaningful after

(1956) 22; U. Cassuto, *From Noah to Abraham* (Jerusalem, 1964) 208; and K. A. Kitchen, *Ancient Orient and Old Testament* (Downers Grove, IL, 1966) 80–81.

⁹ E. A. Speiser, *Genesis* (Garden City, NY, 1964) 104; and R. Davidson, *Genesis 12–50* (Cambridge, 1979) 38.

Solomon's death. Instead one finds an expression such as "from Geba to Beersheba" (2 Kgs 23:8) to demarcate the borders of Judah.

Mahanaim occurs in 32:3 and figures prominently in David's career. Abner crowned Ishbosheth king of Israel there in 2 Sam 2:8 and David made it his temporary capital in 2 Sam 17:24, 17:27 during Absalom's revolt. Hebron is obviously of prime importance to the Patriarchs (13:18, 23:2, 23:19, 35:27, 37:14; see also 25:9, 49:30, 50:13) and it is David's first capital in 2 Sam 2:1-4, 5:1-3.¹⁰

Since so much of the evidence points to the United Kingdom as the time of the redaction of Genesis, we should probably conclude that the patriarchal associations with Bethel antedate Jeroboam I's establishment of the city as a sanctuary site. It is hard to imagine that a later author, presumably a Judean, would have placed Abram at Bethel (12:8, 13:3) and would have made Bethel such an important city in Jacob's life (28:19, 31:13, 35:1-8, 35:15-16). Even those who subscribe to the JEP theory ascribe the first four of these occurrences to J, assumed to be a Judean, and 35:15 is attributed to P, also assumed to be a Judean. Only 35:1-8 and 35:16 are thought to be E, assumed to be an Ephraimite. Moreover, since there is a connection between Samuel and Bethel in 1 Sam 7:16 the Davidic-Solomonic redactor could have had this instance in mind when connecting the Patriarchs with Bethel. The same verse also mentions Mizpah, which we should note appears in 31:49 in the story of Jacob and Laban.

Regardless of the geographical problems involved with 35:19, Rachel's burial spot of Ephrath-Bethlehem is also evoked in stories about David. The two terms occur in 1 Sam 17:12 in connection with Jesse and in Ruth 1:1-2 in connection with David's earlier forebearers. An obvious relationship exists between Ishmael's dwelling

¹⁰ See R. E. Clements, *Abraham and David* (London, 1967) 47-60, for further details, especially regarding the covenant.

"from Havilah by Shur, which is before Egypt," in 25:18, and the exact phrase in 1 Sam 15:7. Finally, the important patriarchal city of Shechem (12:6, 33:18-19, 34:2-26, 35:4, 37:12-14) was, according to Josh 20:7, 21:21, a city of refuge and a Levitical city. Past studies of these cities and the lists in Joshua 20-21 have concluded that they originate in the time of the United Kingdom.¹¹ In other words, we may tentatively associate even Shechem, although it does not occur in the stories about David and Solomon, with both the Patriarchs and the United Kingdom.

All of this goes to show that there are intimate links between the cities mentioned in the patriarchal narratives and the history of the Davidic-Solomonic period. But we can also expand the geographical discussion somewhat to include tribal material. Two points can be made. First of all we should note that the tribes themselves have an importance in Genesis. The tribal distinctions are emphasized in 29:31-30:24, 35:22-26, 46:8-27, 49:1-27. Such tribal distinctions were most important during the era of the Judges and the early monarchy. From Solomon's time on, however, they decreased in importance. This is not to say that tribal origins were no longer important at all or were no longer known—for even the Mesha Stele refers to Gad, for example—but that 1 Kgs 4:7-19 very clearly introduces a new political alignment to compete with the traditional tribal divisions. In other words, if the tribal system appears so prominently in Genesis, we should see here further evidence for the Davidic-Solomonic period for the book's redaction.¹²

The second point to be raised in this regard is the prominence of Judah in Genesis. Very clearly 38:1-30 is

¹¹ W. F. Albright, "The List of Levitic Cities," *Louis Ginsberg Jubilee Volume I* (New York, 1945) 49-73; and B. Mazar, "The Cities of the Priests and Levites," *Congress Volume Oxford* (VTSup 7; Leiden, 1960) 193-205.

¹² On the connection between the Israelite tribes and the Davidic period, see N. K. Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh* (Maryknoll, NY, 1979) 358-75.

included to give us an account of David's distant ancestors. We have no similar stories about Jacob's other sons, at least no detailed ones, because our redactor in David's and Solomon's time was mainly interested in the royal lineage which began with Judah and Perez. Judah's prominence is visible in the Joseph Story throughout (37:26, 43:8–9, 44:14–34, 46:28) and of course 49:8–10 is a clear reference to Judah's role as kingly tribe. These references would have been most meaningful to Israelites of the early monarchy, when dynastic succession was evolving as solely a Judahite privilege.

As is well known, Genesis is replete with evidence indicating the antiquity of the book. In the area of tribal associations, we may note that Reuben's position as first-born, Levi's role as a warrior, and Simeon's geographic tie to Shechem, do not accord with later history and must therefore be ancient traditions. Similarly, the presence of Ishmaelites in 25:12–16, 37:25–28, 39:1, and Midianites in 25:2, 25:4, 36:35, 37:28, 37:36, points to the early origin of the patriarchal traditions. The last historical references to the Ishmaelites are Judg 8:24 (the time of Gideon) and 1 Chr 27:30 (where Obil the Ishmaelite is listed as one of David's officers), with no attestation of the term in a demonstrably post-United Kingdom text.¹³ The last historical reference to the Midianites is 1 Kgs 11:18, also of the Davidic–Solomonic period.¹⁴

There is more evidence which points to the antiquity of Genesis. In regard to onomasticon, we should note that Yahwistic names are wanting in Genesis. They seem to originate with Jochebed in Exod 6:20 and Joshua in

¹³ Individual Ishmaelite tribes listed in 25:12–16 appear in later biblical and extra-biblical sources, but this does not affect our conclusion; cf. I. Eph'al, "Ishmaelites," *EJ* 9 (1971) col. 89; and I. Eph'al, *The Ancient Arabs* (Jerusalem, 1982) 63.

¹⁴ Cf. Eph'al, *The Ancient Arabs*, 63. Isa 9:3, 10:26 refer to earlier historical events, and Isa 60:6 uses Midian only in a geographical, not a gentilic, sense. See further O. Eissfeldt, "Protektorat der Midianiter über ihre Nachbarn im letzten Viertel des 2. Jahrtausends v. Chr.," *JBL* 87 (1968) 392–93.

Num 13:16, but remain rare until the early monarchy when names such as Jonathan, Adonijah, Zeruiah, Benaiiah, and Jehoiada begin to appear with some regularity. Accordingly, the absence of Yahwistic names in Genesis reflects the antiquity of the traditions. They must antedate the United Kingdom, when they presumably were compiled into their present form more or less. The same holds for the divine names in Genesis. The expressions *paḥad yiṣḥāq* in 31:42, 31:53, *ʿabbir yaʿaqōb* in 49:24, the various *ʿēl* names in 14:18, 16:13, 17:1, 21:33, 28:3, 33:20, 35:11, 43:14, 48:3, and the "God of my/your/his father" concept in 26:24, 28:13, 31:42, 32:10, 46:3, 50:17, are for the most part unique to Genesis. Uniqueness need not a priori be equated with antiquity, but in light of all the data presented, the evidence of divine names may be invoked to argue for the early age of Genesis.

Also well-known are the various customs reflected in Genesis which contradict later Pentateuchal law.¹⁵ Abraham married his half-sister Sarah (20:12) in contrast with the prohibition against such marriages in Lev 18:9, 20:17, Deut 27:22. Jacob married his sister-in-law (28:28) contrary to the law in Lev 18:18. The eclipsing of the first-born by a younger brother is commonplace in Genesis (17:17–21, 25:29–34, 27:1–40, 38:27–30, 48:13–20, 49:3–4). Even though all the details of Deut 21:15–17 may not apply to each of these episodes, later law makes it clear that the firstborn is not to be denied his birthright and inheritance. Jacob set up a *maṣṣēbâ* (28:18), a practice outlawed in Exod 34:13, Lev 26:1, Deut 12:3, 16:21–22. Abraham planted an *ʿēšel* (21:33), even though Exod 34:13, Deut 12:3, 16:21 prohibit the *ʿāšērâ*, among which Abraham's tamarisk would have to be included. When these laws are to be dated is a difficult and complicated problem. But notwithstanding their usual attribution to D and P and notwithstanding the usual dates ascribed to these two strata, it is also accepted by more and more critics

¹⁵ Much of what follows is indebted to N. M. Sarna, "Genesis, Book of," *EJ* 7 (1971) col. 390.

that much of Pentateuchal law is older than once believed. The legal process was certainly well under way by David's and Solomon's time, so that once again we have evidence for the antiquity of the Genesis stories.

Next we should turn to literary considerations. The Genesis episodes are the epitome of epic literature, and as Cyrus Gordon has pointed out,¹⁶ there are numerous parallels in the epic literatures of other Near Eastern peoples. A major motif of the patriarchal narratives is the quest for an heir through the proper wife. Abraham's relationship with Sarah to produce Isaac is the most detailed version. Isaac's relationship with Rebekah to produce Jacob is told in far fewer verses but it is nonetheless present. And, as noted in chap. III, Jacob's life is not complete until Rachel produces Joseph. This theme is paralleled in the two epics we have from Ugarit, where both Daniel and Kret seek the proper heir. Another theme which permeates Genesis is the Helen of Troy motif. Abraham must twice retrieve Sarah from a foreign palace, Isaac must retrieve Rebekah, and even Dinah needs to be retrieved by her family. This theme occurs in Ugaritic epic, with Kret's rescue of Hurrai, and of course, as its name implies, it is prominent in Greek epic, with Menelaus' retrieval of Helen. The younger child's eclipsing of the firstborn, mentioned above, is paralleled in the Kret Epic with Octavia's superseding her seven brothers. The *nostos*, or homecoming motif, is the main theme of the *Odyssey*, of the Gilgamesh Epic, of various Egyptian tales, and of the Jacob Cycle as well.¹⁷ Even seemingly minor points are paralleled in the other epic literatures. For example, the number 318 in 14:14 is analogous to the number of Hurrian handmaidens plus the bride in an Egyptian scarab of Amenhotep III and to the number dead after four days of fighting in the *Iliad*.¹⁸

¹⁶ See most importantly, C. H. Gordon, *The Common Background of Greek and Hebrew Civilization* (New York, 1965).

¹⁷ See G. A. Rendsburg, "Notes on Genesis XXXV," VT 34 (1984) 361–65.

¹⁸ S. Gevirtz, "Abram's 318," IEJ 19 (1969) 110–13.

These and many other parallels which could be cited demonstrate the relative antiquity of the Genesis stories. The Ugaritic, Egyptian, and Babylonian materials are all 2nd millennium traditions. The Greek parallels are harder to date because of the question of the date of Homer. The events described are probably of the 12th century and classicists customarily date Homer to the 9th or 8th century. In other words, Near Eastern epic literature seems to have had its heyday in the 2nd millennium, with the Homeric poems and the Genesis accounts of the early 1st millennium as the culmination and best examples of this literary expression.

What is most interesting is that Hebrew epic¹⁹ tends to disappear from the Bible after the United Kingdom. The Genesis episodes, the Exodus account, the Conquest account, the stories of the Judges, and the rise of David are all told in epic fashion. The material dealing with Solomon acts as a bridge, for there is epic material such as the 480-year figure in 1 Kgs 6:1, though most of his reign is described in very detailed, annalistic fashion. From 1 Kings 12 on, Israelite historiography becomes quite dry, devoid of epic quality.²⁰ This suggests, consistent with the historical material presented above, that the book of Genesis is not to be dated later than the United Kingdom. From ca. 900 on, due no doubt to the official scribes now

¹⁹ I use this term in the general sense of a long narrative work incorporating historical and presumably ahistorical material, not in the more restricted sense of a lengthy poetic composition of heroic dimension. On this issue, with a focus on a possible epic *Vorlage* to the present Pentateuchal narrative, see the admirable essay by C. Conroy, "Hebrew Epic: Historical Notes and Critical Perspectives," *Biblica* 61 (1980) 1–30. I disagree with Conroy's conclusion (pp. 29–30) that the terminological question has substantive implications. Thus, I see no harm in continuing to refer to early Israelite literature as "Hebrew epic," by which one can intend prose and/or poetry. It hardly needs to be added that this usage is quite common in biblical studies; indeed this precipitated Conroy's study.

²⁰ A notable exception are the stories about Elijah and Elisha, suggesting perhaps that epic writing continued in northern Israel longer than in southern Judah.

active in Jerusalem, historical writing is annalistic. In the period before the establishment of a bureaucracy, epic narrative of the type found in Genesis was the norm. One sure piece of evidence in this regard, *Frauengeschichten*, the spice of epic, are prominent up to David's time, somewhat present in Solomon's reign, and virtually absent from Rehoboam on.

Finally, we may garner some linguistic evidence in favor of a 10th century date for the redaction of Genesis. In a recent article,²¹ I have argued that the 3rd person common singular pronoun *hw*³ in Genesis (and throughout the Pentateuch) suggests an earlier Hebrew layer than that which uses *hw*³ for the masculine and *hy*³ for the feminine in Joshua through Chronicles. The move from epicene *hw*³ to gender-distinguished *hw*³/*hy*³ probably has the internationalism and the expanded boundaries of the United Kingdom as its catalyst, especially since it can be demonstrated that other Canaanite dialects and indeed all of Semitic distinguish gender for the 3rd person singular pronoun.

Another linguistic item which can be forwarded is the presence of three dual pronominal suffixes in Genesis, at 18:20, 19:9 (both third person forms) and 31:9 (second person form). In two other studies,²² I have demonstrated that, although such forms do appear sporadically in late works, a bunching of them suggests an early date of composition. No specific cut-off date was offered, but it is noteworthy that in prose narrative, the last such forms occur in 1 Sam 6:7 (tris), 6:10 (bis), 6:12, and Ruth 1:8, 1:9, 1:11, 1:13, 1:19, 4:11. In other words, in no demonstrably post-Solomonic historical text (e.g., 1 Kings 12–2 Kings 25, all of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther) do such forms occur.

²¹ G. A. Rendsburg, "A New Look at Hebrew *HW*³," *Biblica* 63 (1982) 351–69.

²² G. A. Rendsburg, "Late Biblical Hebrew and the Date of 'P,'" *JANESCU* 12 (1980) 77; and G. A. Rendsburg, "Dual Personal Pronouns and Dual Verbs in Hebrew," *JQR* 73 (1982) 38–58.

Also of a linguistic nature are the Egyptian names in the Joseph Story. Various studies have dated the names, or better the name types, to various periods, from as early as the 19th Dynasty, the time of Moses,²³ to as late as Saite and Persian times.²⁴ Neither of these extremes is correct, however. A more sober study of the names by A. R. Schulman concludes that "the Egyptian names, all of which are of approximately the same date, argue for the writing of the stories to be dated to a time when these names were in current usage, to the time of the late Twenty-first to Twenty-second Dynasties, which corresponds in historical biblical chronology to the period of David and Solomon."²⁵ A thorough knowledge of Egypt, which the author of the Joseph Story very clearly possessed, would have been accessible at this time given the contact between Israel and Egypt during the 900s.²⁶

The mass of evidence very clearly supports a redaction for the Book of Genesis during the United Kingdom. The historical allusions adduced mainly by Mazar, various indications of the book's antiquity, the literary style, and the linguistic data all merge in the Davidic–Solomonic era. During this period we can assume that literary activity reached new heights in ancient Israel.²⁷ The authorship/compilation/redaction of Genesis was but one of the literary achievements of this era. Concurrently, much more of the biblical historical material was being composed, especially the Davidic Court History (2 Samuel 9–20, 1 Kings 1–2) and no doubt other portions of our canonical books of Samuel. In this manner we are able to explain the

²³ J. Vergote, *Joseph in Égypte* (Louvain, 1959) 141–50.

²⁴ D. B. Redford, *A Study of the Biblical Story of Joseph* (Leiden, 1970) 228–31.

²⁵ A. R. Schulman, "On the Egyptian Name of Joseph: A New Approach," *SAK* 2 (1974) 235–43, especially 243.

²⁶ See A. Malamat, "Aspects of the Foreign Policies of David and Solomon," *JNES* 22 (1963) 1–17.

²⁷ See J. Bright, *A History of Israel* (2nd ed.; Philadelphia, 1972) 214–15; and C. H. Gordon, *The Ancient Near East* (New York, 1965) 166–67.

many similar expressions in Genesis and 2 Samuel 11–15 collated by Benno Jacob,²⁸ the historical connections discussed earlier, and perhaps even U. Cassuto's tentative proposal that 20:1–18 parallels the Philistine capture and return of the ark in 1 Samuel 4–6.²⁹ This chapter on the date of the redaction has been by necessity extremely economical. Further research, it is hoped, will garner even more evidence and point out still other similarities, literary, historical, and otherwise, between Genesis and the United Kingdom.³⁰

²⁸ B. Jacob, *Genesis: Das erste Buch der Tora* (Berlin, 1934) 1048–49.

²⁹ U. Cassuto, *From Noah to Abraham* (Jerusalem, 1964) 341.

³⁰ See, e.g., R. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York, 1981) 117, 120, for connections between 1 Samuel 18 and Genesis 39 and between 1 Samuel 19 and Genesis 31. See also, though I do not agree with all his conclusions, W. Brueggemann, "David and His Theologian," *CBQ* 30 (1968) 156–81.

INDEX

<i>Genesis</i>		4:15	24
		4:16	16
1:1	13	4:17	16, 17, 106
1:2	9	4:19	17
1:4	23	4:21	17
1:9	9	4:22	17
1:21	10	4:24	18, 24
1:22	9	4:25	17
1:25	10	4:26	16, 17, 24
1:27	10	5:1–2	19
1:28	9, 10, 11	5:1–3	112
1:29	11	5:2	24
2:1–2	11	6:1	20, 21, 24
2:2–3	10, 11, 103	6:1–4	21
2:4	13	6:2	20
2:4a	23	6:4	20
2:4b	23	6:5	21, 23
2:5	11	6:5–8	21, 22
2:7	11	6:6–7	21
2:7–8	11	6:6–8	21
2:10–14	16	6:7	20
2:21	11	6:8	22, 23, 24
2:23	11, 103	6:8–9	23, 25
2:25	23	6:9	11, 22, 23, 24, 103
3:1	23	6:12	12, 103
3:8	11, 103	6:16	11
3:24	11, 12, 23, 103	6:17–18	12
4:1–2	14	6:19	10
4:3	14	6:19–21	12
4:3–5	14	6:20	10
4:4–5	14	6:22	12
4:7	14	7:1–3	12
4:8	14, 15	7:3	10
4:10	14	7:4	11, 12
4:11	14	7:5	12
4:12	14	7:6–12	12
4:12–16	106	7:9	10
4:14	15, 24	7:10	11