

By illustrating Deuteronomy's overt references to P, including sections identified by Polzin as P², Milgrom demonstrates that these medicinal, cultic, and theological narrative sections were published prior to the composition, by the end of the seventh or beginning of the sixth century B.C.E., of the Deuteronomic sections which refer to them. The fact that Dtr composed a story in which 18% of the verbatim repetitions are derived from P indicates that P's redaction not only of Num 13–14 but also of the later summary in Num 32^a–13 were completed and published before Dtr began his work. A similar situation can be demonstrated for other narratives in Deuteronomy with JEP parallels in Exodus and Numbers.⁹² Unless one assumes that the P redaction of the Tetrateuch was a piecemeal process extending over an extensive period, the example of Num 13–14 suffices to *imply* – it does not demonstrate – that before Dtr there existed a P redaction of the Tetrateuch.⁹³

Generalizing from these specific converging lines of evidence, socio-cultic, linguistic, and literary, it may be concluded that the P source with both its literary and cultic components is basically a pre-exilic composition.⁹⁴ To return to the question posed at the outset of this study, the exile of 586 B.C.E. is the *terminus ad quem* for the composition of P. The presence of exilic and post-exilic accretions and additions in the source cannot be denied *a priori*, but the burden of proof is properly borne now by those advocating a late chronology for any given element.

parallel material of CHR. The texts of JER (37–45) and EST are shown by this set of control corpora to be typical, respectively, of early and late BH* (p. 225).

I am not a liberty to discuss Guenther's work in any detail until it is published. Nevertheless, it suffices to notice that there is basic agreement between his conclusions and those of Hurvitz and Polzin, as I interpreted him. P² and P* are pre-N₁, DAN, and EST which on Guenther's continuum comprise exilic Hebrew.

I thank Dr. Guenther for sending me a copy of his dissertation and for allowing me to refer to it.

⁹² I will deal with these in a forthcoming study.

⁹³ F.M. Cross' description of P as not being a continuous narrative source is consistent in principle, though not in detail with the positions advanced above (Canaanite Myth, 293–95, 301–321). Cf. Z. Zevit, »The Priestly Redaction and Interpretation of the Plague Narrative in Exodus«, JQR 66 (1976) 196–97. We disagree significantly, however, in the matter of dating (cf. Canaanite Myth, 323–4).

⁹⁴ I am, therefore, in agreement with many of Haran's conclusions in »Temples,« but not with his notion that P was an esoteric-utopian type of composition produced in pre-exilic times, yet unknown to D (and Dtr [?]), and first published by Ezra (Temples, 146–147, idem, »Behind the Stage of History: On the Dating of the Pentateuchal Priestly Source,« Zion 45 [1980] 7–9). Regarding the synchronic and, to some extent, the literary relationships between P and D, my conclusions approach those of M. Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School, Oxford, 1972, p. 180.

The range of dates suggested in critical scholarly literature for the Pentateuchal source P extends from the eighth through the fourth centuries B.C.E. These dates are irreconcilable since the conflicting proposals are based often on different criteria. What they tend to share is the attempt to respond to the question »What is P's *terminus a quo*?« This study suggests that a more fruitful approach is to determine the *terminus ad quem* for the source. It presents and explicates data which are historical, linguistic, and literary, concluding that the *terminus ad quem* for the composition of P, with both its literary and cultic components, is the exile of 586 B.C.E.

Jakob in Bethel Beobachtungen zum Aufbau und zur Quellenfrage in Gen 28¹⁰⁻²²*

von Rolf Rendtorff

(Universität Heidelberg)

Die Erzählung von Jakob in Bethel ist ein geradezu »klassisches« Beispiel für die neuere exegetische Behandlung von Texten des Pentateuch, insbesondere des Buches Genesis. Dabei zeigt sich eine starke Dominanz der Literarkritik, und zwar in der Form der seit J. Wellhausen fast kanonisch gewordenen »Urkundenhypothese«. Alle übrigen Fragen der Gestaltung dieses Textes werden in aller Regel erst *nach* dem Vollzug der »Quellenscheidung« gestellt und damit faktisch dieser untergeordnet¹.

Hier soll einmal bewußt der umgekehrte Weg beschritten werden. Wir wollen zunächst Erwägungen über die Gestaltung des Textes in seiner vorliegenden Form anstellen und dabei natürlich auch auf etwaige Spannungen im Text achten. Erst danach werden wir uns dann mit den Argumenten der Vertreter der Urkundenhypothese auseinandersetzen.

I

Der Anfang unseres Textabschnittes ist deutlich auf den Kontext bezogen: Jakob bricht von Beer-Scheba auf, d.h. er muß vorher dort gewesen sein, was der Leser aus der vorangegangenen Erzählung weiß (vgl.

* Dieser Aufsatz wurde für J.L. Seeligman † zu seinem 70. Geburtstag verfaßt und soll im J.L. Seeligmann Anniversary Volume im E. Rubinstein Publishing House, Jerusalem, erscheinen.

¹ Dies gilt auch für die neueste Untersuchung von Gen 28¹⁰⁻²² von Eckart Otto, Jakob in Bethel. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Jakobüberlieferung, ZAW 88 (1976), 165–190. Er beginnt vor aller weiteren Analyse des Textes mit »literarkritische(n) Vorüberlegungen« (167).