

P AS AN ORIGINALLY INDEPENDENT SOURCE IN THE PENTATEUCH

E. W. NICHOLSON

Throughout the period since J. Wellhausen's work on the composition of the Pentateuch /1/ the dominant view has been that there once existed an independent Priestly narrative which began with the account of creation in Gen. 1 and continued its narration up to at least the period immediately prior to Israel's settlement in Canaan. That not all of the material which we can label P belonged to that original narrative has also been widely agreed, though opinions vary in detail as to what material, especially in the extensive legislation contained in the account of the revelation at Sinai in Exod. 19 - Num. 10, was incorporated by way of secondary accretions, whether before or after the combination of P with the older Pentateuchal sources.

Throughout this same period, however, a minority view has persisted that P never was an independent narrative, and that the material assigned to it is best explained as deriving from an editor or tradent who reworked the older sources incorporating a mass of additional material, some from sources which he inherited and some composed by himself. Such a view was argued in the latter part of the nineteenth century by, for example, S. Maybaum and A. Klostermann, earlier this century by J. Orr, A. C. Welch, M. Löhr, P. Volz, subsequently by I. Engnell, and in still more recent years by, for example, F. M. Cross, R. Rendtorff, S. Tengström, E. Blum, and R. N. Whybray/2/. Of these more recent writers, Cross has provided

1. J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, Berlin 1885, 2nd edit. 1889, 3rd edit. 1899. (The work originated in the form of articles published in *Jahrbuch für deutsche Theologie*, 21, 1876, and 22, 1877).

2. For a discussion of the earlier debate see J. Skinner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*, Edinburgh 1910, 2nd edit. 1930; *The Divine Names in Genesis*, London 1914; C. R. North, 'Pentateuchal Criticism', in *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, ed. H. H. Rowley, Oxford 1951, pp. 48-83. The more recent works referred to are: F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, Cambridge Mass. and London 1973, pp. 293-325; R. Rendtorff, *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch*, BZAW 147, New York

the most comprehensive statement of this view, and the following outline and discussion will focus largely upon his arguments, though the more narrowly based arguments of Tengström will also be briefly discussed. A fresh review of the evidence for such a view requires no apology. The issue is not an end in itself but is fundamental for an understanding of the origin and composition of the Pentateuch as a whole which is currently a subject of renewed debate. What follows is intended as a contribution to this debate.

(I)

Cross begins with an analysis of the Priestly 'tradent's' theology (pp. 295-300). As edited by this tradent, history from creation to Moses is 'periodized' into four ages, those of Adam, Noah, Abraham, and Moses. Each period after creation is marked by a covenant, and this system of covenants, reaching its climax at Sinai, constitutes P's main theological concern. The first was the Noachic covenant (Gen. 9:1-17), a covenant made by ^ʿElōhīm with all flesh, that is, a universal covenant. The second covenant, made with Abram (17:1-27), is 'at once deeper and narrower than the Noachic. More is revealed to fewer. ^ʿElōhīm, "God," now revealed himself by his more intimate and precise epithet ^ʿĒl Šadday' (p. 296). Abram receives the new name Abraham together with the blessing 'I will make thee exceedingly fruitful . . . and kings shall come forth from thee'. The sign of this covenant, and also its law, is circumcision. This Abrahamic covenant was then extended to Isaac (Gen. 17:21; 21:4) and subsequently more fully to Jacob (Gen. 35:9-13). Though both of these first two covenants remained valid, however, each was provisional, a stage on the way to God's ultimate covenant and ultimate self-disclosure - the revelation at Sinai and the covenant made there with Moses and Israel. Its 'prologue' is set out in Exod. 6:2-9 where God's proper name, Yahweh, is finally disclosed. This gives the sequence ^ʿElōhīm, ^ʿĒl Šadday, Yahweh in the Priestly

and Berlin 1977; S. Tengström, *Die Toledothformel und die literarische Struktur der priesterlichen Erweiterungsschicht im Pentateuch*, Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series 17, Lund 1981; E. Blum, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte*, WMANT 57, Neukirchen 1984; R. N. Whybray, *The Making of the Pentateuch*, JSOT Supplement Series 53, Sheffield 1987.

schema of covenants, the general appellative, "god," the archaic epithet, "E1 Šadday," and the unique proper name "Yahweh." (p. 298.) This prologue also renews the promise of the land, but now places it within the context of a new and central theme: 'I am Yahweh, and I will bring you forth from under the burdens of Egypt . . . and I will take you to be my people and I will become your God and you shall know that I am Yahweh . . . and I will bring you into the land' (vv. 6-8). The blessing of the covenant is expressed in its appropriate place in the list of blessings at the close of the covenant formulary (Lev. 26:9). The sign of the covenant is the sabbath (Exod. 31:13, 16f.). That God may 'tabernacle' among his people - that was the purpose of this covenant, expressed most decisively in Lev. 26:11-13 and Exod. 29:45-6, and the elaborate cultic requirements prescribed in the making of this covenant were 'the device contrived by Yahweh to make possible his "tabernacling" in Israel's midst, which alone could make full the redemption of Israel' (pp. 299-300).

Such a well-defined and carefully executed theology does not imply, however, that P was originally an independent narrative. According to Cross, P is 'most easily described as a . . . systematizing expansion of the normative JE tradition in the Tetrateuch' (pp. 294-5); the editor responsible for it was primarily concerned to supplement JE upon which he imposed 'framing elements', at the same time adding theological formulae and an occasional discrete document until reaching the description of the revelation at Sinai where he incorporated a mass of material.

In Genesis this editor enframed the J account of the *primaeval* history and the JE patriarchal history by means of a series of superscriptions employing the rubric 'these are the generations (*toledoth*) of . . .' This formula was secondarily derived from an originally independent source 'The document of the generations of Adam' which has been preserved in 5:1-32 and 11:10-26. It is employed ten times (2:4; 5:1; 6:9; 10:1; 11:10; 11:27; 25:12; 25:19; 36:1; 37:2) and in each case is a superscription. That this series never formed part of an independent P narrative is evidenced especially by Gen. 2:4a which cannot be related to the preceding priestly story of creation but is clearly a P editorial heading to the exclusively J narrative of creation and the 'fall' in 2:4b-4:26. Its occurrence in 6:9 is similarly an editorial heading to the flood story which has been 'completely rewritten by P' (p. 303).

As for narrative material, one is struck by its paucity in the P passages in Genesis. Apart from ch. 23, the bulk of the P material

here consists of the blessing and covenant passages (9:1-17; 17:1-22; 28:1-9; 35:9-13; 48:3-7), none of which can properly be called a narrative, and most of which depend directly on a parallel JE narrative.

Cross goes on to suggest that 'perhaps the most persuasive evidence that the Priestly strata of the Tetrateuch never had existence as an independent narrative source comes from its omissions' (p. 306). He draws particular attention to the absence of a P account of humanity's sin and rebellion in the time before the flood. Apart from Gen. 2:4a, there is no P material in chs. 2-4. P's summary statement in 6:13 'The end of all flesh has come before me, for the earth is filled with violence through them' must presuppose 'a knowledge of concrete and colorful narratives of the corruption of the creation. Otherwise, it has neither literary nor theological force' (p. 306). The P statement in Gen. 9:6 'He who spills man's blood, his blood shall be spilled by man', as well as the entire Priestly scheme of divine covenants must also presume a description of man's *primaevae* rebellion and sin. The paradox to which the generally accepted theory gives rise of an originally independent Priestly narrative which contained no account of this rebellion and sin is removed when P is seen instead as a tradent whose work incorporated the J narratives in Gen. 2-4.

Other narrative traditions absent from 'the putative P narrative' in Genesis are the story of Abraham's fidelity in Gen. 22, the thrice-told tale of the patriarch and his wife in the court of a foreign king (12:10-20; 20:1-17; 26:1-14), the search for a wife for Isaac and the discovery of Rebekah (24), the rivalry between Esau and Jacob for their father's blessing (27), Jacob's vision at Bethel (28:10-22), the entire Jacob-Laban cycle (29-33), the tale of Dinai and Shechem (34), and the Joseph narrative (37:2b-47:26 [50:26]). 'What remains makes poor narrative indeed.' (p. 307.)

The result is the same when one turns to Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. If possible, indeed, P here 'has even a lesser claim to being a narrative source' (p. 307); nor does it cease to depend on JE. Further, what is missing from the P material in these books, if it was an originally independent document, is no less striking than in the case of Genesis (pp. 317-21). For example, nothing is narrated about the birth of Moses, or of the episodes during his youth in Egypt or of his flight to the desert, whilst without the accompanying JE material concerning his death, nothing of the circumstances of it or of the place of his burial is narrated. But the most 'stunning omission' of all from

the alleged P narrative is an account of the covenant ceremony at Sinai, 'the climax to which the entire Priestly labor has been directed' (p. 318). 'It is not by chance that the P tradent poured his traditions into the Sinai section until it dwarfed all his other sections and indeed his other periods. The climactic blessing of Leviticus 26:11-13a stresses most clearly the supreme meaning of the covenant at Sinai, Yahweh's tabernacle in Israel's midst and thereby his covenant presence with his people . . . In looking to the darkness of exile and beyond, the last words of the peroration of Leviticus 26 [vv. 44f.] made Yahweh's purpose clear and the purpose of the Priestly hand which added this summary to the Holiness Code' (pp. 318-9). It is 'beyond credence' that P had no tradition of the covenant ceremonies at Sinai or that he had no covenant at all there. 'Either the Priestly tradent had the tradition and a redactor has removed it in combining P with JE, or he relied on the Epic tradition, especially the E tradition of Exodus 24:1-8. In our view, the latter alternative fits far more easily with the evidence' (p. 320).

(II)

It is well known that in the source analysis of the Pentateuch the flood story in Gen. 6:5-8:22 has been regarded as particularly cogent evidence of the secondary combination by an editor of two originally independent narratives, J and P. For this reason critics of the documentary theory have devoted special attention to this story. All the more surprising, therefore, is Cross's bald statement that it has been 'completely rewritten by P'. In spite of many attempts to challenge it, the evidence in favour of the two-source theory of the composition of this narrative remains compelling ^{3/}. Briefly stated, this evidence is as follows. First, there are discrepancies and contradictions. In J a distinction is maintained between clean and unclean animals, the clean entering the ark by sevens, the unclean by twos (7:2; cf. 8:20), whilst in P one pair of every animal without distinction between clean and unclean enters (6:19f.; 7:15-16). In J the flood is brought about by forty days of rain which began seven days after the command to enter the ark, and the waters of the flood

3. For a detailed discussion see J. A. Emerton, 'An Examination of Some Attempts to Defend the Unity of the Flood Narrative in Genesis', Part I, *VT* 37, 1987, pp. 401-420, and Part II, *VT* 38, 1988, pp. 1-21.

subside after forty days (7:4, 10, 12; 8:6). In P a partially different cause of the flood is described - 'the fountains of the great deep (*tehom*) burst forth, and the windows of the heavens were opened' (7:11;8:2) - and the chronological scheme is also different: the waters increase for one hundred and fifty days and the entire duration of the flood is one year (7:6, 11, 13, 24; 8:3b, 4, 5, 13a, 14). Secondly, there is much repetition of commands and statements, and although some of this may be explained in terms of literary style, not all of it can plausibly be so accounted for but provides supporting evidence for the two-source theory/4/. Not duplicated, however, is the J record of the offering of a sacrifice by Noah after the flood (8:20), and it seems clear that the reason for this is that P reserved all offering of sacrifices until the consecration of Aaron and his sons as priests at Sinai.

In the face of this evidence, it is difficult to comprehend how it can be claimed that a priestly tradent has 'completely rewritten' the flood story. Further, why would such a tradent have endeavoured to change so much of his supposed source and still have left it to tell so much of its own story, a story so manifestly at odds with what he himself evidently believed and to some extent in flat contradiction of it? Volz, acknowledging such a difficulty, suggested that the older J narrative had by the time of P acquired an authority which made it impossible to dispense with it /5/. If this was so, however, why did this editor nevertheless venture to change and contradict it in the ways indicated above? In short, a more plausible explanation of the discrepancies, contradictions, and repetitiveness of this story is to see them arising from a conflation by an editor of two originally separate and distinctive narratives.

Uncompelling also is Cross's argument concerning the absence from P of a narrative of humanity's *primaeva* rebellion which, he maintains, would have been a necessary presupposition of such a statement as that in Gen. 6:11-12 which speaks of the corruption of the world that had originally been 'good' in God's eyes (Gen. 1:31). It is only on the assumption that P *must* have presupposed a description of the fall that it can then be claimed that

4. See J. A. Emerton, *VT* 37, 1987, pp. 411-413.

5. P. Volz and W. Rudolph, *Der Elohst als Erzähler. Ein Irrweg der Pentateuchkritik?*, BZAW 63, 1933, p. 141.

since no P narrative exists the priestly tradent depended upon the J narrative in Gen. 2-4. But the assumption is unwarranted. It is by no means clear that P at 6:11-12 has in mind these earlier stories. These verses speak of 'the earth' as being corrupt, of 'all flesh', that is, most likely, both the human and the animal realms, as having 'corrupted their way upon the earth'. (Contrast J's statement in 6:5 and 8:21 which refers specifically to the wickedness of men and in this way accords with what is narrated in chs. 2-4) It is likely that the priestly author knew the stories of J in Gen. 2-4. But Gen. 6:11-12 does not suggest that he had these stories directly in mind in composing what he here states, and there is no reason why he should not have said succinctly what was self-evident to his audience - the presence of sin and 'violence' in the world - without explaining it or composing an accompanying 'myth' or aetiology about its origin.

The absence from P of other narratives and episodes familiar in JE need not have the weight that Cross attaches to it but can be explained in other ways. The consistency with which, for example, stories reflecting what has aptly been termed the 'all too human' /6/ behaviour of ancestral figures are not represented in P may be because its author studiously avoided a retelling of them: such are, for example, the stories about Noah's drunkenness and those reflecting the doubtful morality of the patriarch and his wife in a foreign court, and the story of Jacob's treacherous deceit of Esau. In the case of Gen. 28:10-22 it is possible that the priestly author wished to avoid such a cult-foundation story, just as elsewhere he avoids those stories in which patriarchal figures build altars and thus found sanctuaries. (In his account of God's appearance to Jacob at Bethel in Gen. 35:6a, 9-13 he makes no mention of the building of an altar, in contrast to what is stated in the older material in 35:1, 3, 7.) The main reason, however, for the literary structure of P arises from its author's distinctive theology. His main emphasis is upon the foundation of the theocratic community of Israel at Sinai; this, as Cross himself states, dwarfs all that precedes. And to this end, it seems, only that is narrated of the periods preceding which is theologically required as necessary *praeparatio* : the story of creation concluding with the hidden foundation of the sabbath, the flood narrative concluding with the Noachic covenant, the covenant with Abraham and its extension to his descendants, the purchase of the burial place from Machpelah

6. R. Smend, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments*, Stuttgart 1978, p. 54.

signalling faith in the divine promise of the land, a story of Jacob's acquisition of wives from his parents' kin thus securing the racial purity of the coming 'congregation', an epitome of the story of the descent of Jacob and his sons to Egypt and of their subsequent bondage there - all this stitched together by a genealogical framework - the call of Moses, the revelation of the divine name Yahweh to him and the promise to deliver Israel from the burdens of the Egyptians, a plague narrative and the escape from Egypt, the journey to Sinai. In short, what emerges from the literary evidence is a coherent and well-executed theology within an appropriately structured literary presentation even though in the process of redaction some of the constituents of the latter have been left out //.

As in past debates about the character of P, the sequence of the names employed for God also merits more significance than Cross is willing to concede. In the P passage Exod. 6:2-9, which duplicates what is narrated in the older material in Exod. 3, God declares that he had revealed himself to the patriarchs as El Šadday and not by his name Yahweh which is now made know evidently for the first time to Moses. The sequence, to which Cross himself draws attention, Elohim-El Šadday-Yahweh is thereby completed, and it seems that such a sequence was of some importance for the writer responsible for P; it points to ever increasing degrees of revelation culminating in God's actions for Israel under Moses and the crowning meeting between Yahweh and his people at Sinai. Under this new name God intends to deliver his people from the burdens of the Egyptians and finally make them his own in fulfilment of the promise made to the forefathers (vv. 7-8). It is difficult to see, as older commentators pointed out, how the priestly writer of Exod. 6:2-9 could have been merely an editor or supplementer of the older Pentateuchal material which up to this stage flatly contradicts what is here narrated. But the passage is comprehensible on the basis that it derives from an originally independent P narrative that has been secondarily worked into the older sources by a scribe.

Reference to Exod. 6:2-9 leads us to Cross's argument concerning P's handling of the Sinai covenant of which, he believes, this passage is the 'prologue'. Assuming that the making of the covenant at Sinai was, as he maintains, crucially important for P, is it

7. See further, V. Fritz, 'Das Geschichtsverständnis der Priesterschrift', *ZThK* 84, 1987, pp. 426-439.

not still somewhat strange that he did not compose an account of his own of the making of this covenant, just as he carefully set out the Noachic and Abrahamic covenants earlier? The absence of such an account is rendered all the more strange when what he is supposed to have 'relied' upon instead is considered. Exod. 24:3-8 narrates the building of an altar, the offering of sacrifices, and the priestly manipulation of blood before the institution proper of the cult at Sinai in P's apparent sequence of events in consistency with which hitherto in the Tetrateuch he studiously avoids any suggestion of a sacrificial cult. Thus, for example, in contrast to the older account of the covenant with Abraham in Gen. 15, in Gen. 17 P makes no mention of any sacrificial rite as having been employed. This surely renders it unlikely that, had P required a description of a covenant rite at Sinai, he would have 'relied' upon Exod. 24:3-8 thus abandoning a principle which he has hitherto followed.

That no P account of the making of the covenant at Sinai exists is most probably because, as many scholars have argued, the priestly author consciously rejected this tradition and instead subsumed the revelation at Sinai and the institution of the theocratic community and its cult there under the covenant with Abraham which was thus all-important for this author/8/. For P, Israel at Sinai 'stands in the covenant of Abraham'/9/; what happened at Sinai was a 'discharging of the earlier pledge of grace'/10/. In contrast to the covenant described in, for example, Exod. 24:3-8 or the book of Deuteronomy, P sets out 'a conception of Israel's covenant relationship to God which is unbreakable', that is, the Abrahamic covenant which is 'everlasting' and 'is not subject to any conditional element of law'/11/.

8. See for example W. Zimmerli, 'Sinaibund und Abrahambund: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Priesterschrift', *TZ* 16, 1960, pp. 268-280 = *Gottes Offenbarung. Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament*, München 1963, pp. 205-216; *Grundriss der alttestamentlichen Theologie*, Stuttgart 1972, pp. 45-47, E. trs. *Old Testament Theology in Outline*, Edinburgh 1978, pp. 55-57; R. E. Clements, *Abraham and David*, London 1967, pp. 74-77.

9. W. Zimmerli, *Gottes Offenbarung*, p. 213.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 215.

11. R. E. Clements, *Abraham and David*, p. 75.

Far from being 'beyond credence', therefore, P's omission of an account of the covenant at Sinai belongs to a coherent theological intention, indeed *kerygma*. And this too strengthens the view that the material in question once constituted an independent narrative.

(III)

We turn finally to Cross's understanding of Gen. 2:4a as a superscription to what follows and not, as generally believed, a conclusion to the preceding creation story. In this he has received support from S. Tengström who has, however, gone further and argued that the whole of this verse is from a P redactor.

To consider first Tengström's view: against the generally accepted understanding of v. 4b as the beginning of the J narrative of creation, he argues (a) that the use of the verb עשה 'made', as against ברא 'created' in v. 4a, is not necessarily an indication that it derives from J rather than from P, since the latter elsewhere employs עשה as an alternative to ברא; (b) that the divine name Yahweh in v. 4b may be a gloss prompted by the use of this name in the narrative that follows; and (c) that syntactically the J narrative could have begun at v. 5; such a beginning, indeed, would reflect the sort of beginning found in other ancient Near Eastern creation stories, for example *Enuma Elish* (pp. 54-5). V. 4 as a whole, therefore, derives from a priestly editor and acts as a superscription to what follows, just as elsewhere the *toledoth* formula functions as a superscription. As such, this verse heads the narrative that follows up to the end of Gen. 4 which the priestly editor understood as the story of the 'generations' of the first humans after the creation narrated in Gen. 1. Viewed in this way the verse means something like 'These are the generations of heaven and earth (who lived) when these (heaven and earth) were created, at the time when Yahweh-God made heaven and earth' (p. 57).

Several difficulties render such a view improbable. First, and most obvious, unless other compelling reasons can be found, there are no grounds for regarding the name Yahweh in v. 4b as a gloss. Tengström himself acknowledges this (p. 54). Second, the order 'earth and heaven' in v. 4b is the reverse of this phrase in v. 4a - unless we change the former with the Samaritan text and the Syriac version to 'heaven and earth' - and the definite article employed with

both words in v. 4a is not used in v. 4b. These differences, which cannot seriously be explained in terms of a desired literary effect, are surely odd if both parts of the verse are from the same hand. Third, the phrase *וּכְלֹל שִׁיחַ הַשָּׂדֶה טָרַם יְהוָה בְּאָרְץ* . . . (v. 5) would read strangely as the beginning of the story that follows and would be quite uncharacteristic of Hebrew narrative art. From a literary and syntactical point of view v. 4b remains the more likely beginning of this narrative, functioning as a protasis to a following apodosis, even though it is disputed whether the latter begins at v. 5 or v. 7.

For these reasons the generally accepted division of Gen. 2:4 between P and J remains the more plausible analysis of this much debated verse. But is v. 4a nevertheless a superscription to what follows, as Cross argues, or a conclusion to that precedes? Either way it is peculiar in this context. If it is a conclusion it departs from the use of the *toledoth* formula which elsewhere is a superscription, and it has also to be understood 'metaphorically'/12/ as applying to the generations of 'heaven and earth' rather than to humans, or as carrying some such generalized meaning as 'story of origins' rather than its usual connotation 'genealogy', 'family tree'/13/. On the other hand, if it is a superscription it also differs, necessarily so, from its use elsewhere by being unable to mention the names of the ancestors of the persons in the narratives that follow, since Adam had no ancestors. Further, 'the generations of the heavens and the earth' is surely a somewhat strained description of Adam and the other persons mentioned in Gen. 2-4. In short, there are difficulties for either view, and such are the verse's peculiarities that it is a weak basis on which to argue that P was a redactor rather than an author. Even if it is conceded, however, that it is a superscription to what follows, and thus an editorial addition, as Cross maintains, it does not constitute evidence that P as a whole in the Pentateuch is the work of an editor rather than from an originally independent narrative, for the documentary theory in arguing that the P material was worked into the older JE material also allowed for the possibility that the priestly

12. S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 9th edit., Edinburgh 1913, p. 6.

13. G. von Rad, *Das erste Buch Mose*, *Genesis*, ATD 2-4, Göttingen 1956, E. trs. *Genesis*, London 1961, *in loc*.

redactor responsible for this may have on occasion inserted comments, linking passages, etc. which he felt necessary/14/.

Tengström, whose views on Gen. 2:4 were examined above, argues that the remaining *toledoth* passages in Genesis likewise provide evidence that P is the work of a redactor rather than the author of an originally discrete narrative. But these passages are a doubtful basis for such a view. It seems in fact that in the case of at least some of them one's assessment of the relation of the P material to the older sources depends on the view one already holds of the nature of P.

An example is provided by Tengström's discussion of Gen. 10. His source analysis of this chapter is the standard one, the J material being vv. 8-19, 21, 24-30, the P sections vv. 1-7, 20, 22-3, 21, 32, the P material thus forming the framework. According to Tengström this framework is not the work of a redactor employing an already existing independent P narrative; rather, it was P himself, understood as an editor, who has constructed it and incorporated the J material into it. He offers two arguments in support of this. First, the structure of the subdivisions is the same in both J and P (p. 23):

(a) a statement of the genealogical descent of the people/ancestors, followed by

(b) a statement of their settlement and geographical 'spread'.

An example of this structure as employed by P is provided by vv. 2-5 (a = vv. 2-4; b = v. 5. Cf. v. 32). Examples in J are vv. 8-12 (a = vv. 8-9; b = vv. 10-12); vv. 15-19 (a = vv. 15-18a; b = vv. 18b-19); vv. 26-30 (a = vv. 26-29; b = v. 30). That both J and P use the same structure, he argues, is best explained on the assumption 'that the author of the P material employed the older material as the model for his own contribution' (p. 23). But the conclusion that Tengström draws from this observation does not necessarily follow. That is, it does not follow that P was necessarily an editor rather than an author; it is clearly just as possible that he was an author who adopted the form from J in composing his own independent narrative which (or some of which) was subsequently combined by an editor with the older J narrative. Alternatively, the conclusion is equally warranted that both the Yahwist and the P author independently employed a common form.

Tengström's second argument is as follows. In v. 6 P lists the sons of Ham (Cush, Egypt, Put, Canaan), but in v. 7 expands only

14. See the apt comments on this by J. A. Emerton, *VT* 37, 1987, p. 402.

on Cush and not upon Canaan, as one expects, since it is mentioned last in the list. A genealogy of Canaan is, however, given in the J passage later in the chapter (vv. 15-19), and the conclusion cannot be avoided, Tengström contends, that the reason P did not expand on Canaan at v. 6 was because he reserved such expansion to the J passage which he, working as an editor, incorporated later in the chapter (pp. 23-4). It is clear once again, however, that what Tengström describes is capable of an alternative explanation, namely, that a redactor combining originally independent P and J passages chose J's genealogy in vv. 15-19 rather than P's (assuming the latter contained one).

The same holds also in the case of the material relating to Arpachshad in 10:22-3 (P), 24-30 (J), and 11:10-16 (P). In 10:23 P expands upon the descendants of Aram, even though, according to Tengström, we expect him to expand instead upon Arpachshad whose line leads to Abraham (11:10-13). Arpachshad's line is, however, given in the immediately following J passage (10:24-30) which has the sequence Arpachshad, Shelah, Eber, and Peleg, exactly as in P's genealogy in 11:10-16. 'The only probable assumption here is that the author of the P material in chapter 11 depended upon the J section in chapter 10' (p. 24). Once again, however, it is only an assumption that P was bound to expand upon Arpachshad at 10:22f. and that, since what follows concerning this ancestor is from J, P was therefore an editor who utilized J instead of composing his own material for this genealogy. It could equally well be that P did not here expand upon Arpachshad's line because he wished to reserve this for ch. 11. Alternatively, if the assumption be granted that P was bound to expand upon Arpachshad after 10:22f., the presence of the J material in vv. 24-30 could again equally well be accounted for as the work of a redactor combining an originally independent P narrative with J and at this point choosing J's genealogy. Further, if P at 11:10-16 was dependent upon J's genealogy in 10:24-30, why should it necessarily follow from this that he was an editor? It is equally possible that he was an author who used J in composing his own independent narrative. Here too, therefore, one's assessment of the relation of the P material to the older source depends on the view one already holds of the character of P. In short, taken by itself, the material in Gen. 10 and 11 settles nothing in the issue under discussion.

In my opinion, what is evident of the genealogies in Gen. 10 and 11 is the case also in the genealogical passages throughout that book. It seems clear that material from both JE and P has been

combined by a redactor, in ways creatively so. (Tengström's monograph is a valuable contribution for its exposition of the function of these genealogies in Genesis.) But it is clear also that these passages by themselves are an insufficient basis on which to determine whether this redactor was P himself rather than one who combined an already existing P source with JE.

A further argument adduced by Tengström remains to be briefly considered. It arises from the absence of a P narrative of the conquest in the book of Joshua where, according to the view currently generally accepted, P is represented by only a small number of sporadic texts. Tengström shares this view. He rejects Noth's well known claim that P in the Tetrateuch is disinterested in the settlement in the land and that the so-called P texts in Joshua are merely secondary insertions in the style of P. Rather, he argues, the P editor of the Tetrateuch looks to the settlement as a fulfillment of God's promises to Israel, and relies upon the book of Joshua for the account of this. The P texts in Joshua evidence this. Since, however, these texts are clearly of an editorial nature, they offer additional support for the view that P was an editor of the Hexateuch rather than the author of an independent narrative (pp. 14-15).

A discussion of the composition of the book of Joshua is beyond the scope of the present essay. This much may be said, however, in response to Tengström's claim. It may be conceded that such P material as there is in Joshua is editorial and not derived from an originally independent source. But there are obvious differences between this material and P in the Tetrateuch. Unlike the latter, in Joshua P does not form the framework of the narrative; rather, it is set within the Deuteronomistic framework. Absent too is a priestly chronological scheme, so characteristic of the P material in the Tetrateuch. Such differences render the P texts in Joshua inadmissible as a basis on which to draw conclusions concerning the origin of the P material in the Tetrateuch.

In conclusion: the arguments by such recent writers as Cross and Tengström that there never was an independent P narrative and that instead the P material in the Pentateuch is in its entirety the work of an editor of JE are unconvincing. The documentary theory remains the most probable explanation of the origin of this material, namely, that in part it derives from an originally independent Priestly narrative which has been secondarily combined with the older JE material by a

