

The Old Testament in its Context:

1 From the Origins to the Eve of the Exodus

by

K A Kitchen

Lecturer in the School of Archaeology and Oriental Studies, Liverpool University

[p. 2]

Conservative Old Testament scholars often seem to spend more time demolishing the views of others about the composition of the Old Testament than in putting forward their own positive theories about it. In the present brief series of articles Mr. Kitchen has been asked to devote his main attention to the outlining of a conservative view of the composition of the Old Testament. He stresses that the present article is merely complementary to his other writings on the subject; his footnote references will enable readers to consult these at the appropriate points.

The aim of the series of articles of which this is the first part is simply to present an appreciation of the Old Testament books and data in the context of that world in which they came to be, namely the world of the Ancient Near East. It is the Hebrews' own world of the twentieth to fourth centuries BC, and not the unverifiable speculations of the eighteenth to twentieth centuries AD, that alone can provide criteria of study that are both tangible/verifiable and relevant to study of the Old Testament and its contents. We must utilize the existing Old Testament because we have no other; major theoretical reconstructions which cannot be independently validated by external evidence as a touchstone are *ipso facto* creations of the imagination and cannot be accorded preference over the extant documents that we now have. It must be stressed that the treatment envisaged here is but bare outlines; anything more substantial would require volumes, not articles, to survey the range of subject-matter at all fully.

ORIGINS AND THE FORMATIVE PERIOD — GENESIS

1. Structure of Genesis

The literary form of Genesis is transparently clear, being marked by an initial section and by ten further sections with a distinctive type of heading. The whole may be summarized thus:

1. In the Beginning, 1: 1-2: 3
Over-all outline of creation, ending with man and rest.
2. Succession of Heaven and Earth, 2: 4 - 4: 26
Narratives and offspring of Adam.
3. 'Book' of Succession of Adam, 5: 1 - 6: 8
Genealogy with 'notes'.
4. Succession of Noah, 6: 9 - 9: 29
Noah's three sons; narrative of judgment by flood.
5. Succession of the Sons of Noah, 10: 1 -11: 9
Genealogies ('Table of Nations') and narrative (Babel).

6. Succession of Shem, 11: 10-26
Genealogy, Shem to Terah.
7. Succession of Terah, 11: 27-25: 11
Narratives of Terah (11) and esp. Abraham (12-25).
8. Succession of Ishmael son of Abraham, 25: 12-18
Statement of Ishmael's sons, his life, their location.
9. Succession of Isaac son of Abraham, 25: 19-35: 29
Narratives of Isaac and his sons.
10. Succession of Esau (Edom), 36: 1 - 43
Genealogies and 'notes' for Esau and Seirites.¹
11. Succession of Jacob, 37: 2-50: 26
Narrative of Joseph and his brothers; Israel in Egypt.

[p. 3]

This structure is no new discovery, but there to be observed by anyone who reads through Genesis. It is the work of the final writer of Genesis as we have it, and therefore the background of this over-all structure will be considered below (final section on Genesis).

2. Content and formation of Genesis

While the narrative and genealogical matter of the whole book is of one piece, it is also possible on content (and in the light of later biblical tradition deriving Israel from Abraham-Isaac-Jacob) to look at Genesis in two major parts: the 'primeval traditions' of 1: 1 -11: 26 (sections 1-6 above), and the patriarchal traditions of 11: 27: -50: 26.

a. The 'primeval' traditions.

Everything within 1: 1-11: 26 precedes Abraham in point of time.² Insofar as he came from Mesopotamia (Ur to Harran, then westward), the originals of this body of tradition could have come with him, and find appropriate background in Mesopotamia rather than elsewhere. This in some measure is clearly so, on the comparative Near Eastern data now available.

To this background or 'context', there are two aspects: individual features and episodes in Genesis 1-11, and the 'primeval' tradition as a unit. A third aspect concerns not content but style and composition.

i. Individual features.

First, creation. The theme of creation, especially as the result of divine initiative, is so widespread that only the delimitation of very special common features would justify linking Genesis 1-2 with any other account. On this ground, the attempts made in the past to establish a definite relationship between Genesis and Babylonian epics such as *Enuma Elish* have now had to be abandoned; in content, aim, theology, and philology, there is divergence and no proven link.³

Secondly, the Flood as a punishment. Here, Mesopotamia has yielded several versions of such an account.⁴ Best known is the account included in the Epic of Gilgamesh, perhaps composed

in the twelfth or eleventh centuries BC⁵ (extant copies, mainly much later). But this particular flood-account was in fact taken over from an older epic to which it organically belongs — the Epic of Atra-khasis from about the eighteenth century BC. From c.1600 BC, there is also a late-Sumerian flood-account, of limited extent. Here, the Mesopotamian material of various dates shows similarities: flood as a punishment, use of a boat to save a human family, birds to find land, *etc.* However, there are equally a good number of differences: theology (poly- and mono- theistic), the reason for punishment (sin in Genesis; mere irritation (noise, *etc.*) in Mesopotamia), the types of boat and of birds (latter, absent in Sumerian version), *etc.* The net result, as far as Genesis and the epics are concerned, is that one may postulate that (in the early second millennium BC) the various peoples of Mesopotamia — Sumerians, Babylonians, Western Semites (including Amorites and Abraham's forebears) — already had a variety of traditions on certain primeval topics of common interest, such as a major flood as divine punishment. We have here parallel traditions seeming to go back in time to a common ancient event.

One other line of Mesopotamian evidence comes in at this point: the Sumerian King List and related traditions. In its original form, this document may have been composed c.2000 BC (IIIrd Dynasty of Ur); in that form, it probably began with a reference to the Flood,⁶ and then proceeded with the long line of dynasties to Ur III, and in a later edition down to that of Isin (twentieth-nineteenth centuries BC). In its expanded final form, the Sumerian King List had firstly a 39-line section on kings and dynasties before the Flood, then the Flood, then (as before) the long line of post-diluvian dynasties; this full, final form also dates to the twentieth-nineteenth centuries BC.⁷ The importance of this document for our purpose is that it shows the Sumero-Babylonian conviction that a specific flood once interrupted the course of their very earliest history and was *ipso facto* a historical event in their reckoning. Therefore, on that showing the event attested also by Genesis and the epics belongs to 'proto-history', not mere myth.

Thirdly, the use of genealogical sequences (with and without figures), as in Genesis 5, 10, 11. King-lists for various purposes, and in some measure genealogical, are attested widely in the Ancient Near East, with and without reigns and/or lifespans. So, for Egypt and the Hittites (mainly cultic), besides

[p. 4]

the Sumerian, Babylonian and Assyrian king-lists.⁸ Furthermore, some of these lists are not wholly continuous, a phenomenon which they pretty certainly share with Genesis 5 and 11 and other biblical genealogies.⁹ The Sumerian King List and Genesis share one other common feature: the great longevity of the antediluvians, and the considerable (but declining) life-spans and reigns after the Flood. A common tradition in two forms (Sumerian and early West-Semitic) may, again, be here attested; as noted elsewhere,¹⁰ these high figures have no bearing on the possible historicity of the names to which they are attached.

One further class of background-evidence bears on genealogies here. This is the interlinked genealogical traditions of Amorite or West-Semitic families in Mesopotamia who became rulers of Babylon and Assyria in the nineteenth century BC — the dynasties of Hammurabi and Shamshi-Adad I.¹¹ The main relevance of this material is twofold here: it is direct evidence that West-Semitic families in Mesopotamia in the Patriarchal Age could and did maintain genealogical traditions of their own that reached back in time,¹² and it shows

features (such as names which are those of groups) reminiscent of Genesis 10 plus 11.¹³ The genealogical data in Genesis 10-11 would thus be a Table of Ancestors, *Ahnentafel*, to Abraham as are the tablet BM.80328 for Hammurabi's third successor and the opening sections of the Assyrian King List for Shamsi-Adad I.¹⁴

Fourthly, a glance at three other features of Genesis 1-11. For the Fall, there is no direct ancient parallel, nor does Near Eastern mythology yield true parallels.¹⁵ The 'sons of God' of Genesis 6: 1-4 were probably ancient 'sacral kings' and dynasts, culpable of polygamy to satisfy lust, and giving free rein to wickedness on earth.¹⁶ For the confusion of tongues (Babel), a Sumerian part-parallel has been suggested.¹⁷

ii. Over-all primeval tradition.

While in biblical studies it is the individual motifs that have received most attention, yet a point of equal importance is the occurrence of an *over-all tradition* in both Genesis (specifically 1-9) and Mesopotamia of the early second millennium BC — a factor that has emerged only in this decade.¹⁸ Thus the epic of Atrakhasis has the creation of man, mankind's multiplying on earth, and mankind attracting punishment from the gods — plague, famine (twice), flood — but surviving by a family in a boat, ending with the re-establishment of man and society. In Genesis 1-9, God creates all, including man; man rebels but is allowed to continue (under penalty); mankind goes on to multiply (Gn. 6: 1ff.) and by wickedness brings down judgment by flood — one family being spared by boat, who are to replenish the earth. Thus, there is an undeniable common framework. However, there are numerous differences in detail and in emphasis — these are not carbon copies! Throughout Genesis creation, judgment and deliverance come from one sole God who keeps His own counsel. Atrakhasis has the polytheistic plurality of gods, divided counsels, and deliverance for man being achieved by one god (Enki) operating surreptitiously in favour of his protégé. Man is here created as a mere labour-saver for the gods, and not in God's own image, and to have dominion over all the earth as in Genesis. There is no clear 'fall' or sense of

[p. 5]

sin in Atrakhasis; the offence of mankind there is merely that their noise spoils the god Enlil's beauty-sleep. It is a far cry from the solemn charge of wickedness, injustice, lust, violence and corruption that occasion the flood in Genesis 6: 1ff., 11-12. Thus, as with the Flood as a single motif, we seem to have a situation of parallel traditions (not borrowings) within the inner diversity of peoples having a common heritage in Mesopotamia: in each case, creation, man's dissent from deity, flood and renewal as a total entity, but differently presented by Hebrews and Babylonians.

Nor is the evidence of Atrakhasis accidental or entirely isolated. The same fundamental pattern is implicit in the Sumerian King List, with its kings (who must follow a creation) who reign before a flood, then the flood, then the re-establishment of kingship (the keynote of ancient society). And the Sumerian flood-story of c.1600 BC would seem, when complete, to have included the creation of man, a punishment other than flood(?), then dissent between men and gods resulting in the flood, the saving of man by boat, and restoration.¹⁹ So, the over-all tradition is not an atypical feature in Mesopotamia.

iii. Stylistic points.

A whole field of study remains to be worked over, here; only a few preliminary observations can be ventured for the moment. Under *mode of composition*, one may note that a given

genealogy or king-list usually shows a very consistent basic pattern, repeated for each successive entry,²⁰ but whenever the author/compiler deemed it appropriate, he would include additional 'notes' on this or that person. Thus Genesis 5: 22-24 and 28ff. include notes on Enoch and Lamech outside the usual formulae; Genesis 10: 8-12 has a considerable note on Nimrod, and lesser remarks on others (Peleg, 10: 25, and the sons of Joktan, 10: 30). Likewise, the Sumerian King List annotates Dumuzi I as a shepherd, and likewise Etana, Lugal-banda as shepherds, Dumuzi II as a fisherman(?), and others as a smith, priests, *etc.* Longer entries (*cf.* Lamech) are given for some rulers — so Etana, 'who ascended to heaven and consolidated all lands', Enmebaragisi who despoiled Elam, Enmerkar who built Uruk, and the interesting lady Ku-Baba, 'a barmaid, who consolidated the foundation of (her city) Kish'.²¹ While various source-materials (date-lists, epics, *etc.*) were utilized by the author of the basic Sumerian King List, the combination of formulaic list and the additional 'notes' is essentially his.²² The same unity must be predicted in Genesis, on the literary plane.

The combination of lists (or genealogies) and narrative — such as one finds in Genesis 1-11 — is not unknown in the Mesopotamian world. A late Assyrian dynastic list appears to have followed up its list of antediluvian kings with a literary narrative of the Flood,²³ before reverting to the long tale of dynasties from after the Flood right down to Assurbanipal of the seventh century BC. Back in the sixteenth century BC, the available creation-section of the late-Sumerian flood tablet not only mentions the founding of cult-cities but gives the whole five with their deities in list-form.²⁴ With the incidental use of figures in narrative, such as the 120 years of Genesis 6: 3, one may compare the 40 years of toil by the gods and the two periods of 1,200 years each of the growth of mankind, in the Atrakhasis epic.²⁵ The use of lists, statistics, *etc.*, is commonplace in Ancient Near Eastern literature, and cannot be used to determine authorship; long-standing attempts in Old Testament studies to segregate such matter under such ciphers as 'P' fly directly in the face of ancient modes of composition and must therefore be dismissed as meaningless and irrelevant.²⁶

Coming finally to *literary style*, one may note the stately, leisurely, sometimes repetitive style in Genesis 1-11. One may notice the use of couplets (bicola), two parallel phrases, to express a matter. Thus, Genesis 2: 5 has twin couplets, so:

‘And no plant of the field was yet in the ground,
 And no herb of the field yet had sprouted,
 For the Lord God had not caused rain upon the ground,
 And man there was none to till the soil.’

Parallel expressions of the same kind may be seen elsewhere; *cf.* Genesis 6: 5, 6, 11, 12 among others. Such use of couplets goes on throughout Ancient Near Eastern literature. It is well attested in both Sumerian and Akkadian (Babylonian) literature, not least in the epics.²⁷ However, it is more characteristic both of West-Semitic literature (including Hebrew and Ugaritic), and in Egyptian. The more repetitious

[p. 6]

elements of style, sometimes used to heighten the effect, are a more significant intermittent feature than the ubiquitous couplet. Genesis 7: 17-20 with its four-times repeated increase and prevailing of the flood waters (each with a fresh complement)²⁸ is a good example. This kind of feature (plus general repetition on a grand scale) can be observed readily in Sumerian and Babylonian epics, *e.g.* as in Lugal-banda (Sumerian)²⁹ or Atrakhasis (Babylonian).³⁰ Such a

style may well have marked the original versions of the matter now found in Genesis 1-11 as brought by an Abraham from Mesopotamia, where Western Semites came to share in a cultural heritage. And these phenomena of style, both the use of couplets (single or multiple) generally in the Near East and the repetitious style in Genesis and Mesopotamian literature, are an inherent part of Near Eastern and biblical literary usage; to scissor-up their elements among imaginary 'source-documents' is a pointless waste of effort,³¹ producing tatters that have no relation to attested usage in the biblical world.

To sum up on the 'primeval' period, one may note that Abraham is said to come from Mesopotamia (Ur, Harran), an event that may be placed in the early second millennium BC.³² For 1,000 years before, Western Semites are attested in Mesopotamia, especially in the last few centuries of this span.³³ There is no reason to exclude them from the common experiences of life in Mesopotamia, or from the impact of Sumerian-Akkadian culture in Mesopotamia (*e.g.* in methods of literary formulation of common traditions in sundry individual forms). Thus, Abraham could be postulated as bringing the basis of Genesis 1-9 and 10-11 (primeval history; ancestry) westward as family tradition.

b. The patriarchal traditions.

A great deal of productive study on the age and background of the patriarchs has been conducted over the last thirty years. The fruits of this are in some measure very readily available, and need not be repeated at length in this study.³⁴ Instead, a basic summary must suffice.

In the nineteenth century (AD), unrestrained by any tangible control-data of factually-validated criteria, it was considered possible by some Old Testament scholars to dismiss the patriarchs as mere retrojections backward from the time of the Hebrew monarchy, or to reinterpret them as personifications of tribes, demythologized deities, or what not. But direct comparison between the contents of the patriarchal narratives and appropriate data in the biblical world gives results that point in quite the opposite direction: to the view that they were human beings exemplifying reality in time and space, not figures of fantasy.

Thus, the proper names are those of types current (especially in the early second millennium BC) as names of human individuals — not deities or tribes only.³⁵ In the matter of social customs, the laws of inheritance on adoptees, children of a chief wife or of a lesser union, *etc.* which are visible in these narratives (Gn. 15, 16, 17, 21, 30) find clear counterparts not only in the often-adduced Nuzi tablets, but also in Mesopotamian law-collections of the nineteenth to eighteenth centuries BC.³⁶ Not every alleged parallel is valid,³⁷ but there is no excuse for evading either the validity of the main material or its significance as relating to the first half of the second mil-

[p. 7]

lennium BC rather than later.³⁸ The wide scope of travel of the patriarchs, and their pastoral (occasionally agricultural) way of life with time in the Negeb area fits well the period in question.³⁹ While the individual kings of Genesis 14 have not yet been identified among the uneven tangle of dynasts of the early second millennium BC, yet their names have good analogies in their period⁴⁰ — and the grouping of power-alliances in Mesopotamia as well as in Palestine is particularly characteristic of this age, *c.* 2000-1750 BC.⁴¹ The religion of the patriarchs ('God of the fathers', *etc.*) also finds its best background then.⁴²

Thus, from many angles, there is every reason to regard the patriarchal narratives as authentic traditions about real people. No single mention of a biblical patriarch is actually known from the data of the second millennium BC to prove their historicity mechanically, nor is this needful or to be expected. The same situation applies to a host of other people in antiquity whose historical existence is doubted by none. But the extent of authenticating background plus the clear content of the narratives and later significance of these patriarchs combine to make the hypothesis that they were real people who acted as depicted the only one worth serious consideration.⁴³ They are, therefore, to be regarded as the historical forerunners of Israel, whose family traditions (reflected in Gn. 11-50) and ancestral traditions (Gn. 1-11) were handed down to their descendants.⁴⁴

With Joseph, the growing patriarchal family ceased its wanderings and came to rest in the Egyptian east Delta (Gn. 37-50, especially 46). Here, again, the narrative makes good sense as authentic tradition portraying reality.⁴⁵ A Joseph c.1700 BC in round figures was but one of many Western Semites to be found in service in Egypt in the late Middle Kingdom (especially the late XIIIth Dynasty⁴⁶) and the Hyksos period. His price as a slave is the correct average for the period;⁴⁷ his roles in Potiphar's household first as domestic, then as steward, correspond with Egyptian usage, while the term *saris* applied to Potiphar should appropriately be given its early meaning of 'dignity' rather than the later one of eunuch.⁴⁸ The proper names, the role of dreams, Egyptian prisons (especially of early second millennium), the use of chariots, mode of dress (linen, gold collar, state seal), corn and famines, all correspond well to

[p. 8]

Egyptian data, and not least of the relevant period. Likewise the economic context of settling Joseph's people in the east Delta, an area to be exploited and developed, and also considered by the Egyptians as suited for cattle-rearing. Joseph's life span of 110 years corresponds to an Egyptian ideal, and embalming and coffins in Egypt are so characteristic as to be almost proverbial till today.

From the time of Joseph in Egypt (c.1700 BC) to the probable date of the Exodus (soon after c.1300 BC)⁴⁹ one must assume some 400 years of transmission in which both the primeval and patriarchal traditions were handed down. This could have occurred orally, and almost certainly did, if one allows the historical existence of the patriarchs and of the Hebrews in Egypt c. 1700-1300 BC. But transmission need not have been exclusively oral, and the present writer would favour — as a theoretical possibility — a written tradition from Joseph onward, with oral tradition alongside it. For Joseph to function as steward of a major household and the more so as a minister of state would compel him into close contact with writing and records: in this case, with Egyptian scribes using hieroglyphic and hieratic (cursive) scripts, as his colleague and then as subordinates. We know that Semites in the Egypt of the XIIth-XIIIth Dynasties (c.1991-1633 BC) got into Egyptian administrative documents and were mentioned on private family monuments.⁵⁰ On the eve of the Hyksos regime and during its course, we find Semites as princelings and officials having their names written in hieroglyphs on scarab-seals and the like.⁵¹ In this context, a Joseph could have done likewise. But for his family traditions, however, I think that a different means from hieroglyphs is indicated. It was pretty certainly during the Middle Bronze Age of Palestine that the West-Semitic linear alphabet was invented, say by about the eighteenth century BC, by the time of Jacob and Joseph.⁵² In this script of about twenty-seven consonantal letters, and in his own early West-Semitic dialect, a Joseph would have no problem in writing (or having

written) a body of traditional matter, to be preserved and occasionally recopied in the same language and in the evolving alphabetic script by his people's descendants.

Finally, one may note that the concept of a family or group in Egypt having (and keeping) such records is not out of the way. Egypt has yielded several family genealogies that span periods ranging from *c.* 340-400 years up to *c.* 1300 years in length, while the famous inscription of Mose ('Mes') records long litigation, with use of old documents, over the ownership of a land-grant made *c.* 1550 BC, the case arising in the fourteenth century BC, and settled *c.* 1250 BC, the date of Mose himself.⁵³ As all these are records of officials or private individuals, the keeping of family records is not restricted to royalty. However, that the Hebrews in Egypt did accumulate a body of tradition is shown clearly (as far as genealogies are concerned) by the existence of the ancestral genealogies of the tribes of Israel from the sons of Jacob downwards as preserved in some measure in 1 Chronicles 2ff.⁵⁴ Unless these were sheer invention throughout — for which assumption there is no warrant — these constitute direct, limited evidence for the transmission here predicated (though not for its written or oral means).

For the authorship of Genesis there is no explicit statement in the book itself. The latest clearly-

[p. 9]

datable⁵⁵ item in it is the use (by its author and narrator — not by Joseph or Pharaoh) of the term 'land of Rameses' in Genesis 47: 11. This brings us to Ramesses II, builder of the city Raamses (Eg. Pi-Ramesse) in Exodus 1: 11.⁵⁶ Hence, the book is at earliest a composition of *c.* 1300 BC or a little later, embodying (a) 'primeval' traditions from ancestral times in Mesopotamia, and (b) family traditions of the patriarchs from Abraham who left Ur to Joseph who attained position in Egypt; it was continued by (c) genealogical (and perhaps other) data linking the tribes of *c.* 1300 BC with their forebears the sons of Jacob of 400 years before (*cf.* 1 Chronicles).

Because of his links with the rest of the Pentateuch, Moses has long been viewed in Judaeo-Christian tradition as author/compiler of Genesis. For this view, there is no proof; but he would be by far the least unfitted so to be, especially in view of the implications of Exodus 2 for the upbringing and education of Moses.⁵⁷

c. Genesis as a book.

Two aspects of Genesis are relevant here, before we take leave of the book: its emphasis and purpose, and its composition as of now.

On emphasis and purpose, one may briefly suggest as follows. In Exodus 2: 24-25, the impetus for the Exodus is taken back to God remembering His covenant with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as their descendants labour unhappily in Egypt. It is as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob that He speaks of delivering them, to Moses (Ex. 3: 6ff.) and commissions Moses for the task; Moses is to speak to Israel's elders as from the God of their fathers on the same theme (Ex. 3: 16ff.). In Exodus 6: 2ff., the promise of the land of the patriarchs' sojournings (Canaan) is then explicitly set forth, and finds further allusion in Exodus 13: 11; 15: 17 (poetic), and 33: 1.

To this summons to go forth from Egypt to a promised land in fulfilment of a covenant with the founding fathers of the Hebrew tribes, the book of Genesis is the literary and explanatory pendant. The main bulk of the work (5/6ths!) is devoted wholly to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and his sons, and very briefly their collaterals, with a prefatorial outline (1/6th — Gn. 1-11) on Abraham's origins and the earliest relations of God and man for all that followed. The prefatorial outline presents man as God's creature in His image, in His world — and disobedient (Gn. 1-3). The subsequent relation of man and God is a tale of human faith and faithlessness, the latter leading especially to the most famous crisis of far-distant antiquity, the judgment of the Flood. From the outline of man and God, the focus changes (with Gn. 10) to the descendants of Shem, other wings of mankind being tidied off with the genealogies of Ham and Japheth. The line of Shem leads down to Terah and to Abraham — the man called out, and to whom was made first the promises that were to be redeemed in the wake of the Exodus. Thereafter, Genesis 12-50 concentrates on the family story of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who receive the promises of becoming a great nation, and of the land in which they sojourn (*cf.* Gn. 12: 1-3; 13: 14-17; 15: 5ff.; 15: 13-21; 17: 2ff.; 22: 15-18 — all to Abraham; Gn. 26: 2-5, 24 (*cf.* 28: 3-4), for Isaac; Gn. 28: 13-15; 35: 10-12; 46: 3-4 — for Jacob). Because of the importance of lineal offspring, much space is devoted to the family concerns of the patriarchs (acquiring wives, sons; inheritance of birthright, *etc.*). Significantly, very little is said of their other activities (*e.g.* everyday work pasturing and cultivating) and external relations (Gn. 14), except as relevant to the main concerns. Collateral lines (*e.g.* Ishmael, Esau, sons of Keturah) are 'tidied up' genealogically just as were the peoples from Ham and Japheth. Two brief passages near the end of Genesis are worth noting. After the account of Jacob giving his final blessing to his sons, the narrator pithily spans the four centuries between them and himself in declaring : 'All these are the twelve tribes of Israel...' (Gn. 49: 28). Thereby the book of Genesis stands forth as a statement of the birthright of the tribes of Israel as they labour in Egypt and are called to leave it. The other passage closes the book: in Genesis 50: 24, 25, Joseph expresses the desire that his bones shall leave Egypt when his people do so, invoking an oath upon them. In Exodus 13: 19, it is Moses who takes care to fulfil Joseph's command, taking the latter's bones with him from Egypt.

Therefore one may suggest that Genesis could have been composed as we have it at about the time of the Exodus, as a work that set forth the basic relationship of God and man as then known, that set out the origins and relevant family history of the founding fathers, and that gave due record of the promises of God to the forefathers of Israel. Proclaimed to the tribes before the Exodus or en route to Sinai, this book would have formed an admirable statement of their heritage and destiny. The most fitting author would be the man mandated to lead them towards that destiny, namely Moses. In later days, Genesis became the literary prologue not to the Exodus-event (once it was itself over) but thereafter to the literary record of that event, of Sinai, of the fulfilment by settlement in Palestine, and to all that has followed historically and theologically since, in God's scheme of salvation.

To finish with Genesis, a note on its final structure. It begins without title, and (in this case, 'In the beginning') with an adverbial phrase. In post-biblical Hebrew usage, it is known by its opening phrase *Bēreshîth* ('In the beginning'). This usage, however, goes right back to the early second millennium BC in Mesopotamia, where texts (especially literary) were known by their first line or phrase, both

in Sumerian and in Babylonian literatures. With Babylonian scribal and literary influence in Syria from the eighteenth century onwards,⁵⁸ this usage probably became common to the ancient Semitic world — Hebrew and Canaanite as well as Mesopotamian. As a Semitic writer of a narrative text, therefore, Moses follows ordinary usage. However, for the rest of Genesis beyond the commencement, other factors are visible. After the basic outline of creation, the ten succeeding segments of the book have each their own title-line (usually translated 'These are the generations of ...'). The use of titles is common in Egyptian literature; Egyptian literary works are often divided into sections in the scribal schools by natural divisions marked by use of red ink for the initial line of each such section (ultimate origin of our rubrics). In Egyptian wisdom-literature, sub-titles or interior title-lines are also attested. It is perhaps, therefore, not too wild to suggest that as a Semite trained in Egypt, Moses adapted these usages, substituting title-lines for rubrics. Traces of specific items in the traditions as taken over and used by him may perhaps occasionally be visible. One notes the variant title-line, 'Book (better, 'Document', *sepher*) of the generations ...' in Genesis 5: 1. This looks like the heading of a prior document, deliberately retained. The use of *spr*, 'document', 'list' in titles and headings of administrative lists and documents is richly attested in North Canaanite Ugarit in the fourteenth-thirteenth centuries BC.⁵⁹ Occasionally an entity within a major section has also a tailpiece — virtually a colophon; *cf.* the subordinate 'tailpieces' in Genesis 10: 5, 20, 31 and the main one in Genesis 10: 32; Genesis 25: 16 concluding verses 12-16; Genesis 36: 19 (concluding 1-19); Genesis 36: 20-30 ended by 30b; Genesis 36: 43 end concludes all in Genesis 36. The usage of colophons at the end of a work or document, at the end of a tablet and like our title-page in function, originated in Mesopotamia⁶⁰ and thence spread to Canaan, as is well attested in Ugarit.⁶¹ Colophons also occur in Egypt.⁶² So these endings, particularly for formal matter, were in full use in the world of a Moses and could be either taken over by him from extant documents of tradition or be used by him to terminate sections of his work in the book we call Genesis.

Notes

¹ Gn. 37: 1 simply brackets chapter 36, resuming from 35: 29.

² Apart from any alleged 'post Mosaica' (for which see *PCI*, Lecture III) or supposed additions to the 'Table of Nations' in Gn. 10.

³ An excellent survey of the matter (with translations of the Babylonian texts) is still that of A. Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1951 and repr.); *cf.*, briefly, *AO/OT*, pp. 87-90 and references.

⁴ All now collected and edited by W. G. Lambert, A. R. Millard, M. Civil, *Atra-hasis, the Babylonian Story of the Flood* (Clarendon, Oxford, 1969), except for Gilgamesh, for which see A. Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1949 and repr), this latter with discussion as well as a translation.

⁵ *Cf.* Lambert, *JTS* 16 (1965), pp. 291-292.

⁶ If one follows a suggestion by Lambert and Millard, *Atra-hasis*, p. 16, on the parallel usage of a king-list for the city of Lagash.

⁷ Standard edition, T. Jacobsen, *The Sumerian King List* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1939 and repr.); text/translation, pp. 70-71ff. Further refs., and remarks on this document, Lambert and Millard, *op. cit.*, pp. 15ff., 25. It should be noted that the long line of dynasties in the Sumerian King List is *not* historically continuous, but contains contemporaneous kings and dynasties set out in line by its compiler. For this reason, plus inflated reigns and omissions, it cannot of course be utilized to calculate a date for the Flood.

⁸ Synopsis of data from Egyptian lists, *cf.* Sir A. H. Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs* (Clarendon, Oxford, 1961), pp. 429ff. (Dyn. of gods and demi-gods before Dyn. I, *cf.* pp. 420-422.) Refs. for Hittite royal offering-lists, *cf.*

AO/OT, p. 36, n.4. For further Mesopotamian lists, see ANET, pp. 265f., 271ff.; I. J. Gelb, JNES 13 (1954), pp. 209-230. Ugarit, cf. AO/OT, p. 44, n.47 middle.

⁹ On this point cf., briefly, AO/OT, pp. 36-39, and Kitchen, 'Myth and the Old Testament' section III (f), i (TSFB 44 (1966), or Symposium Issue). The point is sometimes raised that the discontinuous Near Eastern lists (e.g. Abydos King List in Egypt) do not include figures for reigns or lifespans, and so do not afford a sufficient parallel to Gn. 5, 11 with such figures. However, the objection is not valid. It is quite impossible to use the Sumerian King List as a continuous list (despite its outward form), because it is *known* to omit some rulers or dynasties and is *known* to give contemporaries in a sequence (as if successive) — yet, this same list gives figures throughout for both kings and dynasties. The presence of figures does not guarantee continuity; they are simply one more factor in the material to be considered.

¹⁰ Cf. AO/OT, pp. 39-41 (partly anticipated by Jacobsen, *Sumerian King List*, pp. 153 n. 40, 166-7).

¹¹ First part of the Assyrian King List (Khorsabad/SDAS versions), plus the tablet B(ritish) M(useum) 80328 for the Babylonian branch; cf. J. J. Finkelstein, JCS 20(1966), pp. 95-118, and A. Malamat, JAOS 88(1968), pp. 163-173.

¹² Cf. Finkelstein's calculation (at 15 years per 'incumbency'), giving at least 400 years (*op. cit.*, pp. 109-110).

¹³ Thus, in Gn. 10, the descendants of Shem, Ham and Japheth include names that are eponyms of peoples: Cush (Nubia), Mizraim (Egypt), Canaan, Sidon, etc. — and noted as 'families ... by generations and nations' (Gn. 10: 32, cf. verses 5, 20, 31). Also, the line from Shem (Gn. 11) includes descendants whose names are those of individuals and places (named after them?), e.g. Serug, Nahor, Terah; cf. Malamat, *op. cit.*, p. 166 and n.13. Names that include tribes, peoples and places also occur in the Hammurabi/Shamshi-Adad I ancestry (*ibid.*, p. 165, and Finkelstein, pp. 97f., 101f., etc.).

¹⁴ Contrast Malamat, who takes the whole scope of the biblical genealogies from Shem down to Saul and David, as ancestral series to the kings of Israel (JAOS 88(1968), pp. 168, 173, table p. 172). This view is true in its place — but is more appropriately comparable to the extended Babylonian and Assyrian king-lists not with these Old-Babylonian/Shamshi-Adad ancestral series.

¹⁵ Cf. Kitchen, 'Myth and the Old Testament', section III(c); against illusory conflicts sometimes foisted upon Genesis, cf. *ibid.*, III(b).

¹⁶ See M. G. Kline, *Westminster Theological Journal* 24(1962), pp. 187-204; on *nephilim*, briefly, Kitchen, 'Myth ...', III(d).

¹⁷ By S. N. Kramer, JAOS 88(1968), pp. 108-111; the Sumerian text appears to allude to unity of speech then its division, but there is no 'tower of Babel' motif. The use of brick and bitumen is distinctive for Mesopotamia, as is noted by W. C. Kaiser, NPOT, p. 58.

¹⁸ First pointed out by W. G. Lambert, JSS 5(1960), pp. 113-123, esp. 115, 116); cf., briefly, AO/OT, p. 41 (c). adding in Sumerian King List, and latterly A. R. Millard, TB 18(1967), pp. 5-6, 14ff.

¹⁹ Latest edition by M. Civil in Lambert and Millard, *Atra-hasis* pp. 138-145.

²⁰ In Gn. 5, 'A lived *x* years and begot B. And A lived after he had begotten B, *y* years and begot sons and daughters. And all the days of A were *z* years, and he died.' In Gn. 11, the same formula down to "... daughters', but omitting final total of lifespan. Likewise, in the Sumerian King List, e.g., one finds regular formulae. In the antediluvian section, 'In (the city) X, A reigned *y* years, B reigned *z* years ... (etc.); (so many) kings reigned its (X's) total years. I drop (the topic) X; its kingship to (city) Y was carried.' The post-diluvian main text has a similar formula, but ending with '(city) X was smitten with weapons, its kingship to (city) Z was carried'.

²¹ See full translation, Jacobsen, *Sumerian King List*, pp. 71ff., or the partial one in ANET, pp. 265f.

²² See Jacobsen, p. 143, and cf. generally pp. 142-158.

²³ Cf. discussion of text, King, *Chronicles*, II, pp. 143-5, plus the text CT, 46, No. 5, by Lambert and Millard, *Atra-hasis*, pp. 17-18 (earlier refs., Lambert, JSS 5(1960), pp. 115, 116 and Millard, TB 18(1967), p. 6).

²⁴ Civil in Lambert and Millard, *Atra-hasis*, p. 141: 91ff.; cf. also Millard, TB 18(1967), pp. 5-6.

²⁵ Lambert and Millard, *Atra-hasis*, pp. 45, 67, 73, etc. Other statistics in this epic include reference to purification on the 1st, 7th and 15th of the month (p. 57), and counting the months to birth (p. 63).

²⁶ For basic outlines of more comprehensive reasons for dismissing erroneous forms of literary criticism in biblical studies, see PCI and AO/OT, pp. 112ff., 141ff.

²⁷ As can be seen in translations (e.g. in *ANET*, pp. 37ff., 60ff.), but better in proper text-editions (like *Atra-hasis*).

²⁸ Lifting ark off the ground; bearing it along; covering the mountains; rising 15 cubits on them.

²⁹ Lines 70-77, 266-289, in the edition of C. Wilke, *Das Lugalbandaepos* (Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1969), etc. 30 E.g. lines I, i, 1-6, cf. 146ff., 176ff.; I, i, 41-46 plus I, ii, 57ff.

³¹ Cf. *PCI*, and *AO/OT*, pp. 121ff., on erroneous criteria.

³² On dating, cf. *AO/OT*, pp. 41-56.

³³ One finds MAR.TU, Amorites, in a Fara-text, mentions of them in texts of the Empire of Akkad (Agade), and frequently during the Ur III Dynasty; cf. J.-R. Kupper, *Les nomades en Mésopotamie au temps des rois de Man* (Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres', Paris, 1957 and repr.), pp. 150-151, and Gelb, *JCS* 15 (1961), p. 30. Akkadians and Western Semities (MAR.TU/Amorites) can thus be traced back as far as the Sumerians themselves in early Mesopotamia, with traces of earlier settlers of unknown affiliation; cf. D. O. Edzard and I. J. Gelb, *Genava* 8(1960), pp. 241-253 and 258-271 respectively. There is no warrant for Lambert's suggestion (*JTS* 16(1965)300) that traditions of Mesopotamian origin did not move westward before c.1500 BC based on negative grounds of very dubious validity; cf. also Millard, *TB* 18(1967), p. 17 top.

³⁴ Handy summaries, *NBD*, pp. 68-70, 940-941; *AO/OT*, pp. 41-53, 153ff. (and refs., p. 41 n.28); R. K. Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Tyndale Press, London, 1970), pp. 105-113; C. F. Pfeiffer, *The Patriarchal Age* (Baker Book House, Michigan, 1961 and repr.).

³⁵ So, for Abraham, Isaac, Jacob/Israel, Ishmael; Levi, Zebulon, Dan, Issachar, Gad, Asher and Benjamin, plus non-Hebrews. For name-structures and parallels, see data and refs., *AO/OT*, pp. 48-49 and *HMEHT*, pp. 68-69. For Simeon (known at Ugarit as a personal name), cf. refs. for *sam'unu* and *sm'n* in F. Gröndahl, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit* (Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome, 1967), p. 194. Reuben appears to be an Imperative plus complement ('See, a son'); cf. other such personal names as in Gröndahl, *op. cit.*, pp. 42-43, 60-61, and H. B. Huffmon, *Amofite Personal Names in the Mari Texts* (Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, Baltimore, 1965), pp. 86-87 for Mari. Naphtali, 'wrestler'/tortuous one' is of a good form, but not yet directly paralleled. Judah remains a difficult form; one may tentatively suggest that it is an Imperfective form (common in personal names), but an archaic causative-passive with following noun-subject omitted (*Yēhudā* short for **Yēhudē-El*, 'May El be praised').

³⁶ See *AO/OT*, pp. 153-4, and especially *HMEHT*, pp. 70-71 with reference not only to Hurrian Nuzi but also to earlier Babylonian laws of Lipit-Ishtar. For the sons of the maidservants Bilhah and Zilpah as co-heirs of Jacob with the sons of Rachel and Leah, cf. Laws of Hammurabi, §§ 170-171 (*ANET*, p. 173b), and the acknowledgment of all in Gn. 46: 8-25 and in the blessing of Gn. 49.

³⁷ Thus, Speiser's correlation of sistership contracts at Nuzi with the Patriarchs' subterfuge of calling a wife a 'sister' (latterly, his *Genesis* (Doubleday, New York, 1964), pp. xl-xli, 91-94) is probably erroneous; see D. Freedman, *JANES* 2(1970), pp. 77-85. A question-mark hangs over the possible correlation of the Hittite laws with Gn. 23 (e.g. *AO/OT*, pp. 154-156), in the light of points made by H. A. Hoffner, *TB* 20(1969), pp. 33-35. His objections to using § 46 of the Hittite Laws seem well-founded; it refers to gift not sale. However, § 47b does refer to sale (to 'anyone') of land by a LU GIS.TUKUL. Hoffner (with Goetze) translates this term as 'craftsman' — a possible meaning — and denies that Ephron held this status (p. 34). However, Genesis tells us nothing of Ephron's status (craftsman or otherwise), so this objection is not needfully valid. And the last editor of the Hittite Laws uses the translation *Kleinbürger*, 'ordinary citizen', while allowing 'artisan/craftsman' (J. Friedrich, *Die Hethitischen Gesetze* (E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1959), pp. 33, 97). There is no impossibility in Ephron being either of these. The relevance of the Hittite Laws (§ 47) to Gn. 23 thus turns partly on whether Ephron is really a Hittite — an open question.

³⁸ In a misguided attempt to 'put the clock back' on study of the patriarchs to the nineteenth-century position, J. van Seters (*JBL* 87(1968), pp. 401-408) over-emphasizes attribution of the maidservant's son to the chief wife (with his treatment of Gn. 16: 2 and 30: 3, contrast attribution to Zilpah and Bilhah of their own sons in Gn. 46) and cites § 146 of the Laws of Hammurabi, largely irrelevant (concerning priestesses). He needlessly obscures the relevance of a well-known Nuzi tablet (either interpretation of a damaged passage would fit Genesis, either to retain a maid's offspring or authority over them), making a false distinction therein between maid and slave-girl (both are *amtu/imtu*), and cites an Egyptian text concerned with a family situation more complex than that of the patriarchs. Finally, his late-Assyrian 'parallel' certainly contains a provision for a maid to act like Hagar, but has no relevance to the succession/inheritance aspect of the matter. He is right to put to the test alleged second-millennium background for the patriarchs, but not to dismiss valid matter or to bring in irrelevant

later material. On maids, *cf.* also note 36 (end), above, with Laws of Hammurabi. Another attempt at a retrograde step (on Gn. 23) was sufficiently refuted in *AO/OT*, pp. 155-156, and further by Hoffner, *TB* 20(1969), pp. 35-36 with note 23 (on Tucker and Petschow).

³⁹ *Cf.* *AO/OT*, pp. 49-50 and refs., also Kitchen, *THB* 5/6(1960), p. 13 for cultivating, and *HMET*, p. 73 (travel).

⁴⁰ See *AO/OT*, pp. 43-44 and refs., for names of the four eastern kings. Of the four named Palestinian rulers, the names Bera and Birsha remain elusive in form; Shinab is probably a Sin-ab(i), 'the moon-god is (my) father', and Shemeber perhaps a Sumu-ibru/abru, 'mighty offspring'. For *Sumu*-names in the Mari tablets, *cf.* Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names ...*, p. 248, and names in *-abi*, p. 154 right; for *Sin*-names at Mari, *cf.* J. Bottéro and A. Finet, *Archives Royales de Mari*, XV (*Répertoire analytique*), Imprimerie Nationale, Paris, 1954, pp. 154f.

⁴¹ A point still not sufficiently appreciated; *cf.* *AO/OT*, pp. 45f., with notes 48-50; also *HMEHT*, pp. 72-73 with n.36.

⁴² *AO/OT*, pp. 50-51 and refs.

⁴³ See *HMEHT*, pp. 63-82, especially (*e.g.*) 73-81.

⁴⁴ On the validity of the picture of descent of the Israelite tribes basically from the patriarchs as opposed to unrealistic theories of more recent date, *cf.* the paper by F. D. Kidner, 'The Origins of the People of Israel', *TSTB* 57(1970), pp. 3-12.

⁴⁵ For some Egyptian background to Joseph, see J. Vergote, *Joseph en Égypte* (Publications Universitaires, Louvain, 1959) and my review in *JEA* 47(1961), pp. 158-164, plus the articles 'Joseph', 'Asenath', 'Potiphar', 'Zaphenath-paaneah', *etc.* in *NBD*; my monograph on *The Joseph Narrative and its Egyptian Background* is still delayed.

⁴⁶ So, rather than just the Hyksos period (correcting *NBD*, p. 657a, § *b*). Papyrus Brooklyn 35.1446 has some 40 out of 70 servants as 'Asiatics' (in fact, Semites) in one large Egyptian household in the mid-XIIIth Dynasty; *cf.*, briefly, Kitchen, *THB* 2(1957), pp. 1-2, and fuller background, G. Posener, *Syria* 134(1957), pp. 145-163.

⁴⁷ *Cf.* *AO/OT*, pp. 52-53.

⁴⁸ On *saris*, *cf.* *AO/OT*, pp. 165-166, following on *JEA* 47(1961), p. 160; lack of good evidence for eunuchs in ancient Egypt is confirmed by G. E. Kadish, *Studies in Honor of John A. Wilson* (Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1969), pp. 55-62, with untenable speculation on origin of the Joseph-narrative.

⁴⁹ For a date *c.* 1290/1280 BC (depending on accession of Ramesses II at either 1304 or 1290 BC), see the survey for Exodus and Conquest in *AO/OT*, pp. 57-75. A recent attempt to return to a fifteenth-century date for the Exodus by L. T. Wood (*NPOT*, 1970, pp. 66-87) is vitiated by a question-begging treatment of biblical data, faulty evaluation of some extra-biblical data, and total omission of other data. Thus, he adopts from Rea and Archer the wild suggestion that one of the Hyksos kings might have been called Ramesses, long before the XIXth Dynasty; for personal names of Hyksos king and chiefs, the monuments and scarabs offer much evidence — and no Ramesses. The name of Ra or Re occurs in their throne-names because this was standard usage for all kings of Egypt from the VIth Dynasty onwards. The god Seth is not just a 'Hyksos deity', but a longstanding Egyptian one from well back in the Old Kingdom (H. te Velde, *Seth, God of Confusion*, Brill, Leiden, 1967), identified by the Hyksos with their own weather-god, and *inter alia* taken as representative of foreign lands and deities by the Egyptians. As for important evidence totally neglected, Wood makes no use whatever of the data for wars of Ramesses II in Moab and Seir (Edom) in the thirteenth century BC, with explicit mentions of Dibon and a 'Buteret in the land of Moab' on large relief-scenes in Luxor temple (published by me, *JEA* 50(1964), pp. 47-70, pls. III-VI, esp. pp. 50, 53, 55, 63-70 and pl. III). It is not realistic to have Ramesses' troops rampaging around near Dibon in an area already occupied by the Reubenites as a fifteenth-century Exodus would require.

⁵⁰ Besides Papyrus Brooklyn 35.1446, there are the Illahun papyri. On these plus mentions on private stelae, see Posener, *Syria* 34(1957), pp. 145-163, plus the stela Liverpool E.30 (Kitchen, *JEA* 47(1961), pp. 13, 15-16, 17-18; Dyn. XIII date, *JEA* 48(1962) pp. 159-160).

⁵¹ Such chiefs as the 'foreign rulers' Anath-har, Semqen, User-Anath, and such an official as the Chancellor Hur.

⁵² On the earliest West-Semitic alphabet, best represented by the Proto-Sinaitic inscriptions of *c.* 1550-1450 BC, see latterly W. F. Albright, *The Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions and their Decipherment* (Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge Mass., 1966). He would date an inscribed sherd from Gezer to *c.* seventeenth century BC (p. 10); he ventures the thought (p. 15) that the alphabet may have originated as early as the XIIth Dynasty (*i.e.* *c.* 1991-1786 BC). On a possible background for the invention of this alphabet certainly before 1500 BC, *cf.* Kitchen, in M. Liverani (ed.), *La Siria nel Tardo Bronzo* (Centro per le Antichità ..., Rome, 1969), pp. 85-87.

⁵³ For such genealogies, cf. Kitchen, *THB* 5/6(1960), pp. 14-17 (whence that of Ukhhotep is cited by R. K. Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Tyndale Press, London, 1970), pp. 173-4). The 300 years of the land-grant to Mose (or 'Mes') with litigation runs parallel in time to much of the period between Joseph and Moses. For this text, cf. Kitchen, *op. cit.*, pp. 17-18; full edition, A. H. Gardiner, *The Inscription of Mes in Sethe, Unter-suchungen IV* (Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1905), and new edition with entire tomb, G. A. Gaballa, *Tomb-Chapel of Mose*, in preparation.

⁵⁴ For their use in the period from Jacob to Moses and Joshua, cf. briefly *AO/OT*, p. 55 § 3.

⁵⁵ If one excludes the phrase 'before there reigned any king over the children of Israel', Gn. 36: 31b. The date of the eight kings thereafter remains open — possibly from Jacob onward; cf. *PCI*, Lecture III, Genesis (i), 5.

⁵⁶ Ramesses I reigned only 16 months, and left no known cities or major foundations in that time; hence, he does not call for consideration here.

⁵⁷ Cf. *NBD*, pp. 843-845, and 343-344.

⁵⁸ As (e.g.) at Alalakh, cf. D. J. Wisemann, *Syria* 39(1962), pp. 180-187, especially 180-184 (early second millennium).

⁵⁹ Refs., C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome, 1965), p. 451, No. 1793 *spr*, all refs. with a line 1, plus C. Virolleaud, *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit, V* (Imprimerie Nationale, Paris, 1965), p. 152 refs, under *spr*, and p. 182 No. 140, line 1.

⁶⁰ Material largely collected by H. Hunger, *Babylonische und assyrische Kolophone* (Kevelaer und Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1968).

⁶¹ For convenience, cf., in translation, C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Literature* (Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome, 1949), pp. 49 top, 83 end. Some epic-tablets begin with a title-line to indicate contents, e.g. 'Pertaining to Keret', 'Pertaining to Aqhat', *ibid.*, pp. 67, 93.

⁶² On Egyptian literary usage, cf., provisionally, J. Cerny, *Paper and Books in Ancient Egypt* (H. K. Lewis, London, 1952), especially, pp. 24ff.

Abbreviations used

<i>ANET</i>	J. B. Pritchard (ed.), <i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament</i> (Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1950/55/69).
<i>AO/OT</i>	K. A. Kitchen, <i>Ancient Orient and Old Testament</i> (Tyndale Press, London, 1966).
<i>HMEHT</i>	K. A. Kitchen, 'Historical Method and Early Hebrew Tradition', <i>TB</i> 17 (1966), pp. 63-97.
<i>JANES</i>	<i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society</i> (Columbia University).
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i> .
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i> .
<i>JCS</i>	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i> .
<i>JEA</i>	<i>Journal of Egyptian Archaeology</i> .
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i> .
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i> , new series.
<i>NBD</i>	J. D. Douglas, F. F. Bruce, J. I. Packer, R. V. G. Tasker, D. J. Wiseman (eds.), <i>The New Bible Dictionary</i> (Inter-Varsity Press, London, 1962/65).
<i>NPOT</i>	J. B. Payne (ed.), <i>New Perspectives on the Old Testament</i> (Word Books, Waco, 1970).

PCI K. A. Kitchen, *Pentateuchal Criticism and Interpretation*, Notes of Lectures, Dec. 1965 (TSF, London, 1966 and repr.).

T(H)B Tyndale (*House*) *Bulletin*.

TSFB *Theological Students' Fellowship Bulletin*.

This article (the first of six in consecutive issues) was printed in the *Theological Students' Fellowship Bulletin* No. 59 in Spring 1971.

© 1971 Kenneth Kitchen. Reproduced by kind permission of the author.

Prepared for the Web in October 2005 by Michael Farmery.

<http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/>
