

The Question of the Fathers (אבות) as Patriarchs in Deuteronomy¹

CHRISTO LOMBAARD (UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA)

ABSTRACT

In an involved argumentation that runs most influentially from Van Seters via Römer and Lohfink, the question of whether the “fathers” (אבות) in the book of Deuteronomy had indeed initially referred to the patriarchal trio of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob has been under discussion since the 1970s. In this article, the debate is taken into review in the light of the author’s recently published position on the competition between tradents within post-exilic Israel as reflecting inner-Judean identity politics. His conclusion concurs with Römer’s theory, that editorial insertion of the patriarchs’ names next to the father references in Deuteronomy is probable.

A OH FATHER, WHERE ART THOU?

Within the scholarly discussions on the composition of the Pentateuch, the relationship between Genesis and the rest of the “Big Five” (Lombaard 2005:152) finds a particular point of focus in the patriarchs of Israel: Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, so prominent within the opening book of the Bible, seem to have exerted very little influence on the rest of the Old Testament. Though this may in some way be understandable for other genres of literature in the Hebrew Bible, such as the Prophets (cf. Lombaard 2005:152-159) or the Psalms (cf. Lombaard 1998:59-70), it is certainly unexpected with Exodus to Deuteronomy. Hence, this relative scarcity of patriarchal references outside Genesis must be a factor for consideration in understanding the relationship of these five books to one another and the compositional history of the whole of this “mosaic of Moses” (Deist 1988).

The most direct impetus for a perennial recent debate on the connection between the term “fathers” (אבות) and accompanying reference to the patriarchs in the Old Testament books aside from Genesis, but most specifically in Deuteronomy² (though with implications for the remainder of the Pentateuch) lies

¹ Paper read at the SBL International conference, Rome, Italy, 30 June – 4 July 2009.

² Deuteronomy constitutes a place of special importance within the Pentateuch. This is not only because it provides a kind of concluding summary to its preceding books when read from beginning to end, but also, because historically its Josianic kernel of Deut 12-26 provides what has oft been called the Archimedean point (at times in wholly different contexts by figures such as Otto 1997:321-339 and Du Plessis 1947,

in the words of Van Seters (1972:452, italics added; cf. Van Seters 1999:106, 135-136 & 1992:223-245):

... [A]n examination of all the references to the land promise in Deuteronomy *in which the fathers are named* reveals that these names are always in apposition to the term ‘fathers’ ... This is in contrast to the form of expression used in the JE corpus of the Pentateuch.... So if we were to regard the names of the patriarchs in Deuteronomy as later additions, then unlike JE, the construction would still remain in tact, but the ‘fathers’ would then mean the forefathers of the exodus generation.

Also based on the fact that references to “the fathers” in the Prophets refer not to the patriarchs, but simply to generations that have gone before, the conclusion follows that the references to the fathers in Deuteronomy were only later specified. These references were thus reinterpreted, on certain rare occasions, as being the patriarchs, thus *becoming* what Lohfink (1991:4, translated) would later call “stereotypical pleonasm”. This was namely an exilic project, according to Van Seters (1972:459), as a conflation of identities of the carriers of the respective traditions of land promise to the fathers and of the patriarchs.

These views are related to five³ texts only among some 50 father references in Deuteronomy. The relative scarcity of such patriarchal specifications is thus precisely the trigger for interpretative curiosity here. These five texts are:

drawing on Eissfeldt 1934:188) for the dating of the compositional history of the Pentateuch texts. It is thus methodologically sound first to consider this question as it relates to Deuteronomy itself, before subsequently moving on to the rest the Pentateuch and the First Testament.

³ Most often, seven instances of these father references with patriarchal specifications are listed; cf. Braulik 1991:37-50, most particularly 47 (to which schema, interestingly, the unlikely source of Heinzerling 2009 finds an antecedent in the Goldberg 1908 booklet). I however exclude here Deuteronomy 9:27, because of the connection there of the patriarchs to the term **עֲבָד** and not **אֲבָוֹת**, and the reference in Deuteronomy 34:4, where the three patriarchs are mentioned without reference to the fathers (cf. Römer & Brettler 2000:405-406; Skweres 1979:91). It seems therefore to me unwise to make too much of the seven-schema in the context of this debate, where the specific reference to the **אֲבָוֹת** along with the express naming of the three patriarchs stand central. In addition, in a somewhat different context, Ruppert (2002:38-40), summarises additional complexities in this regard, namely on the possibility discussed in the literature (Hyatt 1955:130-136; Andersen 1962:170-188; Seebass 1966:84) that reference to the God of the fathers may be original in Pentateuch texts, with the explicit divine appellation of **יְהָוָה** being a later addition to such verses. This matter too remains outside the immediate focus of this paper.

REFERENCE IN DEUTERONOMY TO FATHERS SPECIFIED AS THE PATRIARCHAL TRIO		
Text	Special reference	Text quotation (with King James translation; because of the literal qualities of this translation – cf. Lombaard 2002:754-765)
1:8	Promise of land	<p>רְאֵה נָתַתִּי לְפָנֶיכֶם אֶת-הָאָרֶץ בַּאֲשֶׁר וַיֹּשֶׁבּוּ הָדָה לְאַבְרָהָם לְيַצְחָק וְלְיַעֲקֹב לְתַתְּלָהּ וְלִוְעָם אַחֲרֵיכֶם:</p> <p>Behold, I have set the land before you: go in and possess the land which the LORD sware unto your fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to give unto them and to their seed after them.</p>
6:10	Promise of land	<p>וְתֹהֵה כִּי יָבִיאָךְ יְהוָה אֱלֹהִיךְ אֶל-הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּע לְאַבְרָהָם לְיַצְחָק וְלְיַעֲקֹב לְתַתְּלָהּ לְךָ עָרִים גְּדוּלָה וּמְבָטָה אֲשֶׁר לְאַבְנִית:</p> <p>And it shall be, when the LORD thy God shall have brought thee into the land which he sware unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give thee great and goodly cities, which thou buildedst not,</p>
9:5	Promise of land	<p>לֹא בְצַדְקָתֶךָ וּבְיִשְׁרָר לְכַבֵּךְ אַתָּה בָּא לַרְשָׁת אֶת-אָרֶצֶם כִּי בְרִשְׁעַת הַגּוֹיִם הָאֱלֹהִים הָיָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהִיךְ מוֹרִישֶׁם מִפְנִיק וּלְמַשְׁנָה הַקִּים אֶת-הַדְּבָרֶר אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּע יְהוָה לְאַבְרָהָם לְיַצְחָק וְלְיַעֲקֹב:</p> <p>Not for thy righteousness, or for the uprightness of thine heart, dost thou go to possess their land: but for the wickedness of these nations the LORD thy God doth drive them out from before thee, and that he may perform the word which the LORD sware unto thy fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.</p>
29:12	Covenant	<p>לְמַשְׁנָה הַקִּים אֶת-הַיּוֹם לֹא לְעַם וְהַוָּא יְהוָה לְכָל-אֱלֹהִים כַּאֲשֶׁר דָבַר-לְךָ וּכַאֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּע לְאַבְרָהָם לְיַצְחָק וְלְיַעֲקֹב:</p> <p>That he may establish thee to day for a people unto himself, and <i>that</i> he may be unto thee a God, as he hath said unto thee, and as he hath sworn unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob.</p>

30:20	Promise of land	<p style="text-align: right; font-family: 'Times New Roman'; font-size: 10pt;"> לאהבה את־יהוה אל־ה'יך לשמע בקהל ולדבכה־בו כי הוא חייך וארך ימיך לשכחת על־הארמה אשר נשבע יהוה לאבותיך לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב לחת להם: </p> <p style="text-align: center; font-family: 'Times New Roman'; font-size: 10pt;"> That thou mayest love the LORD thy God, <i>and</i> that thou mayest obey his voice, and that thou mayest cleave unto him: for he <i>is</i> thy life, and the length of thy days: that thou mayest dwell in the land which the LORD sware unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give them. </p>
-------	-----------------	--

B THE FATHERLY DEBATE IN OVERVIEW

Although he had been the most direct in formulating this concern, Van Seters was not the first to notice that some reflection may be called for on the connection between “fathers” and “Abraham - Isaac – Jacob” in, most particularly, Deuteronomy. For instance, based on a slightly earlier study (May 1941b:113-128), May (1941a:156) could express uncertainty on whether this connection was indeed primary. However, it was in the Römer work (1990) that this possibility had found its fullest expression, in the wide-ranging (though perhaps at times too much so, according to Lohfink 1991:8-11; cf. however Römer 1991:113) and thoroughgoing manner typical of German dissertations,⁴ with his findings and theories summarised in Römer 1990:266-271, 568-575; 2000:121-138. The central idea around which the more recent discussion runs is formulated by Römer (1990:268) as follows:

Daß die Deuteronomisten den Vätertitel anders verwendeten als die heutigen Exegeten. Die twba in den dr Texten können eine Vielzahl von Generationen bezeichnen, aber gerade nicht die Patriarchen.

As Carr (2001:290-291), accepting Römer’s thesis, however points out, “early redactors” of Deuteronomy could certainly have understood the father references as patriarchal allusions and have then gone on to specify the names accordingly, thus leading all subsequent readers of these texts to (mis)understand the more original references in this newly construed way.⁵

Particularly the opposition between Lohfink (1991) and Römer (1990), on whether the father references in Deuteronomy were indeed initially expli-

⁴ I mean here in language and academic format; the dissertation, though started under Rendtorff in Heidelberg, was completed under De Pury in Geneva and was published in Switzerland too.

⁵ This is essentially my point too on Genesis 22 (Lombaard 2008:907-919), thus leading my thoughts to be closer to Römer’s here, as will become clear below.

citly, or later editorially related to the Abraham-Isaac-Jacob trio, is reviewed in Schmid 1999:75-77 (who himself remains unsure in this regard).⁶ As Schmid here points out, usually this argumentation is followed along the theological lines within the Pentateuch of the promise of the land and either the *conditionality* attached to it (Deuteronomistic theology) or not (patriarchal promises). Lohfink (1991:11) himself ascribes the background of their differences to their respective understandings of what a text really is. His over-arching argument is namely that the stereotypical pleonasms referred to above may better be ascribed to authorial technique (cf. e.g. Veijola 2005:18; Davies 2003:75; McConville 2002:63-64, 123-125) than to editorial inventiveness. This is argued by Lohfink (1991) with respect to each of the father-patriarch occurrences in Deuteronomy, with the stated intent to contest Römer's claims rather than to replace it with a competing theory. De (2005:284⁴⁷⁴) adds that for Lohfink, in this argumentation, the primary texts of reference / textual context for Deuteronomy is the pre-Priestly Pentateuch, whereas for Römer it is the Deuteronomistic History (cf. Römer & Brettler 2000:402). Methodologically speaking, though, it seems to me when comparing Lohfink (1991) and Römer (1990), that whereas the former is more interested in the text itself, also as a procedural point of control, Römer – like van Seters (1972:448-459) does and May (1941a:156) hints at – tries to read behind the text. Römer thus reads into the history which gave the text its shape, which reflects editorially in some way the human life that surrounds it, albeit of course “[n]ow we see but a poor reflection as in a mirror (to misquote here 1 Cor. 13:12 [NIV]).⁷ Nevertheless, the history of the text is such that it is at certain stages “updated” to reflect new social concerns (cf. Römer & Brettler 2000:406-407; Gosse 1993:459-472; Vogt 2006:152¹³²). It is to this kind of approach that I find myself drawn here. This is not something Lohfink is averse to; his approach seems however to accept a longer-term stability from an earlier date for the texts applicable here, whereas Römer sees these texts as more unsettled until a later period of time.

Other critics of Römer's thesis that the father references were not initially, but only later editorially related to the patriarchal trio, follow an approach not entirely dissimilar to his (i.e. Römer's), for example Schmidt (1992:1-27), who essentially departs from a different dating matrix for these texts. For Schmidt, then, the combination of patriarchal traditions with land promises made to the fathers would have occurred pre-exilic, and this forms the background to his interpretation of the relevant texts. This would place Schmidt somewhere between Lohfink, who regards such co-existence of traditions as more anciently established within the texts, and Römer, who regards a confla-

⁶ In the background here too lie the studies of Emerton 1982:14-32 (particularly pp 30-31), Winnett 1965:1-19 (particularly pp 13-14) and Hoftijzer 1956. Cf. Van Seters 1992:215-226 for a broader overview.

⁷ This is a divergence of approaches we are well aware of, in our own way, in South African biblical scholarship – cf. e.g. Le Roux 1993; Lombaard 2006:912-925.

tion of these traditions as more recent. Skweres (1979:88-94, 206-210) on his part, considers the question based on his understanding of early-Deuteronomic (i.e. pre-exilic) textual cross-referentiality, and thus prefers in all cases the less diachronic answers in favour of earlier authorial technique; hence the respective general affinity between his and Lohfink's works on this matter.

C CONCURRENT UNCONCURRING TRADITIONS

Trying to find a midway *within* traditional historical criticism (cf. Lombaard 2007a:61-70) between its atomising analytical instincts and its impulse to explain texts in broadly interpretative schemes rather than at the hand of individual texts (Albrecht 1996:62-64), I tried in a recent study (Lombaard 2008:907-919) to offer a new interpretation of the text of Genesis 22. The particulars of that interpretation aside,⁸ that study drew most directly on recent insights among Old Testament scholars into the competition within ancient Israel between carriers of different traditions. Rather than the kind of "history" provided by the Old Testament itself, and followed by non-critical Introductions of a patriarchal period, *followed* by an Egyptian sojourn and an exodus, *followed* by a taking of the land and a period of rule by judges, *followed* by a period of kings and then prophets, in very broad terms, much of this "history" was written (recalled, invented, for which as a collective term "imagined" may be employed from modern social sciences) concurrently. The traditions related to these "eras" were in the process of such memorialisation to serve certain interests, often competing interests, during the period of the 8th to 2nd centuries of their being collected / created, written down and edited. "Memories" and "stories" (together: accounts; *Geschichten*) thus served searches for identity, and for competing identities, within Israel, and are thus often "sites of struggle".⁹

Based on this kind of approach to the texts of the Old Testament, I can find myself thus in substantial agreement with the position of Römer (1990:393; cf. pp. 573-574 & 2000:121-138), when he writes: "Die Traditionen von Abraham, Isaak und Jakob berichten die Anfänge Israels in einer mit der dtr Darstellung konkurrierenden Art und Weise." Whereas Lohfink (1991:101-102) would thus see these two tradition complexes in Deuteronomy as longer-spanning, more harmoniously co-existent foundational concepts, I understand post-exilic Israel to be an intensely competitive arena for identity politics, between the carriers of different traditions (tradents). This would on the one hand

⁸ Important there too was the multiple referentiality of the patriarchs – that the name of a patriarch could include reference to more than one antecedent figure – proposed, without influence, with regard to Jacob by Noth (1948:86-111; cf. Ruppert 2002:25) and by me with regard to Isaac (Lombaard 2008:907-919).

⁹ Usually this kind of terminology is employed to indicate latter-day interpretative exercises, usually related to social justice issues. Here, though, that phrase is meant to indicate similar struggles in the period of the coming into being of these texts too, then not insomuch as *taking* meaning from the texts as *giving* meaning to the texts.

include the respective patriarchal tradent groups competing with one another (Lombaard 2008:907-919), which opens the door more easily to see, on the other hand, here in Deuteronomy, competition between patriarchal tradents as one group and Deuteronomistic theologians as another. One may well postulate as social background competition in Persian-period Judea between once exiled “Deuteronomists” and still resident, that is, never exiled “patriarchalists” (cf. Römer 2008:5-6; 2000:132-138).

Accepting such a situation opens the strong interpretative possibility that the father-patriarch texts in Deuteronomy reflect an attempt at a meeting of minds of these tradent groups; a “political” coming together of these two broad strands of tradition, reproduced textually in these few verses. The fact that all these textual occurrences are to be found outside pre-deuteronomistic Deuteronomy’s core chapters of 12-26 (cf. Rofé 2002:1-13, McConville 2002:18-51; Christensen 2001:lvii-lxxix for recent summaries of the composition of Deuteronomy), strengthens the possibility that this editorial work occurred later, rather than earlier. Within post-exilic Judea, such textual emendations would have the rhetorical effect that the promises of land (generally) made to the fathers in these verses, which would initially refer *only* to the exiles’ fathers (*presented* here as the Exodus generation who are in need of a theologically sanctioned homeland, but *referring* to the Babylonian exile generations), are then reapplied. The promises are thus now rhetorically expanded to include Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; more accurately: to embrace the tradents who found their core identities in these three patriarchs. This could only have been a post-exilic dynamic.

This argument I propose of course offers no final proof of the May - Van Seters - Römer theory on the addition of the patriarchal names to the pertinent father texts in Deuteronomy. It does however add another consideration, drawing on the sensitivity currently dawning within historically inclined Old Testament scholarship that the Bible texts reflect intense social contestation. Within such a framework (or network of interaction between text and text originators), the addition of the patriarchal names to the father texts in Deuteronomy may well have been more than authorial technique with a view to writerly¹⁰ sensitivities (of which we are also becoming more aware: cf. Otto 2007a:19-28, summarised in Lombaard 2007b:351-365); it may also reflect editorial reproduction of the social processes of the time – texts echoing events and thoughts (cf. Römer 1991:116), to which hypothesis is our only access (Le Roux 2001:444-457). The resultant stereotypical pleonasm in the Deuteronomic father - patriarch verses were created in an evidently formulaic way, perhaps “not fully appreciating the significance of this terminology” (May

¹⁰ This term is from the hermeneuticist Thiselton (1992:98), where it indicates that an author at times intentionally writes so as to entice readers to assign further meaning to what is meant by the immediate words.

1941a:158, reaching this conclusion by a wholly different route than was followed here). Its intended consequence would have been greater social cohesion, though, executed with enough rhetorical finesse in these Deuteronomy texts that some two and a half millennia later we find ourselves still intrigued by it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albrecht, R. "Pentateuchkritik im Umbruch." Pages 61-79 in *Israel in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Beiträge zur Geschichte Israels und zum jüdisch-christlichen Dialog*. Edited by G. Maier. Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 1996.

Andersen, K. T. "Der Gott meines Vaters." *Studia Theologica* 16/2 (1962): 170-188

Braulik, G. "Die Funktion von Siebenergruppierungen im Endtext des Deuteronomiums." Pages 37-50 in *Ein Gott, eine Offenbarung. Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese, Theologie und Spiritualität* (Festschrift für N. Füglister). Edited by F. V. Reiterer. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1991.

Carr, D. "Genesis in relation to the Moses story. Diachronic and synchronic perspectives." Pages 273-295 in *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History*. Edited by A. Wénin. Louvain: Peeters, 2001.

Christensen, D. L. *Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9*, revised. Word Biblical Commentary 6A. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001.

Davies, G. "Covenant, oath, and the composition of the Pentateuch." Pages 71-89 in *Covenant as Context: Essays in Honour of EW Nicholson*. Edited by A. D. H. Mayes & R. B. Salter. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

De, A. *Widerspruch und Widerständigkeit. Zur Darstellung und Prägung räumlicher Vollzüge personaler Identität*. Theologische Bibliothek Töpelmann 128. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2005.

Deist, F. *Mosaic of Moses*. Cape Town: NG Kerkboekhandel, 1988.

Du Plessis, S. J. "Deuteronomium as Archimedespunt van die Pentateuchkritiek." M.Div-verhandeling. Pretoria/Potchefstroom: Universiteit van Suid-Afrika (Potchefstroomse Universiteitskollege vir Christelike Hoër Onderwys), 1947.

Eissfeldt, O. *Einleitung in das alte Testament*. Tübingen: JCB Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1934.

Emerton, J. A. "The origin of the promises to the patriarchs in the older sources of the book of Genesis." *Vetus Testamentum* 32/1 (1982): 14-32.

Goldberg, O. *Die fünf Bücher Mosis - ein Zahlengebäude: die Feststellung einer einheitlich durchgeführten Zahlenschrift*. Berlin: Liebmann, 1908.

Gosse, B. "Le souvenir de l'alliance avec Abraham, Isaac et Jacob et le serment de don de la terre dans la rédaction du Pentateuque." *Estudios Bíblicos* 51 (1993): 459-272.

Heinzerling, R. "Literature on quantitative structure analysis (QSA) of biblical texts." Accessed 12 June 2009. Online: www.ruediger-heinzerling.de/literatu.htm#ZahlenschriftImDeuteronomium, 2009.

Hoftijzer, J. *Die Verheissungen an die drei Erzväter*. Leiden: Brill, 1956.

Hyatt, J. P. "Yahweh as 'the God of my Father'". *Vetus Testamentum* 5 (1955): 130-136.

Le Roux, J. H. "No theory, no science (or: Abraham is only known through a theory)." *Old Testament Essays* 14/3 (2001): 444-457.

_____ *A story of Two Ways. Thirty Years of Old Testament Scholarship in South Africa*. Old Testament Essays Supplement Number 2. Pretoria: Verba Vitae, 1993.

Lohfink, N. *Die Väter Israels im Deuteronomium. Mit einer Stellungnahme von Thomas Römer*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 111. Freiburg Schweiz: Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz, 1991.

Lombaard, C. Some remarks on the patriarchs in the Psalms. *Old Testament Essays* 11/1 (1998): 59-70.

_____ Elke vertaling is 'n vertelling. Opmerkings oor vertaalteorie, geïllustreer aan die hand van die chokmatiese ratio interpretationis. *Old Testament Essays* 15/3 (2002): 754-765.

_____ "What is Isaac doing in Amos 7?" Pages 152-159 in *A Critical Study of the Pentateuch. An Encounter Between Europe and Africa*. Altes Testament und Moderne 20. Edited by E. Otto & J. Le Roux. Munich: LIT Verlag, 2005.

_____ "Teks en mens. JH le Roux se lees van die Bybel binne die konteks van hoofstroom-eksegese in Suid-Afrika." *Old Testament Essays*. Special Edition. 19/3 (2006): 912-925.

_____ The Old Testament between diachrony and synchrony: two reasons for favouring the former. Pages 62-79 in *The Pentateuch between synchrony and diachrony*. Edited by J. Le Roux & E. Otto. New York: T & T Clark. 2007a..

_____. Of serpents, reeds, understanding, and turns. Some perspectives on implied apologetics and Pentateuch theory. *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae* XXXIII/1 (2007b): 351-365.

_____ Isaac multiplex: Genesis 22 in a new historical representation. *HTS Theological Studies* 64/2 (2008): 907-919.

May, H. G. The God of my father: a study of patriarchal religion. *Journal of Bible and Religion* 9/3 (1941a): 155-158, 199-200.

_____ The patriarchal idea of God. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 60/2 (1941b): 113-128.

McConville, J. G. *Deuteronomy*. Apollos Old Testament Commentary 5. Leicester: Apollos, 2002.

Noth, M. *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1948.

Otto, E. "A hidden truth behind the text or the truth of the text: at a turning point of biblical scholarship two hundred years after De Wette's *Dissertatio Critico-Exegetica*." Pages 19-28 in *South African perspectives on the Pentateuch between synchrony and diachrony*. Edited by J. le Roux & E. Otto. New York: T & T Clark International, 2007a.

_____ "Das Deuteronomium als archimedischer Punkt der Pentateuchkritik. Auf dem Wege zu einer Neubegründung der De Wette'schen Hypothese." Pages 321-339 in *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic literature*. Festschrift CHW Brekelmans. edited by M. Vervenne & J. Lust, J. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2007b[1997].

Rofé, A. *Deuteronomy. Issues and Interpretation*. London: T&T Clark, 2002.

Römer, T. *Israels Väter. Untersuchungen zur Väterthematik im Deuteronomium und in der deuteronomistischen Tradition*. Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 1990.

_____. "Nachwort." Pages 111-123 in *Die Väter Israels im Deuteronomium. Mit einer Stellungnahme von Thomas Römer*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 111. N. Lohfink. Freiburg Schweiz: Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz, 1991.

_____. "Deuteronomy in search of origins." Pages 112-138 in *Reconsidering Israel and Judah. Recent studies on the Deuteronomistic History*. SBTS 8. Edited by G. N. Knoppers, & J. G. McConville. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000.

_____. *The So-called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction*. London: T & T Clark – Continuum, 2005.

_____. "Exodusmotive und Exoduspolemik in den Erzvätererzählungen." Pages 3-20 in *Berührungspunkte. Studien zur Sozial- und Religionsgeschichte Israels und seiner Umwelt*. Festschrift für Rainer Albertz zu seinem 65. Geburtstag. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 350. Edited by I. Kottsieper, R. Schmitt & J. Wöhrle.. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2008.

Römer, T. C. & Brettler, M. Z. "Deuteronomy 34 and the case for a Persian Hexateuch." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 119/3 (2000): 401-419.

Ruppert, L. *Genesis. Ein kritischer und theologischer Kommentar*. 2. Teil: *Genesis 11,22 – 25,18*. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 2002.

Schmid, K. *Erzväter und Exodus. Untersuchungen zur doppelten Begründung der Ursprünge Israels innerhalb der Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments*. Wissenschaftliche Monografien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 81. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1999.

Schmidt, L. "Väterverheißen und Pentateuchfrage." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 104/1 (1992): 1-27.

Seebass, H. *Der Erzvater Israel und die Einführung der Jahweverehrung in Kanaan*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 98. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1966.

Skweres, D. E. *Die Rückverweise im Buch Deuteronomium*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979.

Thiselton, A. C. *New horizons in hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992.

Van Seters, J. "Confessional reformulation in the exilic period." *Vetus Testamentum* 22/4 (1972): 448-459.

_____. *Prologue to history: the Yahwist as historian in Genesis*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.

_____. *The Pentateuch: a social-science commentary*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Veijola, T. *Das 5. Buch Mose. Deuteronomium. Kapitel 1,1-16,17*. Das Alte Testament Deutsch 8,1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005.

Vogt, P. T. *Deuteronomic Theology and the Significance of Torah: A Reappraisal*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006.

Winnett, F. V. Re-examining the foundations. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 84/1 (1965): 1-19.