

p. 75 Footnote 16 Current criticism is inclined to follow Gerhard von Rad in regarding J as dependent on summary formulations made for cultic use, praising the God of Israel for a series of mighty deeds, which gave J the outline for what he narrated in detail. The oldest example of such historical summaries is the so-called "Little Creed" (Deut. 26:5-10). The Psalms 78; 105; 136, provide further instances. J merely needed to follow the topics Exodus, Desert Wanderings, and Occupation of Canaan on which the summaries dwell. He prefaced them with the Patriarchal history and the primeval history. With due recognition of his own contribution he nevertheless stands in a literary tradition leading from the old historical summaries to the completion of the Pentateuch. See von Rad, Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs, 1938

p. 76 It is noteworthy that in telling the ancient stories J did not reject the various Canaanite elements that had been introduced into Israel's religion, but he transformed them . . . . . The sacred places were not the only places where Yahweh dwelt and worked, for He was not bound to them. He dwelt in heaven . . . . . When Yahweh appeared to Abram at Hebron, He did not come out of the tree. . . . . But there was no open fight against these paraphernalia of Canaanite worship - only a quiet reinterpretation, which displaced their old meaning and made them harmless. . . . unassimilable ideas were discarded.

*Tactics of the modernists themselves* →

p. 76 It is not surprising to find that occasionally J did not quite succeed in eliminating every non-Israelite trace. In the story of the temptation the serpent is no longer a deity, but something uncanny still clings to it so that even to the modern reader it is not quite like a mere serpent; in the marriage of the angels with human women the mythical is still shining through . . . . . in all these there are elements which cannot easily be harmonized with J's exalted idea of God. But after all, how very little there is of all this, and what a wonderful energy and success in the transformation of religious ideas are manifest all through J's work!

*of course*

*Sp. raw written*

That J deepened the purely Israelite ideas in these stories is also manifest . . . . . It is true that there is a very pronounced anthropomorphism in some stories . . . . . This does not easily conform to the grand conception of the Creator. But it is a question whether J felt an incongruity here, and we must not forget that anthropomorphic ideas are often a sign of vital religion. More serious is, to our mind, that J did not disapprove of Abram's lie. . . . . True enough, these are elements which belong to a lower level of ethics according to our ideas. But they are quite incidental and cannot dim the glory of this man, . . . .

*"E"*

p. 79 E's story is parallel to J's, but it apparently began with Abram, and did not have the account of early mankind.<sup>2</sup>

Footnote 2 One prominent scholar, Sigmund Mowinckel, has argued that there is E material, instead of a younger stratum of J, in Gen. 1-11. Several others, Wilhem Volz and Wilhem Rudolph, have denied that E Represents a continuous strand, but that too has remained a minority view.

p. 80 In J the eating of the aphrodisiac mandrakes had enabled Rachel to conceive. But 81 E said it was due to God's favor (Gen. 30:22) . E could not tolerate the sharp practices of Jacob which J had told so gleefully and as a result of which Jacob had become so wealthy. So he took pains to point out that it was God's special blessing which took the sheep from Laban and gave them to Jacob , and even had Leah and Rachel testify that they were fully convinced of this (Gen. 31:4-16) . . . . Though Rachel had stolen and lied, E has no word of censure for her . . . . E had no antagonism to the local sanctuaries. . . . E wanted to supersede the popular belief by his own higher view. We perceive his method of teaching and admire him for it. /