

p. 84 <sup>Footnote 7</sup> The analysis of J and E in the story in Num. 16 is "not certain". Probably verses . . . . are from E.

p. 86 Even if one confines E's strand to the Pentateuch he was a wonderful teacher.<sup>9</sup>  
Footnote 9 Perhaps the credit belongs not to E as a person but to the prophetic school of which he is a representative. Realization of the broader basis behind this approach relieves one of the necessities of supposing that such a chapter as 1 Sam. 15 must have been written by E, <sup>or a little later</sup>

p. 87 . . . So it was decided, perhaps around 700 B.C. . . . to combine them (J & E) into a single history JE, which was given a pan-Israelitic slant. Scholars have recently begun to give the redactor of this compilation, hitherto called R<sup>JE</sup>, a special designation: the Jehovist. For the period from the creation to Abraham there was only the Judean document. From Abraham on both documents were woven together. For the Abraham stories J served as the basis and the E stories were inserted; but as the redactor proceeded he made more and more use of E; thus in the Joseph story E is the basis, and while in the Exodus story J and E are at first almost equally used, E becomes more and more predominate in the Sinai sections. This was only natural, for the prophetic element is stronger in E and its pedagogic value seemed to the Jehovist to be greater than that of J. The work of compilation was done with great skill. Sometimes both stories were placed side by side without abridgement as, e.g., the stories of Sarah's peril and Abraham's deception (Gen. 12 J; 20 E); sometimes they were woven together into a single story, now J now E forming the basis into which the variant traditions were worked as, e.g., in the story of how Joseph came to Egypt (Gen. 37). Occasionally it was necessary for the redactor to add certain sentences of his own in order to make room for the variant story or to harmonize both, e.g. Gen. 16:9 in J's story of Hagar's flight, for Hagar had to be brought back in order to fit into E's story (Gen. 20). Again, the Jehovist added matter of his own in order to emphasize certain ideas, e.g., by reiterating the promise of Israel's great future (Gen. 22:15-18; 26:3b, 4f). But for all this he treated the stories both of J and of E with much reverence and left them pretty much as they had been handed down. This is fortunate for us and remarkable for him, for his own religious ideas were in several respects more advanced even than those of E. If he had radically revised these stories in the interest of his own higher religious conceptions, many valuable and interesting survivals of earlier stages of religious development would have been altogether lost to us.

p. 229 Footnote 1 The older critical view assumed that J and E continued at least through Joshua and ascribed the Deuteronomic elements in the following historical books to editors. But it is strange that there is no Deuteronomistic editing in Genesis-Numbers. The thesis that an author-editor compiled a work governed by his thought was set forth by Martin Noth in 1943. . . .

p. 279 The style of . . . P . . . is quite uniform and stereotyped like that of a school. It is dry and prosaic, as a rule, . . . In the story of creation . . . is an exception. The style of (P) is so well marked that it is quite easy for even a beginner to single out the priestly work. . . . desire for . . . accuracy . . . But however accurate they may seem to be, they turn out to be altogether unreliable.

*all this of priestly literature*

The long process of purging the ancient tales of all heathen and inferior ideas was brought by P to a successful completion.

p. 281 According to P there had always been only one legitimate place of worship, . . .

*is well illustrated in the exact dates & figures which he gives.*