

product of an interweaving of two originally separate and independent documents.

Pfeiffer's variant to this latter theory should also be noted.<sup>24</sup> He feels that the non-P material in Gen. 1:1-11:9 is so unlike the J stories of the patriarchs that it cannot originate from the same hand. He therefore derives it together with certain other stories in Genesis, such as chs. 14: 19; 34; and 38, from a document of Edomite origin which he designates S (South or Seir), and which he believes to have been added to JEDP ca. 400 B.C. When, however, it is clearly recognized (see Exeg. of Genesis) that the non-Israelite traditions taken over by the Hebrew writers were of widely diverse origin, the difference in tone and character in the material generally attributed to J is sufficiently accounted for; and, at the same time, the difficulty inherent in Pfeiffer's theory—that at so late a date as 400, stories of non-Israelite origin, and of such dubious morality as those in Gen. 34 and 38, should have been intruded into the national tradition—is avoided.

#### VIII. The Purpose of J<sup>1</sup>

An examination of the narrative in the books of Judges and Samuel reveals the same structural pattern as that which appears in the pre-exilic narrative of the Hexateuch—J<sup>1</sup> elaborated by J<sup>2</sup> and E. It is significant, however, that evidence for two strata of material in J comes to an end with II Sam. 8:15, that is, shortly after David had moved his capital from Hebron to Jerusalem.<sup>25</sup>

It may reasonably be inferred that the J<sup>1</sup> document was written about this time, that is, about the year 1000. Furthermore, in view of the interest of J<sup>1</sup> in Hebron,<sup>26</sup> David's first capital, it seems not unlikely that one of the author's purposes in writing history was a desire to record the events which brought greatness to that city and its sanctuary—a greatness now threatened by David's move to Jerusalem. His secondary aim was to bring into an ordered relationship the various local legends current at various holy places in Palestine,<sup>27</sup> and to unify them with the tradition which Israel had brought from the desert. He had then gone on to record the feats of certain heroes (Judges), leading up to the rise of the monarchy and David's accession to the throne.

<sup>24</sup> *Introduction to O.T.*, pp. 150-57.

<sup>25</sup> It seems probable that the story in II Sam. 21:1-11 belongs to the earlier stratum. It is obvious, however, that this story, which tells of an incident that must have occurred early in David's reign, has been moved from its original position in the narrative, for whatever reason.

<sup>26</sup> See Exeg. of Genesis, note on the J material in the story of the spies (Gen. 32:1-21) and the appeal to this in Judges 1:26-28.

<sup>27</sup> See *Atlas and Map of Genesis*.

Underlying his whole narrative is one consistent theme, that of the relation in which Israel stood to the Lord, the God of Sinai. Yahweh had in his call of Abraham chosen Israel to be his people; he had delivered them from the oppression of the Egyptians; he had reaffirmed his choice of them through Moses, revealing his essential righteousness and demanding justice in all the relationships of life; he had settled them in the good land of Palestine, and had protected them against their enemies; and now he had made them into a nation, giving them David as their king to execute "justice and righteousness unto all his people" (II Sam. 8:15 ANV). It was the relationship in which they stood to the Lord that gave significance to Israel—that and nothing else.

#### IX. The Purpose and Methods of J<sup>2</sup>

The J<sup>1</sup> document was written when the future seemed filled with hope. Some seventy-five years later, ca. 930, the political unity of north and south which David had achieved was shattered, the people whom the Lord had chosen and brought into a peculiar relationship with himself were organized into two kingdoms, and the spiritual unity of Israel was threatened.

It may reasonably be assumed that the J material following II Sam. 8:15 comes in the main from the hand of J<sup>2</sup>. Its concluding section is the account of the disruption of the kingdom,<sup>28</sup> which ends with the words, "So Israel rebelled against the house of David unto this day" (I Kings 12:19).

This suggests that the literary activity of J<sup>2</sup> was, to some extent at any rate, motivated by this event. Furthermore, the content of his narrative shows that he was also eager to preserve the spiritual unity of Israel. He saw that the real unity of the people inhered not in the state, but in the will of the Lord who had brought them into a unique relationship with himself.

This had indeed been the theme of the J<sup>1</sup> narrative, but something more than this was needed to meet the situation which the disruption of the kingdom had brought about. For the J<sup>1</sup> document embodied only the tradition of the southern tribes, and stressed the fact of God's activity in the history of Israel with reference only to events in which those tribes had been involved—the Exodus, the deliverance at the Red Sea, the ministry of Moses at Kadesh, and the conquest of the south. The northern tribes had had no part in these events.

<sup>28</sup> Gustav Hölscher, "Das Buch der Könige, seine Quellen und seine Redaktion," *EXXAPETHPION, Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, ed. Hans Schmidt (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911), I, 181-82.

They had entered Palestine by an independent movement<sup>29</sup> from the east across the Jordan, not from the south. Their knowledge of Moses and his work was limited to what they had learned from the southern tribes in Palestine; for their ancestors had not come under his influence. Consequently, Kadesh had no place in their complex of associations: Sinai was for them the center of the Lord's activity (cf. Judg. 5:5), and the Lord was to them still primarily the God of the storm, the God of war. Their awareness of him as the God of justice and righteousness was less insistent than was the awareness of the southern tribes to whose ancestors this truth had been revealed through Moses.

J<sup>2</sup> accordingly undertook the task of revising the J<sup>1</sup> narrative so that it would appeal more directly to the people of the north, and bring home to them the fact of the spiritual unity of the nation as a whole—a unity which inhered in the will of God.

J<sup>2</sup> had begun the process of uniting legends long current in Palestine to the desert tradition of Israel. J<sup>2</sup> continued this process. He first dealt with certain tales which had originated centuries earlier in Babylonia—the Marduk creation myth,<sup>30</sup> the saga of Eden, the garden of God, and the story of the Flood. These had found their way to Palestine, and had long since become a part of the cultural heritage into which the Joseph tribes had entered—though the fact that J<sup>2</sup> made no use of them would seem to indicate that they were unknown in the south. J<sup>2</sup> could not ignore them without endangering the strong tendency toward monotheism, which even at this time characterized Yahwism. He therefore took them over, and, with the necessary theological and moral adaptation,<sup>31</sup> incorporated them into the J<sup>1</sup> narrative, with which he was working.

He then proceeded to expand and elaborate J<sup>1</sup>'s relatively simple narrative of the patriarchs. His additions were made for various reasons: (a) to explain the relationship in which Israel stood to neighboring peoples—for example, the notices which form the nucleus of the much-

<sup>29</sup> Cf. A. T. Olmstead, *History of Palestine and Syria to the Maccabean Conquest* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), chs. xv and xvii.

<sup>30</sup> No trace of this is found in the extant J material in Genesis. There can be little doubt, however, that, as Karl Marx has argued (*Das Buch Jesaja*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1900), pp. 378-89), the J<sup>2</sup> narrative opened with a version of this myth, which was later dropped by R<sup>1</sup> in favor of the revision of it made by P, now contained in Gen. 1:1-2; see *Stippgen, Early Traditions of Israel*, p. 491.

<sup>31</sup> For the details of this adaptation see Exeg. of Gen. 1:1-2:8-22. It may be noted that the inconsistency in I between the flood story and Gen. 1:19-22 is in this way accounted for.

expanded genealogical tables in Gen. 10 and the stories now preserved, along with parallel material from other documents, in chs. 19: 26 and 27; (b) to account for the existence of certain northern tribes which had apparently been unknown to J<sup>1</sup>—the J material in Gen. 30:1-24 and 35:16-20; (c) to bring out the fact—of which J<sup>1</sup> appears to have been ignorant—of the connection of Joseph with Shechem, and to witness to the power and prestige of the tribes claiming descent from him—the material from J<sup>2</sup>'s hand in Gen. 37-50. Other minor additions were designed: (d) to make more explicit the fact of the Lord's care for the patriarchs; (e) to mitigate the somewhat dubious behavior which had been attributed to them in some of the older stories—for example, Jacob's tricky outwitting of Laban (Gen. 30:31-31:35) and Judah's relations with Tamar (ch. 38); and (f) simply to improve the literary quality of the narrative.

This revision of the earlier account of the primeval world and of the patriarchs was a relatively simple matter, and involved little change in the order of events as they had been there set down. J<sup>2</sup>'s elaboration of the story of the oppression in Egypt, the birth and commissioning of Moses, and the events preceding the Exodus was limited for the most part to making more explicit its religious significance. When, however, he came to deal with the life of Israel in the desert and the Conquest, he was compelled to subject his predecessor's narrative to more drastic treatment.

As has already been noted, the tradition of the Joseph tribes knew nothing of Kadesh; for them Sinai was the only desert center of the Lord's activity. If the southern tradition of Moses as the great exponent of Yahwism was to find something more than formal acceptance among the northern tribes—*if*, that is, it was to become a real and essential part of their religion—it was necessary that Moses should be connected with Sinai. J<sup>2</sup> accordingly revised the J<sup>1</sup> narrative by representing the Israelites as proceeding from the Red Sea, not at once to Kadesh, but first to Sinai, where, through the mediation of Moses, the Lord entered into a covenant with them. There can be little doubt that, as Eduard Meyer<sup>32</sup> has argued, the covenant idea in Israel was at least partly derived from the cult of Baal-berith—the Lord of the Covenant—the tutelary deity of Shechem. Hence, J<sup>2</sup> not only transferred the scene of Moses' essential activity from Kadesh to Sinai, to make it definitive for the northern tribes; he also stated it in terms which related it dynamically to their own experience.

<sup>32</sup> *Realien und ihre Bedeutung*, pp. 237-42.