

Critics Disagree Among Themselves
Simpson disagrees with Smend and Eissfeldt

Simpson (in The Early Traditions of Israel, p.370) says that Smend and Eissfeldt hold that Exodus 4.10-12 are from E on the ground that they cannot be separated from verses 13 - 16. But Simpson says that Meyer is correct in stating that the author of v. 12 could not have written 13 - 16. Simpson further holds that Ex. 4.13-16 are a secondary addition of E (pp.164f cf. p. 370) while Smend and Eissfeldt hold that the verses belong to the primary strand of E on the ground that some such passage as this is needed to introduce Aaron, who appears as a known figure in Ex. 32. This introduction, says Simpson, is, however, supplied by Ex. 24.14, which Smend and Eissfeldt erroneously derive from J1. (p.370)

On page 373 of Simpson's The Early Traditions of Israel in his notes on Ex. 13.17-15.21, Simpson states (in note number 72): Smend, Eissfeldt consider the passage this has reference particularly to Ex. 14.11f to be from more than one hand; but the apparent parallelism of 11b, 12 to 11a, may be due to the fact that the redactor who inserted this material selected certain passages from a longer story. Smend's ^{derivation of 11a} ~~derivation of 11a~~ from J1, 11b, 12 from J2 is impossible because of the irrelevancy of the complaint.

Likewise Simpson (p. 184) gives Ex. 14.16, with the exception of and lift thou up thy rod to P, and he (on p. 373) replies to the contention of Smend and Eissfeldt that 16abcb (from and stretch) cannot be from P because the miracle is wrought not by Aaron but by Moses, by saying that the definite role assigned to Moses in the tradition of the Red Sea crossing received by P made the substitution of ^{p.374} Aaron as the agent impossible; and the fact that in the plague of boils, Ex. 9.8-12, Moses is the agent further weakens the force of their argument. It may be added that the analysis of Num. 16 will reveal a strand of P in which Aaron plays a role of less prominence than is usually recognized; the caution may therefore be advanced that a closer examination than has hitherto been made of the P material in the Pentateuch is needed before such inferences as that of Smend and Eissfeldt can safely be drawn.