

Winnett, F. V., The Mosaic Tradition (Toronto) 1949

written traditions and that a long series of redactors tampered with the text, adding remarks of their own, is to my mind quite unwarranted and inherently improbable. Whatever growth there was took place when the tradition was in the oral stage.¹

Footnote 1 Of course at a late date the written form was subjected to a revision by P.

p. 14 The admission of the literary unity of the Plague Narrative has revolutionary implications. For one thing it exposes the absurd extremes to which the documentary theory has been carried. The question of the existence of a P element is not affected, although it is evident that scholars have tended to ^{p.15} assign material to P without adequate warrant. But the theory of two early documents, J and E, is seriously called in question. The fact that the literary phenomena presented by the narrative can be explained more naturally by a theory of stylistic arrangement than by a theory of documentary admixture raises doubts as to whether two such documents ever existed. In the chapters which follow I shall endeavour to utilize the freedom from the traditional viewpoint engendered by our examination of the Plague story to approach the other parts of the Mosaic Tradition unencumbered by the JE hypothesis.

p. 16 Winnett notes that Rudolph and Julicher maintain the unity of the narrative in Exodus Chapter 1, apart from the P additions, though Julicher assigns it to E and Rudolph assigns it to J. Winnett himself (p. 17) argues against the accepted theory that there are two documents (J and E), apart from P additions, in Ex. 1 because the two stories alleged to be given there are in fact interdependent parts of the same narrative.

p. 18 Actually the argument from 'amah and shiphhah is worthless, as Rudolph² has seen, for these words are used interchangeably in Hebrew (cf. 1 Sam. 1.16,18; 25.24f.,27,41; 2 Sam. 14.15-17; Ruth 2.13; 3.9).

Footnote 2 W. Rudolph, Der "Elohist" von Exodus bis Josua, Beih. ZAW, LXVIII (Berlin, 1938), 3. p.4, n.4. A. H. McNeile, Exodus, p. viii, admits that shiphhah occurs in E as well as in J, yet cf. R. H. Pfeiffer, Intro. to the OT (New York, 1941), p.172, n.4.