

Winnett, F. V. The Mosaic Tradition

p.19 Winnett appears to give Ex. 4.19-23 to P, something no one else does. He gives reasons. cf. p. 28

p.24 Winnett regards Ex. 14.19a as the work of P. Most give it to E. None others to P. He even regards Ex. 23.20ff as a later expansion by P. No one else gives it to P. On p. 46 he gives some reasons

p. 28 But P was rarely able to insert anything from another source without adding a few comments of his own in the immediate neighbourhood.

p. 29 Winnett says that Ex. 5 is a literary unity and no one would ever have thought of assigning verses 1, 2, and 4 to a separate source on the ground that they are superfluous doublets had it not been for the JE hypothesis.

p.29 As for [Exodus] 6.2-7.13, all scholars are agreed that this section represents the handiwork of P and/or Rp . . . .

p. 33 Winnett says the facts justify the conclusion that Ex. 19.20-20.17 is a later intrusion into the Exodus tradition. And . . . it is practically certain that the person responsible for this intrusion was P. (None of the other critics share Winnett's view on this))

p. 43 Winnett considers Ex. 23.20-33 to be of later origin than Rā (so he says most scholars) and thinks it is probably P (cf. p. 46) which no other scholar does.

p.44-45 Winnett regards 24.3-8 as the work of P((nobody else does))

p. 56 Winnett argues that P made an effort to compose in the "Mosaic" style and that this accounts for his change from his ordinary style when composing Ex. 34.

p. 57 Winnett says that Ex. 32.30-35 is from the hand of P (No one else does!)

p.57 P is responsible for the present arrangement of the tradition in Ex. 33, says Winnett. The vocabulary of vs. 2-6 suggest P's composition.(p.58)  
Vs. 12-23 "are from P is clear from their vocabulary" says Winnett.(p. 60)

p. 62 . . . we have already seen the tendency of P to make slight alterations in the text of the original tradition immediately preceding and following his own insertions.  
may have

p. 66 Winnett thinks Moses/had two fathers-in-law, Jethro the Midianite and Hobab the Kenite

p. 68 P frequently used stories of disputes in the original tradition as pegs on which to hanf some of his own ideas and doctrines . . .

p. 68 Winnett calls Nu. 11.25 a P verse. Nobody else does! The same is true of Ex. 15.20.

p. 68 Gray, McNeile, and Binns regard Nu. 12 as part of the E Document; Pfeiffer assigns it to E. ~~Rudolph~~ on the other hand, assigns it to J, except for vv.2-8, 10a, 11, which he regards as secondary additions.

p. 69 Of recent years a theory of the Kenite origin of Yahweh has been exceedingly popular, but if the above interpretation be correct, the Kenite theory is completely undermined. (In an accompanying footnote Winnett says, My colleggue, Dr. T. J. Meek, has stood almost alone in opposing this theory) *of his Hebrew Origins (New York,*

1936), pp. 86 f