

Winnett, F. V., The Mosaic Tradition

p. 144 (cont'd) which only arose at a much later period? As long as it is assumed that the distinction between priest and levite did not arise until a comparatively late period, the answer can only be that the story had no basis in the original tradition but reflects later disputes within the priesthood. But I believe it can be demonstrated that the distinction between/priest and levite dates back to the very institution of the Israelite priesthood. If that be admitted, it is highly probably that a form of the Korah story once stood in that part of the narrative dealing with the events at Kadesh.

p. 149 But why did P repeat the water-miracle story at Kadesh? I would suggest that the reason is to be found in P's desire to cast a halo of sanctity about the waters of 'Ain Kadis, whither some of the Jews of the post-exilic period doubtless made pilgrimages. We have already seen in dealing with the theophany prefixed to Ex. 34 that P was anxious to avoid manufacturing stories without any basis in the original tradition. . . . P was too conservative, however, to take the logical step of wiping out the name Meribah in Ex. 17 where it denotes Rephidim and restricting its application to Kadesh.

p. 153 Footnote 2. P was very fond of representing the people as weeping. See his introduction to the story of the Seventh Murmuring in Nu. 14.1, whereas the original introduction in 14.2 has them murmuring. Cf. also Ju. 2.4.

p. 154 Winnett believes "there is reason to believe that the text has been tampered with by P", but earlier (p.14) he rejected the assumption of modern biblical scholars that extensive liberties were taken with the written traditions and that a long series of redactors tampered with the text, adding remarks of their own. . .

p. 163 Dt. 32 is a P composition, or at least dates from the fifth century. Cf. Pfeiffer, Intro. to the O.T. (New York, 1941), p. 280

Winnett thinks both Ex. 19.3b-8 and 34.10b-16 are by P

p. 168 P not only endeavoured to harmonize the two conflicting versions of the Mosaic Tradition, which had reached him but added a great deal of material, chiefly of a legal and genealogical character, drawn from a variety of sources.

p.169 There is no evidence that this / diversified material ever existed as a separate, continuous document. It seems rather to consist largely of the oral tradition which had grown up in Jerusalem around the written tradition.