

p. 154 On Gen. 21.1 The second half of the verse duplicates the first. It appears to stem from P, with a secondary change of Elohim to Yahweh, induced by the preceding clause. It did not, however, seem practical to reflect such a possibility in the translation.

Gen. 21.2b Elohim is the normal designation of the Deity not only in E (vss 6ff.) but also in P, along with El Shaddai.

p. 159 On Gen. 21.22-34 Except for vs. 33, and possibly also 32 and 34, the narrative stems from E, hence the use of Elohim in 22f.

p. 166 On Gen. 22.1-19. It is ironic that the writer who distilled this unique affirmation in so unforgettable a manner should himself be more difficult to ascertain than virtually all critics have assumed. The narrative is attributed to E with scarcely a dissenting voice, and with only a few minor reservation. Nor can the consensus be held at fault, in view of the repeated mention of Elohim (1, 3, 8,9,12) and the seemingly theological tenor of the narrative. Yet Yahweh is also mentioned further down, vss. 11, 15,16; and if the last two occurrences are credited to R(edactor), the same is not the case with the two aetiological references to Yahweh in vs. 14. Furthermore, the style of the narrative is far more appropriate to J than to E, and the ability to paint a vivid scene in depth, without spelling things out for the reader, is elsewhere typical of J. What this amounts to, therefore, is that, on external grounds, J was either appended to E, or E was superimposed upon J. . . . On internal evidence, however, based on style and content, the personality behind the story should be J's. Since the crystallized version was such as to be cited and copied more often than most accounts, it is possible that a hand which had nothing to do with E (conceivably even from the P school) mis-write Elohim for Yahweh in the few instances involved, sometime in the long course of written transmission. The issue is thus not a closed one by any means