

Israel's Prophetic Heritage, essays in honor of James Muilenburg. Edited by Bernhard W. Anderson & Walter Harrelson (Harper & Brothers, New York) 1962

Noth, Martin, "The Background of Judges 17-18" pp. 68 -85
(Martin Noth, Prof. of OT, University of Bonn, Bonn, Germany)

p. 68 It is still a debatable question, to be sure, whether we actually have one

|| narrative or two paralæel "sources," which have only secondarily been combined by

literary means.¹ Since, however, even the majority of the representatives of the

"Two-source" hypothesis, which has become standard in the period since Wellhausen, stress the fact that the two "sources" are very similar, I shall not deal with the

literary-critical problem. Let me^{p. 69}/only remark that I am in agreement with the more

recent and latest works on the Book of Judges,² which hold to the essential literary

unity of Jg. 17-18. This is not to deny that the original story was later distorted some-

what by a few alterations and additions.³ Such particulars may be left aside here,

since they are not essential to the following remarks.

Footnotes 1 A. Murtonen, Testus Testamentum, I (1951), pp. 223 f., even assumes three literary strata, an "original narrative" and two "later narratives."

2 See, among others, F. Notscher . . . H. W. Hertzberg . . . E. Täubler . . .

|| 3 The adherents of the "two-source" hypothesis also cannot dispense with the assumption of secondary alterations and additions.