

Psalm 68, etc., may be shown to antedate the great prophetic movement of the eighth century, and in the case of the first three mentioned, to antedate the United Monarchy. The utility of such scientific means of dating must not be overlooked. It grants scholarship a corpus of literature which can be contrasted with the early prophets, presumably the creative and formative minds in the history of Israelite theology. The results of the theological analysis of this early literature make several conclusions necessary. As long maintained by Kittel, Gressmann, Eichrodt, Albright, and other critics of evolutionary historicism, the basic tenants of prophetic religion are already present in this earlier age: the concept of the covenant, a lofty ethical level (in contrast to the essentially amoral religions of contemporary Canaan), a conception of God as righteous Judge, as cosmic Lord of nature and history; and most striking of all, a consistent tradition of the Mosaic and desert origins of Yahwism. Wellhausen admittedly had considerable difficulty in explaining the historical roots of the prophetic movement. But in light of the above mentioned results, not to mention other lines of evidence, how can such a phenomenon as early Yahwism be explained as it suddenly appears amidst the naturalistic polytheisms of the ancient Near East? . . . . .

p. 208 The Ras Shamrah tablets, the Marseilles Tariff, and South Arabic Inscriptions have given new perspective in studies of the sacrificial system of Israel. Scholarly opinion now indicates that the Israelite system described in the tabernacle legislation of Leviticus probably goes back in its basic outlines to common Semitic practice.

p. 209 While the Priestly account is schematized and idealized, and while the Priestly writers read the theological interpretations and historical developments of later ages into their system, nevertheless, Priestly tradition must be deemed an important historical witness to the Mosaic Age.

Some of the detailed information of the lists and genealogies of P must not be passed over lightly. Often the Priestly scribes placed their ancient sources in wrong contexts; but the day when their work could be universally rejected as "pious fraud" has passed. Examples are the census lists in Numbers 1 and 26 (originally a single document). Moreover, Noth is no doubt correct in regarding the framework of Numbers 26 as premonarchical in its origins.

p. 210 Even more striking is our increasing knowledge of ancient onomastica, which may be applied to the study of Priestly proper names. Such a document as the list of princes, underlying Numbers 1, 2, 7, and 10, may be used to illustrate our contention. Gray in his Studies in Hebrew Personal Names, the standard work of the previous generation, rejected the document as a fiction on grounds which archaeological data have now shown to be false or inapplicable.

It will be instructive to describe briefly how his arguments have been refuted. Names with a Sadday element, which appear no less than three times in this list and nowhere else in the Bible, were rejected as artificial constructions without archaeological parallel. We have noted in §4 the place which Sadday assumes in the religion of the Patriarchs, but more striking evidence is found now in the occurrence of the name Sadday-<sup>\*</sup>ammi (<sup>\*</sup>Shaddai is my kinsman<sup>\*</sup>) in an Egyptian inscription of the fourteenth or