

tions and repetitions in Genesis still stand, for we considered it beyond our terms of reference to interpret them or to propose a hypothesis other than the Documentary on how the book was composed. Statistics, it has been said, is the science of making wise decisions in face of uncertainties: even complete similarity in language behaviour makes the assumption of single authorship only highly probable, but not certain. Nothing in our calculations has any bearing on the question of Mosaic authorship. However, heterogeneity of Genesis excludes it; homogeneity does not.

Despite these reservations, we are firm in our belief that the Documentary Hypothesis in Genesis should either be rejected or at least thoroughly revised. Several of the book's problems may have been solved, many remain, and a new one has been posed by the findings submitted here in short: how hitherto convinced Documentarians will come to terms with them.

Die mittels der statistischen Linguistik und mit Hilfe der elektronischen Datenverarbeitung durchgeführte Untersuchung der Gültigkeit der Quellenscheidungstheorie in Genesis erwies, daß es außerordentlich unwahrscheinlich ist, den Jahwisten zu trennen, und daß die Quelle P zwar von diesen beiden absichtlich, was aber wohl auf den Inhalt der dieser Quelle zugeschriebenen Textteile zurückgeführt werden muß. Obendrein stellte es sich heraus, daß der zweifelslos bestehende Wechsel im Sprachverhalten viel eher und weit eindeniger auf dem Unterschied zwischen den Worten des Erzählers und der direkten Rede beruht, wobei dann auch noch die in den einzelnen Teilen des Buches sich allmählich ändernde Erzählungstechnik mitspielt.

## Converging Lines of Evidence Bearing on the Date of P

by Ziony Zevit

(University of Judaism, Los Angeles, California)

General acceptance of the ordering of the Pentateuchal documents, J-E-D-P, among liberal biblical scholars is due primarily to the brilliant advocacy of J. Wellhausen in *Geschichte Israels*, 1878, and *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 1882 (E. T. *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, 1885).<sup>1</sup> From the outset of his work, Wellhausen presupposed the conclusions of his predecessors that the basic composition was a Hexateuch comprised of four major sources, the Jahwist, the Elohist, the Priestly source, and Deuteronomy. Furthermore, he accepted the dating of Deuteronomy to the age of its discovery in the time of Josiah,<sup>2</sup> and of J

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the Introductions of S. R. Driver, O. Eissfeldt, G. Fohrer, O. Kaiser, A. Weiser.  
<sup>2</sup> *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, 1885; reprinted New York, 1957, 6-10.

The ever recurring anomaly of P then calls for some discussion. At first sight, it looks as if this phenomenon would corroborate at least part of the Documentary Hypothesis, but only seemingly so because the argument is circular. If certain parts of Genesis, because of their totally different literary type, are marked as a source *per se*, then one must not infer from their different language behaviour that they belong to a different source. Comparing then the two literary types is pointless and using the computer to manifest the difference is a waste of time and funds.

Such reasoning explains without much difficulty the aforementioned often met anomaly of P. The subcategory NP being the only heterogeneous one among nine could have been expected: it is spread here and there all over the book, comprises *toledot* in Divisions I and II and other portions as unlike *toledot* as genuine narratives, mainly in Division I. (e.g. in the Flood Story). This is why NP resembles N/ especially in Division I. With regard to P's high values of VR, it could have been foreseen too: if a text abounds in proper names, each occurring only one or twice as it happens in the genealogies, and if proper names are considered to be lemmata, then VR must grow inordinately.

To sum up:

(1) No statistically significant difference was found in any analysis between the Jahwist and the Elohist.

(2) A wide gap divides P from J+E, but it is accounted for by differences in genre and content and hence not reason enough to regard P as a separate source.

(3) A pronounced variety of language behaviour occurs in the SDS-dimension: the narrator's if clearly distinguished from that of his persons. If a partition of Genesis is indeed a *sine qua non*, then one would have to assume that the storyteller wrote his part and passed the pen to a colleague whenever direct speech began only to have it returned to him when the latter terminated – which is clearly unthinkable.

(4) Significant variation in language behaviour also came to light between the Primeval and the Patriarchal Stories, and to a lesser degree between the latter and the Joseph Cycle. We wish to suggest that it is necessitated by two (or three) different literary techniques employed in Divisions, respectively.

(5) There exist strong interaction between SDS and DIV and between these two and DOC (if there were any Documents).

The objectivity of the method and the accuracy of the data are inassailable. The critical school cannot approve of the method if it reinforces that school's view and repudiate it when it does not.

The above notwithstanding, a few qualifying remarks are appropriate. It is so far in Genesis only that the Documentary Hypothesis is so shaken – what will emerge in Exodus remains to be seen. The contradic-