

THE
LOGICAL FALLACIES
OF THE
**DOCUMENTARY
HYPOTHESIS**

ALSO BY CLAYTON HOWARD FORD

*Who Really Wrote the Bible?
A Response to the Documentary Hypothesis*

*The Christian's Biggest Challenge:
And Other Hard Truths on Suffering*

*A Brief Word of Exhortation:
Lessons from the Epistle to the Hebrews*

Proof

*The Basic Doctrines of the Christian Faith:
A Primer*

www.claytonhowardford.com

THE
LOGICAL FALLACIES
OF THE
**DOCUMENTARY
HYPOTHESIS**
THIRD EDITION

CLAYTON HOWARD FORD

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis Copyright © 2021, 2025 by Clayton Howard Ford. All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any way by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording or otherwise without the prior permission of the author except as provided by USA copyright law.

The author is grateful for permission to include the following copyrighted material:

Scripture taken from the New King James Version®. Copyright © 1982 by Thomas Nelson. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations marked “NAS” are taken from the *New American Standard Bible*®, copyright © 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995 by The Lockman Foundation. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Excerpts from *Ancient Near Eastern Texts: Third Edition with Supplement*, edited by James B. Pritchard, copyright © 1950, 1955, 1969, 1978 by Princeton University Press, republished with permission of Princeton University Press; permission conveyed through Copyright Clearance Center, Inc. All rights reserved.

Excerpts from *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* by David M. Carr, copyright © 2011 by Oxford University Press, reproduced with permission of Oxford University Press through PLSclear. All rights reserved.

Excerpts from *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis* by Joel S. Baden, published by Yale University Press, copyright © 2012 by Yale University, reproduced with permission of Yale University Press. All rights reserved.

Excerpts from *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, edited by Jeffrey H. Tigay, copyright © 1985 by Jeffrey H. Tigay, reproduced with the kind permission of Dr. Jeffrey H. Tigay.

Excerpts from *The Bible with Sources Revealed* by Richard Elliott Friedman. Copyright © 2003 by Richard Elliott Friedman. Used by permission of HarperCollins Publishers.

Excerpts from *WHO WROTE THE BIBLE?* by Richard Elliott Friedman. Copyright © 1987 by Richard Friedman. Reprinted with permission of Simon & Schuster, Inc. All rights reserved.

To Yahweh, my Father,
who has taught me whatever truths I may know,
and to Susan, my wife,
for being by my side through thick and thin.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations.....	xi
Preface.....	xiii
Chapter 1: <i>Argumentum ad Ignorantiam</i>	1
Chapter 2: Suppressed Evidence.....	47
Chapter 3: Circular Reasoning.....	85
Chapter 4: Unwarranted Assumption	111
Chapter 5: <i>Argumentum ad Logicam</i>	223
The Appendices	245
Bibliography	315

Abbreviations

All Scripture quotations are taken from the New King James Version (with the name “God” changed to “Elohim” and the name “the LORD” changed to “Yahweh”) unless they are marked with one of the following:

AT – Author’s Translation

FV – Friedman’s Version (Friedman’s translation of the Pentateuch as found in *The Bible with Sources Revealed*)

NAS – New American Standard Bible

Other abbreviations:

ABH Archaic Biblical Hebrew

CBH Classical Biblical Hebrew

DSS Dead Sea Scrolls

LBH Late Biblical Hebrew

LXX Septuagint

MT Masoretic Text

SP Samaritan Pentateuch

Preface

The purpose of this book is to expose the logical fallacies underlying many of the arguments supporting the Documentary Hypothesis.¹ Perhaps one of the criticisms that will be brought against this book is that it spends 90% of its time analyzing the arguments of Richard Elliott Friedman and Joel S. Baden and little time analyzing the arguments of the classical proponents of the Hypothesis, such as Julius Wellhausen. That is because over the last one hundred plus years, scholars, including Friedman and Baden, have already criticized the arguments of the classical proponents and as a result, the Hypothesis has evolved to its present state.

Another result of that criticism is that fewer and fewer scholars hold to the classical version of the Hypothesis or hold to the Hypothesis at all. Those who do hold to it do not seem to bother to defend it but take it for granted, spending their time refining its details. Baden, however, has become the most vocal defender of the so-called Neo-Documentary Hypothesis,² while Friedman, for several decades now, has been the most vocal defender of the classical version of the Hypothesis, though he departs from Wellhausen's model at several important points. He also claims that the opponents of the Hypothesis have never answered his Seven Main Arguments supporting the Hypothesis. If true, then this book may be the first to answer those arguments.

¹ For an explanation and brief history of the Documentary Hypothesis, see Clayton Howard Ford, *Who Really Wrote the Bible? A Response to the Documentary Hypothesis* (Kindle Direct Publishing, 2021).

² Baden lists the major differences between the Neo-Documentary Hypothesis and the classical version in Joel S. Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012, hereafter referred to as *Composition*), 246-249.

It is my hope that, in exposing these logical fallacies, this book will help to bring clearer thinking to the field of Pentateuchal criticism.

I would like to thank Eyal Rav-Noy for his valuable input.

October 2021

Preface to the Second Edition

For the second edition, I corrected typographical errors and improved the wording in some places.

March 2025

Preface to the Third Edition

The major revision is the new arrangement of material in Chapter 2.

September 2025

Chapter 1

Argumentum ad Ignorantiam

Richard Elliott Friedman gathers what he believes is “the largest tabulation of evidence in one place to date”¹ in support of the Documentary Hypothesis in *The Bible with Sources Revealed*. Traditionally, the documentarians have relied on the anomalies within the Pentateuch as their support for the Hypothesis. Claus Westermann lists five categories of anomalies: style and language; the different names for God; contradictions and discrepancies; doublets and repetitions; and theological differences and varieties of viewpoints.² Friedman says these are no longer sufficient. Style is not included in his tabulation

since style is not usually a satisfactory criterion for distinguishing sources because it often involves subjective judgments. The exception is when we can observe an element of style that is definable and quantifiable. As an example of such an element, punning (paronomasia) occurs frequently in some of the sources but is rare in others.³

¹ Richard Elliott Friedman, *The Bible with Sources Revealed* (N.Y.: HarperCollins Publishers, 2003, hereafter referred to as *Sources*), 2.

² Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1-11: A Continental Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 576-584.

³ *Sources*, 2. Friedman and the other documentarians overlook two important facts when it comes to punning. The first is that punning is usually done in narratives, and P and D have little narrative compared to J and E. The second is that J and E make the same puns. See Eyal Rav-Noy and Gil Weinreich, *Who Really Wrote the Bible?* (No location, Richard Vigilante Books, 2010), 74-79.

He also says, “The name of God and the doublets were the starting-points of the investigation into the formation of the Bible. But they were not, and are not, major arguments or evidence in themselves.”⁴ Instead, they become significant only when they are viewed together with the other evidence in his tabulation.

He has classified these “hundreds of points of data”⁵ into seven categories:

1. Linguistic: Each document was written at a different stage during the development of the Hebrew language. Thus, J and E reflect an early stage of Classical Biblical Hebrew (CBH), P reflects a later stage of CBH, and D reflects a still later stage.⁶ This means that P must have come before D and the exile instead of after them, as Wellhausen thought.

2. Terminology: Each document uses its own terminology. Friedman lists twenty-four examples of words and phrases which appear only or primarily in one source but not in the others. For example, the phrase “fire came out from before YHWH” appears three times in the Pentateuch, but only in P.⁷

3. Consistent Content: Each source has its own idea of when the divine name, Yahweh, was first revealed. The author of J thought it was known from the time of creation (thus, its consistent use of the name throughout Genesis), but the authors of E and P thought it had not been revealed until the time of Moses (thus their consistent avoidance of the name throughout Genesis). Each source also has its own theological outlook. Certain sacred objects appear frequently in some documents, but not in others. “In the P source, access to the divine is limited to the Aaronid priests.”⁸ D, however, thought “all Levites are priests.”⁹ “In all the stories in P, there are no mentions of dreams, of angels, or talking animals, though these things occur in J,

⁴ *Sources*, 28.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.*, 7-8.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 8-9.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 11.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 12.

E, and D.”¹⁰ There are no blatant anthropomorphisms in P, as there are in J, E, and D. Also, “ages, dates, measurements, numbers, order, and precise instructions are an obvious, major concern in P. There is nothing even nearly comparable in degree in J, E, or D.”¹¹

4. Continuity of Texts: Each of the sources reads as a flowing and sensible text, without a break.¹²

5. Connections with Other Parts of the Bible: Each source has affinities with specific portions of the Bible.¹³ Thus, D has affinities with Jeremiah, P with Ezekiel, and J and E with Hosea. J has such strong affinities with the court history now found in 2 Samuel that Friedman has concluded they were written by the same author. Following the ancient Near Eastern custom of naming a literary work after its opening words, he has entitled this combined work, *In the Day*.¹⁴

6. Relationships among the Sources: “The sources each have connections to specific circumstances in history. And they have identifiable relationships with each other.”¹⁵ J shows a particular interest in the southern kingdom of Judah while E shows an interest in the northern kingdom of Israel. For example, J pictures Abraham as living in Hebron, which became the capital of Judah. E talks about Shechem and Penuel, two cities built by the northern king, Jeroboam. P can be connected to the time of Hezekiah while D can be connected to the time of Josiah, a hundred years later. The P narrative follows that of JE, which means that P was written as an alternative to JE.

7. Convergence: “Above all, *the strongest evidence establishing the Documentary Hypothesis is that several different lines of evidence converge.*”¹⁶ The anomalies alone are not the strongest argument. It

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 11.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 12.

¹² *Ibid.*, 13.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 14.

¹⁴ Richard Elliott Friedman, *The Hidden Book in the Bible* (N.Y.: HarperCollins Publishers, 1999, hereafter referred to as *Hidden*), 55.

¹⁵ *Sources*, 18.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 27 (italics his).

is that when we separate the doublets, the contradictions are also resolved and the divine names consistently fall into one document but not the others. And when we separate the documents, the linguistic evidence consistently fits each document, the terminology consistently falls into one document or another, the texts in each document consistently flow together, etc. Thus, “the powerful argument is not any one of these matters. It is that all these matters *converge*.”¹⁷

He has correctly entitled these categories “The Seven Main Arguments,” for arguments are the only evidence which he presents. Indeed, arguments are the only evidence which any documentarian presents, which means that their evidence is only as good as their arguments.

In general, arguments fall into two classes: deductive arguments and inductive arguments. A deductive argument consists of three parts: a major premise, a minor premise, and the conclusion. For example:

Major premise: All humans are mortal.

Minor premise: Plato is a human.

Conclusion: Therefore, Plato is mortal.

To be a sound argument, the premises must be true and the argument must be free of all logical fallacies. If the argument is sound, then the conclusion is necessarily true.

An inductive argument draws a general principle from a set of specific observations (its premises) and then applies that principle to a specific case (its conclusion). For example:

Observations: The New England Patriots have won all of the regular season and playoff games this year (which was true in 2007).

General principle: The New England Patriots are unbeatable.

Conclusion: The Patriots will win the Super Bowl this year (2007).

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 28 (italics his).

At best, even though its premises may be true and the argument may be free of all logical fallacies, the conclusion of an inductive argument can only be *probably* true, not *necessarily* true (and in this case, it was not true: the Patriots lost to the Giants in 2007). The strength of the argument depends on how many factors are involved in determining the outcome of the conclusion: the more factors that are involved, the less probable its conclusion. The strength of the argument also depends on its set of observations (its sample size): the larger the sample size, the more probable its conclusion.¹⁸ I was a student in a philosophy class in which a military officer argued that his gun will never fail him in the future because it had never failed him in the past. The rest of us argued that the history of all guns shows that guns eventually do fail, which means that his gun will fail him one day. He based his argument on a small sample size, the history of one gun (his gun). Our argument was based on a vastly larger sample size, the history of all guns. Still, his conclusion may have been the correct one: his gun may have been one of the few that never failed.

Of course, in our speech and in our writings, we do not present our arguments in the clearly laid-out formats used in the examples above. Doing so would quickly render conversation and the reading of literature mundane and boring. The alternative, however, easily allows for the camouflage of logical fallacies. This is not to say that the committing of logical fallacies is deliberately done. Sometimes it is, but often the arguer is unaware that he or she is committing a logical fallacy until the opponent identifies and exposes the logical fallacy, thereby exposing the unsoundness of the argument.

For example, the *argumentum ad ignorantiam* (argument from ignorance) or the *appeal to ignorance fallacy* occurs when the arguer says, "My opponent has not proven that my position is false. Therefore, my position must be true." That the opponent has not successfully proven that the arguer's position is false does not *necessarily* mean that the arguer's position is true. It may mean that the opponent has not yet found the correct counter-argument or evi-

¹⁸ For an excellent explanation of deductive and inductive arguments, as well as logical fallacies, see Robert Arp, Steven Barbone, and Michael Bruce, eds., *Bad Arguments: 100 of the Most Important Fallacies in Western Philosophy* (Oxford: John Wiley & Sons Ltd., 2019).

dence to disprove the arguer's position. Or the opponent may think that the position is so obviously false that it is not worth disputing.

Friedman commits this fallacy when, in his "Foreword" to the twentieth anniversary printing of *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, edited by Jeffrey H. Tigay, he states,

Tigay discusses why it is called the Documentary Hypothesis in his introduction, referring to its hypothetical methodology (p. 2). Really, it is long past time for us to stop referring to it as a hypothesis. The state of the evidence is such that it is now—at the very least—a theory, and a well established one at that. To my mind, in the absence of any proper refutation of its strongest evidence, it is fact.¹⁹

Friedman has not defined what he means by "proper," so, for all we know, valid refutations have been made but have been dismissed by him as not "proper" *in his opinion*. However, even if no refutations have been made at all, it does not *necessarily* follow that the Hypothesis should now be promoted to fact.

No matter how Friedman defines a "proper" refutation, it should not include absolute proof that Moses did indeed write the Pentateuch. The conservative scholars should not be required to prove that Moses wrote the Pentateuch any more than the documentarians should be required to prove that they wrote their own works. Joel S. Baden does not have to prove that he wrote *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis*. Friedman does not have to prove that he is the author of *Who Wrote the Bible?*²⁰ However, if I were to claim that Friedman did not write that book, that rather two other authors wrote documents that were then conflated by a redactor to form that book, the burden of proof would rest on myself. So, too, the conservative scholars should not

¹⁹ Richard Elliott Friedman, "Foreword," in Jeffrey H. Tigay, ed., *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2005. hereafter referred to as *Empirical*), [7]; the pages of the Foreword have not been numbered, so I have numbered them starting with [1]. The book was originally published in 1985 by the University of Pennsylvania Press without the "Foreword."

²⁰ Richard Elliott Friedman, *Who Wrote the Bible?*, 2nd ed. (N.Y.: Simon & Schuster, 2019, hereafter referred to as *Wrote*). All references are to this edition unless stated otherwise.

be required to prove that Moses wrote the Pentateuch since the Pentateuch clearly says that Moses wrote it (Deut. 31:9, 24-26; more on this in Chapter 5). The burden of proof rests on the documentarians.

In that “Foreword”, Friedman claims that the proponents of the models that seek to overthrow the Documentary Hypothesis do not challenge

the newest strong evidence, namely: (1) linguistic evidence showing that the Hebrew of the texts corresponds to the stages of development of the Hebrew language in the periods in which the hypothesis says those respective texts were composed; (2) evidence that the main source texts (J, E, P, and D) were continuous, i.e., it is possible to divide the texts and find considerable continuity while keeping the characteristic terms and phrases of each consistent; and (3) as this book shows, evidence that the manner of composition that is pictured in the hypothesis was part of the literary practices of the ancient Near East.²¹

These are the reasons why, in his mind, the Hypothesis should be elevated to the level of fact. The first line of evidence is also the first of his Seven Main Arguments. The second line of evidence here is also the fourth of his Seven Main Arguments. We will examine these two lines of evidence in Chapter 2. Later in the “Foreword,” Friedman will replace the third line of evidence with all seven of his Main Arguments.

Of the three arguments presented here, the third offers the best support for the Hypothesis. It also offers, as we shall see, the worst. In fact, it can be used to argue *against* the Hypothesis. But first, let us see why it offers support for the Hypothesis.

Friedman notes that some opponents of the Hypothesis have argued that the Hypothesis is mere conjecture because no other literary work has been created by the conflation of other documents, but this argument is not true.²² In *Empirical*, Tigay gathered studies in which he and other scholars prove that other works, both ancient and modern, from the Near East and other places, were redacted. These works include *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, the Septuagint, the Sa-

²¹ Friedman, “Foreword,” in *Empirical*, [1].

²² *Ibid.*, [2].

maritan Pentateuch, works from Qumran, and the *Diatessaron*, which was formed in the second century CE when Tatian conflated the four Gospels together. Tigay *et al.* can prove these works have been redacted because they have not only the resultant documents but also the sources that were used. For example, the earliest versions of *Gilgamesh* do not have the flood story in it, but the redactor of the version from 1250 BCE inserted the flood story from the *Atrahasis Epic*. The redactor of the Samaritan Pentateuch, when that person came to Ex. 20, added text from the Masoretic Text of Deut. 5 and 18 to the Masoretic Text of Ex. 20 to create the Samaritan Text of Ex. 20. The studies show that in the resultant documents, one can detect stylistic changes, vocabulary changes, contradictions, doublets, resumptive repetition, and even theological differences (all anomalies that can be found in the Pentateuch) that came about because of the combination of sources. One could argue by analogy that the same anomalies appear in the Pentateuch because of the combination of sources. Thus, these texts, these analogues, can be used to support the Documentary Hypothesis.

The problem is that the diversity of techniques employed by the diversity of authors and redactors makes the use of analogues a hazardous affair. Let me illustrate. Critical scholars have not only attacked the traditional authorship of the Pentateuch, they have also attacked the traditional authorship of the books of Daniel and Jonah. Conservative scholars have responded to these attacks in part by charging the critics with inconsistency. Thus, Hobart Freeman complains,

We have here...a classic example of the inconsistency of modern critical scholarship. Their argument for denial of the authorship of the book of Jonah to the prophet himself (whose existence, like Daniel, as a historical figure the critics admit) is that Jonah is always referred to in the *third* person in the book bearing his name.... Had Jonah composed the book he would have written in the *first* person concerning himself. However, in the case of Daniel who does this very thing, rather than its being evidence of Danielic authorship, Daniel's employment of the first person is

set aside by the critical school as “a common literary device employed to give vividness to the narrative”!²³

Freeman’s point is well taken: it *is* inconsistent of the critics to acknowledge a work’s point of view whenever it happens to support their position and to dismiss it whenever it does not. But it is also just as inconsistent for the conservative scholars to argue that the book of Daniel was written by Daniel *because* it was written in the first person and that the book of Jonah was written by Jonah *even though* it was written in the third person.

Furthermore, both positions are based on invalid assumptions. The conservative position assumes that *all* works written in the first person were authored by the person telling the story. This is true of many works, but the critics are correct in pointing out that the use of the first-person point of view is “a common literary device” employed by authors who wish to make their fictional stories seem more authentic. *To Kill a Mockingbird*, for example, seems to be the autobiography of a young girl named Scout but is in fact a fictional story by Harper Lee. Agatha Christie’s *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd* is in the first person, but the person telling the story is the fictional male doctor, not the actual female author. These analogues support the critics’ position. However, analogues which *undermine* the critics’ position also exist. Their position assumes that no author would refer to himself or herself in the third person. Yet, Caesar in his *Gallic Wars*, Josephus in his *Jewish Wars*, and Xenophon in his *Anabasis* did just that.²⁴ Indeed, an author from the critics’ own ranks, Otto Eissfeldt, also did just that in his massive *The Old Testament: An Introduction*.

Smend’s views have been accepted, in some cases with not insignificant modifications of his analysis, by the following among others: Eichrodt, Holzinger, Meinhold, and Eissfeldt. Eissfeldt, to obviate the confusion which can so easily arise from the use of

²³ Hobart Freeman, *An Introduction to the Old Testament Prophets* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1968), 264–265 (italics his). Freeman quotes from Arthur S. Peake (ed.), *A Commentary on the Bible*, 522.

²⁴ Hence, the old argument that Moses could not have written the Pentateuch because it refers to him in the third person (see *Wrote*, 5-6) is also invalid.

the sigla J¹ and J²...introduced the siglum L (= lay source) for Smend's J¹, and replaced his J² with a simple J.²⁵

Thus, analogues can be used to prove and disprove either position. One could even use the analogues I have cited to argue that Daniel did not write the book of Daniel even though it was written in the first person and that Jonah did write the book of Jonah even though it was written in the third person. The point of view of a particular work, therefore, cannot tell us anything conclusive about the author of that work because no matter which position one takes, there exist analogues which support it and counter-analogues which contradict it. We must look elsewhere for evidence and arguments to settle this question

The documentarians face the same dilemma concerning the authorship of the Pentateuch. They contend that the anomalies prove that the Pentateuch was created by the conflation of documents written by different authors and that Tigay's analogues support that contention. However, the analogues of Tigay *et al.* include not only texts that were conflated but also texts that were supplemented and assimilated. The Pentateuchal anomalies, therefore, were not necessarily created by conflation. They could have been created by supplementation or assimilation.²⁶ Some of the contributors to *Empirical* actually argue this point.

²⁵ Otto Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, translated by Peter R. Ackroyd (N.Y.: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965), 169. This is not the only place he has done so in his book:

Bruston himself, the originator of this [newest documentary] hypothesis... made a start in that he endeavoured to trace two Yahwists whom he found in the Hexateuch, through Judg.-Kings, and Smend and Eissfeldt have carried on these attempts further (246).

Finally Smend and Eissfeldt believe that, as in the Heptateuch..., the solution of the problem here is to be found in the application of the theory of three sources... (271).

...and in the next generation or the next but one Steuernagel (1912), Holscher, König (1926), Eissfeldt (1933) and Lods (1950)... (335).

²⁶ *Conflation* occurs when two or more complete narratives or documents are interwoven to form one complete narrative or document. *Supplementation* occurs when a base text accretes through the addition of details, characters, dialogue,

Cases that tend to confirm established hypotheses of biblical criticism occupy center stage in this volume, but here and there we have seen analogues which may suggest different explanations of certain problems. In Chapter 4, Alexander Rofé argues that the case of Joshua 20 supports the supplementary hypothesis instead of the documentary hypothesis. In Chapter 6, Yair Zakovitch suggests that assimilation explains the critical problems of Genesis 34 better than the documentary hypothesis does. Certainly the possibility exists that in other cases, too, analogues may suggest explanations better than those currently preferred by critics.²⁷

Indeed, while such analogues obviously cannot be found in Tigay's book, certain analogues suggest that the Pentateuchal anomalies could have been created by a single author; that is, certain analogues exist which have the same anomalies which the Pentateuch has but which are known to have been written by a single author.

Back in 1966, K. A. Kitchen believed he had found such analogues. He pointed to "monumental Near Eastern texts that had *no* prehistory of hands and redactors" and argued that "any attempt to apply the criteria of the documentary theorists to Ancient Oriental compositions that have known histories but exhibit the same literary phenomena results in manifest absurdities."²⁸ Tigay objects to these analogues. It is true that some of Kitchen's texts change their style, but, Tigay argues, stylistic changes *alone* do not qualify as significant anomalies. They must appear in conjunction with doublets and/or contradictions as they do in the Pentateuch.

None of the texts adduced by...Kitchen displays such a combination of criteria.... Hence none is truly analogous to the biblical texts which critics consider composite, and none can serve as a control against which to test the methods of biblical criticism.

scenes, laws, etc. *Assimilation* occurs when the details and motifs of a passage become attached to a similar passage, making the two passages even more similar.

²⁷ Tigay, "Summary and Conclusions," in *Empirical*, 240.

²⁸ K.A. Kitchen, *Ancient Orient and Old Testament* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1966, hereafter referred to as *AOOT*), 117, 115.

Only texts that display such *combinations* of evidence can serve this purpose.²⁹

I, however, have found such a text. I have found a book which displays the same combinations of anomalies which the Pentateuch displays but which is known to have been written by a single author. That book is *Who Wrote the Bible?* by Richard Elliott Friedman.

The host of anomalies that we will find in the eighth chapter of *Wrote* can justify dividing this chapter into two previously existing sources. To separate out these two sources, I will simply analyze the text in the same fashion in which the documentarians analyze a Pentateuchal passage.

Chapter eight of *Wrote*, like most modern writings, has not been divided into verses, so I have adopted the following numbering system to make reference to the various parts of the chapter more convenient. The paragraphs of the chapter have been numbered consecutively. Within each paragraph, the sentences have also been numbered consecutively. Thus, a reference such as 6:4 is referring to the fourth sentence in the sixth paragraph.

I call the two sources S and W. The author of S (the Scholarly source) is concerned with historical knowledge. He is interested in knowing and stating facts. He also tells us when the facts are lacking. Appropriately, he relies on archaeological findings, and he often gives us exact dates and even census figures. In this last regard, he is like the theoretical Priestly Writer. The author of S never refers to the four documents J, E, D, and P, nor does he care to know who wrote them. After all, such information is still theoretical, not factual.

The author of W, on the other hand, is interested in knowing how people feel and how they react. He never mentions archaeology, he never gives us census figures, and, although he mentions the passage of time (such as "fifty years later," 2:2), he never gives us exact dates. He is much more interested in how the exile affected the development of the Judahites' psychology, how this in turn affected the development of their theology, and how both in turn affected the development of the Bible. He also believes that a study of this devel-

²⁹ Tigay, "The Stylistic Criterion of Source Criticism," in *Empirical*, 152-153 (italics his).

opment will provide us clues as to who wrote the four documents. It is this ultimate interest that gives the source its name.

There are stylistic differences between the two sources, as the analysis will point out. Each source also has its distinctive bank of vocabulary. S's vocabulary includes:

Disappear, disappearance – 20:3, 5; 22:1, 7; 23:1, 3; 24:2
Mystery, mysteries – 20:3; 22:1; 24:5
Neighbor, neighborly (all used in reference to Edom) – 3:3
(twice); 10:2
Object(s) – 20:6; 24:2; 25:6

W's vocabulary includes:

Literature – 8:4, 5, 6
National – 4:6; 5:2; 6:2; 7:10; 12:5
Practical, practically – 5:3; 14:1; 15:1
Priesthood(s) – 16:3; 26:1, 7; 27:2
Relate, relationship – 12:1; 17:2, 6
Religion(s) – 6:1, 2 (twice), 8; 7:1, 3, 7 (twice), 10

Also, the words “leader(s)” and “leadership” occur four times in this chapter, and three of those occurrences are in W (4:5, 6; 17:3). “Exiles” appears twelve times in this chapter, and nine of those appearances are in W (2:1; 4:2; 8:5; 12:1, 4; 14:6; 19:5; 21:5; 27:4). The noun “exile” (meaning “the exile”) appears eight times and six of those appearances are in W (7:10; 8:1, 5; 12:6; 18:2; 27:3). W's vocabulary list may be longer because it is the larger source.

Baden thinks that the documents' use of synonyms is more significant than their use of banks of vocabulary. Thus, for “handmaiden,” P and J use *šiphāh*, whereas E uses *ʾāmāh*.³⁰ S and W also use synonyms in this manner. Both speak of the ark as being “carried away” (19:6 W; 20:4 S), but only W says the people were also “carried away” (4:7) or “carried off” (27:3); S says they were “deported” (24:9, 13). S refers to the Judahites as “Jews” (3:5; 14:5; 19:3; 33:4); W calls them “the people of Judah” (5:1; 7:1, 10). S refers to the Judahites who went to Egypt as “those in Egypt” or “those of Judah

³⁰ *Composition*, 30.

who fled to Egypt” (3:1; 11:1); W simply calls them “refugees” (2:1; 8:5; 12:1; 27:5, 6). S refers to those who returned from the Exile as “returnees” (24:12, 15); W calls them “ex-exiles” (36:5). S speaks of the exiles as “exuding” their feelings (10:1); W speaks of them as “expressing” their feelings (8:2–11, five times).

Baden thinks it is even more significant when the documents use the same word but with different meanings. Thus, *minḥah* in J and E means any sort of gift, whereas in P it means specifically a grain-offering.³¹ The same phenomenon occurs in S and W. “Sources” in S means any sources of information, whereas in W it means specifically written sources of information.

The detailed analysis that follows employs the format found in multivolume commentaries. A portion of the chapter will be quoted, followed by some comments about that portion. In the text, S is printed in bold and W in regular print. The redactor’s insertions are enclosed in square brackets. Where the redactor has replaced an original word with a substitute to smooth the reading of the text, the original word is enclosed in braces ({}) next to its substitute.

1 **¹The period that followed the disasters of 587 B.C. is the hardest for us to know.** ²Even though it {the exile} is more recent than the other periods I have described, it is the hardest to write about. ³There are two reasons for this. ⁴The first is simply the lack of sources. ⁵[Neither the Bible nor archeology has told us very much.]

2 ¹There is very little in the narrative books of the Bible that tells us about what happened to the generation of exiles and refugees from Judah. ²The story ends in the books of Kings and Chronicles with the fall of the kingdom, and the next books of historical narrative in the Bible (Ezra and Nehemiah) pick up the story fifty years later. ³A small portion of the book of Daniel deals with those years, but it refers only to a few events in the lives of Daniel and his friends. ⁴It does not deal with the fate of the nation. ⁵Probably our best means is deducing information from parts of the books of the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

3 **¹Archeology[, too,] has revealed little about the fate of the exiled community in Babylonia or about those in Egypt.** ²We are

³¹ *Ibid.*

not even sure about what was happening back in the land of Judah itself. ³We have some evidence that Judah's old neighbor Edom had not been very neighborly, but had shared in the Babylonian conquest of Judah and was encroaching on Judah's territory. ⁴And we know that the Samaritans continued to occupy the northern territory that had once been the kingdom of Israel. ⁵But we know hardly anything about how many of the Jews were able to remain in Judah or about what their lives were like there.

Sentence 1:2 is a doublet of 1:1 but with a change in emphasis from "knowing" about the exile to "writing" about it. Sentence 1:1 best fits S because of the date and because of its interest in "knowing" the facts about the exile. Sentence 1:2 best fits the interests of W's author because, as we shall see, he is interested in literature. The first reason why the exile is "the hardest to write about" is "the lack of sources" (1:4). As mentioned earlier, "sources" in W always refers to written sources only. In S, it includes both written and archaeological sources (22:9). This distinction is not yet clear in 1:4. By inserting 1:5 and the word "too" in 3:1, the redactor took advantage of this obscurity and made archaeology part of the first reason, thereby forcing the word in W's text to take on S's meaning. In this fashion, he deftly made the two documents appear as one from the beginning.

Paragraph three obviously belongs to S because of its emphasis on archaeology and on what we know and do not know based on archaeological information.

4 ¹The second reason why it is so difficult to talk about this period is that, for most of us, it is barely possible to know how it *felt*. ²Outside of those of us who have actually had the experience of being an exile or refugee, it would take an enormous leap of sympathy (in the true Greek sense of the word *sym-pathos*, "to feel with") to know what the exiles felt. ³We would have to imagine seeing the defenses of the city where we have lived all our lives torn down. ⁴All the public buildings and all the most beautiful homes are burned. ⁵The religious leaders of our community are executed. ⁶The national leader's children are butchered in front of him, then his eyes are put out, and then he is led away in manacles. ⁷We are carried away in a group of

thousands, probably never to see our country again. ⁸And then we live as outsiders in our conquerors' country. ⁹It is a horror.

Here we are introduced to the W author's concern for the people's feelings and for their psychological reaction to their situation. In paragraph two, the author had referred to biblical literature. Thus, in W's first three paragraphs, we are introduced to the author's two major interests. From here he will explore how the second eventually affected the first.

5 ¹What were the exiled people of Judah to do? ²How were they to maintain their identity as a national group and not simply be assimilated into the mass of the Babylonian empire? ³Or to put it more practically, what did they have to hold on to?

6 ¹Probably the most important single thing was religion. ²Other countries that the Babylonians conquered also had their own particular national religions, but one of the remarkable characteristics of pagan religions in the ancient world is that they were all extremely compatible. ³The god who was identified with the wind may have been called Marduk in Babylon and Baal-Haddad in Canaan and Zeus in Greece, but he was still essentially the same god. ⁴He was the wind. ⁵The Mesopotamian goddess Ishtar was essentially the same as the goddess Ashtoreth in Canaan and Aphrodite in Greece. ⁶She was fertility. ⁷And so on. ⁸The interchangeability of the pagan deities made it possible for a conquered people to assimilate to their conquerors' religion.

7 ¹But the religion of the people of Judah was different. ²There was no god in the pagan pantheon who corresponded to Yahweh. ³Scholars still debate the specific character of Judah's religion in this period. ⁴Was it completely monotheistic in the modern sense? ⁵Was Yahweh believed to be all-powerful? ⁶Were other lesser deities tolerated? ⁷But, whatever Judah's religion was, it was not compatible with pagan religion. ⁸Yahweh was not a force in nature. ⁹He was outside the natural realm, controlling its forces. ¹⁰And so, by holding on to their national religion in exile, the people of Judah, intentionally or not, reinforced their ethnic identity.

These paragraphs are full of W's characteristic language (for example, "people of Judah," "practically," "national") and of the

writer's interest in how the people's reaction and their religion related to each other. Paragraph five begins with a question. Of the 25 paragraphs assigned to W, nine begin with a question and another two begin with a statement which leads into a question. S never does this. This is one obvious difference between the styles of the two sources.

8 ¹Were they content in exile? ²Whatever tranquility or acceptance they found in Babylonia, the community still expressed longing for home. ³They instituted five annual fast days to commemorate their misfortune. ⁴And they expressed their feelings in literature, which is preserved in several places in the Bible. ⁵The literature of the exile includes Psalm 137 and the book of Lamentations, as well as several sections from the prophets: the last part of the book of Jeremiah, reflecting the refugees' life in Egypt; and the entire book of Ezekiel and the latter part of the book of Isaiah, reflecting the exiles' life in Babylonia. ⁶It is not happy literature. ⁷Some of it expresses bitterness. ⁸Much of it expresses guilt. ⁹(Why did this happen to us? ¹⁰It must be that we did something wrong.) ¹¹Just about all of it expresses sadness.

9 **¹Psalm 137, written by a Judean poet and preserved by the community among their psalms, is one indicator of the experience of exile:**

²*By the rivers of Babylon*

³*There we sat*

⁴*Also, we wept*

⁵*When we remembered Zion*

⁶*By the willows in her midst*

⁷*We hung up our harps*

⁸*For there our captors required of us words of song*

⁹*And our conquerors, joy*

¹⁰*"Sing us a song of Zion"*

¹¹*How shall we sing a song of Yahweh on foreign soil?*

¹²*If I forget you Jerusalem*

¹³*Let my right arm forget*

14Let my tongue stick to the roof of my mouth

15If I don't remember you

16If I don't hold up Jerusalem

17Over my highest joy

18Remember, Yahweh, the Edomites

19With the day of Jerusalem

20Who said, "Tear up, tear up

21To the foundation of it"

22Despoiled daughter of Babylon

23Happy is he who pays you back

24Your payment

25As you paid us

26Happy is he who takes hold and smashes

27Your suckling babies

28Against a rock

10 ¹The poem does not exude affection for the Babylonians. ²And it takes bitter note of the Edomites, Judah's kin and neighbor who abetted the conquering enemy.

In paragraph eight, the W author begins his discussion of how the people's feelings led to the production of what became biblical literature, although he does not yet discuss the Pentateuchal sources.

Paragraph ten must have come from S because it refers to Edom's attack on Judah, which was mentioned back in paragraph three which is also S. Paragraph nine must also belong to S because it leads into paragraph ten and because of its strange relationship to paragraph eight. The author of 8:5 mentions Psalms 137 in passing as if his readers were already familiar with it, but the author of paragraph nine introduces it and even quotes the entire psalm as if his readers were *not* familiar with it.

11 ¹As for those of Judah who fled to Egypt, things did not go well for them either, because nineteen years later the Babylonians invaded Egypt. ²We only know of a colony of Judean mercenaries at Elephantine, which was located at the first cataract

of the Nile. ³This fits with the report in Kings and Jeremiah that it was the Judean army that led the community to Egypt.

12 ¹How were the exiles and refugees to relate their fate to *God*? ²Questions of theology were not matters of purely theoretical speculation in this moment. ³Theology and history were now on a collision course. ⁴The way in which one understood God made a difference to the way in which one understood the situation in which the exiles found themselves. ⁵Is Yahweh a *national* God? ⁶If so, he is left behind in Judah, and the people are cut off from him in exile. ⁷This very question is asked by the author of Psalm 137[, translated on the previous pages]: “How shall we sing a song of Yahweh on foreign soil?”

13 ¹Or is Yahweh a *universal* God? ²And if so, why did he let this disaster happen? ³That is, if Yahweh is the one true God of the whole world, why did he allow the Babylonians to destroy his Temple, carry off his anointed kings and priests, and exile the people? ⁴Since the exiled community was hardly likely to believe that the Babylonians were stronger than Yahweh, the answer that was regularly suggested to them was that it was their own fault. ⁵*They* had failed to keep their covenant with Yahweh. ⁶*They* had worshiped other gods. ⁷The Babylonians were merely Yahweh’s tool, which he was using to fulfill the covenant curses because Judah had broken its contract. ⁸One of the logical consequences of monotheism is guilt.

14 ¹There were also practical problems. ²Now that the Temple was destroyed, how were the people to worship God? ³**The Egyptian group at Elephantine actually built a Temple there—which was clearly against the law of centralization in Deuteronomy.** ⁴**The extraordinary thing about the Elephantine Temple is that they worshiped Yahweh and two other gods, one male and one female, there.** ⁵**The Jews in other parts of the world apparently were not happy with this development, because when the Elephantine Temple was destroyed in the fifth century they would not help rebuild it.** ⁶[As for the Babylonian community,] the prophet Ezekiel, who was one of the Babylonian exiles, envisioned a plan for a rebuilt Temple in Jerusalem. ⁷He described the new Temple in detail, including its measurements in cubits, but the Temple that he pictured was never built.

Paragraph eleven refers to the Israelites who went to Egypt as “those of Judah who fled to Egypt” instead of “refugees,” W’s usual term. It tells us what we know about these people and it tells what happened to them but not how they reacted. All of this points to S as its source.

In paragraphs six and seven, the author of W discussed how religion affected the people’s reaction to the exile. In paragraphs twelve and thirteen, he discusses the reverse. That 12:7 (W) translates Psalm 137:11 exactly as it was translated in paragraph nine (S) may mean that the redactor reworded one translation to match the other or that both authors were familiar with a translation found in a third source.

Paragraph fourteen picks up on the theme of practical problems first stated in 5:3 (W). This theme unites the W passages in paragraphs fourteen to sixteen. But in the midst of paragraph fourteen, S returns with a continuation of its discussion of the Elephantine temple. This continuation was placed here instead of immediately after paragraph eleven because it fits in with the subject of worship and it provides a contrast to Ezekiel’s temple. The leap from S’s Elephantine temple in Egypt to Ezekiel’s temple vision in Babylon required a transitional phrase which the redactor provided in 14:6a.

15 ¹The other practical and pressing problem was: now that the monarchy was gone, who was to lead the people? ²King Jehoahaz was imprisoned in Egypt. ³He died there. ⁴King Jehoiachin and King Zedekiah were imprisoned in Babylon. ⁵We do not know what happened to Zedekiah, but, according to the very last sentences of the book of 2 Kings, Jehoiachin was released from prison thirty-seven years after his capture. ⁶Still, that did not mean that he was reinstated as king.

16 ¹The priests, too, had lost their center, the Temple, and that meant that there were no more sacrifices to perform. ²It meant that their authority, their income, and most of their functions were threatened. ³It also meant that the rival priesthods, the Mushites (those who traced their ancestry to Moses) and the Aaronids, did not have much left to fight over.

17 ¹In short, the Babylonian destruction of Judah had brought horrors and tremendous challenges and crises to this nation. ²They were forced to reformulate their picture of themselves and of their

relationship with their God. ³They had to find a way to worship Yahweh without a Temple. ⁴They had to find leadership without a king. ⁵They had to learn to live as a minority ethnic group in great empires. ⁶They had to determine what their relationship was to their homeland. ⁷And they had to live with their defeat.

The practical problems continue in paragraphs fifteen and sixteen, where the loss of leadership is discussed. Paragraph seventeen summarizes *W*'s discussion to this point. It lists all the problems which faced the exiles. *W* now turns to the resolution of those problems.

18 ¹And then, after only fifty years, the impossible happened. ²The exile ended, and they were allowed to go home.

19 **¹In 538 B.C., the Persians conquered the Babylonians. ²Babylonia, Egypt, and everything in between, including Judah, now were part of a tremendous, powerful Persian empire. ³The ruler of this empire was Cyrus the Great. ⁴In the same year that he took Babylon, Cyrus allowed the Jews to return to Judah. ⁵By royal decree, Cyrus permitted the exiles to rebuild their homeland and their Temple. ⁶The precious implements of the Temple, which the Babylonians had carried away, were returned—with one exception: the ark.**

Sentence 19:4 is a doublet of 18:2. Sentence 19:4 has the term "Jews," a term used only by *S*. Sentence 19:1 mentions a date. All this proves that 19:1–4 came from *S*. Sentence 19:5 came from *W* because it has the term "homeland," used previously in paragraph seventeen (*W*). Sentence 19:6 also belongs to *W* because it leads into paragraph twenty-one, which, as we shall see, also came from *W*.

This raises the interesting observation that the author of *W* did not know about the Persian conquest of Babylon. He never mentions it. Nor does he mention that it was the Persians who allowed the exiles to return. He apparently thought that Cyrus was a Babylonian emperor!

20 **¹For some reason, the biblical sources do not tell what happened to the ark containing the tablets of the Ten Commandments. ²Archeology, too, has shed no light on this at all. ³The**

disappearance of the ark is the first great mystery of this period, and it remains one of the great mysteries of the Bible. ⁴There is no report that the ark was carried away or destroyed or hidden. ⁵There is not even any comment such as “And then the ark disappeared, and we do not know what happened to it,” or “And no one knows where it is to this day.” ⁶The most important object in the world, in the biblical view, simply ceases to be in the story.

21 ¹Did it ever really exist? ²For the purposes of our search, it is necessary to recognize at least that the earlier historical books *portray* it as existing, enshrined in the Temple. ³The books of Kings and Chronicles say explicitly that the ark was placed in the inside room (the Holy of Holies) of the Temple on the day that King Solomon dedicated the Temple. ⁴It then ceases to figure in any direct way in the story, and there is no report of what happened to it when the Temple was destroyed. ⁵And now, in the report of the exiles’ return to Judah, it is not mentioned, while the less important Temple utensils are. ⁶The community that returned to Jerusalem rebuilt the Temple, but this second Temple did not contain the ark. ⁷Nor did it have cherubs, the giant golden statues of winged sphinxes whose purpose, after all, was at least partly to spread their wings over the ark. ⁸The second Temple’s Holy of Holies apparently was an empty room. ⁹All of this will be relevant to the search for who wrote the Bible.

These paragraphs form the most extensive doublet in this chapter. Both discuss the disappearance of the ark but with some subtle changes in wording. “Ceases to be in the story” of 20:6 becomes “ceases to figure in any direct way in the story” at 21:4. They also reflect the interests of the two authors. Paragraph twenty mentions archaeology; paragraph twenty-one does not. Paragraph twenty-one sees the disappearance as “relevant to the search for who wrote the Bible”; paragraph twenty does not. Thus, paragraph twenty was derived from S and paragraph twenty-one from W.

22 ¹The second great mystery of this period is the disappearance of the Davidic dynasty. ²According to the biblical books of Ezra and Nehemiah, those who returned from Babylonia were led by two men named Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel. ³Both of

these men were from the royal house of David. ⁴They were descendants of King Jehoiachin. ⁵Zerubbabel is also mentioned in the biblical books of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, who prophesied in this period. ⁶But Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel cease to be mentioned after the fifth chapter of Ezra. ⁷There is no report of the disappearance of these men, no explanation of what happened to the royal family. ⁸Rather, as with the ark, the monarchy simply ceases to be mentioned. ⁹Neither the biblical nor the archeological sources indicate what happened to the family of the messiah, the descendants of David.

²³ ¹Also, prophecy diminishes, and perhaps disappears, in this period. ²The age of the great prophets is past. ³The prophets Haggai and Zechariah preached at the time of Zerubbabel, but as the kings disappeared, so did the prophets.

That these two paragraphs came from S is apparent by their relationship to paragraph 20. The term “disappear” and its variations are employed in all three paragraphs, and the term “mystery” is used in paragraphs twenty and twenty-two. Neither term appears in paragraph twenty-one. In addition, archaeology is again mentioned in paragraph twenty-two.

²⁴ ¹The fifty years of exile in Babylonia and Egypt are not described. ²The nation’s most sacred object and its royal family disappear. ³Prophecy diminishes. ⁴And there are more unknowns. ⁵The entire period seems to be an age of mysteries. ⁶How many of the people who were in Babylonia actually took advantage of the opportunity to return to Judah? ⁷Did the majority stay or leave? ⁸The Bible’s figures are confusing. ⁹According to the book of Jeremiah, 4,600 had been deported from Judah to Babylonia in 587; according to the book of 2 Kings, it was 11,600. ¹⁰But according to the book of Ezra, 42,360 returned just fifty years later. ¹¹That is a very prolific community. ¹²It is possible that this number of returnees includes some who came from Egypt. ¹³Or it may include people from the northern tribes of Israel who were deported to Mesopotamia by the Assyrians in 722 B.C. and who were now reunited with the exiles from Judah. ¹⁴We just do not know. ¹⁵We also do not know who was already in the land of Judah when the new re-

turnees arrived. ¹⁶Had *everyone* left the land for Babylonia or Egypt? ¹⁷Probably not. ¹⁸But who—and how many—stayed?

This paragraph summarizes S's discussion to this point even as paragraph seventeen had summarized W's discussion. The author again discusses what we know and do not know. Dates appear and census figures abound. The terms "mystery" and "disappear" are employed again.

25 ¹We do know something about how life developed in the land as the exiles returned and began to rebuild. ²They completed building the second Temple, and it was dedicated on Passover, 516 B.C. ³This was seen, at least by some, as the fulfillment of a prophecy of Jeremiah's. ⁴We do not know the size of the second Temple, whether it was the same as the first Temple or not. ⁵We do know that it did not have the ark, the cherubs, or the Urim and Thummim. ⁶(The Urim and Thummim were sacred objects that were used by the High Priest, apparently to obtain oracles.) ⁷We know that it had a High Priest. ⁸We know that the High Priest was an Aaronid, not a Mushite.

26 ¹[Most important,] our sources indicate that the entire Temple priesthood was Aaronid at this time. ²All other Levites were not recognized as legitimate priests. ³Levites were regarded as secondary clergy, assistants to the Aaronids, who alone exercised the priestly prerogatives. ⁴The struggle between the Mushite and Aaronid priests was over. ⁵Somehow, the Aaronids had won completely. ⁶Their {The Aaronids'} old claim that they alone were the legitimate priests was now the accepted view. ⁷The triumph of the Aaronid priesthood in this period was to have tremendous implications for the formation of the Bible.

Paragraph twenty-five must belong to S. The contrast between what we know and what we do not know continues throughout the paragraph. Another date is given. Sentence 25:2 is a doublet of 21:6a (W), and 25:5 is a doublet of 21:6b-7 (W).

W, which had left off in paragraph twenty-one with a discussion of the second temple's Holy of Holies, returns in paragraph twenty-six with a discussion of the second temple's priesthood and the triumph of the Aaronids, another event which affected the develop-

ment of the Bible. “Priesthood” was previously used in 16:3 (W). Sentences 26:4, 5 belong to S because they are a doublet of 26:7, because they form a transition from paragraph twenty-five to paragraph twenty-eight (both of which are S), and because paragraph twenty-six can be read without them.

27 ¹How did the Aaronid priests come to be so completely in control? ²Perhaps it was because they were the priesthood in power at the time of the fall of the kingdom. ³Since the Babylonians took the upper classes into exile, it would thus be the Aaronid priests who would have been carried off to Babylon. ⁴For example, the prophet Ezekiel was an Aaronid priest, and he was among the Babylonian exiles. ⁵The Mushite priests, meanwhile, would have been more likely to be among the refugees in Egypt. ⁶For example, the prophet Jeremiah, who was apparently a Mushite priest, was among the Egypt refugees. ⁷Since it was now the Babylonian group that was leading the return and governing the new community (initially under Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel), the Aaronid priests would be, at the very least, in a position to dominate, and perhaps in a position to define who was a priest and who was not.

28 **¹Another {The} reason why the Mushite priests lost to the Aaronids in this period may be that Mushites, notably Jeremiah, had been perceived to be pro-Babylonian. ²Now that the Persians had conquered the Babylonians, the Persian authorities might well have preferred to empower the Aaronid priests. ³The Aaronids had been anti-Babylonian, as indicated by the fact that the Babylonians had executed the chief priests in 587.**

Paragraphs twenty-seven and twenty-eight offer alternative explanations for the success of the Aaronids. In paragraph twenty-seven, we find W’s terms “priesthood” and “refugees.” Also, the mention of Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel’s leading the return is an unnecessary doublet of 22:2 (S). Paragraph twenty-eight offers a date and mentions the Persian conquest of Babylon, which W never mentions. Notice also that the author of S definitely identifies Jeremiah as a Mushite (28:1) while the author of W hesitates to do so (Jeremiah “was *apparently* a Mushite,” 27:6).

29 ¹There is one more reason to be taken in to account to explain the success of the Aaronid priests in rebuilt Judah. ²That is the influence and power of one man: Ezra.

30 ¹In the entire Bible, two men are known as lawgivers: Moses and Ezra. ²**Ezra came from Babylon to Judah eighty years after the first group of exiles returned, in 458 B.C.** ³He {Ezra} was a priest and a scribe. ⁴The biblical record states explicitly that he was an *Aaronid* priest. ⁵It also indicates that he was no ordinary scribe. ⁶His writing skills were associated with one document in particular: “the *torah* of Moses.”

31 ¹Ezra arrived in Jerusalem with two important documents in his hand. ²One was this “*torah* of Moses,” and the other was a letter from the [Persian] emperor, Artaxerxes, giving him authority in Judah. ³The emperor’s authorization empowered Ezra to teach and to enforce “the law of your God which is in your hand.” ⁴The enforcement powers included fines, imprisonment, and the death penalty.

32 ¹What was this “*torah* of Moses,” this “law of your God which is in your hand”? ²References to it in the biblical books of Ezra and Nehemiah include material from JE, D, and P. ³It is therefore likely that the book that Ezra brought from Babylon to Judah was the full Torah—the Five Books of Moses—as we know it.

Sentence 30:2 obviously belongs to S because of the date. Sentence 31:1 is a doublet of 30:2, so it must belong to W. It follows that paragraphs thirty-one and thirty-two also belong to W since they discuss the two documents mentioned in 31:1. One of those documents is “the *torah* of Moses.” This means that 30:3–6 also came from W. The redactor must have inserted “Persian” in 31:2 because W does not know about the Persian conquest. If the emperor’s nationality were ever identified in the original text, the author of W would have identified him as Babylonian.³²

³² Of course, I am arguing in a circle, but I am arguing exactly as the documentarians argue. They contend that E’s name for the land between the northern stretches of the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers is *Aram-naharaim*. They further contend that E never calls that land *Padan-aram*, which is P’s name for that land. So when *Padan-aram* shows up in an otherwise E passage (Gen. 33), they argue that a redactor must have inserted the name into the passage. See *Wrote*, 239.

33 ¹Ezra's political authority was somehow shared with a governor, Nehemiah, who also was appointed by the emperor. ²With the backing of the emperor, who was perhaps the most powerful man in the world, Ezra and Nehemiah wielded considerable authority. ³They rebuilt the city walls of Jerusalem that the Babylonians had torn down. ⁴They enforced the observance of the Sabbath. ⁵They forced intermarriages between Jews and others to be dissolved. ⁶In the absence of any Judean kings, these two men were the leaders of the people. ⁷Judah was not an independent country. ⁸It was now a province of the Persian empire. ⁹And Ezra and Nehemiah were the emperor's designated authorities.

34 ¹In the second Temple period, centralization was achieved. ²There apparently was no competition from any other religious center in Judah. ³What Hezekiah and Josiah had tried to do was now actually achieved. ⁴One God, one Temple. ⁵The Elephantine Temple was far away, and in any case it was destroyed around the time that Ezra was in Jerusalem.

Paragraph thirty-three belongs to S because of the use of "Jews," S's term, in 33:5 and because of the knowledge that the empire was a "Persian empire." It also emphasizes that Ezra the priest had to share political authority with Nehemiah, a non-priest, a fact which flatly contradicts paragraph thirty-six, where W says the political authority was held by the priests alone. Thus, W apparently never knew about Nehemiah's role at this time. Paragraph thirty-four discusses the Elephantine temple and its relationship to the centralization issue, a relationship also discussed in 14:3-5 (S).

35 ¹Ezra called a public assembly at the water gate of Jerusalem. ²He held it on the fall holiday, when the people would come from all over Judah to Jerusalem. ³On that occasion he brought out the scroll of the Torah and read it to the assembled mass. ⁴This was followed by a covenant ceremony in which the people renewed their commitment to their God and to their pact with him as written in this Torah. 36 ¹The period of restoration, the age of the second Temple, appears from biblical and postbiblical sources to have been a time of dedication to the book as never before. ²Why? ³Presumably because political authority was now more in the hands of the priests, who

had more of an interest in it than the kings had had. ⁴Perhaps, also, the book came to be especially treasured by the people at this time because it was a link to the past. ⁵It was the connection that meant for the ex-exiles that this was a rebuilding, not just a new start. ⁶As a work of history, it gave a feeling of heritage from an extraordinary past. ⁷As a work of law, it showed a way to participate in the covenant—which is to say, in the heritage—in the present.

37 ¹How did Ezra come to have a copy of this book? ²How did it come to have all the sources combined? ³How was he able to promulgate it successfully as “the *torah* of Moses,” which was then accepted for two and a half millennia? ⁴When we know who produced P and who combined all the sources into one work, we shall know the answers to these questions, and much more.

The author of W has come full circle. He has discussed how the people’s reaction to the exile ultimately affected the formation of the Pentateuch. Here he discusses the people’s reaction to the Pentateuch now that it has been formed. He also refers to the people as “ex-exiles” (36:5), not as “returnees,” S’s term.

This, then, is how a documentarian would analyze and divide chapter eight of *Wrote*. Our analysis cannot be complete until we explain why these two sources came to be combined. The author of W sought to identify the authors of the four documents by digging up clues from the history of the Judahites. The approach itself was sound, but his grasp of history was that of a student’s, not that of a scholar’s. He knew the outline of that history, but he did not give any dates, and he was totally unaware that the Persians had conquered the Babylonians before the Jews were released from the exile or that Ezra shared political power with Nehemiah. W’s theory, therefore, was founded on an incomplete, even inaccurate, knowledge of history. The redactor accepted W’s theory but recognized this problem. He therefore sought to bolster W’s theory by combining W with S which *was* written by a scholar. Now W’s theory appears to be valid because it seems to be based on S’s grasp of history. However, because we have discovered what the redactor has done and have once again separated out the two sources, we can see how weak the foundation of W’s theory really is.

Friedman thinks that Tigay's analogues can be used to prove that the Hypothesis is a fact. I have just presented an analogue, provided by Friedman himself, which proves that a single author, such as Moses, could have written the Pentateuch. In Chapter 4, we will see more examples of Pentateuchal anomalies appearing in the works of Friedman and other documentarians. One may object that modern Western works are not the appropriate analogues for an ancient Near Eastern work such as the Pentateuch. One of the advantages of modern Western works, as Matitiahu Tsevat points out,³³ is that we know who wrote them. Admittedly, an ancient Near Eastern analogue would be better, and, as it turns out, there is one such analogue which exhibits the same types of anomalies which we find in the Pentateuch but which was written by a single author.³⁴

The Ramesside inscription known as the Poem tells of the battle between Ramesses II and the Hittites at Kadesh. The Poem was inscribed at eight locations throughout Egypt and archaeologists have also discovered two papyri which have portions of the Poem, suggesting that copies were distributed to the Egyptian population.³⁵

Egyptologists agree that the Poem is unique among the literature of Egypt. As far as we know, this is Egypt's first narrative poem.³⁶ Among the vast multitude of inscriptions and written literature uncovered in Egypt, scholars cannot find another work that can be considered to be a source for the Poem.³⁷

Egyptologists also agree that the Poem is the work of a single author. Most likely an unknown scribe actually composed the work, but certainly Ramesses II would have authorized the project and approved the composition before it was inscribed. He is, therefore, the single author of the Poem.

³³ Matitiahu Tsevat, "Common Sense and Hypothesis in Old Testament Study," *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 28 (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 220.

³⁴ Much of the information that follows is taken from Joshua A. Berman, *Inconsistency in the Torah: Ancient Literary Convention and the Limits of Source Criticism* (N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2017, hereafter referred to as *Inconsistency*), 19-25.

³⁵ For translations into English see Miriam Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, Vol. II, 2nd ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 62-72, and K. A. Kitchen, *Ramesside Inscriptions Translated & Annotated: Translations* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1996, repr., Wallasey, Great Britain: Abercromby Press, 2019), 1-11.

³⁶ Lichtheim, 6, 59; *Inconsistency*, 54.

³⁷ *Inconsistency*, 54.

Yet there are inconsistencies in the Poem, the same kind of inconsistencies scholars find in the Pentateuch. Most of these inconsistencies have been listed by Joshua A. Berman. [My additional observations are enclosed in square brackets.]

Shift in narratorial voice: The Poem narrates the events in the third person until line 88, where it suddenly shifts to the first person, so that Ramesses is now telling the story.

Inconsistency concerning the Pharaoh's isolation: The Poem pictures the Pharaoh fighting the Hittites by himself, his troops having abandoned him. Line 89 specifically says that his shield-bearer was not with him. Yet Ramesses encourages his shield-bearer, who is with him as he is surrounded by the Hittites, in lines 205-229, and he praises his shield-bearer and his household butlers for remaining with him throughout the battle in lines 273-274.

Inconsistent lists of the enemy nations: The Poem opens with a list of thirteen nations, including the Hittites, who opposed Ramesses (lines 2-6). Yet later, when the Pharaoh engages them, seventeen nations are listed (lines 43-47). [Later still, when the Hittite king sends the chiefs of these nations into battle (lines 147-152), only eight are listed and one of them, Aleppo, does not appear in the other two lists.]

Inconsistent accounts of Ramesses's divine paternity: The Poem names both Montu (line 37) and Amun (lines 92 and 188) as the Pharaoh's father.

Inconsistent references to the Pharaoh's steed: Line 78 says that Pharaoh's chariot was pulled by his steed, Victory in Thebes, yet Ramesses later praises his *two* steeds, Victory in Thebes and Mut is Content (line 267).³⁸

Doubled reproach of the Pharaoh's troops: Twice Pharaoh rebukes his troops for their cowardice (lines 168-203 and 251-

³⁸ Similar to Num. 13-14 mentioning only Caleb, then both Caleb and Joshua.

276). [The language differs from one rebuke to the other. Also, in the first rebuke, he credits Amun for helping him defeat the Hittites, while in the second he credits his two steeds. Furthermore, that Ramesses rebukes his troops the first time means that they have joined him and should be ready to go with him into battle, especially following this stinging rebuke. Yet, immediately after this first rebuke, Menna, Ramesses' shield-bearer, is afraid because the troops have abandoned him and the Pharaoh.]³⁹

There is another contradictory doublet which Berman does not list here. In both the first and third engagements, a cry from the Hittite battleline warns the Hittite warriors not to approach Ramesses, for doing so is certain death. In the first cry, a single warrior cries out and likens Ramesses to Seth and Baal and says that those who do approach him will become so weak that they will be unable to use their weapons (lines 157-165). In the second cry, all of the warriors cry out to each other and liken Ramesses to Sekhmet and say that those who do approach him will be burnt to death (lines 285-289).⁴⁰

Furthermore, as Berman also points out, the Poem mixes genre. It is about four-fifths poetry and one-fifth prose.⁴¹ What we have here, then, is another analogue for which Tigay has been looking: an ancient Near Eastern work which *combines* the same anomalies which we find in the Pentateuch, but was written by a single author. This is evidence that the Pentateuch could have been written by a single author, despite its inconsistencies.

Analogues, therefore, can be used to prove and to disprove the Hypothesis. In fact, one can use analogues to support (or deny) almost any hypothesis concerning the creation of the Pentateuch as long as one points to the correct analogue. For example, Friedman says that Num. 11 is a unified story, coming from E.⁴² Baden says that it is conflated from two complete stories, one from J, the other

³⁹ *Inconsistency*, 54-55.

⁴⁰ Following Lichtheim's translation. In Kitchen's translation, there is only one warrior crying out in both scenes.

⁴¹ *Inconsistency*, 23.

⁴² *Sources*, 258-260.

from E.⁴³ Still other scholars say that only one story is complete and that the other supplements it.⁴⁴ Each scholar argues that the text supports his hypothesis. And each scholar can point to the appropriate analogue to support his hypothesis and to disprove all of the others.

This is why Tigay says that analogues cannot be used to prove any one hypothesis.

This would be a fatal flaw in the use of such analogues if we imagined that analogues can confirm any particular theory about the development of an Israelite composition. That, however, is not the function of an analogue. Even another text by the same author cannot prove how a text was produced. Analogues can only serve to show what is plausible or realistic by showing what has happened elsewhere.⁴⁵

Analogues, therefore, cannot be used to prove that the Hypothesis is a fact. They can only be used to show that it is plausible. But, then, they can be used to show that almost any other hypothesis is plausible. They can be used to show that the anomalies of the Pentateuch could have been created by conflation, supplementation, assimilation, or a single author. The anomalies, therefore, cannot be used to prove anything conclusive about the authorship of the Pentateuch because no matter which position one takes there exist analogues which support it and counter-analogues which contradict it. The documentarians must look elsewhere for evidence and argumentation to prove their Hypothesis.

As if to undermine the Hypothesis even further, the analogues make one wonder if it is possible to recover the sources at all.⁴⁶ George Foot Moore believes that if we had no prior knowledge of

⁴³ *Composition*, 82-101.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 101-102.

⁴⁵ Tigay, "Introduction," in *Empirical*, 17.

⁴⁶ More and more scholars are starting to wonder this as well. See, for example, the remarks of Jan Christian Gertz in "Source Criticism in the Primeval History of Genesis: An Outdated Paradigm for the Study of the Pentateuch?" in Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch J. Schwartz, eds., *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*, FAT 78 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2011, hereafter referred to as *The Pentateuch*), 179-180.

the Gospels and if the *Diatessaron* had been written in Greek, we could separate the Gospel of John; however, we could not separate the Synoptics from each other because of their homogeneity.⁴⁷ David M. Carr has argued, by analogy, that scholars have separated P from the Pentateuch but have not been completely successful in separating J from E because of their homogeneity.⁴⁸

The analogues tell us that what scholars in the past have taken as sure evidence of the work of a redactor may be the work of an author after all. For decades scholars have taken the presence of *Weideraufnahme* (resumptive repetition) as a sure sign of a redactional insertion, but as long ago as 1962, Isaac Leo Seeligmann pointed to examples of obvious “Pseudo-*Weideraufnahme*,” that is, repetitions created by authors.⁴⁹

The analogues also show us that redactors do not always do what we expect them to do and that they may employ contradictory methods, even when dealing with sources for the same document. Thus, in her studies of the sources for the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, Sara J. Milstein concludes that one source was faithfully preserved for one thousand years, but then part of it was eliminated before being incorporated into the *Epic*. A second source was completely rewritten by editors early on, but then was also faithfully preserved for one thousand years before being brought into the *Epic*.⁵⁰ Maxine L. Grossman found examples of modular addition and subtraction as well as expansion and contraction in the Qumran texts of the Rule of the Community.⁵¹ Carr has observed that sometimes redactors left behind in the texts indicators of their work, but

⁴⁷ George Foot Moore, “Tatian’s Diatessaron and the Analysis of the Pentateuch,” in *Empirical*, 254-255.

⁴⁸ David M. Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011, hereafter referred to as *Formation*), 109-110.

⁴⁹ Raymond F. Person, Jr., and Robert Rezetko, “Introduction,” in Raymond F. Person, Jr., and Robert Rezetko, eds., *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism*, *Ancient Israel and Its Literature* 25 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016, hereafter referred to as *Challenging*), 26. See also Raymond F. Person, Jr., *From Conversation to Oral Tradition: A Simplest Systematics for Oral Traditions*, *Routledge Studies in Rhetoric and Stylistics* 10 (London: Taylor & Francis, 2016), 158-164.

⁵⁰ Sara J. Milstein, “Outsourcing Gilgamesh,” in *Challenging*, 57-59.

⁵¹ Maxine L. Grossman, “Community Rule or Community Rules: Examining a Supplementary Approach in Light of the Sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Challenging*, 314.

At the same time, documented cases of transmission history also suggest that such indicators are easily lost in the process of gradual growth of texts, both in the initial processing of separate documents and in subsequent scribal smoothing of the marks that once indicated their separate existence.⁵²

As Raymond F. Person, Jr., and Robert Rezetko point out, the erasure of these indicators means that “in some cases, short of conflicting textual data, we would not recognize that texts are actually composite.”⁵³ The case could be made, therefore, that there has been significantly more redactional activity in the Pentateuch but we just are not aware of it because the redactors covered their tracks.

These contradictory practices and the fact that the redactional indicators can be erased make reconstructing the sources and the literary history of any given text well-nigh impossible if one does not have the physical sources that were actually used. No wonder Carr says,

as I have surveyed documented cases of textual growth from ancient Mesopotamia to the finds at Qumran, I often am struck with the fact that it would have been virtually impossible to reconstruct the documented revisions to many texts if we did not have manuscript attestation of earlier stages with which to work. This survey has convinced me of at least two things: 1) that ancient texts did sometimes undergo radical and sometimes complex growth and 2) that biblical scholars probably can only discern the contours of *certain* stages of the growth of texts like the Pentateuch, since we lack documentation for many of the most important and often unreconstructable revisions.⁵⁴

Person and Rezetko are even more reticent about the possibility of reconstructing the sources behind any given text:

⁵² *Formation*, 106.

⁵³ Person and Rezetko, “Introduction,” in *Challenging*, 18.

⁵⁴ David M. Carr, “Scribal Processes of Coordination/Harmonization and the Formation of the First Hexateuch(s),” in *The Pentateuch*, 64 (italics his).

[T]he most that source and redaction criticism may be able to do *even with empirical evidence* is help us understand in general ways the composite nature of the text with only sketchy notions of what sources and redactional layers may have contributed to the literary character of the text. Once we devote much time to analyzing these reconstructed sources and redactional layers themselves as literary objects worthy of close literary and theological study, we probably have crossed a line of plausibility that becomes much too speculative, at least in most cases.⁵⁵

In short, far from proving that the Hypothesis is a fact, the analogues actually prove that finding the sources behind the Pentateuch is much more difficult than Friedman would like to believe. Stephen A. Kaufman, knowing that the Pentateuch is one of the sources behind the Temple Scroll, applied source-critical techniques to the Scroll to see if he could recover the Pentateuchal source and found that he could not. His conclusion?

It is a legitimate and worthwhile enterprise to point out inconsistencies, duplications and other irregularities in a biblical text and to compare texts in terms of their language, forms, literary structures and contents. But, except where there are many substantial, coincident reasons to suspect that all is not whole, the reconstruction of redaction history on the basis of such inconsistencies and comparisons promises to be nothing more than so much wasted effort.⁵⁶

Carr argues that the analogues prove that “a return to the clarity and simplicity of the documentary hypothesis is no longer possible,”⁵⁷ because the actual practices of the redactors, as attested by the analogues, make it impossible for the demarcation of the sources to be as precise as the documentarians have made it in the past. While the Priestly and Deuteronomistic sources, in their broad contours, have been established, the distinction between “cross-

⁵⁵ Person and Rezetko, “Introduction,” in *Challenging*, 35 (italics theirs).

⁵⁶ Stephen A. Kaufman, “The Temple Scroll and Higher Criticism,” *Hebrew Union College Annual*, Vol. 53 (1982), 43.

⁵⁷ *Formation*, 124.

Pentateuchal” J and E is “fatally flawed.”⁵⁸ The analogues also reveal problems with the accepted literary histories of other biblical texts. “As a result, the broader structure of much recent transmission-historical scholarship on the Hebrew Bible, particularly the Pentateuch, must be, in my opinion, rebuilt.”⁵⁹

Yet the analogues suggest that even reconstructing P may be a problem. There is a long-running disagreement among the documentarians as to whether P is a document or just the redactional layer which holds the Pentateuch together. Baruch J. Schwartz insists that it is a document because the P material from Ex. 19 through Leviticus is continuous, complete, and coherent.⁶⁰ Even so, if we remove Ex. 34:29-35, in which Moses must cover his face with a veil because his radiant face scares the congregation, the material is still continuous, complete, and coherent. And are the instructions for the building of the tabernacle any less complete if we say that all references to the table of showbread are later insertions? Is P’s law code any less coherent if, say, the laws on leprosy were added later? It might be argued that there is nothing in the text to suggest that these passages were added later, but this is where the analogues argue against Schwartz. The analogues suggest that redactors could have supplemented the text with these passages and then erased all traces of their presence.⁶¹ The same could be said of the rest of the P material. In other words, the continuity was created by redactors. But if they erased all the markers pointing to their work and we have no manuscript attestation, then we will never know. Let me reiterate at the risk of creating a doublet: for almost any position in this debate there exist analogues which support it and counter-analogues which contradict it.

Like the redactors’ conflicting relationship with their sources, Friedman has a conflicting relationship with the studies and ana-

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 144.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁰ Baruch J. Schwartz, “The Priestly Account of the Theophany and Lawgiving at Sinai,” in Michael V. Fox, *et al.*, eds., *Texts, Temples, and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 117.

⁶¹ We should not be surprised that redactors can do this since authors do this all of the time. My original draft of this chapter did not include the material on the Poem. At some point in the development of this chapter, I inserted that material and used the appropriate wording so that it did not *look* like an insertion.

logues of Tigay *et al.* That he wrote the “Foreword” to Tigay’s book suggests that he finds value in it, and he even says as much: “This book thus has value even beyond its stated purpose.”⁶² Yet in his writings in which he defends the Hypothesis, he barely mentions the studies and analogues or (more likely) never mentions them at all. The studies and analogues are not included in his Seven Main Arguments, which are supposed to be “the largest collection of evidence ever assembled in one place concerning this hypothesis,”⁶³ even though he was very familiar with *Empirical* years before he published *Sources*.⁶⁴ He does mention the *Epic of Gilgamesh* (and only the *Epic*), and only in passing after he lists the Arguments: “The poetic text that comes closest to the qualities of the biblical text that we are discussing here is the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, and the *Epic of Gilgamesh* is a composite of several sources. It is a *demonstration* of composition by combining sources in the ancient Near East, not a refutation of it!”⁶⁵ And *Empirical* receives just a quick nod in the epilogue of the re-release of the second edition of *Wrote*, which is his most extensive presentation of the Hypothesis to the general public: “Some had argued against the documentary hypothesis, saying that no ancient work was ever composed that way: with multiple authors, compiled by editors, including double versions of the same stories. But a group of scholars published a whole collection of ancient texts that were composed in just this way.”⁶⁶

In the “Foreword” itself, he ends up throwing the third line of evidence away and replacing it with his Seven Main Arguments:

These analyses provide the visible, empirically-documented parallels that the challengers of the Documentary Hypothesis asked. But a point that we should all note here is that, even before these new analyses came to light, this argument was really

⁶² Friedman, “Foreword,” in *Empirical*, [5].

⁶³ *Sources*, 3.

⁶⁴ Much of what he wrote in the “Foreword” was taken word for word from an earlier study: Richard Elliott Friedman, “Some Recent Non-arguments Concerning the Documentary Hypothesis,” in Fox, 87-101. He also reviewed *Empirical* in 1987 (Richard Elliott Friedman, “Review of *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*,” *Journal of Religion* 67 [1987]: 539-540).

⁶⁵ *Sources*, 30 (italics his).

⁶⁶ *Wrote*, 226.

no argument at all. A lack of analogies to the Torah's literary history was never a case against that history's reality. As Tigay puts it, "The reluctance of these writers to contemplate the possibility of something unique in Israelite literary history does not commend itself." Indeed it does not. A vast body of evidence led to the identification of distinct source works and layers of editing in the Five Books of Moses. Numerous lines of evidence converged to point in the same direction. This convergence of evidence is what made the hypothesis so compelling a century ago and in our own day. Tigay and Rofé especially emphasize this convergence of many lines of evidence in establishing the Documentary Hypothesis. *This has been the strongest argument for the hypothesis all along and the one least addressed by its opponents.* One cannot challenge such a body of evidence with a simple claim that other works did not get written that way. And, as the researches in this book show, as a matter of fact other works did get written that way. These researches should bring this argument to an end, and it will not be missed. But really it was never an argument anyway.⁶⁷

In other words, it was not necessary to answer the opponents' argument that no other work had been created by the combination of other documents. Even if that were true, so what?

Friedman is correct in thinking that his opponents' argument does not *necessarily* disprove the Documentary Hypothesis. His opponents' argument is an example of inductive reasoning, which draws a general principle from a set of observations or examples. Thus, the opponents' argument is:

Literary work A was not composed by the conflation of documents;

Literary work B was not composed by the conflation of documents;

Literary work C was not composed by the conflation of documents, etc.;

Therefore, no literary works have been composed by the conflation of documents.

⁶⁷ Friedman, "Foreword," in *Empirical*, [3-4] (italics his).

Therefore, the Pentateuch, which is a literary work, has not been composed by the conflation of documents.

The drawback to inductive reasoning, however, as both Friedman and Tigay know, is that the conclusion is not *necessarily* true. Even if one could prove that all other literary works were not created by the conflation of other documents, it still would not necessarily follow that the Pentateuch was not created this way; it could be the first and only literary work that was created this way.

However, Friedman is incorrect when he uses this weakness in inductive reasoning to summarily dismiss his opponents' argument as a non-argument. By the same token, we would have to dismiss the majority of scientific findings. How do we know that water boils at 100 degrees Celsius at sea level? We know this because scientists have boiled thousands of samples of water at sea level and every one of them boiled at 100 degrees Celsius. Do we say that these scientists are wrong because their findings do not *necessarily* mean that the next sample will boil at 100 degrees Celsius? And by the same token, the documentarians could not construct a similar argument in their favor. Even if one could prove that all other literary works *were* created by the conflation of other documents, it still would not necessarily follow that the Pentateuch was created this way; it could be the only literary work that was *not* created this way. But then the question would be raised (and raised legitimately), "How likely is that?"

While the conclusion of an inductive argument is not necessarily true, it is *probably* true, and the strength of its probability rests on the size of its set of observations or examples (its sample size); the larger its sample size, the larger its probability. We are reasonably certain that the next sample of water will boil at 100 degrees Celsius at sea level because of the large number of samples that have already done so. We are also reasonably certain, for the same reason, that if a scientist reports that his sample of water boiled at 50 degrees Celsius at sea level, then something went wrong. This is why the argument of Friedman's opponents cannot be dismissed so lightly. They have a huge body of literary works which tells them that literary works are not usually created by the conflation of other documents, that the probability is on their side. When, therefore, the

documentarians tell them that the Pentateuch is the exception to the rule, they cannot help but believe that something went wrong.

This is why Tigay's analogues are significant. They help add weight to the documentarians' side of the argument.⁶⁸ They increase the sample size to the documentarians' inductive argument. And they negate the opponents' claim that NO other literary works have been created in this manner, for they show that at least SOME literary works have been created by the conflation of other documents.

Still, Tigay's analogues also add weight to other hypotheses, which means that they do not prove that the Hypothesis is a fact. This may explain why Friedman ultimately reverts to his Seven Main Arguments, the seventh of which, he claims, his opponents never address.⁶⁹ I will address these Arguments individually and collectively in subsequent chapters.

For now, let me point out that there are three major problems with these Arguments. Contrary to Friedman's assertions, these "hundreds of points of data" do not outweigh the importance of the anomalies to the Hypothesis. Most of these points of data come to light only *after* we separate the four documents from the Pentateuch; none of these points of data would have ever compelled anyone to separate the Pentateuch in the first place. That J shows an interest in those things that became a part of the southern kingdom while E shows an interest in those things that became a part of the northern kingdom becomes apparent only after we first separate J and E from the Pentateuch. The Pentateuch as it now stands shows an interest in all of those things, with no obvious preference for one over the other. That the phrase "fire came out from before YHWH" occurs only in P becomes apparent only after we first separate out a document and call it P. Its three occurrences in the Pentateuch would never have compelled anyone to separate the Pentateuch into documents just to see if all three occurrences happened to appear in the same one. It was the anomalies that first compelled scholars

⁶⁸ Baden, however, insists that the composition of the Pentateuch is unique among the world's literature and that the only analogue that comes closest to it is the *Diatessaron* (Joel S. Baden, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*, FAT 68 [Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2009, hereafter referred to as *Redaction*], 292-293).

⁶⁹ In *Empirical*, he cautiously says that this argument "is the least addressed by" the opponents of the Hypothesis, but in *Sources* (28), he says that he knows of no opponent who has addressed this argument.

to separate the documents; only then did these hundreds of points of data come to light. This is why Friedman's Arguments are merely pillars supporting the Hypothesis and not the foundation itself: they are still built upon the foundation of the anomalies, which were used to justify the division of the Pentateuch in the first place. But Friedman's analogue, which demonstrates that the anomalies could have been created by a single author, has helped to undermine that foundation, meaning that his pillars have nothing upon which to stand. The Arguments prove nothing if there are no documents in the first place.⁷⁰

Second, the characteristics of the documents depend on his precise demarcation of the documents, but the analogues, as we have seen, prove that the precise demarcation of the sources is impossible to draw.

However, the third and biggest problem with these Arguments is that they, like the Pentateuchal anomalies themselves, do not *nec-*

⁷⁰ Baden insists that only contradictions, doublets that contradict themselves, and narrative inconsistencies should be used to separate the text into sources. The other anomalies, especially style and terminology, should be used only to confirm the identifications of the sources. He is correct when he says that the style and terminology arguments are descriptive rather than prescriptive (*Composition*, 29-32). However, describing something that does not exist does not confirm its existence. It is possible to describe the characteristics of a Jabberwocky; that does not mean that it exists. Many of Friedman's Arguments describe the characteristics of the theoretical documents and so seemingly serve the function of merely confirming the identification of the sources. For his first Argument, he says that JE, P, and D represent three stages in the Hebrew language and he specifically says this becomes apparent after the documents are separated (*Sources*, 7). In his sixth Argument, he says that J shows an obvious interest in the southern kingdom of Judah, a point which should become apparent only after the documents have been separated. Yet, he gives Num. 21:1-3 to J in part *because* the story takes place in territory that eventually becomes a part of Judah, which fits with J's interest (277). He assigns the verses in Num. 32 to J and P according to the terminology used elsewhere by those documents (his second Argument) while trying to create complete and continuous accounts (his fourth Argument) (300). The names of God, which have been used to separate the documents from the very beginning, are part of his third Argument, and the doublets and contradictions finally appear in his seventh Argument. From this point on, therefore, my critique of his Arguments takes the position that he intends for his Arguments to perform both functions, that of separating the documents and of confirming the identification of the documents, and that he places his Arguments on equal footing with the anomalies traditionally used by the classical documentarians to separate the documents.

essarily prove that the Hypothesis is correct because most of his Arguments can also be used to further justify the division of his own chapter.

2. Terminology: Friedman came up with a list of twenty-four words and phrases that consistently appear almost four hundred times only or primarily in one document.⁷¹ From the eighth chapter of *Wrote* (which is less than 1/20 the size of the Pentateuch by word count⁷²) I also came up with twenty-four such words and phrases which are consistent through ninety-five occurrences.

3. Consistent Content: “Ages, dates, measurements, numbers, order, and precise instructions are an obvious, major concern in P. There is nothing even nearly comparable in degree in J, E, or D.”⁷³ Dates and numbers, such as census figures, are an obvious concern in S. There is nothing even nearly comparable in degree in W. The latter source is much more interested in the development of the Israelites’ theology, which is why the word “God” appears ten times in W (twice in quotes from the Bible) but only once in S and why “Yahweh” appears eleven times in W (once in the Psalm he quotes) but only three times in S (twice in the Psalm).

4. Continuity of Texts: Each source reads as a flowing, sensible text without a break.⁷⁴ S and W also read as flowing, sensible texts without a break when we separate them.

6. Relationships among the Sources: J shows an obvious interest in the southern kingdom of Judah and E in the northern kingdom of Israel.⁷⁵ S shows an obvious interest in history, especially in the facts that can be confirmed by archaeology. W, however, shows an interest in psychology, especially in how people feel and react to their circumstances.

⁷¹ *Sources*, 8, 28.

⁷² The Torah has 79,976 Hebrew words. Chapter 8 of *Wrote* has 3,605 words.

⁷³ *Sources*, 12.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 13.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 18.

7. Convergence: The six lines of evidence converge and point in the same direction.⁷⁶ The evidence converges here as well. When we separate the two documents, the doublets, the terminology, the content, the continuity of the texts, and the interests all fall consistently to one document or the other. Friedman's Arguments, therefore, lead us to conclude that chapter eight of his own book was created by the splicing together of two sources, even though we know that the chapter was written by a single author.

If Friedman's seven lines of evidence prove that the Hypothesis is a fact, then they also prove the fact that he did not write his own book.

There is one more telling argument against Friedman's Seven Main Arguments. It is widely regarded among New Testament scholars that Mark is one of the sources behind Matthew and Luke. Joseph A. Weaks conducted a study in which he reconstructed Mark from the other two Gospels.⁷⁷ He called his reconstruction MarQ. Using, by his own account, generous standards, he was able to reconstruct only 52%, by word count, of Mark. He then compared the characteristics of MarQ with the characteristics of the actual Gospel of Mark. In every comparison, the characteristics of MarQ did not match those of Mark. For example, the frequency of the word "immediately" dropped from 3.62 per thousand words in Mark to 0.70 per thousand words in MarQ. Quite often, MarQ looked more like Matthew than Mark. The reason for this is that neither Matthew nor Luke imported Mark wholesale.

The redactor had an agenda, a set of interests and principles that (imperfectly and inconsistently) were applied as sources were used. The story was retold through a particular set of lenses, such that the version of the source that it is possible to reconstruct is not a random sample, but rather a selective and tainted result.⁷⁸

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 27.

⁷⁷ Joseph A. Weaks, "Limited Efficacy in Reconstructing the Gospel Sources for Matthew and Luke," in *Challenging*, 331-354.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 352.

Thus, for example, Mark's Old Testament quotes are missing from MarQ because Luke did not import them into his Gospel. For his own reasons, he deliberately left them out. Authors, and apparently redactors, often do not blindly use their sources. They use only what suits their purposes. To cite another example outside of Weaks' study, Tatian left out the genealogies from both Matthew and Luke. If we did not already have those two Gospels, would anyone have ever guessed that Tatian's sources originally contained the genealogies of Jesus?

Weaks, therefore, concludes:

The fact is that distinctive features found in the analysis of a reconstructed text have no definitive correlation with the original historical source it attempts to approximate. A reconstructed text is unreliable in that it is missing the very features and structures characteristic of the actual source text and, further, it contains features and structures that originate not from the actual source text but from the reconstruction process itself.⁷⁹

The same may be true of Friedman's sources. The bulk of his Seven Main Arguments consists of pointing out the consistent characteristics of the documents, but he cannot guarantee that those characteristics originate from the actual source texts and not from the reconstruction process itself. As we shall see in Chapter 2, the documents are not complete, meaning that the redactor(s) cut out portions of them. And Friedman argues elsewhere that the final redactor was also an author with a particular theological viewpoint, meaning that he had an agenda.⁸⁰ By Weaks' argument, therefore, Friedman's reconstruction of the documents most likely does not represent the actual documents. To make this plainer, P is called that because of its emphasis on priestly matters. But P may have come from a much larger document that did not emphasize priestly matters at all. The redactor who finalized the Pentateuch may have

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 350.

⁸⁰ Richard Elliott Friedman, "Sacred History and Theology: The Redaction of Torah," in Richard Elliott Friedman, ed., *The Creation of Sacred Literature* (University of California Press, 1981; repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1995), 31-34.

pulled only the P portions from the actual source text to suit his agenda. The P text reconstructed by the documentarians, therefore, may not represent the actual source text.

I say “may” and “most likely” because I do not know with certainty. Then again, neither do Friedman and the other documentarians. They present the Hypothesis as if it were a fact and present their arguments as if they were indisputable truths but the fact is, it is all pure *guesswork*. All Tigay *et al.* have managed to do is to make the guesswork appear legitimate. Even when the scholars have the manuscript attestation in hand, they do not always agree as to what it means. We have seen that Grossman says the texts of the Community Rule show that it has undergone modular addition and subtraction as well as expansion and contraction. Carr, however, argues that, despite the paleographic evidence, the shorter texts represent an older tradition than the longer text so that the texts show that the Rule has undergone expansion only.⁸¹ In *Empirical*, Emanuel Tov argued that the MT of 1 S 16-18 resulted from the conflation of the LXX text with another source.⁸² In a later article, Tigay himself noted that Rofé disagreed with Tov, arguing that the LXX is an abridgement of the (proto-) MT *Vorlage*.⁸³ The only fact the analogues prove beyond the shadow of a doubt is that when scholars lack manuscript attestation of the sources behind any given text, as in the case of the Pentateuch, then the reconstruction of those sources and the literary history of that text becomes a matter of sheer speculation. That is why there are almost as many hypotheses as there are nonconservative scholars. It seems that each one has his or her own idea on how the Pentateuch came to be created. If the Hypothesis is to rise above this morass of intellectual imagination and be elevated to the level of fact, the documentarians must find evidence other than ana-

⁸¹ *Formation*, 82-88.

⁸² Emanuel Tov, “The Composition of 1 Samuel 16-18 in the Light of the Septuagint Version,” in *Empirical*, 97-130.

⁸³ Jeffrey H. Tigay, “The Documentary Hypothesis, Empirical Models and Holistic Interpretation,” in Jun Ikeda, ed., *Modernity and Interpretations of Ancient Texts: The Collapse and Remaking of Traditions*, IAS Reports 1102 (Kyoto: International Institute of Advanced Studies, 2012), 125-126, as cited in Person and Rezetko, “Introduction,” in *Challenging*, 8. Tigay is referring to Alexander Rofé, “The Battle of David and Goliath: Folklore, Theology, Eschatology,” in Jacob Neusner, Baruch A. Levine, and Ernest S. Frerichs, eds., *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 117-151.

logues and argumentation. They must find the manuscript attestation of the sources. They must find undisputed copies of J, E, P, and D. Until then, Friedman will have to face what is, for him, an uncomfortable fact: the Hypothesis may be a plausible hypothesis, but it is *only* that: a hypothesis.

Chapter 2

Suppressed Evidence

The *suppressed evidence fallacy* occurs when the arguer ignores or suppresses the evidence that contradicts his or her position. For example, as part of his third line of evidence, Friedman says,

Further conveying the idea in P that priests are the only channel to God, there are no blatant anthropomorphisms in P. In J, God walks in the garden of Eden, personally makes Adam's and Eve's first clothing, personally closes Noah's ark and smells Noah's sacrifice. In E, God wrestles with Jacob and stands on the crag at Meribah as Moses strikes it and water comes out. And in E and perhaps J as well, Moses actually sees the form of God at Sinai/Horeb. In P there is nothing so direct and physical as this.¹

He can say this only because he is ignoring the abundant anthropomorphisms within P. P's anthropomorphisms begin to appear in its very first story: the Creation Story of Gen. 1:1-2:3. In that story, God speaks, sees, names, blesses, and rests.² He does every one of these things in many of P's other stories. In those other stories, he also hears, knows, and remembers,³ and God himself speaks of his face,

¹ *Sources*, 12.

² Speaks: Gen. 1:3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 29. Sees: 1:4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31. Names: 1:5, 8, 10. Blesses: 1:22, 28; 2:3. Rests: 2:2, 3.

³ Hears: Gen. 17:20; Ex. 16:7. Knows: Ex. 2:25. Remembers: Gen. 8:1; 19:29; Ex. 2:24; 6:5.

mouth, arm, hand, ears, and even his soul, which is capable of abhorrence, an otherwise human emotion.⁴

A celebrated example of an anthropomorphism in J—an example cited by Friedman in the quote above and by many other scholars—occurs near the end of the Flood Story when Noah sacrificed some animals and “Yahweh smelled a soothing aroma” (Gen. 8:21). Yet in P, Yahweh warns the Israelites that if they disobey him, “I will not smell your soothing aromas” (Lev. 26:31, AT). These are the only places in the entire Pentateuch in which Yahweh is said to smell.

Another oft cited example of an anthropomorphism in J—also cited by Friedman above—is the scene in which Adam and Eve “heard the sound of Yahweh Elohim walking in the garden” (Gen. 3:8). Yahweh also walks through the Israelites’ army camp in D (Deut. 23:14). And yet in P, Yahweh promises the Israelites that if they do obey him, “I will walk among you...” (Lev. 26:12). Again, these are the only places in the entire Pentateuch in which Yahweh is said to walk. Anthropomorphisms cannot get more blatant than that.

Diachronic Dissension

In the first of his Seven Main Arguments, Friedman claims that all of the documents were written in Classical Biblical Hebrew (CBH), which prevailed before the exile, and not in Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH), which prevailed after the exile. He further claims that JE comes from the earliest stage of CBH, P from a later stage, and D from a still later stage. Notice that he is not merely claiming that the three documents (JE, P, and D) linguistically differ from each other. He is claiming that they represent three stages in the development of the Hebrew language. The implication, of course, is that the three documents could not possibly have been written by the same author at the same time since they were written in three distinct epochs in Hebrew history. He does not present any of his own evidence to support this, but relies on the studies conducted by Robert Polzin, Gary Rendsburg, Zion Zevit, Jacob Milgrom, Avi Hurvitz, and Ronald

⁴ Face: Lev. 17:10; 20:3, 5, 6; 26:17. Mouth: Num. 20:24; 27:14. Arm: Ex. 6:6. Hand: Ex. 6:8; 7:4-5. Ears: Num. 14:28. Soul: Lev. 26:11, 30.

Hendel.⁵ Friedman also claims that the opponents of the Hypothesis almost never challenge this evidence.⁶ He believes that this evidence is so strong that, in his “Foreword” to Tigay’s book, he states that this evidence, along with the continuity of the documents (see “Discontinuous Documents” below) plus Tigay’s analogues, should elevate the Hypothesis from mere hypothesis to fact. He also refers to this evidence in *Hidden*.⁷

However, a reading of the studies themselves reveals that Friedman is overstating his case. Contrary to Friedman’s claims, Polzin actually concludes that P represents a stage of Hebrew between CBH and LBH, meaning that it was written sometime during the exile, after D. Rendsburg and Hurvitz criticize Polzin’s arguments, while Zevit criticizes both Polzin and Rendsburg. Hurvitz and Zevit conclude that P was indeed written in CBH before the exile, but neither of them is willing to say when P appeared in relation to JE or D. In fact, in his most extensive study of P’s linguistic characteristics, Hurvitz specifically points out that “the relationship of P to D and its implication for the dating of the Priestly Source” “could not even be touched upon within the limited scope of the present framework.”⁸

⁵ The studies as cited in *Sources*, 8, n. 1: Robert Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1976); Gary Rendsburg, “Late Biblical Hebrew and the Date of P,” *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 12 (1980): 65-80; Ziony Zevit, “Converging Lines of Evidence Bearing on the Date of P,” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 94 (1982): 502-509; Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, Anchor Bible 3 (New York: Doubleday, 1991), pp. 3-13; Milgrom, “Numbers, Book of,” *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 4, pp. 1148-1149; Avi Hurvitz, “The Evidence of Language in Dating the Priestly Code,” *Revue Biblique* 81 (1974): 24-56; Hurvitz, *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship Between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel* (Paris: Gabalda, 1982); Hurvitz, *בין לשון ללשון* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1972); Hurvitz, “Continuity and Innovation in Biblical Hebrew—The Case of ‘Semantic Change’ in Post-Exilic Writings,” *Abr-Naharaim* [sic, should be *Abr-Nahrain*, also known as *Ancient Near Eastern Studies*] Supp. 4 (1995) [also known as T. Muraoka, ed., *Studies in Ancient Hebrew Semantics* (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters Publishers, 1995)], pp. 1-10; Hurvitz, “The Usage of *שש* and *בין* in the Bible and Its Implication for the Date of P,” *Harvard Theological Review* 60 (1967): 117-121; Ronald Hendel, “‘Begetting’ and ‘Being Born’ in the Pentateuch: Notes on Historical Linguistics and Source Criticism,” *Vetus Testamentum* 50 (2000): 38-46. The same studies are also cited in Friedman, “Foreword,” in *Empirical*, [7], n. 5.

⁶ *Sources*, 8.

⁷ *Hidden*, 358-359, 362.

⁸ Hurvitz, *A Linguistic Study*, 151.

Rendsburg, meanwhile, takes the position, completely contrary to Friedman, that “the entire Pentateuch may be considered a unified work and may be dated to a time earlier than the composition of Joshua, Judges, and Samuel.... [A]s a whole the Pentateuch is ancient.”⁹

Milgrom concludes—on linguistic grounds—that P was written in CBH, but also concludes—not on linguistic grounds—that P appeared before D simply because it can be shown that the author of D used P as one of his sources (see “D Knows J, E, and P” below). Hendel, after studying the usage of the various verbal forms of *one* word, concludes that the data “would seem to support the classical view that the J source is earlier than the P source” (which, contra Friedman, “stems roughly from the exilic or early Persian period”) but also admits that the data “may not be sufficient to confirm any particular source-critical model.”¹⁰ Nor does Hendel say whether J represents the earliest stage of CBH. In fact—and this is what Friedman suppresses—*none* of the studies cited by Friedman speak about the three stages of CBH, let alone conclude that JE, P, and D represent those three stages. These studies, therefore, do not support Friedman’s first line of evidence. They do not even address it.

Furthermore, despite Friedman’s assertions to the contrary, this evidence—indeed, the very idea that linguistic characteristics can be used to date the documents—*has been* challenged, particularly by many of the contributors to *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology* and by Ian Young, Rezetko, and Martin Ehrensverd in their *magnum opus*, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*. Friedman relies on several studies done by Hurvitz, but Philip Davies, in his contribution to *Biblical Hebrew*, criticizes those studies as mere exercises in circular reasoning.¹¹ Hurvitz’ dating method rests on the

⁹ Rendsburg, 78.

¹⁰ Hendel, 46. Umberto Cassuto says that the usage of the Qal form of *yāladh* and the Hiphil form of *hōlīdh* is determined by Hebrew grammar, not sources (*Torath HaTeudoth* [The Hebrew University, Magnes Press, 1941, repr, as *The Documentary Hypothesis and the Composition of the Pentateuch*, Israel Abrahams, trans. (Jerusalem: Shalem Press, 2006)], 51-56).

¹¹ Philip R. Davies, “Biblical Hebrew and the History of Ancient Judah: Typology, Chronology and Common Sense,” in Ian Young, ed., *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 369 (London: T&T Clark International, 2003), 154.

assumption that CBH ended during the exile and that post-exilic authors could not successfully imitate CBH. Yet most scholars (including Hurvitz) agree that Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 are written in CBH and most scholars (including Hurvitz) agree that those two texts are post-exilic.¹² Hence, texts that are written in CBH are not necessarily pre-exilic. Young *et al.* conclude that linguistic characteristics cannot be used to date biblical texts since CBH and LBH represent, not stages in the development of the Hebrew language, but literary styles concurrently used throughout the biblical period.¹³

In *Challenging*, Person and Rezetko, while contending that most, if not all, of the biblical texts are composite,¹⁴ specifically address Friedman's argument as it is presented in *Empirical*, saying that it goes beyond and even contradicts what Tigay and the contributors to *Empirical* would assert about the efficacy of linguistic data.¹⁵ They point out what Tigay himself says concerning *Gilgamesh*: "[M]any of the late variants seem to employ language not less ancient than the language they replace."¹⁶ They also point out that Rofé argues that the author who inserted vv. 4-6 into Josh. 20 "phrased his innovation in the familiar language of the sources, imitating ancient usage rather than writing in his own Second Commonwealth Hebrew; thus he was successful in hiding his origins and date." "Phenomena such as these," he goes on to say in a footnote, "detract from the value of

¹² Martin Ehrensward, "Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts," in *Biblical Hebrew*, 164-188. See also Davies, 154.

¹³ Ian Young, Robert Rezetko, and Martin Ehrensward, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*, Vol. 2 (London: Equinox Publishing, Ltd., 2008, repr., London: Routledge, 2016), 96.

¹⁴ Person and Rezetko, "Introduction," in *Challenging*, 25.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 10-11.

¹⁶ Tigay, "The Evolution of the Pentateuchal Narratives in the Light of the Evolution of the *Gilgamesh Epic*," in *Empirical*, 40-41. In *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic*, he says something similar: "These examples suggest a measure of linguistic and stylistic updating in the late version. It is difficult to estimate the extent of such modernization, owing to the small number of passages attested in both versions and available for comparison. A first impression, however, is that modernization was not extensive: The number of variants demonstrably using language prevalent in later literature is much smaller than the total number of variants studied. It appears that even when the editor(s) modified their sources, they usually relied upon ancient or 'classical' vocabulary" (Jeffrey H. Tigay, *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic* [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982; repr., Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, Inc., 2002], 67-68).

linguistic considerations in the dating of biblical passages.”¹⁷ In other words, documents that use “ancient” vocabulary still could have been written much later.

Rezetko rejects Friedman’s argument in particular (“Never mind Richard Elliott Friedman’s remarks in his new ‘Foreword’ to the reprinted Tigay volume of *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*.... He repeatedly extols the power of linguistic data for dating biblical writings.”) and all arguments in general which support the linguistic dating of biblical documents when he states,

contemporary textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible challenges contemporary historical linguistics (that is, linguistic dating) of Biblical Hebrew insofar as practitioners of the latter seek to undermine the conventional view, based on empirical textual data, that “early” sources and books were edited and/or authored in the Second Temple period.¹⁸

Even Friedman’s own studies do not completely agree with him that linguistic characteristics can successfully date the documents. While Rendsburg believes that “the date of P can be determined by linguistic means,”¹⁹ he also points out that there is actually very little difference between CBH and LBH, meaning that Hebrew was a very stable language for over a millennium.²⁰ In support of this view, he cites both Joseph Blau (“Yet, as a rule, the differences between these layers [LBH and Early Biblical Hebrew] are unexpectedly slight; and Biblical language, though stemming from all parts of Erets Israel over a very long period, is surprisingly uniform.”²¹) and William Chomsky:

The Hebrew people were thrown into contact and collisions with other people. Its vocabulary was considerably enriched by

¹⁷ Alexander Rofé, “Joshua 20: Historico-Literary Criticism Illustrated,” in *Empirical*, 146 and n. 29.

¹⁸ Rezetko, “The (Dis)Connection between Textual and Linguistic Developments in the Book of Jeremiah: Hebrew Bible Textual Criticism Challenges Biblical Hebrew Historical Linguistics,” in *Challenging*, 269, and n. 93.

¹⁹ Rendsburg, 76.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 73.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 66.

the admission of numerous foreign words borrowed from the many peoples among whom they dwelt. Yet the original linguistic pattern of Hebrew remained more or less intact. Thus we speak of biblical Hebrew as a unitary phase of the language, distinguished by typical characteristics of grammar and style. Yet, the interval between the earliest biblical documents, such as the Song of Moses or the Song of Deborah, on the one hand, and the books of Koheleth and Esther, on the other, is as long as the interval separating the period of Alfred the Great from our own day.²²

Because of this uniformity, scholars cannot define significantly different sets of linguistic characteristics for different eras in Israel's history. Thus, linguistic characteristics cannot be used to date the documents.

Other scholars, such as Rezetko, would say that these sets cannot be defined because we simply do not know enough about the development of the ancient Hebrew language.

Our knowledge is insufficient, first, because of the absence of both early biblical manuscripts and an adequate control corpus of dated and localized extrabiblical sources, and second, because the actual distribution of linguistic data in the extant (late) texts of the Hebrew Bible (biblical DSS, MT, SP) resists an explanation along the lines of simple linear development from so-called Archaic to Early to Transitional to Late Biblical Hebrew.²³

This is not to say that some scholars have not tried to define such sets. It is thought by many scholars that Chronicles was written in LBH and that Samuel was originally written in CBH. It is also thought by some scholars that *anoki* was used in CBH, whereas *ani* was used in LBH, which, if true, would be evidence that P was written *after* the exile rather than before it, as Friedman contends.²⁴

²² *Ibid.*, 73.

²³ Person and Rezetko, "Introduction," in *Challenging*, 29, n. 84.

²⁴ See S.R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 8th ed. (N.Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898, hereafter referred to as *ILOT*), 155, second note. The problem with this supposition is that J, E, and P (and, therefore, the Pentateuch) use both pronouns, making them useless for dating the documents. According to

Theoretically, in the passage in which God grants his covenant to David (1 C 17), the Chronicler should have changed every occurrence of *anoki* to *ani* when he incorporated 2 S 7, and this is what we find when we see 2 S 7:18 and its parallel, 1 C 17:16. But we also find *anoki* in both 2 S 7:2 and its parallel, 1 C 17:1. And we find *ani* in 2 S 7:8 and 14 and their parallels, 1 C 17:7 and 13. Thus, we find both the “early” *anoki* and the “late” *ani* in both the early Samuel and the late Chronicles.²⁵ Characteristics that are initially thought to be early or late can turn out to be both upon further study.

However, the challengers, in turn, have been challenged.²⁶ *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew* was compiled specifically as a response to *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*. The contributors to the volume argue in support of using linguistics to date biblical texts. They critique the arguments of Young *et al.* and question their methodology. This does not mean that they support Friedman’s argument. They rarely mention the four documents and never mention Friedman’s argument. At best, they see only three major epochs in the history of Biblical Hebrew: Ancient or Archaic Biblical Hebrew (ABH), Classical or Standard or Early Biblical Hebrew (CBH or SBH or EBH), and Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH).²⁷ None of them further subdivide CBH into three epochs as Friedman does. Indeed, in a final blow to Fried-

Oswald T. Allis, in Genesis alone, *anoki* occurs 35 times in J, *ani* 15 times; *anoki* occurs 18 times in E, *ani* 17 times; *anoki* occurs once in P (23:4), *ani* 7 times. *Ani* also occurs once in Gen. 14, which is an independent source, and the “early” *anoki* occurs in Gen. 15:14, which Friedman assigns to R, who worked in the post-exilic era (Oswald T. Allis, *The Five Books of Moses* [Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1943, repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2001], 43). Cassuto (60-61) says that the usage of the pronouns, at least in the book of Genesis, consistently follows a set of grammatical rules and therefore cannot be used to divide the text into sources.

²⁵ Robert Rezetko, “Dating Biblical Hebrew: Evidence from Samuel-Kings and Chronicles,” in *Biblical Hebrew*, 225-226.

²⁶ See the critique of Davies in particular and *Biblical Hebrew* and *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts* in general, as well as the numerous references to studies critiquing the position of Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensverd in Benjamin D. Sommer, “Dating Pentateuchal Texts and the Perils of Pseudo-Historicism,” in *The Pentateuch*, 104, n. 53.

²⁷ See the contributions by Tania Notarius and Chaim Cohen in Cynthia Miller-Naudé and Ziony Zevit, eds., *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*, *Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic* 8 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012, hereafter referred to as *Diachrony*).

man's argument, Hurvitz himself would argue that it is impossible to further subdivide CBH because, as he states in a study not in *Diachrony* and not cited by Friedman, "linguistically we are unable to tell apart the BH of the ninth century [BCE] from that of the seventh [BCE]." ²⁸

Friedman is overstating his case. The use of linguistic characteristics to date the four documents is not as clear cut as he would like us to believe. Even if the dust settles in favor of linguistic dating, the evidence presented by his own studies shows that all four documents were written in CBH, with no significant linguistic differences between them. Which means that all of them could have been written at the same time by the same author. ²⁹

D Knows J, E, and P

Baden argues that E must have existed as an independent document because D refers to E quite often. More importantly, when D refers to the stories in which, in the canonical text, J and E are combined and especially in the stories about the events at Horeb, D

²⁸ Avi Hurvitz, "The Relevance of Biblical Hebrew Linguistics for the Historical Study of Ancient Israel," in *Proceedings of the Twelfth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, July 29-August 5, 1997: Division A: The Bible and Its World* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1999), 32*.

²⁹ The long poetic sections of the Pentateuch, such as the Song of the Sea (Ex. 15:1-18) and the Song of Moses (Deut. 32:1-43) have been dated anywhere from ABH to LBH (Yigal Bloch, "The Third-Person Masculine Plural Suffixed Pronoun *-mw* and Its Implications for the Dating of Biblical Hebrew Poetry," in *Diachrony*, 147-170). But even the contributors to *Diachrony* admit that characteristics common to an early epoch can carry forward to later epochs (see, for example, B. Elan Drescher, "Methodological Issues in the Dating of Linguistic Forms: Considerations from the Perspective of Contemporary Linguistic Theory," in *Diachrony*, 29). Since the biblical examples of ABH are all poetry, the linguistic characteristics of ABH are really the linguistic characteristics of Hebrew poetry, first established in ancient times. In English, certain linguistic characteristics which are common to our poetry are not common to our prose. For example, we do not write *'tis* in prose, but we do in poetry, a practice established centuries ago. It is conceivable, therefore, that the Pentateuchal poetry was written in the CBH epoch when the rest of the text was written. See the contribution by Bloch in *Diachrony*, who argues that there is no linguistic reason to date any of the biblical poetry to the ABH period at all. This does not mean that the Pentateuch was written during the monarchic period, when CBH prevailed. Due to the lack of texts, we do not know how far back CBH actually stretches. The Pentateuch could have been written much, much earlier.

refers only to the E passages. This can only mean that the authors of D had the complete E document (before it was redacted to the other documents) in front of them when they wrote D.³⁰

However, Baden's argument depends on how one assigns the passages in the first place. Many of the passages to which D refers and which Baden would assign to E Friedman would assign to J (Ex. 24:18b; 34:1a, 4 [except "like the first ones"], 5a α , 28; Num. 16-17; 20:14-21; 21:12-13; 21-31; 33-35; 32)³¹ and even to P (Ex. 31:18).³² Besides, Baden finally admits that there is an element of J that does appear in D's picture of the events at Horeb, for D pictures Yahweh as appearing in fire (4:12, 15, 33, 36; 5:4-5, 19-23; 9:10, 15), something he does in J (Ex. 19:18) but not in E.³³ So, according to Baden and Friedman, the picture of the events at Horeb we find in D not only pulls from E (Ex. 20:1-19; 32:7-9, 16) and J (Ex. 19:18; 24:18b; 34:1a, 4, 5a α , 28), but also from P (Ex. 31:18). That is, the authors of D had, not just E, but the combined JEP in front of them when they wrote D. Or, to put it another way, the author of Deuteronomy had the other four books in front of him when he wrote the fifth book.

Baden admits that D also knows J (although, of course, a J separate from E). Moses retells the Spies Story in 1:19-45, citing details from J's version (such as the fact that they went to the Wadi Eschol) and even using J's wording (Num. 13-14).³⁴ He commands the Israelites, "You shall not test Yahweh, your God, as you did at Massah" (6:16, AT), a reference to Ex. 17:7.³⁵ He mentions manna (8:3, 16; Ex. 16:4-5; Num. 11:4-9) and that God brought water out of the rock (8:15), probably a reference to Ex. 17:1b β -7.³⁶ In 9:22-23, D has Moses mention Taberah (Num. 11:3), Massah (Ex. 17:7), Kibroth Hattaavah (Num. 11:34), and Kadesh-Barnea (Num. 13-14) in passing, all place names in J stories.³⁷

There are other references to J which Baden does not mention. According to him, J (not E or P) refers to the ark as "the ark of the

³⁰ *Composition*, 128. See also *Redaction*, 99-195.

³¹ *Sources*, 161, 177, 179, 268-270, 276-277, 278, 279, 300-302.

³² *Ibid.*, 173.

³³ *Composition*, 144.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 143. 135-136.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 134.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 135.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 134.

covenant of Yahweh” (Num. 10:33; 14:44).³⁸ But so does D, twice as often as J does (Deut. 10:8; 31:9, 25-26). In his blessing of Joseph (Deut. 33:13-17), Moses quotes from Jacob’s blessing of Joseph (Gen. 49:22-26). Deut. 29:23 refers to Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, and Zeboim, cities listed in Gen. 10:19, as well as to the overthrow of those cities (Gen. 19:24).

Baden, however, insists that D “is entirely ignorant of P”³⁹ because this assertion also supports his version of the Hypothesis. This would mean that P existed independently of both E and J and was not redacted with them until after D was written. But, again, the argument depends on how one assigns the passages in the first place. Deut. 9:10, in which Yahweh gives Moses two tablets “written with the finger of God,” is a reference to Ex. 31:18, which, as we have seen, Baden assigns to E. But Friedman assigns it to P,⁴⁰ meaning that D does know P.

And the argument also depends on suppressing the abundance of passages that work against it. Baden knows full well—or at least should know full well because it has been known to the documentarians for several years now—that D knows P. He admits in an endnote that D’s Spies Story quotes verbatim from P’s Spies Story (Num. 14:31) when Yahweh says, “Your children, who you say will be victims...” (1:39). But since this is apparently the exception to the rule, it must have been inserted by the compiler.⁴¹ Except that this is not the exception to the rule. In J’s Spies Story, Caleb is called simply Caleb; only in P is he called Caleb the son of Jephunneh (Num. 13:6; 14:6, 30, 38; 26:65; 32:12;⁴² 34:19). But he is also called that in D (1:36). In P’s story, Joshua is originally called Hoshea (Num. 13:8, 16). He is called that again in only one other place: not in D’s retelling of the Spies Story, but much later, in Deut. 32:44.

In the retelling of the Spies Story, D does not refer to the forty years of wandering—which is the punishment in P, but which is never mentioned in J or E—but D refers to it several times elsewhere. Thus, Moses’ opening speech takes place “in the fortieth

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 80.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 138.

⁴⁰ Partly because the only other reference to “the finger of God” (Ex. 8:15) is also a P passage (*Sources*, 173, n. *).

⁴¹ *Composition*, 289, n. 11 (also 290, n. 26). See also *Redaction*, 278-279.

⁴² P, according to Baden (*Redaction*, 143).

year” (1:3). While recalling the journey past Seir (2:2-8), a reference to Num. 20:14-21 (E, Baden, J, Friedman⁴³), Moses reminds the Israelites that Yahweh provided for all their needs “these forty years.” Further on, he says, “And you shall remember that Yahweh your God led you all the way these forty years in the wilderness, to humble you and to test you.... Your garments did not wear out on you, nor did your foot swell these forty years” (8:2, 4). The reason Israel had to wander for forty years, according to P, was so that every male twenty years old and up (Num. 14:29-35), that is, every man of war (Num. 1:3), would die in the wilderness. D says this happened: “And the time we took to come from Kadesh Barnea until we crossed over the Valley of the Zered was thirty-eight years, until all the generation of the men of war was consumed from the midst of the camp, just as Yahweh had sworn to them” (2:14-16).

In 4:3, Moses says, in reference to another incident, “Your eyes have seen what Yahweh did at Baal Peor, for Yahweh your God has destroyed from among you all the men who followed Baal of Peor.” Moses uses the full name, Baal Peor, from J’s version of the story (Num. 25:1-5), but the destruction he references must be the plague from P’s version (Num. 25:6-19).

In P, Yahweh says that he will bring Israel out of Egypt by multiplying his signs and wonders (Ex. 7:3). In D, Moses repeatedly reminds the Israelites that Yahweh brought them out of Egypt through signs and wonders (4:34; 6:22; 7:19; 29:1-2; see also 26:8; 34:11). In Deut. 16:3, Moses tells the Israelites to eat unleavened bread during Passover and the seven days following it as a reminder that they left Egypt “in haste” (*bēhipāzôn*), a word that appears again in the Pentateuch only in Ex. 12:11 (P), where Yahweh tells the Israelites to eat the Passover “in haste.” Moses refers to “the day that Elohim created man” (4:32), a reference to Gen. 1:27 (P). He says to the Israelites, “Your fathers went down to Egypt with seventy persons, and now the Lord your God has made you as the stars of heaven in multitude” (10:22), a reference to Gen. 46:27 (P). In P, Yahweh tells Moses, “The children of Israel shall keep the sabbath, *to observe the sabbath*” (Ex. 31:16). The last phrase appears again in the Old Testament only in Deut. 5:15.

⁴³ *Composition*, 136; *Sources*, 276-277.

Milgrom notes that the expression *as I/he commanded/swore/promised* “is D’s unique formula for indicating its sources.” Three times D’s source is P:⁴⁴

Scale disease: “Take heed in a plague of leprosy, that you carefully observe and do according to all that the Levitical priests shall teach you; *just as I commanded them*, so you shall be careful to do” (Deut. 24:8 AT, referencing Lev. 13-14⁴⁵).

The covenantal relationship: “That he may establish you today as a people for himself, and that he may be God to you, *just as he has promised you*, and *just as he has sworn to your fathers*, to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob” (Deut. 29:12 AT, referencing, in whole, Gen. 17:7-8; Ex. 6:7; Lev. 26:12; and, in part, Ex. 29:45; Lev. 11:45; 22:33; 25:38; 26:45; Num. 15:41).

The levitic prebends: “Therefore Levi has no portion nor inheritance with his brethren; Yahweh is his inheritance, *just as Yahweh your God promised him*” (Deut. 10:9). “The Levitical priests, the whole tribe of Levi, ... shall have no inheritance among their brethren; Yahweh is their inheritance, *as he promised them*” (Deut. 18:1-2 AT, both referencing Num. 18:20).

To these, we should add Deut. 2:14 (“And the time we took to come from Kadesh Barnea until we crossed over the Valley of the Zered was thirty-eight years, until all the generation of the men of war was consumed from the midst of the camp, *just as Yahweh had sworn to them.*”), which is a reference to Num. 14:28-35.

Of his examples from Deuteronomy, Milgrom says:

To be sure, this evidence only proves that “D is certainly cognizant of the *content* of P, but not necessarily of the *language* of P... (Nonetheless,) that D indicates its sources by a formula means that it takes for granted that they are well known to the reader. Though, it may be argued, God’s commands, promises,

⁴⁴ Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 9.

⁴⁵ The phrase “plague of leprosy” is employed only in these places in the entire Old Testament.

and oaths could have been handed down orally, it is more likely that the accuracy of God's *ipsissima verba*, particularly his laws, would not have been left to the vagaries of memory, but would have been written down"⁴⁶

Milgrom also notes, "all eighteen verses of D's diet laws [Deut. 14:3-20] can be shown to be a borrowing from and alteration of Lev 11..., which proves that D had before it the present MT of Lev 11."⁴⁷

What Milgrom does not note is that D adds to the law of leprosy: "Remember what Yahweh your God did to Miriam on the way when you came out of Egypt!" (Deut. 24:9), a reference to Num. 12 (E, according to both Baden and Friedman,⁴⁸ one of the few times they agree on J and E.)

The author of Deuteronomy never tells the reader what happened to Miriam. He is presupposing that the reader has already read Numbers. Otherwise, the reference to Miriam, as well as his references to the spies and to Dathan and Abiram and to Sihon and Og and to the locations in 9:22-23, will not make sense to the reader. The author is also presupposing that the reader has read Leviticus. Otherwise, Moses' command concerning leprosy will not make sense to the reader. The author is also presupposing that the reader has read Exodus, otherwise the references to the events at Horeb will not make sense to the reader. The author is also presupposing that the reader has read Genesis. Otherwise, the reference to the covenant in 29:12, as well as the numerous references to the fact that Israel is about to enter the land which Yahweh had sworn to give to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (1:8; 6:10; 9:5; 30:20; 34:4), something which Yahweh did in Genesis, will not make sense to the reader. Some stories in Deuteronomy are presented with more detail than others, but none are presented with more detail than what are given in the previous books; that is, to fully understand the stories, one must go back to the previous books. Friedman and Baden both

⁴⁶ Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 9 (italics his).

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 10 (see his defense of this view, 698-704). For a contrary opinion, see Christophe Nihan, "The Laws about Clean and Unclean Animals in Leviticus and Deuteronomy and Their Place in the Formation of the Pentateuch," in *The Pentateuch*, 401-432.

⁴⁸ *Composition*, 117; *Sources*, 261-262.

admit that D is complete and coherent, but Deuteronomy is not completely coherent until one has read the previous four books.

Furthermore, I suggest that Deuteronomy's references back to the other four books mean more than just that the author of D was familiar with those four books. They mean that Deuteronomy was written as the climax of those four books. Deuteronomy cannot be completely understood without the previous four books and the previous four books are not complete without Deuteronomy. Rendtorff sought the links which hold the larger units of the Pentateuch together. Those links are in Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy ties the other four books together. This means that the Five Books were conceived as—and are meant to be seen as—a unity.

Word Lists

For his second line of evidence in *Sources*, Friedman says that “Certain words and phrases occur disproportionately—or even entirely—in one source but not in others. The quantity of such terms that consistently belong to a particular source is considerable.”⁴⁹ He lists “twenty-four examples of such terms, which are consistent through nearly four hundred occurrences.”⁵⁰ Thus, “the word ‘congregation’ (*‘ēdāh*) occurs more than one hundred times in the Torah, all in P, without a single exception.”⁵¹ He uses this argument in *Wrote* to justify dividing the Flood Story into a P version and a J version:

But it is not only that it is possible to carve out two stories. What makes the case so powerful is that each story consistently uses its own language. The P story... consistently refers to the deity as God. The J story always uses the name Yahweh. P refers to the sex of the animals with the words “male and female” (Gen. 6:19; 7:9, 16). J uses the terms “man and his woman” (7:2) as well as male and female. P says that everything “expired” (6:17; 7:21). J says that everything “died” (7:22).⁵²

⁴⁹ *Sources*, 8.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 28.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁵² *Wrote*, 43-44.

He notes that P says everything “expired” while J says everything “died.” He notes the same thing in *Sources*: “P uses the term ‘expired.’ J uses the term ‘died.’ This is consistent with the rest of P, which uses the term ‘expired’ eleven times, whereas it never occurs in J, E, or D.”⁵³ So “expire” makes his list because it is used only by P.⁵⁴

He also cites J’s use of the word “die” because it seems to support the Hypothesis. What he conveniently forgets to say, the evidence which he suppresses, is that “die” does not make his list because it appears in all four documents, including P. In fact, “die” appears in P (132 times) more often than “congregation” does and almost three times as often as it appears in J (47 times). He also conveniently forgets to note that the writer of the passages assigned to P liked to pair the word “expire” with the word “die.” In nine of P’s eleven uses of the word “expire,” “die” appears somewhere in the immediate vicinity. Num. 20:3-4 is only one example:

And the people quarreled with Moses, and they said, saying, “If only we had *expired* when our brothers *expired* in front of YHWH! And why have you brought YHWH’s community to this wilderness to *die* there, we and our cattle?” (Num. 20:3-4, FV, emphasis added).

Friedman quotes this passage in *Wrote* and says that verse 3 belongs to P in part because “it uses the word ‘expire’ in reference to death, which I noted in the P version of the flood story....”⁵⁵ Yet, he also assigns verse 4 to P, even though it uses the word “die.”

Of particular interest is how P describes the deaths of the patriarchs (all AT):

Abraham expired and died... (Gen. 25:8).
And he [Ishmael] expired and died... (Gen. 25:17).
So Isaac expired and died... (Gen. 35:29).

⁵³ *Sources*, 44, n. **.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁵⁵ *Wrote*, 180.

That one verse in the Flood Story uses the term “expired” while the succeeding verse uses “died” is not evidence that the Story came from two different authors. It is evidence that the one and only author who wrote Numbers 20 and described the deaths of the patriarchs also wrote the Flood Story. We will return to this Argument in Chapter 3.

The Prophets Knew the Entire Pentateuch

In the fifth of his Seven Main Arguments, Friedman says that the sources have connections with particular portions of the Bible. Thus, D has connections with the book of Jeremiah, P with the book of Ezekiel, and JE with the book of Hosea.⁵⁶ What Friedman is suppressing is that, while these books may have a high number of allusions to these particular sections of the Pentateuch, the prophets were familiar with the rest of the Pentateuch.

It is true that D’s terminology and outlook dominate the book of Jeremiah. But the prophet is also familiar with J and even quotes from it (compare Jer. 48:45-46 with Num. 21:28-29).

In *Wrote*, Friedman demonstrates that Jeremiah quotes from P several times, though, according to Friedman, Jeremiah does so only to attack it. Friedman says that many of the sources arose out of a conflict between the Aaronid priests, who were descendants of Aaron and who originally functioned as priests in Hebron in the southern part of Israel, and the Shilonites, who were descendants of Moses and who originally functioned as priests in Shiloh in the northern part of Israel. With the collapse of the northern kingdom, the Shilonites migrated to Judah, trying to serve as priests alongside the Aaronids, who insisted that only they could be priests and relegated the Shilonites to the role of Levites. The Aaronids supposedly produced P, which defended their position and denigrated Moses at times, while the Shilonites supposedly produced E and the Deuteronomistic History, which, of course, defended their position and

⁵⁶ *Sources*, 14-18. He also includes his contention that J was once united with the Court History of David now found in 2 Samuel, along with some of the intervening texts in Joshua, Judges, and 1 Samuel, to form a work he calls *In the Day*. He presents his detailed arguments in support of this contention in *Hidden*. Answering those arguments would require writing another book. However, I do address his terminology argument in chapter 3.

denigrated Aaron.⁵⁷ Jeremiah was a Shilonite, which explains why D's terminology infuses his book and why he attacked P.

As proof that Jeremiah was opposed to P, Friedman cites Jer. 3:16:

“Then it shall come to pass, when you will multiply and be fruitful in the land in those days,” says Yahweh, “that they will say no more, ‘The ark of the covenant of Yahweh.’ It shall not come to mind, nor shall they remember it, nor shall they visit it, nor shall it be made anymore” (AT).

The ark is important in P and the phrase, “Be fruitful and multiply,” appears several times in P. Here, Jeremiah seems to be attacking the ark while reversing P's phrase.⁵⁸ But if reversing P's phrase means that he is attacking P, what are we to conclude when we see Ezekiel also reversing it in 36:11, even though he agrees with P everywhere else?

What Friedman neglects to mention is that Jeremiah uses the phrase again, this time in the correct order:

“But I will gather the remnant of My flock out of all countries where I have driven them, and bring them back to their folds; and they shall be fruitful and multiply” (Jer. 23:3, AT).

If using the phrase in reverse order is attacking P, then using it in the correct order must be agreeing with it.

Quoting a passage out of context usually distorts the meaning of the passage. Reading Jer. 3:16 in context (Jer. 3:11-18), we find that Jeremiah is not attacking P at all. He sees Yahweh calling the northern kingdom of Israel to repentance and if they repent, he will bring them back to Zion and appoint shepherds, who, like the shepherds in Jer. 23:3, will care for them and help them to multiply and be fruitful (the reversal being merely an exercise in poetic license). The ark, which represents Yahweh's throne, will no longer be needed because Jerusalem itself will become Yahweh's throne and even the

⁵⁷ For a detailed explanation of his theory, see *Wrote*.

⁵⁸ *Wrote*, 148-149.

other nations will be gathered to it and sin no more. This bold vision is not an attack on P but rather an expansion on it.

Friedman also cites Jer. 7:22.⁵⁹ P spends much time proscribing how and when the Israelites were to present their burnt offerings and sacrifices. But Jeremiah says:

“For I did not speak to your fathers, or command them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices.”

If this passage means that Jeremiah is opposed to P, then it means that he is also opposed to D, for D commands the Israelites to bring burnt offerings and sacrifices to the place at which Yahweh causes his name to dwell (Deut. 12:11, 26-27).

Again, Friedman is quoting out of context. Jeremiah goes on to say:

“But this is what I commanded them, saying, ‘Obey My voice, and I will be your God, and you shall be My people. And walk in all the ways that I have commanded you, that it may be well with you’” (Jer. 7:23).

The last sentence is very Deuteronomic. However, the phrase, “I will be your God, and you shall be My people,” occurs several times in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah⁶⁰ (more often as “I will be their God, and they shall be My people”), and while the English translation remains the same, the Hebrew varies in most of the passages. The exact wording used in 7:23 appears in only one other place in the entire Old Testament: Lev. 26:12. Jeremiah is not attacking P. This is just an ancient Oriental way of saying I did not speak to them about burnt offerings and sacrifices as much as I did obedience. Or another way of putting it is, “My message to them was, “To obey is better than sacrifice” (1 S 15:22).

Finally, Friedman cites Jer. 4:23:⁶¹

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 149.

⁶⁰ Jer. 31:1, 33; Eze. 37:27. Reversed in Jer. 11:4; 24:7; 30:22; 32:38; Eze. 11:20; 14:11; 36:28; 37:23; Zec. 8:8.

⁶¹ *Wrote*, 148.

I beheld the earth, and indeed it was without form and void;
And the heavens, they had no light.

This is an obvious reference to P's Creation Story, which begins with the earth being without form and void. At the end of the Story, God declares that everything was good. But Jeremiah sees the earth reverting back to its original state.

Once again, Friedman is quoting Jeremiah out of context. The verse before tells us why this is happening:

“For My people are foolish,
They have not known Me.
They are silly children,
And they have no understanding.
They are wise to do evil,
But to do good they have no knowledge.”

The earth is reverting back to its original state, not because Jeremiah is attacking P, but because the people are continually sinning.⁶²

Jeremiah also favorably uses other terms and phrases from P which Friedman does not discuss at all. Both Leviticus (18:21) and Deuteronomy (18:10) forbid sacrificing children but employ different wording, with the former specifically mentioning Molech and the latter specifically mentioning fire. Jeremiah also refers to the sacrificing of children (32:35), but he uses the wording of Leviticus, not that of Deuteronomy.⁶³ The prophet speaks of Yahweh's soul abhorring his people (Jer. 14:19), an anthropomorphism found again only at Lev. 26:11 and 30. He also asks if Israel is a servant “born in the house” (Jer. 2:14), a phrase found elsewhere (other than Gen. 14:14) only in P (Gen. 17:12, 13, 23, 27; Lev. 22:11). In Jer. 32, the

⁶² Friedman's interpretation of Jer. 8:8 is also incorrect (*Ibid.*, 189). He thinks that Jeremiah is calling P a false *torah*. Jeremiah is actually attacking the so-called wise men and scribes who have convinced the people that, despite their sinful lifestyles, they are still following Yahweh's *torah*, when in fact they are not.

⁶³ Risa Levitt Kohn, *A New Heart and A New Soul: Ezekiel, the Exile and the Torah*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 358 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 89. Kohn's work is based on her 1997 doctoral thesis. Friedman was a member of her dissertation committee (ix); therefore, much of the information I present here was known to him years before he published *Sources*.

prophet buys property and five times (vv. 11, 12 [twice], 14, 16) he refers to his purchase as a *miqnah*, a word found otherwise only in P (Gen. 17:12, 13, 23, 27; 23:18; Ex. 12:44; Lev. 25:16 [twice], 51; 27:22). Both Yahweh and the prophet's cousin (vv. 7-8) speak of the prophet's right of redemption (*gē'ullāh*), a reference to Lev. 25:24-52.⁶⁴ In chapter 5, we will encounter another phrase from P employed by Jeremiah which Friedman does not discuss at all.

Friedman goes on to show that Ezekiel is very familiar with P, at least with the part of P the rest of us would call Leviticus. He notes that in Eze. 5 and 6, the prophet takes the blessings and curses from Lev. 26 and turns them into a "covenant lawsuit," an indictment, against Israel.⁶⁵ What Friedman fails to note, but what many other scholars have noted, is that in 5:16-17 Ezekiel combines the imagery of Lev. 26:22-26 with the imagery of Deut. 32:23-25, 42. The imagery in both passages speaks of beasts, pestilence, and the sword as instruments of punishment. But only Deuteronomy speaks of arrows and famine as forms of punishment, which also appear in Ezekiel's passage. In the entire Old Testament, only the passages in Deuteronomy and Ezekiel picture Yahweh using arrows against his own people.⁶⁶

The prophet combines terminology from Leviticus and Deuteronomy in other portions of his book as well. Lev. 10:10-11 says that the function of the priest is to "distinguish between holy and unholy, between unclean and clean" and to "teach the children of Israel all the statutes which Yahweh has spoken to them by the hand of Moses." Deuteronomy (17:8, 9; 21:5) says that the functions of the priests include judicial duties, that they are to make decisions in "matters of controversy (*rîb*)." The prophet combines the two functions in 44:23-24: "And they (the priests) shall teach My people the difference between the holy and the unholy, and cause them to discern between the unclean and the clean. In controversy (*rîb*) they shall stand as judges."⁶⁷ Deuteronomy (4:15-18) forbids the making of any idol in the likeness (*tabnît*) of any living thing, including

⁶⁴ The word also appears in Ruth 4:6-7, where it also references Lev. 25. In Eze. 11:15, the word means *kindred*.

⁶⁵ Wrote, 149-150.

⁶⁶ Jason Gile, "Ezekiel 16 and the Song of Moses: A Prophetic Transformation?", *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 130, No. 1 (Spring 2011), 103. See also Kohn, 97.

⁶⁷ Kohn, 96. Also noticed by Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 615.

things that creep (*rāmas*). Ezekiel is taken to the Temple in Jerusalem where he sees “every likeness of creeping thing” (8:10, AT) (*kāl-tabnît remes*) being worshipped. Only in these two contexts does *tabnît* refer to an idol. Elsewhere it means “plan” or “pattern.” In that same verse, Ezekiel also sees “abominable (*šeqeš*) beasts,” *šeqeš* being a term that is used in Is. 66:17 and appears otherwise only in Leviticus (7:21; 11:10-13, 20, 23, 41-42).⁶⁸

More significantly, the prophet takes the entire Song of Moses from Deut. 32:1-43 and turns it into a *rîb* in chapter 16 of his book. Jason Gile points out that both passages follow the same plot line:

(a) Yhwh discovers destitute Israel in a barren location; (b) he delivers her and renders lavish care upon her so that (c) she prospers; (d) Israel in her prosperity forsakes Yhwh; (e) she pursues other gods and (f) forgets her origins, thereby (g) provoking Yhwh to anger; (h) Israel is punished for her sins; and finally, (i) Israel is restored.⁶⁹

Both passages also use the same terminology and motifs (for example, only in these two passages is Israel seen consuming both honey and oil). Ezekiel’s point seems to be that what was predicted by the Song has now come to pass.⁷⁰

Ezekiel employs Deuteronomy’s terminology throughout his book. Like Jeremiah, he refers to the sacrificing of children (20:31), but he uses the wording of Deuteronomy, not that of Leviticus.⁷¹ Deuteronomy (4:34; 5:15; 26:8), Psalms (126:12), Jeremiah (32:21), and Ezekiel (20:33, 34) are the only books to employ the phrase “with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm.” The first three use it in reference to Yahweh’s past deliverance of Israel from Egypt. Ezekiel uses it in reference to Yahweh’s future deliverance of Israel from exile.⁷² Risa Levitt Kohn notes that, except for one appearance in Genesis (45:20) and one appearance in Isaiah (13:18), only Deuteronomy (7:16; 13:9; 19:13, 21; 25:12) and Ezekiel (5:11;

⁶⁸ Kohn, 91.

⁶⁹ Gile, 88.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 92.

⁷¹ Kohn, 89.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 87.

7:4, 9; 8:18; 9:10; 20:17) share the expression “My/your eye will not spare.”⁷³ Kohn could have also noted that only Deuteronomy (13:9) and Ezekiel (5:11; 7:4, 9; 8:18; 9:5, 10) share the longer expression “My/your eye will not spare, neither will I/you pity.”⁷⁴

Ezekiel is also familiar with J. He uses the imagery from Jacob’s blessing of Judah from Gen. 49:9-11 (including lion, cub, prey, gone up, crouches, lioness, scepter, vine, blood) in his poem in chapter 19 to chastise Judah’s monarchy.⁷⁵

Hosea is also familiar with J and with Jacob’s story as it is related in J in particular. But he is also familiar with both P and D. Through the prophet, Yahweh says,

“I will also cause all her mirth to cease,
Her feast days,
Her New Moons,
Her Sabbaths—
All her appointed feasts” (Hos. 2:11),

all of which are proscribed in P. Hosea recalls that the Lord brought Israel out of Egypt by a prophet (Hos. 12:13), referring, of course, to Moses. But Moses is called a prophet only in D (Deut. 18:15, 18; 34:10). One of the curses in Deuteronomy is that the Israelites will be returned to Egypt (Deut. 28:68). Hosea says this will happen (Hos. 8:13). Deuteronomy develops the concept of God’s love for

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 91.

⁷⁴ Kohn’s work obviously has much useful information in it, but this is one example of why her work is open to criticism. She did not include Eze. 9:5 in her list of references because she wants to say, “In Ezekiel this expression refers exclusively to Yahweh” (91), which is not correct. Similarly, she says that the phrase “scattered among the nations” occurs in Ezekiel ten times, “always in connection with Yahweh’s dispersion of Israel” (88). She missed Eze. 28:25, so it actually occurs eleven times, but three of those references (29:12; 30:23, 26) refer to the dispersion of Egypt, not Israel. She correctly says that the terms *’p* and *hnh* (anger and fury) are never used together in P and she correctly says that the terms are used together in D, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel to describe Yahweh’s wrath (92)—but not, as she implies, *only* in those books. For some reason she does not list the references in Psalms (6:1; 78:38; 90:7), Isaiah (42:25; 63:3, 6; 66:15), Lamentations (4:11), Daniel (9:16), Micah (5:15), and Nahum (1:6). She also missed Deut. 29:22 and Jer. 32:37 and did not understand that *’p* in Eze. 23:25 means “nose,” not “anger.” There are other errors as well. See also n. 15 in Chapter 5 of this book.

⁷⁵ Gile, 105-106.

Israel. Hosea picks up this concept from Deuteronomy, emphasizes it more so than any other book in the Old Testament, and develops it even further.⁷⁶

The Gospel accounts record that the Pentateuchal book from which Jesus quoted most often was the book of Deuteronomy. Yet every documentarian concedes that the entire Pentateuch came into existence centuries earlier. That Jesus quoted from Deuteronomy, therefore, does not mean that a separate D source existed in his time, only that Deuteronomy was his favorite Pentateuchal book. These three prophets may have had their favorite parts of the Pentateuch, with Deuteronomy being Jeremiah's, Leviticus being Ezekiel's, and Genesis being Hosea's, but even so, all three prophets knew the entire Pentateuch. For them, the Pentateuch was a single Pentateuch, not four documents.

Discontinuous Documents

For his fourth argument in *Sources*, Friedman says, "One of the most compelling arguments for the existence of the source documents is the fact that, when the sources are separated from one another, we can read each source as a flowing, sensible text. That is, the story continues without a break."⁷⁷ This is also his second argument in support of elevating the Hypothesis to a "fact."

The question we must ask is, "*Whose* sources are flowing, sensible texts?" Friedman, of course, is saying that his sources are flowing and sensible. Yet Baden claims that his sources are also flowing and sensible. In other words, if we were to swap some of Friedman's E passages with some of his J passages so that we end up with Baden's sources, the resultant documents would still be continuous, complete, and coherent. And if we were to swap again so that we get Wellhausen's documents and swap again so that we get S.R. Driver's documents, they would still be continuous, complete, and coherent.

Continuity can also be used to justify documents other than the traditional J, E, P, and D. Jason M. H. Gaines believes that P was originally a poetic narrative which was supplemented by prosaic pas-

⁷⁶ Carsten Vang, "God's Love According to Hosea and Deuteronomy: A Prophetic Reworking of a Deuteronomistic Concept?", *Tyndale Bulletin*, 62.2 (2011), 173-194.

⁷⁷ *Sources*, 13.

sages. His reason for believing this? “[C]onnecting all of the poetic lines together forms a nearly complete, independent, and previously unrecognized document.”⁷⁸ Carr points to the document proposed by Reinhard Kratz, which merely consists of Ex. 15:22a, Num. 20:1aβb, Num. 22:1, Num. 25:1, Deut. 34:5a, Deut. 34:6, and Josh. 2:1, a completely readable document.⁷⁹ As Carr rightly states,

Most extensive texts are quite complex (e.g., this book), and given enough time, it should be no surprise that scholars can produce shorter, readable versions of them, perhaps more readable than the original. Indeed, just the past few decades of scholarship are littered with various theories proposing more and less readable earlier strata standing behind existing biblical texts. Yet the documented variety of readable sources that can be produced out of Pentateuchal and other texts militates against the probability that such reconstructed sources ever existed in an earlier time. Instead, given what we know about partial preservation and modification of prior traditions by ancient scribes, it is more likely that most (semi-)readable texts produced by contemporary transmission-historians are nothing but the inventions of their creators.⁸⁰

I produced two continuous texts from Friedman’s book. Continuity, therefore, does not necessarily connote correctness.

Besides, the documents are not as continuous as Friedman would like us to believe. It does not take him long to modify his sweeping generalization.

⁷⁸ Jason M. H. Gaines, *The Poetic Priestly Source* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2015), 2.

⁷⁹ *Formation*, 112-113.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 114. The same point militates against the traditio-historical and the supplementation approach taken by certain scholars such as Rendtorff *et al.* For decades, the *Reader’s Digest Condensed Books* (now known as the *Reader’s Digest Select Editions*) have “condensed” popular fiction and (for a time) nonfiction works, removing certain passages while retaining the essential plot or ideas of each work. This does not mean that the editors have recovered the original narrative or manuscript to which later “traditions” or supplements have been redacted. It simply means that, with a certain amount of ingenuity, it is possible to find a narrative within a narrative and a document within a document. It does not mean that one has accurately reconstructed the history of the text.

Specifically, the combined JE text that was assembled by RJE reads as a flowing narrative, with only an occasional gap. When interrupted by material from P or other sources, it picks up after the interruption where it had left off. The P text likewise is a flowing narrative, with only an occasional lacuna. Within JE, each of its source texts, J and E, flows sensibly much of the time as well, but not always. It appears that RJE was willing to make cuts in his received texts (J and E) to a far greater degree than was R in his received texts (JE, P, D, and other, smaller texts).⁸¹

While this appears to be an honest and realistic acknowledgment that there are some gaps in the documents, he is still suppressing what he really thinks. In his other writings, he actually comes to the exact opposite conclusion: the documents are not complete and continuous at all. In his article in the *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, he says, "When the strands of the interwoven source works are untwisted and separated from one another, neither J nor E can be read as a continuous story. Each is incomplete."⁸² And P did not attain document status *until it was redacted to J and E!* When R first received P, it was merely

a collection of accounts, lists, and legal materials.... This collection of Priestly compositions, further, is an incomplete corpus. Parts of accounts are missing, and matters which seem crucial to the Priestly perspective are not treated; and without the *tôle-dôt*, plagues, and Stations frameworks the whole does not hold together well.⁸³

⁸¹ *Sources*, 13.

⁸² Richard E. Friedman, "Torah (Pentateuch)," in David N. Freedman, ed., *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (N.Y.: Doubleday, 1992), VI, 618. He says essentially the same thing in "Three Major Redactors of the Torah," in Chaim Cohen, et al., eds., *Birkat Shalom: Studies in the Bible, Ancient Near Eastern Literature, and Postbiblical Judaism Presented to Shalom M. Paul on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008), 34.

⁸³ Richard Elliott Friedman, *The Exile and Biblical Narrative: The Formation of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly Works*, Harvard Semitic Monographs 22 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981, hereafter referred to as *Narrative*), 118-119. As part of his sixth Argument (*Sources*, 26-27), he says that P follows the same storyline that JE does and was written as an alternative to JE. We can know, he says, that R did not rearrange P to match the sequence in JE because P is a continuous text. That P is, in

In other words, when he says that P reads as a flowing, sensible text, he really means that P and R *together* read as a flowing, sensible text. Remove R, and P falls apart.⁸⁴

A look through the documents reveals why he concludes that they are not continuous after all. In *Hidden*, Friedman reproduced the entire J document, which meant that he had to acknowledge the gaps in J by inserting these bracketed statements:

[Accounts of the births of the other sons, except Joseph, are not present]
[Rachel gave birth to a son and named him Joseph]
[No story of Joseph's rise from prison to high rank is preserved]
[A report of Jacob's death is not present]
[The account of the oppression of the children of Israel is lost]
[No story of plagues or of Israel's departure is present]
[No report of the arrival at Sinai is present]⁸⁵

He concedes that in J's narrative in Exodus, "the gaps are huge and are not restricted to minor points."⁸⁶

In J, Yahweh tells Noah to board an ark that no one built; it just appears out of nowhere. Noah builds the ark only in P. Also in J, Yahweh closes the ark door (Gen. 7:16b), but only after it has been raining for forty days and nights (v. 12), meaning that the ark itself should also have been flooded.⁸⁷ J does not record the deaths of

fact, *not* a continuous text does away with that argument. See also Baden's rebuttal to the argument that P follows and was written as an alternative to JE in *Redaction*, 197-207, and *Composition*, 188-192. Essentially, he argues that P is simply following the same, or a similar, Israelite tradition that J and E were following.

⁸⁴ Indeed, in Friedman's scheme of things, P is so dependent on R that he seemingly confuses the two at times. For example, in his word list, he says that the phrase "in that very day" appears eleven times in the Pentateuch, once in R at Deut. 32:48 and the other ten times in P (*Sources*, 8), when it actually appears nine times in P and a second time in R at Ex. 12:51 (141). He also says that the phrase "gathered to his people" appears eleven times (I count ten, see Appendix C; Driver counts nine, *ILOT*, 133, no. 25(b)), all in P (*Sources*, 9, and Friedman, "Torah (Pentateuch)," 610), when the two appearances at Deut. 32:50 are actually in R (*Sources*, 364).

⁸⁵ *Hidden*, 102, 113, 126, 127, 129, 131.

⁸⁶ Friedman, "Three Major Redactors of the Torah," 34.

⁸⁷ Which is why Driver (*ILOT*, 14) says that v. 16b in J originally came after v. 9, though he offers no reason for why, in the present text, it has been moved.

Abraham, Isaac, or Jacob, though it knows that Joseph buried Jacob. J, E, and P know that the first patriarch's name was Abram before Gen. 17 and was Abraham afterwards, but neither J nor E have a story in which his name was changed; only P does. Similarly, God changes Jacob's name to Israel only in E and P, yet J also knows that Jacob's other name is Israel, and J does not use that other name until Jacob's name is changed in the other two documents. In J, Yahweh tells the Israelites to observe the Feast of Unleavened Bread, "as I commanded you" (Ex. 34:18). Nowhere in J does Yahweh command the Israelites to observe the Feast before Ex. 34. That command is in E (Ex. 13:3-7). J's Spy Story starts with, "And he said to them" (Num. 13:17), but we are never told who "he" is or who "them" are; P tells us (vv. 4-16).

Friedman had to insert the first bracket after Leah gives birth to her first four sons. The story says, "Then she stopped bearing" (Gen. 29:35). The next thing it says is, "[she] said, 'Yahweh shall add to me another son'" (Gen. 30:24). Read continuously, this sounds like Leah was expressing a desire for more sons. But it is actually what Rachel said when Joseph was born, which is why Friedman had to insert the second bracket. J does not record the births of the sons of the handmaids nor the births of Leah's last two sons nor the birth of Benjamin. Those births are recorded in E. Yet, in J, Joseph knows he and Benjamin come from the same mother (Gen. 43:29) and the brothers know there are twelve of them (Gen. 42:13).

Friedman has E start at Gen. 20:1, in the middle of Abraham's Story, and admits, "It certainly does not appear to be the beginning of the source, as Abraham and Sarah come out of nowhere."⁸⁸ E must be missing the beginning of Jacob's story also because it does not record the births of Jacob and Esau. Instead, Jacob's story begins with the theophany at Bethel:

And he took one of the stones of that place and put it at his head,
and he lay down in that place to sleep (Gen. 28:11b).

We do not find out who "he" is until three verses later. The story ends with Jacob's vow (Gen. 28:20-22), then E jumps to:

⁸⁸ *Sources*, 61.

Rachel envied her sister, and said to Jacob, "Give me children, or else I die!" (Gen. 30:1b).

E does not tell us how Rachel and her sister entered the story or why Rachel envied her sister. It goes on to tell us that Leah had stopped giving birth, though Leah had not appeared in E at all before now, let alone give birth. When she does give birth to two sons, E knows that they are her fifth and sixth sons (Gen. 30:17, 19) and even Leah knows that she has given birth to six sons (v. 20). Yet the births of the first four sons are recorded in J, not E.

This passage ends with

Then God remembered Rachel, and God listened to her and opened her womb. And she conceived and bore a son, and said, "God has taken away my reproach." So she called his name Joseph, (Gen. 30:22-24a)

then jumps to

And he heard the words of Laban's sons, saying, "Jacob has taken away all that was our father's, and from what was our father's he has acquired all this wealth" (Gen. 31:1, AT).

Obviously, E is missing something here.

Like J, E does not record the deaths of Abraham, Isaac, or Jacob. Only P does.

In E, Moses arrives in Egypt and shows the people the signs God had told him to show them. "So the people believed; and when they heard that Yahweh had visited the children of Israel and that he had looked on their affliction, then they bowed their heads and worshipped" (Ex. 4:31). The next thing E says is: "So they said, 'The God of the Hebrews has met with us'" (Ex. 5:3). Read continuously, the "they" should be the people. Instead, it is Moses and Aaron, who are now speaking to Pharaoh. E is missing a transition that is now supplied by J.

Friedman tries to divide the crossing of the sea (Ex. 14-15) between J, P, and E.⁸⁹ This is how E describes the drowning of the Egyptian army (Ex. 14:19a, 20a, 25a; 15:20-21):

And the Angel of Elohim, who went before the camp of Israel, moved and went behind them. So it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel. And He took off their chariot wheels, so that they drove them with difficulty.

Then Miriam the prophetess, the sister of Aaron, took the timbrel in her hand; and all the women went out after her with timbrels and with dances. And Miriam answered them:

“Sing to the Lord,
For He has triumphed gloriously!
The horse and its rider
He has thrown into the sea!”

Miriam sings about something that E never depicts.

As Friedman noted above, J knows how Joseph ended up in jail but it does not know how he got out of jail and ended up second in command over Egypt. E knows how he got out of jail, but it does not know how he ended up in jail in the first place. Read separately, J and E are incoherent. And E only gets more incoherent as the Joseph story progresses.

Then Reuben spoke to his father, saying, “Kill my two sons if I do not bring him back to you; put him in my hands, and I will bring him back to you” (Gen. 42:37).

“And may El Shaddai give you mercy before the man, that he may release your other brother and Benjamin. If I am bereaved, I am bereaved!” (Gen. 43:14).

Then he brought Simeon out to them (Gen. 43:23).

Then Joseph said to his brothers, “I am Joseph; does my father still live?” But his brothers could not answer him, for they were dismayed in his presence (Gen. 45:3).

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 142-146.

So Israel took his journey with all that he had, and came to Beersheba, and offered sacrifices to the God of his father Isaac (Gen. 46:1).

The Joseph story is coherent only when we read J and E together.
P's Joseph story is not much better.

Now Jacob dwelt in the land where his father was a stranger, in the land of Canaan (Gen. 37:1).

Joseph was thirty years old when he stood before Pharaoh, king of Egypt (Gen. 41:46).

So they took their livestock and their goods, which they had acquired in the land of Canaan, and went to Egypt, Jacob and all his descendants with him (Gen. 46:6).

P offers no explanation for how Joseph came to be in Egypt or how he came to be standing before Pharaoh or why Jacob and his family decided to move to Egypt. In 48:3-7, Jacob is speaking only to Joseph, but in the very next P passage (49:29-33), he is suddenly talking to all of his sons.

P's creation story ends on a positive note:

Then God saw everything that He had made, and indeed it was very good. So the evening and the morning were the sixth day.

Thus the heavens and the earth, and all the host of them, were finished. And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had done, and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had done. Then God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because in it He rested from all His work which God had created and made (Gen. 1:31-2:3).

P's very next story begins:

Noah was a just man, perfect in his generations. Noah walked with God. And Noah begot three sons: Shem, Ham, and Japheth. The earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence. So God looked upon the earth, and indeed it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted their way on the earth (Gen. 6:9-12).

Again, P offers no explanation for this sudden turnaround from everything being good to everything being corrupt. J gives that explanation.

Like E, P does not record the births of Jacob and Esau, a fact which Friedman freely admits.⁹⁰ It jumps from the marriage of Isaac and Rebekah (Gen. 25:20) to the marriage of Esau to Canaanite women (Gen. 26:34). It then tells us that Esau's marriages upset Rebekah, so Isaac sends Jacob to Paddan Aram to find a wife from Laban's family, which upsets Esau, who then marries an Ishmaelite woman (Gen. 27:46-28:9). The next thing it tells us is: "And he carried away all his livestock and all his possessions which he had gained, his acquired livestock which he had gained in Paddan Aram, to go to his father Isaac in the land of Canaan" (Gen. 31:18). We have to assume that the passage is referring to Jacob, even though it does not use his name, because he is the only son of Isaac who went to Paddan Aram. P does not tell us whether he successfully found a wife until Gen. 35:22-26, when it merely lists his twelve sons and who gave birth to them.

In the canonical text, major characters are introduced through genealogies and/or birth stories. P is especially known for its genealogies. Even so, major characters in P have a tendency to just suddenly appear. Esau and Jacob, as we have seen, just suddenly appear. Noah just suddenly appears. His genealogy is given after the Flood Story, but it does not extend to Terah, Abraham's father. Terah just suddenly appears. Moses just suddenly appears in Ex. 6:2.

Concerning the Plagues Story, Friedman admits, "Separated from one another, neither JE nor the Priestly material flows comfortably."⁹¹ P's plagues usually end with a comment such as, "And Pharaoh's heart grew hard, and he did not heed them, as Yahweh had said" (Ex. 7:22). In Ex. 12, Yahweh instructs the Israelites to keep the Passover while he strikes down the firstborn. P notes the Israelites' obedience in only one line: "Then the children of Israel went away and did so; just as Yahweh had commanded Moses and Aaron, so they did" (Ex. 12:28). P does not even describe the striking down of the firstborn; E does. The next thing we see in P is Israel leaving Egypt. Again, P provides no explanation for this sudden

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 71.

⁹¹ Friedman, "Sacred History and Theology," 31.

turnaround in events. There is no mention of Pharaoh's change of heart, no command from Pharaoh telling them to go, nothing. That information comes from E.

So, despite his bravura at the beginning, Friedman ends up, not with documents, but with fragments. J, E, and P are not continuous, coherent documents. Each of them has gaps, sometimes serious gaps. When we separate them, we cannot read each source as a flowing, sensible text. To completely understand them, we need information that only the other sources can supply. The narratives are coherent only when the sources are read together.

Baden's suppression of evidence is even worse than Friedman's, perhaps because he understands, more so than Friedman does, that the continuity of the documents is essential to the Documentary Hypothesis. The claim that the documents are coherent, complete, and continuous is what sets the Hypothesis apart from the other hypotheses that try to explain the anomalies of the Pentateuch. At best, dividing the Pentateuch according to its anomalies only results in creating dozens or even hundreds of fragments. Scholars of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries even suggested that the Pentateuch had been created by the uniting of these fragments. This theory was known as the Fragmentary Hypothesis. The success of the Documentary Hypothesis over the Fragmentary Hypothesis came about, as Baden explains, with the recognition "that alongside the narrative difficulties in the text—indeed, hand in hand with them—are marked continuities, historical claims of one passage that are assumed and incorporated and developed in another...."⁹² That four such continuities can be detected among the fragments is the reason why the documentarians insist that there are four originally independent sources behind the Pentateuch: "The original independence of the documents is to be seen in the coherence, continuity, and completeness of each.... This claim—four originally independent documents that have been subsequently combined and interwoven—is the central assertion of the Documentary Hypothesis."⁹³ If, in fact, the four sources are not coherent, continuous, or complete, then the Hypothesis, along with its documents, falls apart.

⁹² *Composition*, 19.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 20.

This is exactly the position taken by the scholars who follow what Baden calls the European approach, an approach advocated by Rolf Rendtorff, who, in a sense, has resurrected the Fragmentary Hypothesis of the nineteenth century.⁹⁴ According to the European approach, the Pentateuch consists of numerous small literary units (as little as six or seven lines each) that were gradually linked together literarily (by numerous redactors) into increasingly larger complexes. To understand a passage in the Pentateuch, therefore, the scholar must uncover the smallest literary unit(s) underlying the passage and then reconstruct the literary history that led to the formation of the passage as we have it now.

Baden agrees with Rendtorff when he says, concerning the J document, "If one does not succeed in demonstrating this chief source convincingly, then the hypothesis as a whole can scarcely be maintained."⁹⁵ Baden takes up Rendtorff's challenge, saying that he will demonstrate that J is a document by proving its coherence and continuity. He then goes on for a little over twelve pages to show the literary links between the J passages from the beginning of the J document to its end. At the conclusion of his demonstration, he insists that J is a complete document.⁹⁶ Baden seems to have successfully answered Rendtorff's challenge. The Hypothesis seems to be safe and secure after all. But all is not as it seems.

After his defense of J, he moves on to prove the coherence of E, again contra Rendtorff, only in the end to finally admit

One of the primary arguments against E as an originally independent document is its ostensibly fragmentary nature. Even scholars writing in defense of an E document frequently describe it as the fragmentary remains of an originally complete whole. There is some truth to this. E lacks a clear beginning.... The story of the Exodus proper, whether it included plagues or

⁹⁴ According to Baden (*Ibid.*, 55-56, 60), though Konrad Schmid would say this is an unfair assessment of Rendtorff's position. See his "Has European Scholarship Abandoned the Documentary Hypothesis? Some Reminders on Its History and Remarks on Its Current Status," in *The Pentateuch*, 17-30.

⁹⁵ Rolf Rendtorff, *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch*, trans. by John J. Scullion, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 89 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 108.

⁹⁶ *Composition*, 67-80.

something else, is referred to in other E passages (Exod 11:1; 18:8-10) but is missing from E itself; so too the beginning of the Jacob story.⁹⁷

But that is perfectly acceptable because

What must be understood in evaluating the completeness of E is that though E is missing some significant pieces, it is not alone in this. Both J and P are also incomplete. J is missing the birth of Isaac and the death of Abraham; is fragmentary from the end of Numbers 14 on, comprising perhaps a handful of verses in Numbers 20-21 before the blessing of Moses in Deuteronomy 33; and is most likely missing a section in the Sinai pericope as well. Kuenen goes so far as to say of J, "It is no more complete than E." P, for its part, lacks the births of Jacob and Esau, Jacob's marriages, and the descent of Joseph to Egypt. The incompleteness we recognize in E, then, is not unique to E: all the sources (with the exception of D) have gaps. E is different only in degree, not in kind.⁹⁸

Hence, in defending E against its critics, Baden acknowledges J has gaps, that J is even fragmentary at its terminus. But in defending J against Rendtorff, Baden suppresses that knowledge. He must do so. If he does not, then Rendtorff is correct: J is not a document, but a collection of fragments. And if J is a collection of fragments, then J, and with it, the whole Documentary Hypothesis, falls apart.

Baden also quotes Friedman's statement from the *Anchor Bible Dictionary* concerning the incompleteness of J and E. His response is, "such an assertion is based on one's particular view of what makes a narrative 'complete.'"⁹⁹ With this statement, Baden has hit the issue square on the head. Whenever a documentarian, even if that documentarian is Baden himself, declares that the documents are complete, he is merely offering an *opinion*.¹⁰⁰ This is why each

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 127.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹⁹ *Redaction*, 94.

¹⁰⁰ As Schwartz acknowledges concerning the continuity of the P narrative ("The Priestly Account of the Theophany," 107).

documentarian can propose a set of documents contrary to those of everyone else and still proclaim that his are complete and continuous—because *in his opinion* they are. And with this statement, Baden exposes the ultimate weakness in the Hypothesis. After rejecting the European approach as subjective and arguing that the fate of the Hypothesis hangs on whether the documents are complete, he essentially admits that the validity of the Hypothesis ultimately rests on *his opinion*. Even so, with so much at stake, he finally concedes that, even in his opinion, the documents are incomplete.

And yet, Rendtorff may be wrong and Baden may be right after all. The documents may be complete. Tatian conflated the four Gospels to form the *Diatessaron*, but he did not conflate any of the Gospels *entirely*. Moore estimates that Tatian incorporated approximately 96 percent of John, 76.5 percent of Matthew, 50 percent of Mark, and 66.2 percent of Luke.¹⁰¹ We have already seen that Moore believes that it would be almost impossible to reconstruct the Synoptic Gospels from the *Diatessaron*, but if we could, at best we could reconstruct only 50 percent of Mark. If we discovered that there were gaps in our reconstruction, this would not disprove the existence of the Gospel of Mark. And the *Diatessaron* is not the only analogue that can be cited. Carr notes that there are plenty of analogues which demonstrate “that scribes did *not* preserve their source documents unaltered and without gaps, *particularly* in cases of conflation of parallel sources.”¹⁰² So, even though J, E, and P may have gaps, they still could be parts of even larger documents that are complete, continuous, and coherent.

This sounds like a wonderful supporting argument for the Hypothesis, but it also opens the door to more speculation. Scholars can now dream up hundreds of different documents with improbable gaps, point to the *Diatessaron*, and say, “That proves that my documents could still be complete, continuous, and coherent—in *my opinion*--in spite of the gaps.”

The point is that the continuity argument is pointless. It does not help elevate the Hypothesis to the level of fact at all. In fact, it does quite the opposite. Are the documents complete, continuous, and coherent? The answer is: *no one knows* because no one has physical

¹⁰¹ Moore, 245-246.

¹⁰² *Formation*, 112 (italics his).

copies of the documents in front of him or her.¹⁰³ The one mark which distinguishes the Documentary Hypothesis from all other hypotheses is its claim that the sources are continuous, complete, and coherent, but whether that claim is true or not ultimately rests, not on fact, but on one's *opinion*, which can shift depending on whether one is suppressing the evidence. While the analogues can be used to support the contention that the documents are continuous despite the gaps, those very same analogues can also be used to support a myriad of hypotheses with their supposedly complete documents. If the argument proves anything it is that the Pentateuch itself is complete, continuous, and coherent, for one cannot understand any of the documents without reading the others. Friedman's fourth line of evidence, therefore, is no evidence at all.

¹⁰³ Baden suggests that E is missing its beginning, not because the compiler excised it, but because that is how the compiler found it (*Composition*, 127, 225; see also *Redaction*, 258, n. 2; 260, n. 4). But we will not know which option is true until someone discovers a copy of the E document.

Chapter 3

Circular Reasoning

Circular reasoning occurs when the arguer starts his or her argument with what he or she is trying to prove, that is, he or she already accepts as true what he or she is trying to prove is true. A blatant exercise in circular reasoning is this conversation:

Arguer: I always tell the truth.

Respondent: How am I supposed to know that that is true?

Arguer: Because I said so.

Respondent: Just because you said so does not mean that it is true.

Arguer: Yes, it does.

Respondent: Why is that?

Arguer: Because I always tell the truth.

To break this cycle of circularity, the Respondent should require some proof outside of the Arguer's self-assertions.

At least one redactor is necessary to the Hypothesis: if the Pentateuch was created by the conflation of documents, then someone had to have conflated them. However, to make the Hypothesis work, the documentarians are required to make the redactor(s) do more than just mechanically cut and paste the documents. The documentarians may deny this, but quite often the roles they give to the redactor(s) are the result of circular reasoning.

Baden insists that Num. 11 is a combination of two stories, one from J and the other from E. In both stories, Moses speaks to Yahweh and Yahweh speaks to Moses. Moses' speech in both stories nat-

urally would have started with, “And Moses said to Yahweh,” and Yahweh’s speech in both stories naturally would have started with, “And Yahweh said to Moses.” Yet, in the canonical text, we find each introductory statement only once. Baden’s solution, of course, is that the compiler excised one occurrence of each of those statements from the stories.¹ Since he has no objective or physical evidence to back this up, that is, since he has no proof outside of his assertions, the argument is:

Baden: There were originally two sets of speeches with two sets of introductory statements.

Respondent: Then why is there only one set of introductory statements in the text?

Baden: Because the compiler cut out one set of introductory statements.

Respondent: How do you know that the compiler cut out one set of introductory statements?

Baden: Because there were originally two sets of introductory statements.

Content, Characteristics, Continuity, Consistency, and Circularity

Suppose we were to give a child a number of marbles and four bags and told the child to sort the marbles into the bags. Suppose further that the child decides that all of the blue marbles should go into the first bag. Should we be impressed when we find only blue marbles in the first bag since that was the criterion for entry into the bag in the first place?

Now suppose we repeated this experiment four times with four different children. In the first bag of the first child, we find all blue marbles. In the first bag of the second child, we find both blue and black marbles (because they both begin with “b”). In the first bag of the third child, we find striped marbles. And in the first bag of the fourth child, we find small marbles. Should we believe them when they tell us that they used the same scientific and objective criteria for sorting the marbles? Or should we conclude that each of them

¹ *Composition*, 88-89.

chose to use a different set of criteria, that is, the criteria they chose were completely subjective?

The documentarians like to tout the consistency of the documents, whether it be how consistently a document uses a list of words, or how consistently a document employs a certain style, or how consistently one document notes peoples' ages while the other documents do not. Yet, this consistency is a result of their circular argumentation: P uses a certain list of words because only those words were allowed into P in the first place. Even so, the results they have achieved are not as consistent as they would like us to believe. Despite the fact that hundreds of scholars have spent the last two hundred years dividing and redividing the Pentateuch, they still cannot completely agree as to which verse belongs to which document: hand the Pentateuch to Wellhausen, Driver, Friedman, and Baden, and you will get back four different sets of documents. This means that there is another problem with their methodology: it is based on subjectivism.

Returning to Friedman's second converging line of evidence, he says that "Certain words and phrases occur disproportionately—or even entirely—in one source but not in others. The quantity of such terms that consistently belong to a particular source is considerable."² He lists "twenty-four examples of such terms, which are consistent through nearly four hundred occurrences."³ For example, "The word 'congregation' (*'ēdāh*) occurs more than one hundred times in the Torah, all in P, without a single exception."⁴ He uses this argument in *Wrote* to justify dividing the Flood Story into a P version and a J version:

But it is not only that it is possible to carve out two stories. What makes the case so powerful is that each story consistently uses its own language. The P story... consistently refers to the deity as God. The J story always uses the name Yahweh. P refers to the sex of the animals with the words "male and female" (Gen. 6:19; 7:9, 16). J uses the terms "man and his woman" (7:2) as well as

² *Sources*, 8.

³ *Ibid.*, 28.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 9.

male and female. P says that everything “expired” (6:17; 7:21). J says that everything “died” (7:22).⁵

Friedman further argues that this list is not the result of circular reasoning.

I have also seen the claim that the scholar just chooses the evidence to fit his or her arrangement: for example, that the scholar assigns every verse that has the word “congregation” in it to P and then says that the recurrence of this word in P is proof of the hypothesis. This argument should be seen as false in the light of all the evidence presented here. No scholar is clever enough to make all of these terms line up within the sources—and to make it all come out consistent with the other signs of the sources.⁶

What Friedman wants us to believe is that the documentarians divided the Pentateuch into four documents, not on the basis of vocabulary, and that when they were done, all of the verses that have the word “congregation” in it ended up in P. To draw up his list of twenty-four examples, therefore, Friedman searched through the documents looking for words and phrases that appeared only or primarily in one document. If a word or phrase appeared in more than one document, it did not make his list.

Even if this were true, this is still an exercise in circular reasoning. The argument rests on the well-known fact that each author employs his or her own bank of vocabulary: Faulkner’s bank of vocabulary is not Hemingway’s. The word lists, therefore, are evidence that the four documents were written by four authors, which, in turn, is evidence that the Hypothesis is correct when it says that the four documents once existed independently. But the existence of the word lists is dependent on the existence of the documents, for if the documents did not exist, neither would the word lists. Thus, the argument’s conclusion (the four documents once existed) is also the argument’s starting premise.

⁵ *Wrote*, 43-44.

⁶ *Sources*, 30-31.

The argument is circular for another reason. If I split a text in two, I can prove that two authors wrote the two texts by adding words that appear only in text A or only text B (that is, words that support my already drawn conclusion) and strike the words that appear in both texts (that is, words that contradict my already drawn conclusion). Then, lo and behold, I end up with two word lists, one for text A and another for text B, which support the conclusion with which I started.

With this method one can justify any division of any text. I used this method to justify the division of chapter 8 of Friedman's own book. And I can use this method to justify the division of the paragraph from *Wrote* quoted above:

A	B
The P story...consistently refers to the deity as God.	The J story always uses the name Yahweh.
P refers to the sex of the animals with the words "male and female" (Gen. 6:19; 7:9, 16).	J uses the terms "man and his woman" (7:2) as well as male and female.
P says that everything "expired" (6:17; 7:21).	J says that everything "died" (7:22).

A is interested only in P's version of the Flood Story, while B is interested only in J's version. In the first pair of sentences, A uses "consistently refers," while B prefers "always uses." In the second pair of sentences, A again uses "refers" while B again prefers "uses." In addition, A uses the term "words" while B prefers the word "terms." The verb in both sentences of the third pair is "says," but this does not damage the case at all. As Friedman himself points out, both P and J utilize the words "male and female," but he can still find two sources within the Flood Story.⁷

⁷ A case of this sort would further contend that the convoluted style of the paragraph's first sentence ("But it is not only that it is possible") stands in sharp contrast to the simple styles of the sources. The second sentence has A's word "consistently"

I can also use this method to successfully argue that the Pentateuch should be divided not into four theoretical documents (JEPD) but into its most natural division, into the five books themselves (GELND), and that each book was written by its own author. A list of terms that would justify this division can be compiled by simply adding the terms that appear only or primarily in one book and striking those that appear in two or more books. Appendix A presents the list of terms that appear only or primarily within each book and *nowhere else in the Old Testament*. Appendix B presents the list of terms that may appear throughout the Old Testament, but *within the Pentateuch* these terms appear only or primarily within each book. The book of Deuteronomy was not included because Biblical scholars are already aware that Deuteronomy contains dozens of words and phrases that are unique to that book. Driver, for example, lists 41 words and phrases that appear only or primarily in Deuteronomy which are consistent through at least 341 occurrences.⁸ In Genesis alone there are 166 words and phrases that appear only or primarily within that book and which are consistent through 1,118 occurrences. Altogether, in the first four books, there are 417 words and phrases which are consistent through 2,897 occurrences.

In addition, we can detect within the books the same usages of the words that the documentarians detect within the documents. Baden thinks that the documents' use of synonyms is more significant than their use of banks of vocabulary. Thus, for "handmaiden," P and J use *šipḥāh*, whereas E uses *šmāh*.⁹ Within the books, Genesis uses *šalumāh* for "sheaf," whereas Leviticus and Deuteronomy use *šomer*. Baden thinks it is even more significant when the documents use the same word but with different meanings. Thus, *minḥah* in J and E means any sort of gift, whereas in P it means specifically a grain-offering.¹⁰ In Leviticus and Deuteronomy, as we just saw, *šomer* means "sheaf," but in Exodus it means a unit of measure (an

and B's term "uses." All of this proves that the redactor wrote these two sentences in an effort to make the two sources appear as one.

⁸ *ILOT*, 99-102. I say "at least" because for item 33 he lists no verses and for some of the other items he lists two or three verses, then says "and constantly" or "and repeatedly."

⁹ *Composition*, 30.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

“omer”). According to the documentarians, the Qal form for “he be-got” is used by J, whereas the Hiphil is used by P.¹¹ Genesis uses only the Qal Future form of “expire,” whereas Numbers uses only the Qal Preterite and the Qal Infinitive.

Note, however, that dividing the text this way does away with Friedman’s word list. “Congregation” does not appear in this word list because it appears in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, which means that it appears in more than one book and must be struck from the list. “Prison,” though, which could not be on Friedman’s list because it is used by both J and E, now appears on this list because it is used only by Genesis. This is why the word lists are dependent on the existence of the documents: change how one divides the text and the word lists inherently change.

Conversely, a list of terms can also be used to do just the opposite: to justify that a group of divided texts should be united. In his book, *Hidden*, Friedman argues that J extends past the Pentateuch through 1 Kings 2 in a united work he calls *In the Day*. He justifies uniting the various texts which are now divided and scattered through the Pentateuch and the historical books by drawing up a list of 50 words and phrases that appear only or primarily in these texts.¹²

Yet, this methodology can also be used to support the argument that the Pentateuch is a unified text after all. Friedman points out that the phrase “fire came out from before YHWH” appears three times in the Pentateuch and that all three of its appearances are in P,¹³ but conveniently overlooks the fact that the command, “You shall not boil a young goat in its mother’s milk,” also appears only three times in the Pentateuch (and only three times in the Old Testament), once in E (Ex. 23:19), once in J (Ex. 34:26), and once in D (Deut. 14:21), which, by Friedman’s own argument in support of *In the Day*, would suggest that all three documents were written by the same author. Appendix C lists the 216 words and phrases that ap-

¹¹ See, for example, Hendel, 39-42 and *ILOT*, 134, no. 45. All 11 of J’s usages and all but 3 of P’s 62 usages (the exceptions being Lev. 25:45 and Num. 26:29, 58) cited by both Hendel and Driver appear in Genesis. So if we divided the Pentateuch into its Five Books rather than into four documents, the argument could be made that one author used both verbal forms.

¹² *Hidden*, 327-330, 379-387.

¹³ *Sources*, 9.

pear only or primarily in the Pentateuch (but in more than one book) and which are consistent through 2,291 occurrences. If we add the 143 words and phrases that appear in Appendix A, along with the 41 words and phrases that appear only in Deuteronomy, to the words and phrases that appear in Appendix C, then we have a very long list, much longer than 50 words, which can justify the contention that the Pentateuch was written by a single author.¹⁴ To strengthen the case even further, between Appendices A, B, and C, I count 331 words and phrases which cross documents 3,012 times.¹⁵ Of these, 13 appear in the four main documents 273 times, which is evidence that all four documents were written by the same author.

To reverse the argument again, we could come up with a word list which would justify splitting *In the Day*. For this purpose, I will use *I* to represent the entire work, *J* for the J portion, and *K* for the non-J portion (Joshua through 1 K), so that $I = J + K$. Appendix D lists words that appear only or primarily in J but not in K and words that appear only or primarily in K but not in J. Nine of the latter words also appear in Friedman's list, which means that only 41 of his words and phrases actually appear in both J and K (although in Appendix E, I list an additional 7 words and phrases which appear only or primarily in both J and K). However, Appendix D lists 74 words and phrases which appear in either J or K, which means that, as far as word lists go, there is a better case for dividing I than for uniting it.¹⁶ The point is that word lists can be used to justify dividing any united text or uniting any divided text, meaning that word lists prove nothing at all.

Furthermore, what Friedman says about the documentarians is not true: the classic documentarians did divide the Pentateuch into sources based on the words the passages employed. Once they de-

¹⁴ Plus add the Pentateuchal peculiarity of using the masculine pronoun, *hw'*, to mean "she." This usage appears in J (*e.g.*, Gen. 19:20), E (Gen. 20:5, twice), and P (*e.g.*, Num. 5:31). Outside of the Pentateuch, this peculiarity appears only in 1 K 17:15, Job 31:11, and Is. 30:33.

¹⁵ For this purpose, I count R, RJE, and Other as documents.

¹⁶ Appendix D lists words which appear only or primarily in I and nowhere else in Old Testament narrative because those are the types of words that appear in Friedman's list. I could build an even better case for dividing I if I included words that are used elsewhere in Old Testament narrative but *within* I appear only in J or K. For example, *šābar*, to buy, is used several times outside of I in E and D (see Appendix C) but *within* I it appears only in J (9 times), never in K.

cided that the documents employed certain words, they would assign verses which used those words to the appropriate documents. They even assigned phrases (not sentences, *phrases*) to documents just so they could say that certain terms were used by a particular document and not by the others, even though it resulted in incoherent passages.

At times, even Friedman is guilty of doing this. He divides Num. 32 into J and P according to the characteristic language of the two documents, resulting in two passages that do not flow well.¹⁷ Baden criticizes the classic documentarians for assigning verses according to their terminology,¹⁸ then does it himself. For example, he says that Gen. 35:21 cannot be P because of the word “tent” (*ohel*) which P does not use before Ex. 26:7.¹⁹ He decided that one of the characteristics of P is this restricted use of the word, then ensured that all occurrences of the word “tent” before Ex. 26:7 were excluded from P. We are then supposed to recognize that one of the telling points of the Hypothesis is how consistent P is, a consistency which he artificially obtained. In other words, the argument is:

Baden: One of the telling points of the Hypothesis is that when we pull out all of the P passages, they consistently have this characteristic.

Respondent: How did you know that these passages belonged to P?

Baden: Because they have this characteristic.

Either methodology can be applied to any of the other characteristics of the documents. One can decide which passages belong to which document, then add to his list of characteristics the ones that appear in only one document (because they emphasize the differences between the documents, thereby supporting the Hypothesis) and strike the ones that appear in more than one document (because they suggest that the text should be divided differently or, worse, that the documents are actually similar and should be united). I employed this method after I divided Friedman’s chapter.

¹⁷ *Sources*, 300-303.

¹⁸ See in particular *Composition*, 108-109.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 237.

I noticed that W sometimes started its paragraphs with a question whereas S never did, so, of course, I noted that characteristic. However, I conveniently ignored the fact that both of the sources, including the Scholarly source, were written in a distinctly *non*-scholarly, *non*-technical style.

Conversely, one can decide which characteristics belong to which document, then assign passages to the documents according to their characteristics. As part of his third converging line of evidence, Friedman asserts, "Ages, dates, measurements, numbers, order, and precise instructions are an obvious, major concern in P. There is nothing even nearly comparable in degree in J, E, or D."²⁰ That is because most texts that mention ages, dates, etc., are automatically assigned to P. Thus, Gen. 41:46 ("Joseph was thirty years old when he stood before Pharaoh king of Egypt") is given to P *precisely* because it mentions Joseph's age. The previous P verse is Gen. 37:1 and the next P verse is Gen. 46:6.²¹ The verse stands in complete isolation and has nothing to do with what comes before it or after it in P. It would have made more sense to give it to E, which surrounds it, but then Friedman could not say that ages are a major concern in P and not in E. I did the same thing when dividing S from W. I assigned all of the passages that had dates and census figures to S and none of them to W. When I was done, I discovered that dates and census figures were a major concern in S and not in W.

Similarly, also in his third line of evidence, Friedman says that in P, Aaron's staff is used for performing miracles, while in E, Moses' staff is used for performing miracles.²² Again, this is because P's plagues were given to P *precisely* because Aaron's staff was used (because P elevates Aaron but denigrates Moses), while E's plagues were excluded from P *precisely* because Moses' staff was used (because E elevates Moses but denigrates Aaron).²³ However, Friedman does run into some difficulty in the story of the crossing of the sea (Ex. 14) because the criteria he uses for determining which verses belong to P forces him to assign to P the verses in which Moses uses

²⁰ *Sources*, 12.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 92, 101, 109.

²² *Ibid.*, 11.

²³ *Wrote*, 60-64, 169-181, 196. See also Friedman, "Torah (Pentateuch)", 613, 616.

his staff to split the sea. To his credit, he acknowledges this exception in *Sources*, but in a footnote so he can downplay it.²⁴

Numbers 16 is usually divided into two sources, with the rebellion led by Korah given to P. Baden gives the rebellion led by Dathan and Abiram to E *precisely* because they challenge Moses' prophetic authority and only E develops the theme of Moses' prophetic authority.²⁵

Baden says that Gen. 35:11-12 is P because its three major characteristics (the name "El Shaddai," the command to "be fruitful and multiply," and the idea of "community") tie it to other P passages that come before it (Gen. 1:22, 28; 9:1, 7; 17:1, 6, 16, 20; 28:3) and after it (Gen. 48:3-4), *precisely* because those passages have the same three characteristics.²⁶ In other words, passages that have these three characteristics are admitted to P. Is it any wonder, then, that P consistently displays the same style and themes when that was the prerequisite for being admitted to P in the first place?

In short, what the documentarians have done is developed a list of characteristics for each of the documents (list of words and characteristic expressions, name of God in Genesis, themes and concerns, etc.), then assigned passages to the documents based on those characteristics. The assignment of a passage to a document is based on circular reasoning because the argument is:

Critic: Only Document X has this characteristic (uses this word or states the person's age or develops Moses' prophetic authority, etc.). Passage A also has this characteristic. Therefore, Passage A must belong to Document X.

Respondent: But if you give Passage A to Document Y, then Document Y also has this characteristic.

Critic: That is why we cannot give Passage A to Document Y.

Respondent: Why not?

Critic: Because only Document X has this characteristic.

Naturally, the resultant main documents consistently display those characteristics (according to the documentarians). This is not proof

²⁴ *Sources*, 11, n. 4.

²⁵ *Composition*, 163-164.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 235.

that the Hypothesis is correct, only proof that the documentarians have been diligent in following their own method.

The other problem that the documentarians have is that, at best, they have been *individually* diligent, not *collectively* diligent, for, like the children in our illustration, they cannot agree on which marbles belong in the first bag. Baden assigns the verses which relate the rebellion of Dathan and Abiram to E, but Friedman gives them to J.²⁷ Conversely, the plagues that Baden gives to J,²⁸ Friedman gives to E.²⁹ Perhaps one cannot fault them for disagreeing on J and E since the two documents are so similar stylistically, but they cannot even agree on what is P and non-P. Thus, Baden gives Ex. 31:18 to E³⁰ but Friedman gives it to P.³¹ Friedman gives Num. 21:1-3 to J³² but Baden gives the passage to P.³³ And they are not the only ones who disagree. It seems that no two documentarians can completely agree on which verse belongs to which document.³⁴ They cannot even agree on how many documents are involved. Of the sixty-two usages of the Hiphil form of “he begot” which Hendel and Driver give to P,³⁵ Friedman gives only six to P (Gen. 6:10; 17:20; 48:6; Lev. 25:45; Num. 26:29, 58), one to R (Gen. 25:19), and the rest to the Book of

²⁷ *Sources*, 268-270.

²⁸ *Composition*, 75-76.

²⁹ *Sources*, 130-140.

³⁰ *Composition*, 128.

³¹ *Sources*, 173.

³² *Ibid.*, 277.

³³ *Redaction*, 132-134.

³⁴ To complicate matters further, Friedman does not always agree with *himself*. In the first edition of *Wrote*, published in 1987, all of Gen. 25:8 belongs to P (248), but according to the second edition, published in 1997 (257) and released again in 2019 (239), the phrase, “And he expired,” as well as the second half of the verse belongs to P; the rest of it is J. Yet, according to *Sources*, published in 2003, all of it belongs to P again (71). This is just *one* example of Friedman changing his mind. He even admits in *Sources* (6) to changing his mind and hints that he may change it again because “The process of identifying the sources is a continuing task.” Baden has changed his mind as well. In *Redaction* (168), published in 2009, he says that Ex. 34:17-26 belongs to J, but in *Composition* (224; 276, n. 126), published in 2012, he says that the passage, because it contains elements of E, P, and D, must have been inserted after the compilation of the Pentateuch.

³⁵ See note 11 in this chapter.

Records, an independent document incorporated into the Penta-teuchal text by R.³⁶

This is one reason why Friedman's Seven Main Arguments fail to support the Hypothesis: they are based on *his* documents. They are not based on Wellhausen's or Driver's and certainly not Baden's. The strength of his Arguments weakens and even fails altogether if we reassign the verses. For example, in his sixth Argument, he says that E has a disproportionate number of connections with the northern kingdom of Israel.³⁷ It tells of the births of many of the brothers who became the leaders of the northern tribes in Gen. 29-30, but Driver (admittedly with some hesitation) gives most of those verses to J.³⁸ Reuben, whose tribe was a part of the northern kingdom, offered to protect Benjamin in Gen. 42:37, but Baden gives that verse to J.³⁹ In E (Gen. 32:31-32), the place where Jacob sees God is named Penuel, a city which the northern king, Jeroboam I, built. But Driver (without hesitation) assigns those verses to J.⁴⁰ The Egyptian slave-drivers are called in E *missîm* (Ex. 1:11), which is supposed to be a criticism of Solomon and Rehoboam, the Judean kings who placed *missîm* over the northern tribes. But again, Baden assigns this verse to J.⁴¹ Friedman's Seven Main Arguments fail to support the Hypothesis because they are based on his idiosyncratic assignment of the verses. They are not based on a scholarly consensus of the assignment of the verses—because there is no such consensus.

To look at it another way, Driver could have come up with his own version of the Seven Main Arguments, with the first six converging to support his version of the Hypothesis. Baden can do the same thing and so can any other documentarian. So which version do we accept? Friedman's line of reasoning commits the fallacy of proving too much: it can be used to prove any version of the Hypothesis, which means that it ultimately proves no version.

One reason the documentarians have not reached a consensus is that they cannot agree on which characteristics to assign to which document. Each documentarian has his own list of characteristics

³⁶ *Sources*, 40-42, 49, 57, 71, 112, 232, 290-291.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 19-20.

³⁸ *ILOT*, 16.

³⁹ *Composition*, 73.

⁴⁰ *ILOT*, 16.

⁴¹ *Composition*, 74.

for each document. For most documentarians, Gen. 15 must belong to J because the use of the name *Yahweh* outweighs all other characteristics. But not for Baden. He assigns that chapter to E because it shares numerous characteristics with other passages which he has also identified as E.⁴² So, Baden's list of characteristics not only differs from that of other documentarians, he also argues in a circle, for the characteristics of the other E passages have now become the means for identifying Gen. 15 as another E passage.

Many documentarians still use the stylistic differences in the Pentateuch to separate the documents. Friedman, however, contra his own position in *Wrote*, eliminated style from his collection of evidence in support of the Hypothesis "since style is not usually a satisfactory criterion for distinguishing sources because it often involves subjective judgments."⁴³ Style is difficult to quantify and so whether two Pentateuchal passages betray differences in style is often subject to debate. Friedman, therefore, eliminated it from his idiosyncratic list of characteristics.

The real difficulty with style, however, is the question of whether a difference in style necessarily means a difference in authorship. Let us look at two samples from literature outside of the Old Testament, both of which discuss mathematics:

If there be given n Equations, not all homogeneous, containing Variables: a test for their being consistent is that either, first, there is one of them such that, when it is taken along with each of the remaining Equations successively, each pair of Equations, so formed, has its B-Block evanescent; or secondly, there are m of them, where m is one of the numbers $2.....n$, which contain at least m variables, and have their V-Block not evanescent, and are such that, when they are taken along with each of the remaining Equations successively, each set of Equations, so formed, has its B-Block evanescent.⁴⁴

⁴² *Ibid.*, 287, n. 104.

⁴³ *Sources*, 2.

⁴⁴ Charles Lutwidge Dodgson, *An Elementary Treatise on Determinants* (London: Macmillan, 1867), 61 as quoted in Francine F. Abeles, *The Mathematical Pamphlets of Charles Lutwidge Dodgson and Related Pieces*, Vol. 2 of *The Pamphlets of Lewis Carroll*, edited by Stan Marx and Edward Guiliano (Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1994), 158-159.

“Try another Subtraction sum. Take a bone from a dog: what remains?”

Alice considered. “The bone wouldn’t remain, of course, if I took it—and the dog wouldn’t remain: it would come to bite me—and I’m sure *I* shouldn’t remain!”

“Then you think nothing would remain?” said the Red Queen.

“I think that’s the answer.”

“Wrong, as usual,” said the Red Queen: “the dog’s temper would remain.”

“But I don’t see how—”

“Why, look here!” the Red Queen cried. “The dog would lose its temper, wouldn’t it?”

“Perhaps it would,” Alice replied cautiously.

“Then if the dog went away, its temper would remain!” the Queen exclaimed triumphantly.

Alice said, as gravely as she could, “They might go different ways.” But she couldn’t help thinking to herself, “What dreadful nonsense we *are* talking!”⁴⁵

The styles of the two works are completely different. The first is a somber and stilted exposition of technical truths. The second is a wonderfully witty work of nonsense. The first was written in the precise prose of the thesis. The second was written in the fluid prose of fiction. If we did not already know the author of either passage and we took the first passage as characteristic of the style of our anonymous author, we could easily conclude that our author did not write the second passage (and even draw up a list of words to justify our conclusion), but we would be wrong: *both* styles are characteristic of our anonymous author. The first passage is from *An Elementary Treatise on Determinants* by Charles Lutwidge Dodgson. The second is from *Through the Looking Glass* by Lewis Carroll, which is Dodgson’s *nom de plume*. Of course, we could never have derived that information from the passages themselves; we had to look outside of the passages for that information.

⁴⁵ Lewis Carroll, *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland and Through the Looking Glass* (N.Y.: Airmont Publishing Company, Inc., 1965), 237-238.

How, then, do we determine how many authors wrote the documents? The majority of documentarians admit that the authors of J, E, P, and D are anonymous. When we compare any two passages, even passages that supposedly came from the same document, how do we know if they were written by the same author or by different authors? Even if we agree that the two passages are written in the same style, does that mean they were written by the same author? Authors can imitate the style of other authors, so the two could have been written by two authors.⁴⁶ Even if we agree that the two passages are written in different styles, does that mean they were written by different authors? Dodgson just proved that authors can change styles, so they could have been written by the same author. Whether a documentarian argues, therefore, that two anonymous passages are written by the same author or by different authors, he is making a subjective judgment. He cannot possibly know how many authors are involved, unless, as we did with Dodgson, he obtains information from outside of those passages. This conclusion has tremendous consequences for the coherence of the documents. That the Priestly passages were all written in the same style does not mean they were all written by the same author, especially since Friedman has already stated that R can imitate that style.⁴⁷

This conclusion also tears the heart out of the terminology argument. As I said earlier, the argument is based on the well-known fact that different authors employ different banks of vocabulary: Faulkner's bank of vocabulary is not Hemingway's. That two texts use different banks of vocabulary, therefore, implies that they were written by two different authors. The fallacy is in thinking that two banks of vocabulary are *always* produced by two authors. That argument works only when we compare texts by known authors, in which case the lists are not necessary because the authors are already known. When we compare the text of a known author with that of an anonymous author, the conclusion is not assured. If the two vocabularies are the same, it could mean that the known author

⁴⁶ Friedman acknowledges that J and E cannot be separated on the basis of style alone. He entertains the possibility that the author of J or the author of E "consciously (or perhaps even unconsciously) decided to imitate" the style of the other author (*Wrote*, 67-68).

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 198-199.

wrote both texts; it could also mean that the anonymous author imitated the known author. If the two vocabularies are different, it could mean that we have two authors; it could also mean that the known author changed his style. We run into the same difficulties when we compare texts by anonymous authors. If the vocabularies are the same, do we have one author or did one author imitate the other? If the vocabularies are different, do we have two authors or did one author change his style? In other words, the banks of vocabulary displayed by different texts are not *necessarily* produced by different authors. The problem is further exacerbated when we divide or unite texts because one can come up with any number of banks of vocabulary depending on how one divides or unites the texts. The banks could even have been produced by the process of dividing and uniting the texts itself; that is, the dividing and uniting of the texts created documents that never existed and were therefore never written by authors in the first place. Proof that the documents created by the process once existed must be obtained from outside of the resultant documents; otherwise, one is arguing in a circle, for any evidence derived from the resultant documents to prove the documents' existence already presupposes the documents' existence.

This is the ultimate reason why Friedman's Seven Main Arguments fail. Their purpose is to prove that the documents once existed, yet the evidence is dependent on the existence of the documents: change how one divides the Pentateuchal text and the evidence changes. The evidence, therefore, presupposes the documents' existence.

Now let us consider Baden's argument that Gen. 35:21 cannot be P because of its use of the word "tent." In P, from Ex. 26:7 forward, "tent" refers to the covering of the Tabernacle only. It has a sacred meaning. In Gen. 35:21 it refers to Jacob's tent. There it has a profane meaning. On the surface, Baden's argument seems to make sense. However, how does Baden know that P did not use the word in both senses? He cannot know until he receives information from outside the two passages. Until then, the characteristic he has chosen for P is subjective and his argument is circular because the evidence he needs to support his basic premise (that P does not use "tent" until Ex. 26:7) is derived from the resultant document.

In place of subjective characteristics such as style, Baden calls upon the documentarians to divide the Pentateuchal text into sources based upon the contradictions, doublets (meaning the doublets that contradict each other) and discontinuities within the text.⁴⁸ These initially sound like objective criteria by which one can assign passages to the documents. However, Baden does not apply them consistently. He admits that there are no contradictions or narrative inconsistencies in the three stories in which a husband lies about his wife, claiming that she is his sister (Gen. 12:10-20; 20; 26:6-11).⁴⁹ Yet, he still assigns the first and third stories to J and the second to E.⁵⁰ When Baden applies his own standard inconsistently, he is being just as subjective as the rest of the documentarians.

And what is to keep the documentarians from subjectively finding contradictions? Alan Lenzi warns,

I think speculation and thus the tentativeness of our conclusions about scribal revision increase in direct proportion to our reliance upon internal (intratextual) evidence. That is, when an argument for revision relies exclusively on some inconsistency, tension, or contradiction within the text and there is no other evidence to corroborate this perception, we run the risk of imposing modern literary expectations on ancient texts and thereby inventing problems to which revision is the solution. This problem is exacerbated when the texts are also undated and unprovenanced.⁵¹

According to Westermann, the inventing of problems has occurred repeatedly: "Classical literary criticism used it [the criterion of contradictions and discrepancies] recklessly and never tired of discovering new incongruities or contradictions so as to postulate a new source." Scholars like Cuthbert Simpson, Robert Pfeiffer, and Eissfeldt "found" inconsistencies to justify further dividing J into still smaller documents. This is why Westermann says, "One must use

⁴⁸ *Composition*, 16-19, 30.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 17.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 71, 220. See also *Redaction*, 213-215.

⁵¹ Alan Lenzi, "Scribal Revision and Textual Variation in Akkadian *Šuila*-Prayers: Two Case Studies in Ritual Adaptation," in *Challenging*, 67-68.

this criterion with caution” and never by itself, for “it has meaning only in relation to other criteria.”⁵²

Then there are the times when the characteristics the critics have chosen have the audacity to appear in the wrong documents despite the documentarians’ diligence, such as the time when Moses’ staff, a recurring character in Friedman’s E narratives, makes a guest appearance in P’s story of the crossing of the sea. How the documentarians handle these inconsistencies is itself inconsistent and therefore subjective. For example, if a word or a phrase appears in more than one document, they handle this inconsistency in one of four ways:

1. They add the word to their list but treat its appearance in the other documents as if it has no bearing on their case at all. In the paragraph from *Wrote* quoted above, Friedman thinks it is significant that P uses the words “male and female” while J uses “man and his woman.” Yet, he casually admits that J also uses P’s words, then moves on to his next example as if this admission does not weaken his argument in the least bit.

2. They ignore the word’s appearance in the other documents. As we saw in Chapter 2, Friedman cites J’s use of “died” in the paragraph quoted above because doing so gives the impression that it supports the Hypothesis, then ignores its use in the rest of the documents, including P, because acknowledging its use in those documents would undermine the Hypothesis.

3. They simply strike the word from their list. The documentarians’ list used to include the words *’āmāh* (E’s term) and *šiphāh* (P and J’s term), both of which mean “female slave or handmaiden.” Hence, for a while most of Gen. 33 was assigned to J⁵³ because of its consistent use of *šiphāh*, even though it always referred to God as Elohim, supposedly a sure sign of a passage from E or P. When the opponents of the Hypothesis pointed out this conflict, the critics quietly dropped these synonyms from their list. Friedman now assigns

⁵² Westermann, 580-581.

⁵³ As in, for example, *ILOT*, 16.

this passage to E.⁵⁴ Baden, however, retains these words in his list,⁵⁵ which means again that the documentarians' criteria are subjective.

4. They blame the redactor for the word's appearance in the other documents. The stretch of land between the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers is called in the Pentateuch Paddan Aram. Friedman says that only P uses this name. So when the name appears in an otherwise E text (Gen. 33:18), he accuses the redactor of inserting the name into the text.⁵⁶

They handle inconsistencies with the other characteristics of the documents in the same four ways: they treat them as if they have no bearing on their case at all, or they ignore them, or they change the list of characteristics, or they blame the redactor. This is still another reason why Friedman's Seven Main Arguments fail. Several times the Arguments point out the consistency of certain characteristics within the documents, but quite often the consistency has been artificially created by employing these four methods.

For example, in his third Argument, Friedman states that one characteristic of the J document is that the narrator never uses Elohim.⁵⁷ When, therefore, the J narrator uses the compound name, Yahweh Elohim, in Gen. 2 and 3, he insists that the redactor inserted Elohim after every appearance of Yahweh.⁵⁸ So his argument is:

Friedman: The J narrator never uses the name Elohim.

Respondent: Gen. 2 and 3 prove that you are wrong.

Friedman: The redactor must have inserted the name Elohim into Gen. 2 and 3.

Respondent: How do you know this?

Friedman: Because the J narrator never uses the name Elohim.

⁵⁴ *Sources*, 86-87.

⁵⁵ *Composition*, 30.

⁵⁶ *Sources*, 87. Similarly, Driver gives Gen. 7:7-10 "in the main" to J. The presence of P's words, "two and two," "male and female," and "God," in these verses came about because they were "borrowed by the redactor from P" (*ILOT*, 14, second note).

⁵⁷ *Sources*, 10-11.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 35.

Thus, the J narrator consistently avoids using Elohim because the redactor keeps him consistent.

The redactor has become an indispensable tool to the documentarians in their efforts to keep the documents consistent. The error in their argumentation, as Oswald T. Allis points out, is that it is the same as emending the text so that it agrees with one's theory: the text is made to fit the theory, not the theory to fit the text. Saying that the redactor inserted Elohim into Gen. 2 and 3 is the same as excising Elohim from those chapters. Either way, the difficulty for the Hypothesis created by the text has been removed.

For the critics to blame the failure of the analysis to work out satisfactorily on an unknown redactor who has changed the text of his sources is equivalent to changing the actual text which the critics have before them in the interest of their theory as to what that text originally was. To put it bluntly, it is what is called "doctoring the evidence." By such means any theory can be proved or disproved.⁵⁹

The documentarians do not see a difficulty in the text as a sign that something is wrong with their Hypothesis; they see it as a sign that the redactor has changed the text. The redactor, therefore, is not only indispensable for keeping the documents consistent, he is also indispensable for solving any problems created by the Hypothesis.

Sometimes, when the documentarians encounter a passage whose characteristics do not match the characteristics of any of the documents, instead of deciding that they need to change their list of characteristics to include this passage, they simply discard it into one of their junk piles labeled "Independent Source" or "Inserted by Redactor." These passages are not always words or phrases, either. Sometimes they are complete stories (such as Gen. 14) or whole chapters (such as Num. 15 or Num. 28-29⁶⁰) which the redactor wrote himself, making the redactor an author in his own right (a concept which raises a host of embarrassing questions for the documentarians, such as, "If the redactor felt free to add his own material, why did he not add more material at other places to clear up the

⁵⁹ Allis, 60.

⁶⁰ *Sources*, 266-268, 293-296.

contradictions?”). By this method, one can change the size and content of the documents to one’s liking, eliminating any troublesome passages to the junk piles.

Thus, I propose a new, abbreviated P: Gen. 1:1-2:3; 5:1-28, 30-32; 6:9-22; 7:6, 11, 13-16a, 24; 8:1, 2a, 3b, 4f, 7, 13a, 14-19; 9:1-17, 28f; 10:1-7, 20, 22f, 31f; 11:10-32; 12:4b-5; 13:6, 11b, 12a; 16:1a, 3, 15, 16; 17; 19:29; 21:1b, 2b-5; 23; 25:7-11a, 12-17, 19f; 26:34f; 27:46; 28:1-9; 31:18b; 33:18b; 35:9-15, 23-29; 36:1-30; 37:1; 41:46; 46:6-27; 47:27b-28; 48:3-7; 49:29-33; 50:12f; Ex. 1:1-5, 7, 13; 2:23b-25; 6:2-7:13; 7:19-20a, 22; 8:1-3a, 12-15; 9:8-12; 12:1-20, 28, 37a, 40-51; 13:20; 14:1-4, 8, 9b, 10ac, 15-18, 21ac, 22f, 26, 27a, 28f; 16:2f, 6-35a, 36; Num. 13:1-17a, 25f, 32; 14:1-3, 5-10, 26-38; 20:1a, 2-13, 23-29; 22:1; 27:12-22; 32:2, 5, 13-24, 28-31; Deut. 32:48-52; 34:8-9. A study of these passages will reveal that my document closely follows Friedman’s P and R until the giving of the manna in Ex. 16, then jumps to the story of the spies in Num. 13 and 14, followed by the water from the rock and the death of Aaron in Num. 20, the commissioning of Joshua in Num. 27, the granting of the land to the tribes of Reuben and Gad in Num. 32, and the death of Moses in Deut. 32 and 34. My document completely bypasses Mount Sinai and the giving of the law. Since this document no longer emphasizes the priestly elements, it should be renamed, perhaps Tertius (T), for the three covenants (Adamic, Noahic, and Abrahamic) given in it.

El Shaddai promised Abraham only two things in his covenant (Gen. 17): seed and land. The only law Abraham had to follow was that of circumcision. T tells us that the first promise was fulfilled in Egypt: “And they grew and multiplied exceedingly” (Gen. 47:27b). “But the children of Israel were fruitful and increased abundantly, multiplied and grew exceedingly mighty; and the land was filled with them” (Ex. 1:7). When God appeared to Moses (Ex. 6:2-8), he said that he was going to fulfill the second promise. His intent was to deliver Israel from Egypt and take them to the land he had promised to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. And that is exactly what he does in T. Israel is delivered from Egypt and they go straight to the promised land (except that their rebellion causes the journey to last forty years). God never said to Moses in Egypt that along the way they would have to stop at a mountain to receive a set of laws, so in T they do not.

Some might object that T would of course include the law giving at Sinai because J and E do. However, this would be the same kind of objection that Cross and others had about P, namely that P cannot be a document because it does not have a complete history of the patriarchs like J and E do. As Baden points out,⁶¹ this is a subjective argument. There is no objective reason whatsoever to think that every document must cover the same sequence of events in the lives of the patriarchs. So, too, there is no objective reason whatsoever to think that a document must have a passage in which Moses receives the law at a mountain just because the others do.

There are two problems with T. The first is that the Tent of Meeting is mentioned in Num. 14:10 and the Tent of Meeting was constructed in the Priestly Law Code and the second is that Eleazar is referred to as a priest (Num. 27:19, 21, 22; 32:2) and the priesthood was also established in the Priestly Law Code, but those references were obviously added by R when he inserted the Priestly Law Code into T. The Priestly Law Code was an ancient independent document which R incorporated when he conflated J, E (or JE), T, and D to form the Pentateuch. Or perhaps R wrote the Code himself since he was also an author who (according to Friedman) could imitate the Priestly writing style (or, in this case, the style of Tertius).

The point is that it is possible to define different documents as long as one has a redactor who can solve the problems created by the documents. The documentarians would counter this by saying that it is possible to create any number of "documents," but none of them would be continuous like the four documents which they have created. But this is yet another problem that is solved by the redactor: any gaps in T were obviously caused by the redactor. After all, this is how the documentarians explain the gaps in *their* documents.

That explanation, however, is just another example of the documentarians' circular reasoning. The documents were originally continuous. The reason there are gaps in them now is that the redactors cut out portions of them. How do we know that the redactors cut out portions of them? Because the documents were originally continuous. There is no proof outside of the Hypothesis' assertions that the documents were originally continuous or that the redactors existed, let alone cut anything. The documentarians cannot simply admit

⁶¹ *Composition*, 180-182.

that the “documents” they have created are fragmentary and incomplete. The distinguishing mark that separates the Hypothesis from all other hypotheses is its insistence that the documents are coherent, complete, and continuous. The Hypothesis, therefore, *must* hold the redactors responsible for the gaps.

The irony in all of this is that the documentarians cannot be certain that the redactors of the documents are not also responsible for the continuity of the documents in the first place. Baden has spilled much ink trying to demonstrate that the documents are coherent, complete, and continuous, but what he has *not* demonstrated is that the continuity was created by the *authors* of the documents and not by *redactors*. He notes that E’s version of the Joseph Story has a link to E’s version of the Exodus Story because Joseph makes the Israelites promise to carry his bones with them when God takes them out of Egypt and in Ex. 13:19, that is exactly what they do. This is a telling continuity point for Baden.⁶² However, how does he know that the author of E wrote Ex. 13:19 and not the redactor? If E was actually a collection of fragments, as many scholars contend, then perhaps the links connecting the fragments were added by a redactor, not the author. After all, this is exactly what Friedman claims for P and this is exactly the point made by Rendtorff and his followers. They claim that J, E, and P are not documents at all. They further claim that the Pentateuch consists of numerous small literary units that were gradually linked together (by numerous redactors) into increasingly larger complexes. In other words, the continuity was created by the redactors.

What bothers Baden about Rendtorff and his followers is that they are doing exactly what Baden and the documentarians are doing, only they are pushing it to the logical extreme. As soon as one decides that a problem text is not a sign that something is wrong with one’s hypothesis but is a text that can be fixed by one’s redactor (who is also an author), then there is no limit to how many hypotheses one can dream up. Thus, Baden rightly complains that there is no control in Rendtorff’s method, which is why his followers produce different results:

⁶² *Ibid.*, 124.

Levin finds ten layers in Genesis 27; Kratz finds five; Jacques Vermelyen identifies four; Blum considers it a unity. Nothing in the method prohibits scholars from identifying as many layers as desired: the isolation of the smallest literary unit is largely subjective, and even more so the identification of the successive layers added to it.⁶³

He also rightly points out that because the isolation of the smallest literary unit is largely subjective, it is based on circular reasoning. The scholar subjectively decides what the smallest literary units are. Any texts which link the units together, thereby forming larger units, the scholar allocates to the redactor. That way the scholar can justify calling these units the smallest literary units. In other words, "The identification of the smallest literary unit depends on the removal of the literary links to the other texts; the removal of those links is done on the basis of the identification of the smallest literary unit."⁶⁴

But how does this differ from the results the documentarians have achieved? Where Baden sees J, Friedman often sees E, and *vice versa*. All of the documentarians agree that Gen. 17 is P. Even so, they postulate that anywhere from one to five different authors contributed to it.⁶⁵ Baden himself can count four different ways, including his own, in which the documentarians have divided the three verses of Gen. 16:8-10.⁶⁶ He divides Num. 11 into what he considers two complete and coherent stories. Yet he complains that some scholars see one story as merely a supplement to the other: "The claim that one story is complete while the other is not is revealed as largely subjective and based less on an independent reading of each story on its own than on the a priori belief of the scholar."⁶⁷ Friedman, however, sees the chapter as a unity.⁶⁸ What does that say about Friedman's a priori belief? Or Baden's, for that matter? Is Baden really less subjective than these other scholars?

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 63.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 58.

⁶⁵ Sean E. McEvenue, *The Narrative Style of the Priestly Writer* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1971), 192.

⁶⁶ *Redaction*, 211-213.

⁶⁷ *Composition*, 102.

⁶⁸ *Sources*, 258-260.

Baden is also guilty of circular reasoning. He claims that his division of the Pentateuch into documents is based solely on finding contradictions, doublets, and discontinuities in the text. However, the texts that resolve the contradictions are allocated to the compiler. For example:

According to E, Joseph is sold into the house of Potiphar, Pharaoh's eunuch and chief steward; according to J, he is sold into the house of an unnamed Egyptian and ends up in prison. When these stories converge, Joseph would appear to be in two places at once. Thus the compiler equates Potiphar's house with the prison in Genesis 40:3, 5.⁶⁹

The text as it stands makes sense; the contradiction appears only when Baden allocates Genesis 40:3, 5 to the compiler. The same is true when he allocates other explanatory texts to the compiler. In other words, the identification of the contradictions depends on the removal of the explanations of those contradictions; the removal of the explanations of those contradictions is done on the basis of the identification of the contradictions. Allocating the explanations for the contradictions to the compiler is necessary so that Baden can keep the contradictions because without the contradictions there are no documents and without the documents, there is no Hypothesis. Thus, the redactor is not only indispensable for keeping the documents consistent, he is also indispensable for finding the documents in the first place.

In short, Baden *et al.* are just as guilty of subjectivism and circular reasoning as Rendtorff *et al.* are. All Baden is really doing is complaining that Rendtorff *et al.* are putting small marbles in the first bag instead of blue marbles, like he has done. But neither camp is following objective criteria for sorting the marbles. Each one is simply doing what any child would do: whatever he wants.

⁶⁹ *Composition*, 222.

Chapter 4

Unwarranted Assumption

The *unwarranted assumption fallacy* occurs when the arguer makes an assumption that is not or cannot be supported by evidence. For example, back in the twelfth century, Rabbi Abraham ibn Ezra advanced the argument that Moses could not have written Deuteronomy because verse 1:1 says that Moses spoke the words recorded in that book “across the Jordan” (*‘ēber hayyardēn*), meaning that he was standing on the side of the Jordan opposite of the author. Moses was standing on the east side of the Jordan, so the author must have been on the west side. The Bible, however, makes it clear that Moses never crossed to the west side of the Jordan. Therefore, Moses could not have written Deuteronomy. Several documentarians, including Driver,¹ Friedman,² and Baden,³ have favorably cited ibn Ezra or advanced the same argument.

However, each of them is committing the unwarranted assumption that the phrase, “across the Jordan,” meant to the ancient Hebrews what it means to them, namely that it refers to the side of the Jordan opposite of the speaker or author.

Friedman translated the entire Pentateuch for his book, *Sources*, which means that he needed to translate this phrase several times. In a footnote to Deut. 3:20, he says that, in Deuteronomy, the narrator consistently pictures Moses as being “across the Jordan” (that is, on the east side) while Moses consistently speaks of the land of

¹ *ILOT*, 84-85.

² *Wrote*, 6.

³ *Composition*, 14.

Israel as being “across the Jordan” (that is, on the west side).⁴ What he overlooks is that in Deut. 3:8, which he translated, Moses, in his speech, refers to the very land upon which he is standing as being “across the Jordan.” The phrase, therefore, must have meant something else to the ancient Hebrews because translating it literally oftentimes does not make sense.

Translating the phrase literally also poses a further problem for Friedman, for he believes that *In the Day* was written by a single author, yet this author refers to both sides of the river as being “across the Jordan” (west side: Gen. 50:10, 11; Josh. 5:1; 9:1; east side: Josh. 13:8; Jud. 10:8⁵). So, where did this author live?

Even Friedman is forced to translate the phrase differently at times because the context requires him to do so. The classic use of this phrase occurs in Num. 32:19. The tribes of Reuben and Gad, while standing on the eastern side of the Jordan, use this phrase twice in one sentence to refer to *both* sides of the river. This is how Friedman translates the verse (the words in italics translate the phrase): “Because we won’t have a possession with them from *the farther side of the Jordan*, because our possession has come to us from the eastward *side of the Jordan*.”⁶

These examples, and others that could be cited throughout the Old Testament, show that the phrase had nothing to do with the position of the speaker or the author⁷ because, even though it literally means “across the Jordan,” in reality it is an idiom that means “(in) the region alongside the Jordan” or even “on the bank of the Jordan.”⁸ Because it was often not clear which side was meant, the phrase was almost always qualified with a directional word or phrase such as “eastern” (Num. 32:19), “toward the rising of the

⁴ *Sources*, 315, n. *.

⁵ *Hidden*, 12.

⁶ *Sources*, 301-302.

⁷ Other passages in which the phrase “across the Jordan” refers to the land upon which the narrator or speaker is standing: Num. 32:32; 34:15; 35:14; Josh. 1:14, 15; 12:7; 22:7; Jud. 7:25; 1 C 26:30; Is. 9:1. Similarly, passages in which the phrase “across the river” (*i.e.*, the Euphrates) refers to the land upon which the narrator is standing: 1 K 4:24; Ezra 8:36; Neh. 2:9; 3:7.

⁸ In the same sense, though using different terminology, that “The West Bank” today refers to a large geographic region which stretches from the western bank of the Jordan to almost the Mediterranean Sea. In the Aramaic sections of Ezra, “across the river” refers to any and all parts of the Persian Empire west of the Euphrates.

sun” (Deut. 4:47), “west” (Josh. 5:1), or “toward the setting sun” (Deut. 11:30). If the phrase had automatically referred to the land opposite of the speaker or author, such qualifying phrases would not have been necessary. Therefore, since the phrase had nothing to do with the author’s position, since the phrase did not mean to the ancient Hebrews what it means to Friedman and the other documentarians, the argument is completely groundless. Moses did write Deuteronomy, knowing full well that when he referred to the eastern side of the Jordan as being “across the Jordan,” he was referring to the very ground upon which he was standing.

The Author Cannot Create Anomalies

The documentarians do not believe the Pentateuch was composed by a single author partially because they make several unwarranted assumptions about the author of the Pentateuch.⁹ The first reason why they do not believe the Pentateuch was composed by a single author is that they make the unwarranted assumption that a single author cannot create the anomalies found in the Pentateuch, at least not as many as exist in the Pentateuch.¹⁰ This assumption is crucial to the Hypothesis, for if a single author cannot create these anomalies, then the Pentateuch could not have been written by a single author. However, if a single author *can* create these anomalies, then the Pentateuch could have been created by a single author.

Differences in Style

That four different styles have supposedly been detected within the Pentateuch is said to be evidence that four different authors contributed to it. At least three unwarranted assumptions are at work here. The first is that each author has an inherent and unique style. The second is that no author can imitate the style of another author. The third is that no author can ever change his or her inherent style

⁹ Tsevat (220-226) cites examples which demonstrate that the critics’ assumptions about authors do not always apply even to modern Western authors.

¹⁰ William H.C. Propp, “The Priestly Source Recovered Intact?” *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. 46, Fasc. 4 (Oct. 1996), 459. This is itself an unwarranted assumption. If a single author is capable of creating one anomaly, what is to stop him from creating one hundred anomalies? At which point does the number of anomalies cease to be the work of a single author and become the work of multiple authors?

even if he or she changes topics or genre or addresses a different audience, an assumption stated much more gracefully in this piece of poetry:

They scan divine affairs,
True poems, treasured, dearth.
Conceived in heaven's lairs,
Revered upon their birth.

Symbols glide and rise to flight,
Lofty words on lofty heights.

If one such poet dares
To view the things of earth,
Poetic parlance fares
A fate of equal worth.

Symbols glide, remain in flight,
Matters not what he may write.

So ingrained into the thinking of the documentarians is the third assumption that apparently the authors of the four documents *cannot* write both prose and poetry. Whenever the documentarians encounter a passage of Pentateuchal poetry (such as The Song of the Sea or the Blessing of Jacob or the Blessing of Moses), they immediately designate it as an independent composition, written by yet another unknown author, which the author of the appropriate document somehow found and incorporated into his own work.

Each of these assumptions is essential to the style argument. That the four documents were written in four different styles necessarily means they were written by four different authors if and only if each author writes in his or her own unique style—and only in that style. If the first assumption is false, that could mean that each author could have several writing styles. Different passages written in different styles, therefore, could still be the work of a single author. Alternatively, if the first assumption is false, that could mean that several authors share the same writing style. Different passages written in the same style, therefore, could be the work of different authors. If an author can change styles, then the

Pentateuch could still be the work of a single author, and if an author can imitate another author's style, then once again, different passages written in the same style could be the work of different authors. Finally, if the first assumption is true but the second is not, then by necessity the third assumption would also be invalid, for to imitate the style of another, the first author must change his or her style to match that of the second author's.

Friedman employs the argument of style in *Wrote* rather inconsistently. On the one hand, he concludes that Baruch wrote Deuteronomy as well as the book of Jeremiah because "Parts of Jeremiah are so similar to Deuteronomy that it is hard to believe that they are not by the same person."¹¹ On the other hand, he does not conclude that Ezekiel wrote P even though Ezekiel's book "is written in a style and language remarkably similar to P's. It is almost as much like P as Jeremiah is like D; there are whole passages in Ezekiel that are nearly word-for-word like passages in P."¹² Since Friedman argues that P came before Ezekiel, we must conclude that Ezekiel imitated the Priestly Writer's style. Ezra apparently could do the same thing. According to Friedman's theory, when Ezra redacted P to JE and D, "he added texts of his own, and these new texts were in the typical language and interests of P.... [T]hey are so much like the P texts in their language that for a long time investigators thought they were part of P itself."¹³

Documentarians have long been pressed to define the difference between the styles of J and E.¹⁴ Friedman theorizes that the similarity in styles came about because one author decided to imitate the style of the other.¹⁵ Thus the Yahwist imitated the Elohist's style, or the Elohist imitated the Yahwist's style. Since all of these authors (Ezekiel, Ezra, and the Yahwist or the Elohist) could imitate the style of another author¹⁶ and thereby change their own styles in the

¹¹ *Wrote*, 109.

¹² *Ibid.*, 147.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 198-199.

¹⁴ Concerning J and E, Westermann (577) admits that the style argument "has proved nothing more than that they do not belong to P."

¹⁵ *Wrote*, 67.

¹⁶ Knowing that authors can imitate the style of other authors takes the sting out of the argument that Moses could not have written the Pentateuch because it contains his obituary (Deut. 34:1-12). Since Moses could not have written his own obituary

process, it is certainly possible that the single author of the Pentateuch could change his style several times at will.

Nothing prevented Friedman from changing his style. Both *Wrote* and an earlier work, *Narrative*, claim to have the same author. In his "Notes" in the back of *Wrote*, Friedman refers to the earlier work as "my *The Exile and Biblical Narrative*."¹⁷ Yet there are striking differences between the styles of the two works.

Friedman believes that there were two editions of the Deuteronomistic History, the first produced during Josiah's reign, the second during the Exile. As part of his attempt to support this theory, he points to an observation made by one of his teachers, Frank Moore Cross:

He referred to a problem that earlier investigators had reckoned as a clue as well. The Deuteronomistic writer occasionally speaks of things as existing "to this day," when the things in question existed only while the kingdom was standing. Why would someone writing a history in, say, 560 B.C. refer to something as existing "to this day," when that something had ended back in 587? For example, 1 Kings 8:8 refers to the poles that were used for hoisting and carrying the ark. It states there that the poles were placed inside the Temple of Solomon on the day it was dedicated and that "they have been there unto this day." Why would someone write these words after the Temple had burned down? Even if the words were not his own, but rather appeared already in one of his sources, why would he leave them in? Why not edit them out?¹⁸

This paragraph from *Wrote* appears as only one sentence in *Narrative*: "Cross also points to the notation of earlier literary critics that the expression 'to this day' occurs regularly, often referring to cir-

and the obituary is written in the same style as other Pentateuchal passages, so the argument goes, then Moses could not have written those other passages (*Wrote*, 5). However, because Friedman now rejects style as being subjectively judged and because he admits that style can be imitated, the argument is now invalid. Someone (tradition says Joshua) added the obituary while imitating the style (or styles, since Friedman finds three sources in these twelve verses) employed in the Pentateuch.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 256, n. 7.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 91.

cumstances which obtained only while the kingdom of Judah was still standing.”¹⁹ In *Narrative*, the argument is merely stated; in *Wrote*, it is stated then elaborated upon. This phenomenon occurs often: arguments which are developed in a few paragraphs in *Narrative* may occupy an entire chapter in *Wrote*.

In *Narrative*, Friedman uses Hebrew terms and often quotes the Hebrew text of the Old Testament; in *Wrote*, he rarely uses Hebrew terms and always quotes from his translation of the Hebrew text, never from the text itself. In *Narrative*, he is dispassionate and objective, calmly presenting his evidence; in *Wrote*, he presents the same information in a fashion that is designed to arouse the reader’s curiosity and thereby makes it much more interesting. Thus, the “literary critics” in *Narrative* become *Wrote*’s “investigators.” What began as a mere “notation” is now “reckoned as a clue.” In *Narrative*, Friedman rarely draws attention to himself; in *Wrote*, he draws so much attention to himself that the work often lapses into autobiography, as when he discusses the significance of the Tabernacle measurements:

When I first worked out the Tabernacle measurements a few years ago, I was stymied. The Tabernacle was twenty by eight by ten cubits—what did that prove? It was not proportional to either Temple or to anything else in the Bible. A few days later,

¹⁹ *Narrative*, 5. The argument is not as cogent as Cross and Friedman believe. If we were willing to presuppose the existence of the Deuteronomistic History, we could argue that there was only one edition of the History, that it was pieced together during the Exile, that the Deuteronomist found the words “to this day” in his sources, and that he had not bothered to edit them out. Friedman cites 1 K 8:8 to illustrate his argument (*Wrote*, 91), but the author of Chronicles repeated this verse in 2 C 5:9, even though the words were no longer relevant, even absurd, in his day because the ark, along with its poles, had disappeared a hundred years earlier. Obviously, he had found the words in his source and had not bothered to edit them out. It does not matter whether his source was the History itself. The point is if he did not see a need to edit the words out of his post-Exilic work, then it is possible the Deuteronomist did not see the need to edit the words out of his single, Exilic edition of the History. According to Friedman’s analysis, Dtr¹ included Josh. 6:25, which claims that Rahab the harlot “dwells in Israel *to this day*.” The Deuteronomist did not see a need to edit this verse, even though understood literally it would have made Rahab well over 600 years old by the time Dtr¹ was put together! If this was his attitude towards this verse, then it could very well have been his attitude toward his other sources when he compiled his first and only History during the Exile.

though, I realized that there is in fact a space described in the Bible that is just these measurements: the space under the wings of the cherubs inside the Holy of Holies of the Temple.²⁰

This comes out in *Narrative* as simply, “As we have already observed, these dimensions are by no reckoning proportionate to those of either Temple.... The measurements of the Tabernacle correspond rather to those of the space inside the Holy of Holies in the First Temple, beneath the wings of the cherubim.”²¹

In short, the style of *Narrative* can be described as scholarly and technical, solemn and precise. It is closely akin to the style of P. The style of *Wrote*, however, has been described by David Noel Freedman as “eminently readable, even racy.”²² It is closely akin to the style of J or E. Yet both books claim to have been written by the same person.

Even Friedman himself admitted that the style of *Wrote* was “new”: “One of the fine things that came about through this project was my acquaintance with Joann Ellison Rodgers, who helped me learn a new kind of writing....”²³ Portions of *Narrative* first appeared in 1980. *Wrote* was first published in 1987. Thus, in six or seven years, Friedman developed a new writing style. At that rate, he could easily develop four different styles within, say, forty years.

This new writing style was not the only one Friedman employed within *Wrote*: he often changed from one style to another. We have already noted that *Wrote*'s style is “eminently readable.” However, the style of significant portions of his book resembles the style of P. Lists which mechanically follow an established formula (such as genealogies) are an integral part of P's style. Such lists can also be found in Friedman's book. Several appear at the end of the book: Friedman's “Notes,” a “Selected Bibliography,” an “Index,” and a chart that tells which verse belongs to which source. Lists also appear within the text itself. Especially noteworthy are the two lists found on pages 47-48:

²⁰ *Wrote*, 161.

²¹ *Narrative*, 49.

²² Back of dustcover for the 1987 edition of *Wrote*.

²³ *Wrote*, 270.

The group of stories that invoke *Elohim* are the stories of:

Dan
Naphtali
Gad
Asher
Issachar
Zebulon
Ephraim
Manasseh
Benjamin

...The group of stories that invoke the name of *Yahweh* are the stories of:

Reuben
Simeon
Levi
Judah

Notice how the two lists begin with a recurring formula (“The group of stories that invoke X are the stories of:”) even as P’s genealogies begin with a recurring formula (“These are the generations of X”). Other lists can be found on pages 36 and 155.

According to Friedman himself, “P obviously has a concern for ages, dates, and measurements in cubits. J does not.”²⁴ Outside of chapter 10 of *Wrote*, measurements and cubits are rarely if ever mentioned, but a good portion of chapter 10 itself is devoted to discussing the Tabernacle’s measurements—in cubits. Friedman even begs his readers to “bear with me for just a little more counting of cubits,”²⁵ as if he feared his readers would not find the counting of cubits to be eminently readable.

Perhaps Friedman’s change in style is best illustrated by comparing two passages that discuss the same subject:

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 44.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 157.

Moreover, the investigators found that it was not only the names of the deity that lined up. They found various other terms and characteristics that regularly appeared in one or the other group. This tended to support the hypothesis that someone had taken two different old source documents, cut them up, and woven them together to form the continuous story in the Five Books of Moses.

And so the next stage of the investigation was the process of separating the strands of the two old source documents. In the eighteenth century, three independent investigators arrived at similar conclusions based on such studies: a German minister (H.B. Witter), a French medical doctor (Jean Astruc), and a German professor (J.G. Eichhorn)...

By the beginning of the nineteenth century, the two-source hypothesis was expanded. Scholars found evidence that there were not two major source documents in the Pentateuch after all—there were four!²⁶

The investigators saw that they were not simply dealing with a book that repeated itself a great deal, and they were not dealing with a loose collection of somewhat similar stories. They had discovered two separate works that *someone* had cut up and combined into one.

The first of the three persons who made this discovery was a German minister, Henning Bernhard Witter, in 1711. His book made very little impact and was in fact forgotten until it was re-discovered two centuries later, in 1924.

The second person to see it was Jean Astruc, a French professor of medicine and court physician to Louis XV. He published his findings at the age of seventy, anonymously in Brussels and secretly in Paris in 1753. His book, too, made very little impression on anyone. Some belittled it, perhaps partly because it was by a medical doctor and not by a scholar.

But when a third person, who was a scholar, made the same discovery and published it in 1780, the world could no longer ignore it. The third person was Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, a

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 8-9.

known and respected scholar in Germany and the son of a pastor....

The idea that the Bible's early history was a combination of two originally separate works by two different people lasted only eighteen years. Practically before anyone had a chance to consider the implications of this idea for the Bible and religion, investigators discovered that the first five books of the Bible were not, in fact, even by *two* writers—they were by *four*.²⁷

This is an excellent example of two anomalies appearing in conjunction with each other, an example for which Tigay has been looking. Here we have a doublet which betrays a difference in style. Notice the change in vocabulary: "different" in the first passage becomes "separate" in the second, "source documents" becomes "works," "woven together" becomes "combined," "hypothesis" becomes "idea." In the first passage, the investigators "arrive at" or "find" things, whereas in the second, they "see" or "discover" things. In the first the names tend to be initialized, but in the second they are spelled out. In both Astruc is a "medical doctor," but in the second he is also a "professor of medicine and court physician." In the first Eichhorn is a "professor," but in the second he is a "scholar." However, the most striking difference between the two is that the second passage is concerned with dates and even Astruc's age (even as P is interested in dates and ages), while the first is not (even as J is not)!

Friedman inconsistently applies the argument of style and he himself has changed his own style, even within *Wrote* itself. He therefore invalidates one of the major assumptions supporting the Documentary Hypothesis. Perhaps this is why style is not included in his Seven Main Arguments.

Doublets

Doublets are particularly important to the documentarians, especially Martin Noth who has categorically argued

that fundamentally only one of the usual criteria for the disunity of the old Pentateuchal tradition is really useful, though this one is quite adequate and allows a thorough-going literary analysis.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 36-37.

I refer to the unquestionable fact, attested time and again throughout the tradition, of *repeated occurrence* of the same narrative materials or narrative elements in *different versions*. This phenomenon can hardly be explained in any other way.²⁸

The unwarranted assumption here is that an author would never repeat himself for any reason whatsoever.

Noth was speaking specifically of the separation of J from E, but he and most documentarians also find this criterion adequate for separating those two from P. Thus, of the following two passages, they give the first to J and the second to P because they are repetitive:

So Noah, with his sons, his wife, and his sons' wives, went into the ark because of the waters of the flood (Gen. 7:7).

On the very same day Noah and Noah's sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth, and Noah's wife and the three wives of his sons with them, entered the ark (Gen. 7:13).

However, most of them will not apply this criterion to the four documents themselves, even though repetitions still occur within them. For example, Eduard Nielsen points out that the Flood Story states no less than four times that the flood came upon the earth (7:10, 12, J; 7:6, 11, P). Yet no one postulates four sources. To this, J.A. Emerton responds that the four verses do not say the exact same thing: they each tell us something new about the flood. V. 10 tells us the point in time at which the flood came; v. 12 tells us its duration; v. 6 tells us Noah's age when the flood came; and v. 11 tells us that the flood came, the date it came, and how it came.²⁹ But if this is the reason why they have not been given to four sources, why were they given to two sources? Why were they not given to the same source? This reasoning eliminates virtually all of the doublets as a criterion for source division, for the only ones that could be assigned to dif-

²⁸ Martin Noth, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, translated by Bernhard Anderson (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972), 21 (italics his).

²⁹ J.A. Emerton, "An Examination of Some Attempts to Defend the Unity of the Flood Narrative in Genesis: Part 1," *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. 37 (Oct. 1987), 418.

ferent sources would be the ones that say *exactly the same thing*. But very few doublets do. As we shall see below, Friedman gives 7:18 to J and 7:24 to P because they say exactly the same thing (“And the waters prevailed”), but only if one looks at the first half of the verses. Each verse then goes on to tell us something new: v. 18 tells us that the prevailing waters caused the ark to move and v. 24 tells us how long the waters prevailed. By Emerton’s argument, therefore, they belong to the same document.

Nielsen also points out that 7:9, in which the animals board the ark, is given to P because it uses Elohim, yet 7:15, in which the animals again board the ark, is also given to P, creating a doublet within P. To this, Emerton responds, “It is not a necessary presupposition of source criticism that every apparent reduplication testifies to the use of more than one source. The examples need to be evaluated.” Furthermore, “the problem is not merely the presence of Elohim in vii 9...or of reduplication. There is also the problem of the number of creatures taken into the ark and the contradictory accounts, and the relation of vii 9 to the different accounts...”³⁰ In other words, contrary to Noth, repetitions alone are *not* adequate, but their significance must be evaluated in the light of the other “usual criteria,” which in turn, means that Emerton’s response to Nielsen’s first argument is invalid.

But how can we be certain that the repetitions the documentarians have selected are significant, and that others can be ignored? How can we be absolutely certain that the repetition found in Gen. 7:7 and 7:13 is significant enough to assign the verses to two sources but that the repetition in 7:9 and 7:15 can be ignored? More importantly, how can we be certain that the repetitions the documentarians have selected are significant when the documentarians themselves are not certain? There are so many repetitions in Gen. 17 that some scholars postulate up to five sources or stages of development.³¹ (In other words, up to five authors, all of whom could imitate P’s style, contributed to this one chapter.) Yet Sean E. McEvenue sees the repetitions as forming a series of deliberate parallelistic patterns. In direct opposition to Noth’s dogma, McEvenue has issued a dogma of his own: “What we have seen of the priestly style

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 418-419.

³¹ Representative analyses are listed in McEvenue, 192.

in general makes it impossible to base a division of sources on repetition!... The only convincing proof of a distinction of sources is evidence of contradictions within a text.”³² McEvenue further concludes that, contrary to Noth’s position and contrary to the assumption which underlies his position, there *is* another explanation for repetitions: “It will be evident that here [Gen. 17], as elsewhere in P, repetition is not due to conflation but to stylistic intention....”³³ Repetition can be a part of the author’s style!

McEvenue, at least, has tried to define the relationship between the argument of repetition and the argument of style. Most documentarians have not. The relationship seems obvious when repetitive passages employ different styles, for then the two arguments seem to support each other. We have already seen a doublet of this kind in Friedman’s book. G.E. Wright, another of Friedman’s teachers, created a similar doublet in his commentary on Deuteronomy. While commenting on Deut. 31, he wrote: “The order of material in this chapter seems rather badly mixed.” Only three paragraphs later he wrote the same statement using a different vocabulary: “...[I]t is something of a mystery why the heterogeneous contents of this chapter are so badly disarranged.”³⁴ And Baden did Wright one better. He is so certain that the Hypothesis is correct that he said so not once, not twice, but three times, and in three different styles:

It is a hypothesis—it just happens to be the most economical, clearest, and most complete solution currently available for the literary complexities of the canonical text.

Ideally, the case studies and the discursive chapters will be convincing illustration that the Documentary Hypothesis remains the best explanation for the composition of the Pentateuch.

Why the Pentateuch is incoherent, that is the driving question of all critical enquiries into the composition of the text, and the

³² *Ibid.*, 147-48.

³³ *Ibid.*, 148.

³⁴ George Ernest Wright, “The Book of Deuteronomy,” in George Arthur Buttrick, ed., *The Interpreter’s Bible*, Vol. II (N.Y.: Abingdon Press, 1953), 513, 516.

Documentary Hypothesis is the simplest and the best answer to that question.³⁵

However, what is to be done with repetitive passages that employ the *same* style? To assign them to the same author is to admit that an author can repeat himself, but to assign them to two authors is to admit that style is not unique to each author and that one author can imitate the style of another. Such passages bring the two arguments into conflict and invalidate at least one of them: they cannot both be true.

To complicate matters further, the documentarians do not handle such passages consistently. In *Narrative*, Friedman gives Gen. 7:18 (“And the waters prevailed”) to J and 7:24 (“And the waters prevailed”) to P precisely because they say the same thing.³⁶ Perhaps it could be argued that in this case the argument of repetition takes precedence over the argument of style. But why should it? And why does it not take precedence over style in these J passages?

And the waters increased...
(7:17).

And the waters... increased...
(7:18).

And the waters prevailed exceedingly on the earth, and all the high mountains under the whole heaven were covered
(7:19, AT).

The waters prevailed fifteen cubits upward, and the mountains were covered (7:20).

And why does it not take precedence in the repetition in 7:9 and 7:15, or in these other repetitions from P?

“But I will establish My covenant with you” (6:18).

“Thus I establish My covenant with you” (9:11).

“You shall bring two of every sort into the ark, to keep them alive with you” (6:19).

“Two of every kind will come to you to keep them alive”
(6:20)

³⁵ *Composition*, 32, 33, 249.

³⁶ *Narrative*, 82.

“Be fruitful and multiply” (9:1).

“Be fruitful and multiply” (9:7).

And God said, “This is the sign of the covenant...” (9:12)

And God said to Noah, “This is the sign of the covenant...” (9:17).

And why does repetition not take precedence over style in the stories of Abram’s lie concerning Sarai (Gen. 12:10-20) and of Isaac’s lie concerning Rebekah (26:1-11), both of which Friedman and virtually all other documentarians assign to J, even though they are said to be two versions of the same story?³⁷

This inconsistency brings up the problem of what to do with this doublet from *Wrote*:

Julius Wellhausen (1844-1928) stands out as a powerful figure in the investigation into the authorship of the Bible and in the history of biblical scholarship in general.

...Julius Wellhausen stands out as a dominant figure of modern Biblical scholarship.

Much of what Wellhausen had to say was taken from those who preceded him....

Much of what Wellhausen said came from those who preceded him.

His contribution does not so much constitute a beginning as a culmination in that history.

His own contribution does not so much constitute a beginning as a culmination.

...Wellhausen’s contribution was to bring all of these components together, along with considerable research and argumentation of his own, into

He brought all the pieces together, along with his own investigations and arguments, into a clear, organized, synthesis.³⁸

³⁷ *Sources*, 51, 72-73.

³⁸ *Wrote*, 145.

a clear, organized synthesis.³⁹

The first set of passages comes from the “Introduction,” the second set from chapter 9. Should we stand with McEvenue and say these passages are the work of a single author whose style included repetition? Or should we stand with Friedman and Emerton and give these passages to two authors because they say the same thing?

The documentarians themselves do not agree whether repetition is an effective criterion; the argument conflicts with the argument of style; the documentarians apply the argument inconsistently; and Friedman, Wright, and Baden have created doublets (and a triplet) within their works. All of this tends to invalidate the entire argument.

Contradictions

We have already encountered McEvenue’s dogma that “the only convincing proof of a distinction of sources is evidence of contradictions within a text.” The alleged contradictions within the Pentateuch have long been used to justify its division into sources. The unwarranted assumption here is that an author would never contradict himself for any reason whatsoever.

Baden makes this anomaly the cornerstone of his analysis of the Pentateuch: “As should by now be clear, it is the primary and fundamental claim of this book—in contrast to almost all previous source-critical scholarship—that the literary analysis of the Pentateuch must begin with and be carried out on the basis of the narrative consistencies and contradictions.”⁴⁰ He rejects all of the other “usual criteria” and relies on contradictions, doublets (meaning doublets that contradict themselves), and inconsistencies to separate out the sources. Yet he regularly contradicts himself.

On the one hand, he insists that J, E, and P are complete documents. On the other hand, he admits that they are not: “What must be understood in evaluating the completeness of E is that though E is missing some significant pieces, it is not alone in this. Both J and P are also incomplete.”⁴¹ He admits that there are no contradictions

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 11-12.

⁴⁰ *Composition*, 30.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 127.

or narrative inconsistencies in the three stories in which a husband lies about his wife, claiming that she is his sister (Gen. 12:10-20; 20; 26:6-11), and therefore, theoretically, all three could have come from the same source.⁴² Even so, he gives the second story to E and the first and third stories to J.⁴³

Baden says that Gen. 37 creates a contradiction because it has two groups of merchants, the Ishmaelites and the Midianites, take Joseph to Egypt. He reviews the attempts by several commentators and scholars to resolve this contradiction. Some have suggested that the Midianites pulled Joseph out of the pit and then sold him to the Ishmaelites, but this does not explain Gen. 37:36, which says that the Midianites sold Joseph to Potiphar in Egypt.⁴⁴ Abraham ibn Ezra suggested that the two groups are actually one group who are called by two names, as Judges 8:24 indicates. But Baden rejects that explanation because Gen. 37 does not explicitly say the two groups are the same. So he dismisses this explanation as “midrashic.”⁴⁵

His explanation is that a single author would never have created this contradiction; two authors must have contributed to this passage. One author, J, had the brothers selling Joseph to the Ishmaelites, who take him to Egypt; the other author, E, had the Midianites pulling Joseph out of the pit and then taking him to Egypt. The contradiction came about when a compiler combined the two stories.⁴⁶

Critics of the Hypothesis might ask, “If an author would not create this contradiction, why would the compiler?” In an endnote, Baden addresses this question.

The presence of both the Ishmaelites and Midianites in the narrative could have been understood by the compiler in either of

⁴² *Ibid.*, 17; *Redaction*, 213-215.

⁴³ *Composition*, 71, 220; *Redaction*, 215.

⁴⁴ This explanation is further strengthened by the realization, as pointed out to me by Rav-Noy in a personal communication, that Genesis never says that the Midianites took Joseph to Egypt. Thus, Gen. 37:36 could be understood to mean that the Midianites sold Joseph to Egypt and to Potiphar through the Ishmaelites. Joseph, who was in the pit and therefore never saw what actually transpired, assumed that the Midianites pulled him from the pit because his brothers had sold him to them (Gen. 45:4-5). Admittedly, this explanation is splitting hairs, which is one reason why I still prefer the explanation that the two groups are actually one group,

⁴⁵ *Composition*, 1-12.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

the standard ways we have encountered in the introduction if we imagine him being concerned with this at all. Either he thought that the Midianites were the ones who sold Joseph to the Ishmaelites, confusing as this is (and contradictory with 37:36), or, more likely, he simply saw the two groups as the same, not only because they may have been conflated in Israelite thought by the time the compiler worked (as Gunkel would have it [*Genesis*, 393]; this is a far better use of the evidence of *Judg* 8:24 than is made by those who argue for an authorial equation of the two groups), but because they fulfilled precisely the same function in both stories: the Arab caravan that brought Joseph to Egypt.⁴⁷

So Baden starts off by essentially saying that an author *cannot* see the two groups as being the same, then contradicts himself by concluding that a compiler *can* see the two groups as being the same. He never explains why an author cannot do what a compiler can do.

In *Redaction*, Baden correctly criticizes the classical documentarians for their increasing reliance on the redactor. Over time, the redactor evolved from the compiler who simply conflated the documents to the problem solver who was called upon to fix the problems created by the Hypothesis. In the process, the documentarians turned him into a theologian and a historian.⁴⁸ In *Composition*, his critique becomes even more pointed:

While the redactor's role in scholarship changed, from the logical outgrowth of the existence of the sources to the solution to difficult passages, his literary role was dramatically altered as well: no longer a compiler, who made small adjustments for the purpose of a better final text, the redactor now became an author in his own right. Thus the passages that could be ascribed to him were expanded from those that served the process of compilation to virtually any text at all; there was no longer any limit on what type of text could be, in theory, the work of a redactor. In this way almost any passage that could be removed without grossly disturbing its context could be attributed to a

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 264, n. 30.

⁴⁸ *Redaction*, 253.

redactor. These passages, frequently described as “secondary additions,” comprise a wide range of genres, styles, and content: from seemingly repetitive statements, as in Exodus 3:14, to prolepsis, as in Exodus 4:21-23; from historical referents in the Covenant Code to the patriarchal promises. Though some of these “secondary additions” contain little in the way of new ideas, some, particularly the patriarchal promises, carry significant theological weight. These passages were not assigned to the redactor because they were theological, necessarily, but rather on stylistic or terminological grounds or because they could be removed from their contexts without breaking the flow of the narrative. Yet because they do contain theological concepts, the redactor became—almost by accident—not just an author, but an active, regularly intervening, theologically minded author. The distance between this active theologian and the compiler necessitated by the theory is difficult to overstate.⁴⁹

Baden’s critique is spot on. Friedman, for example, freely admits that his R, by adding text to the Plagues Stories, became a theologically minded author.⁵⁰

Baden calls for a return to the original view of the compiler.

The compiler’s work was entirely literary: it was no more than the combination of the four documents into a single story, with the rare small adjustments and insertions that contributed to that process. This approach highlights the fundamental distinction between an author and an editor and keeps each in its proper place.⁵¹

Moreover, for Baden, the solution for problems in the text must come from the text itself. He rejects the traditional explanations for the apparent contradiction concerning the sale of Joseph because

The solutions to the textual problem do not—indeed, apparently cannot—rest on the plain meaning of the passage alone.

⁴⁹ *Composition*, 217.

⁵⁰ Friedman, “Sacred History and Theology,” 31-34.

⁵¹ *Composition*, 248.

New narrative elements must be introduced, or selective appeals made to unrelated biblical passages, or novel theories of reading imposed on the text. Insofar as the plain meaning of the text in all of these cases is subordinated to an externally derived hermeneutic, these methods may all be lumped under the term “midrash.”⁵²

Yet the problems created by the Hypothesis force even Baden to abandon his ideals, causing him to ultimately contradict himself.

Citing the inconsistencies in the plot and language of the Spies Story in Num. 13-14, he agrees with virtually all documentarians that this passage should be divided between P and J, though, of course, the details of his division do not necessarily agree with the details of anyone else.⁵³ His solution to the problems of the passage, however, is midrashic because he introduces an element from outside of the text: he replaces the canonical author with two theoretical authors. His solution also produces an additional problem, for the beginning of J’s story is missing. The documentarian solution to *that* problem, that the redactor removed it in favor of P’s beginning, is also midrashic for it introduces yet another element from outside of the text: a redactor. Indeed, the Hypothesis itself is midrashic because, as Baden himself has pointed out, the one mark that separates it from all other hypotheses is its insistence that the documents are complete, continuous, and coherent. Yet, to fill in the acknowledged gaps in the documents, Baden must postulate phantom texts (such as the missing beginning of J’s Spies Story) that obviously cannot be found in the canonical texts. When conservative scholars point to Jud. 8:24 to support their “midrashic” explanation that the Ishmaelites and the Midianites in Gen. 37 are the same merchant group, they are at least pointing to a text that actually exists! Baden contradicts himself right from the start by dismissing all other solutions to the problems of the Pentateuch as midrashic while failing to realize that the documentarian solution is just as midrashic as the others.

But the problems multiply greatly when we turn to Num. 32:7-15, in which Moses, in his recapitulation of the Spies Story, mixes

⁵² *Ibid.*, 12.

⁵³ *Redaction*, 114-130.

the details and the wording of both the P and J versions so well, that the documentarians despair over separating these verses, indeed the whole chapter, into two coherent passages. Harvey H. Guthrie, Jr., simply surrenders:

This ch. has defied any generally agreed analysis into sources. Certainly part of it represents the conclusion of the JE narrative in Num., the continuation of which is found in Deut. 34. P elements are also present. It may be that an editor has recast the narrative on the basis of JE and P rather than merely combining them.⁵⁴

But that would make the redactor an author, which is unacceptable to Baden.

Friedman admits to the difficulty: "This chapter appears to be composed of material from both J and P, but it is difficult to separate and identify which verses are from which source."⁵⁵ He states that his first priority is to identify the sources based on the terminology and his third priority is the coherence of the narrative, and it shows: neither one of his sources is coherent.

Baden believes he has successfully divided the chapter between P and E (not P and J as Friedman did), including assigning all of 7-15 to P (Friedman gives most of 7-12 to J). To do so, however, he must perform some literary gymnastics, including asserting that the redactor added the phrase "to the wadi Eschol" to verse 9, the phrase "because they have not wholly followed Me" to the end of verse 11, and the phrase "for they have wholly followed Yahweh" to the end of verse 12. The purpose for these insertions was to bring the chapter into alignment with the now redacted Num. 13 and 14.⁵⁶

As complex as this explanation is, he still has not explained the presence of *all* of the non-P elements in 7-15, as Carr has pointed out.⁵⁷ Concerning the phrases which the redactor allegedly added to the end of verses 11 and 12, Baden says,

⁵⁴ Harvey H. Guthrie, Jr., "The Book of Numbers," in Charles M. Laymon, ed., *The Interpreter's One-Volume Commentary on the Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971), 98.

⁵⁵ *Sources*, 300, n. *.

⁵⁶ *Redaction*, 143-144.

⁵⁷ Carr, "Scribal Processes," in *The Pentateuch*, 74, n. 29.

That this is a redactional insertion, and not original to these verses, may be seen most clearly when these phrases are removed from the P text. What we are left with is not only a considerably smoother text, but one which is strikingly similar to the equivalent P verses in Num 14:29-30.⁵⁸

But is this not what the classical documentarians did, assign passages to the redactor “because they could be removed from their contexts without breaking the flow of the narrative”?

Ironically, Baden is correctly using the title “redactor” here because the person he imagines creating Num. 32 is not the simple compiler he has been advocating, which makes the critique of Baden’s solution by Liane M. Marquis so pointed. Baden assumes

that the compiler inserted phrases into Numbers 32 to reconcile this account with the now-combined spies story in Numbers 13-14. While innovative, this is not something that the compiler is seen to do elsewhere. The details are so minor that they do not significantly change the meaning of the story. That the spies began at Kadesh-Barnea or went to the wadi Eshcol is not enough of a contradiction or narrative problem to warrant the intervention of the compiler per Baden’s own conception of how the compiler works. The compiler “is not a historian—he is not concerned with giving the one accurate account of Israel’s early history. And above all he is not an interpreter; he does not create new theological concepts.” Baden, *Composition*, 226-227. If an “accurate” rendering of the spies story is the impetus for the addition of Kadesh Barnea or the wadi Eshcol, it should not be of major significance to the compiler. And if theological interpretation is not of import, then the addition of Caleb’s loyalty to the priestly story seems rather unnecessary.⁵⁹

Then there is the problem of the relationship between the Spies Story and Moses’ retelling of it in Deuteronomy. In the retelling, the spies are sent out, in part, to “bring back word” as to the best way to

⁵⁸ *Redaction*, 143, n. 116.

⁵⁹ Liane M. Marquis, “The Composition of Numbers 32: A New Proposal,” *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. 63 (2013), 429 n. 52.

go in the Promised Land (Deut. 1:22) and the spies do so (v. 25). The spies are not specifically told to “bring back word” in the Story, but they do so anyway (Num. 13:26). Baden says this verse was inserted by the redactor to bring the Story more in line with D’s version because “his aim in combining all the documents was to create a single account of Israelite history.”⁶⁰ But this makes the redactor a historian, which contradicts the statement which Marquis quotes from *Composition* and Baden’s own critique of the role of the redactor in *Redaction*. Moses refers to the J version of the Spies Story in his retelling, yet in the midst of it appears one solitary line from P’s version: “Your little ones, whom you said would be victims...” (Deut. 1:39, AT, referring to Num. 14:31). Baden says the redactor must have added it but admits he does not know why the redactor would have done so.⁶¹ The redactor is not combining sources here. Yet Baden *must* say that the redactor inserted the line here because no other explanation (D knew P or the Pentateuch was written by a single author) is acceptable to him. However, Baden has done exactly what he accuses the classical documentarians of doing: he has turned the compiler into an *author*, and in the case of Num. 32, a *theologically minded* author and a *historian*, thereby contradicting himself.

So what are we to do with Baden’s books? Should we begin dividing them into sources because he keeps contradicting himself?

Baden is not the only documentarian who has contradicted himself. Many documentarians are themselves authors who unintentionally create contradictions when they insist that a single author would never contradict himself but then allow the theoretical authors of their theoretical documents to do so. The classic example is the critics’ claim that the lists of Esau’s wives (Gen. 26:34; 28:9; 36:2-3) are contradictory, but they still assign each of them to P.⁶² E.A. Speiser says that we can account for this and other inconsistencies in P if we postulate that P was developed over centuries by a school of scribes.⁶³ In other words, Speiser wants us to believe that

⁶⁰ *Redaction*, 275-276.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 278.

⁶² For example, *Sources*, 74, 77, 90-91. See n. * on p. 91.

⁶³ E.A. Speiser, *Genesis*, The Anchor Bible 1 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1981), xxvi. But if we are going to take this route, if we are going to say that a school of authors created the inconsistencies in P, then why postulate docu-

a *single* author could not have created this contradiction but a *school* of authors could have done so. And he wants us to believe that despite centuries of constantly revising their own text, this same school of authors was also incapable of detecting and correcting this contradiction.⁶⁴

A few scholars have pointed out to their fellow documentarians that if they were to push their arguments to their logical conclusions, then they should divide J into smaller documents because it too contains contradictions, etc., etc. Eissfeldt has felt he could detect an L layer within J. Pfeiffer has proffered S and S² sources. Other, less imaginative scholars have simply divided J into a J¹, a J², and even a J³. Of course, one gets the impression that J is being not divided but shattered, that we are no longer dealing with “internally consistent documents,” to borrow Friedman’s phrase, but with dustbins full of shards, that we are moving away from the Documentary Hypothesis towards the Fragmentary Hypothesis. Most documentarians, therefore, reject the efforts of these scholars as being too extreme. In rejecting these efforts, however, they place themselves in the odd position of defending the unity of J at all costs—even at the cost of being inconsistent. J. Philip Hyatt is one such documentarian. He admits that “there are some inconsistencies in the J narrative.” One would think that he would argue, therefore, that J must have been written by two or more authors. After all, in that same article, he states that scholars have already proven that Moses could not have written the Pentateuch because of the “outright disagreements in the laws and narratives that would not have existed if they had come from the pen of one man.” But this is not what he does. Instead, he insists that the single author of J “was a literary genius” and argues that we can explain away the inconsistencies in J “by viewing the Yahwist as a collector of traditions who did not always trouble himself to reconcile them.”⁶⁵ So, on the one hand, Hyatt argues that a single author did not write the Pentateuch *because* of the inconsistencies; on the other hand, he argues that a single author

ments at all? Why not just say that a school of authors created the inconsistencies in the Pentateuch and be done with it?

⁶⁴ The best reconciliation of these lists is that of Gleason L. Archer, *Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1982), 99-100.

⁶⁵ J. Philip Hyatt, “The Compiling of Israel’s Story,” in Laymon, 1082-1083.

did write J *in spite of* the inconsistencies. Hence, it is now Hyatt who, with the very same pen, is creating inconsistencies and outright disagreements.

Friedman is also willing to let his theoretical authors contradict themselves. He believes that Baruch was the author/editor of both editions of the Deuteronomistic History. He has argued that the phrase “to this day” is evidence that the first edition was produced before the Exile. The problem is why would Baruch retain these words in his exilic edition when the things referred to no longer existed? “Why not edit them out?” Friedman’s solution is:

The editor of the second edition did not bother to edit them out because that was simply not his concern. He was not rewriting the whole history or looking for contradictions to clean up. He was just adding the end of the story and adding a few lines at the beginning.⁶⁶

If this explanation is accepted as plausible, then theoretically we could say that the single author of the Pentateuch was also not concerned enough to clean up his contradictions.

Perhaps this explanation will also tell us why there are contradictions in Friedman’s book (although the likeliest explanation is that Friedman was unaware that he had contradicted himself). In *Wrote*, it is argued that the Shilonite priests compiled the original Deuteronomistic law code (Deut. 12-26). Years later, another Shilonite, Baruch, built the first edition of the Deuteronomistic History (Dtr¹) around this law code. The onset of the Exile forced Baruch to revise parts of Dtr¹ and add new sections which bridged the gap between Josiah and the Exile. The revisions and additions are called Dtr². In *Wrote*’s symbolism, D includes the law code, Dtr¹ and Dtr².⁶⁷

⁶⁶ *Wrote*, 92.

⁶⁷ Friedman equates D with the law code when he says that D uses “the crucial expression ‘place where Yahweh sets his name’ (or ‘causes his name to be mentioned,’ or ‘causes his name to dwell’)” (110), phrases which occur in Deuteronomy only in the law code, and again when he says, “It was an age in which the law code which they had preserved was royally endorsed as the book of the Torah (D)” (220). At least twice he quotes or refers to passages (Deut. 3:23-26; 30:11-14) which he says came from D but which he elsewhere identifies as coming from Dtr¹ (215-216, 251, n. 24). Finally, he equates D with both Dtr¹ and Dtr² when he says, “The sources—

As evidence for this argument, Friedman urges that the development of the History paralleled the history of the Shilonites.

For example, the ark is not mentioned in E or in the Deuteronomic law code, both of which were written when the Shilonite priests did not have access to the ark. But the ark *is* mentioned in the parts of Deuteronomy that were written during the reign of Josiah (Dtr¹), when the Shilonites *did* have access to the ark.⁶⁸

Yet later, this statement is completely reversed: “Recall that Jeremiah is from the priests of Shiloh, who brought us E and D, the two sources that never mention the ark.”⁶⁹ Does D mention the ark or not? Friedman seems somewhat indecisive on this point. The 1997 edition of *Wrote* fixed the contradiction by revising the second statement: “Recall that Jeremiah is from the priests of Shiloh, who brought us E, the source that never mentions the ark, and D, the source that mentions it rarely (only in chapters 10 and 31).”⁷⁰ This revision brings the book back into line with the assumption that a single author would never contradict himself, but one cannot help but wonder how and why Friedman contradicted himself in the first place.

That “the words ‘none arose like him’ are applied to only two people in the Bible”⁷¹ (Moses in Deut. 34:10 and Josiah in 2 K 23:25)

J, E, P, and D (Dtr¹ and Dtr²)—were not all completed until shortly before” the days of the second Temple (200).

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 111.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 1987 edition, 168.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 1997 edition, 168; *Ibid.*, 2019 edition, 149.

⁷¹ *Wrote*, 95. Actually, the words “none arose like him” are applied to a third person. In a dream, Yahweh says to King Solomon, “Behold, I have given you a wise and discerning heart, so that there has been no one like you before you, and none shall arise like you after you” (1 K 3:12, AT). In the Hebrew, Yahweh’s words form a chiasm:

like you
 there has not been
 before you
 and after you
 there will not arise
like you.

is said in chapter 5 of his book to be one piece of evidence that the Deuteronomist equated Josiah with Moses. This equation in turn is said to be evidence that Dtr¹ (which includes 2 K 23:25) was written during Josiah's reign. Yet, in the "Introduction," Friedman quotes Deut. 34:10 and then concludes "that these sound like the words of someone who lived a long time after Moses and had the opportunity to see other prophets and thus make the comparison."⁷² Why is it when the words "none arose like him" are applied to Moses, they are proof that Deuteronomy must have been written long after Moses' death, but when they are applied to Josiah, they are proof that Dtr¹ must have been written while Josiah was still alive?

As further evidence that Dtr¹ was composed during Josiah's reign, Friedman alleges that the Deuteronomist rates every Judean king through Josiah as good, qualifiedly good or bad depending on what he did or did not do to the high places. After Josiah, this criterion disappears. The last four kings are rated as bad, but the high places are never mentioned. The question is then asked: "If all of the Deuteronomistic history were the work of one person, why would he set up this criterion and apply it to every single king except the last four—the very four in whose reigns the kingdom finally fell?"⁷³

When we turn to 2 K 23:25 and observe the Hebrew word order of the first few words and the last few words of the statement concerning Josiah, we find the same pattern:

like him
 there has not been
 before him
 and after him
 there did not arise
like him.

Thus, the author of First and Second Kings equated Solomon with both Josiah and Moses, just as he equated Josiah with Moses. This equation, however, poses a serious problem for Friedman's theory, for he believes that First and Second Kings were composed by a Shilonite and the Shilonites supposedly loved Josiah and Moses but despised Solomon.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 7.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 98. Friedman tries to buttress his belief that the first edition of the Deuteronomistic History ended with the account of Josiah by presenting three related arguments, all of which have to do with how the History treats the four kings who came after Josiah, the last four kings to rule over Judah. The first argument, as we have already seen, is that the high places are mentioned in the accounts of every

Unwarranted Assumption

king of Judah except the last four. The majority of the kings of Judah through Josiah are also compared to David, but not the last four. The Historian also invoked God's covenant with David to explain why the bad Judean kings who came before Josiah did not lose the throne (for example, see 1 K 11:35-36; 15:3-4; 2 K 8:18-19). The very last king was bad and he, of course, did lose the throne, but the three kings who preceded him were also bad, and the Historian did not invoke the covenant to explain why *they* did not lose the throne. Friedman believes that this difference in the treatment of the last four kings represents "a different point of view" from that presented in the accounts of the other kings (see *Wrote*, 97-99).

However, every one of these arguments is fallacious. What he has said about the last four kings is true, but what he has said about the kings who came before them is not, as this chart demonstrates:

The Kings of Judah up to Josiah and their ratings:	1	2	3
Solomon (good, then evil)			
Rehoboam (evil)		x	
Abijam (evil)	x		
Asa (good)			
Jehoshaphat (good)		x	
Joram (evil)	x	x	
Ahaziah (evil)	x	x	x
Jehoash (good)		x	
Amaziah (good)			
Azariah (good)		x	
Jotham (good)		x	
Ahaz (evil)			x
Hezekiah (good)			
Manasseh (evil)		x	x
Amon (evil)	x	x	x
Josiah (good)			

The accounts in which:

- 1 – the high places are *not* mentioned
- 2 – the king is *not* compared to David
- 3 – the covenant is *not* mentioned (for evil kings only)

The accounts of the Judean kings do *not* always mention the high places. The criterion is conspicuously absent from the accounts of four kings who came *before* Josiah. Like the four kings who came after Josiah, these rulers are judged to have been evil, yet the high places are not mentioned.

The majority of kings are *not* compared to David. Of the sixteen kings in the chart, *nine*, some good and some evil, are not compared to David. He is sometimes mentioned in the stories of these kings, but he is not the standard by which they are judged.

The author of this question is obviously implying that the History cannot be the work of one person. Yet the author of other passages in *Wrote* argues that the History *is* the work of one person—and this author never answers this question, as if it had never been brought up in his own writings. Do we have here two sources and two authors? Or do we have a single author who has forgotten to answer his own question?

In *Hidden*, Friedman calls the contradiction in the Joseph story concerning the Ishmaelites and the Midianites “utterly irreconcilable.”⁷⁴ Yet, a similar phenomenon occurs in *Wrote*. Outside of chapter 8, we are told that the Aaronids were opposed by a group of priests known as the Shilonites. But in chapter 8 itself, we are told that the Aaronids were in fact opposed by a different group of priests, known as the Mushites. It is true that back in chapter 6 the two groups are equated (just as the Midianites and the Ishmaelites are equated in Jud. 8:24):

Moreover, the Shiloh priests were very possibly Mushite—i.e., descended from Moses—and a family with such a famous, noble ancestor would be even more likely to be conscious of its heritage.⁷⁵

The term “Mushite” is here defined in its first appearance in the book. If we were documentarians, we could build a case that this

In the accounts of four kings who came *before* Josiah, the author of First and Second Kings does *not* use the covenant to explain why these kings did not lose the throne. In fact, the examples cited by Friedman, the examples given above, are the *only* times he refers to the covenant in this manner.

Perhaps Friedman could argue that these three arguments, taken separately, do not prove anything, but taken together, they support and verify his theory. Does it not seem unusual that all three converge in the accounts of the last four kings? But a study of the chart reveals that all three arguments also converge in the accounts of two other kings: Ahaziah and Amon. Both of these kings came before Josiah and both were evil. Yet in their accounts, the high places are not mentioned, they are not compared to David, and the covenant is not used to explain why they did not lose the throne. And Friedman says their stories were part of the *first* edition.

These three arguments, therefore, do not buttress his belief that the first edition of the History ended with the account of Josiah.

⁷⁴ *Hidden*, 353.

⁷⁵ *Wrote*, 111.

first appearance could not possibly be original for when the term reappears in chapter 8, it is defined again. We could argue that if this first appearance had been original and if the book had come from one author, this second definition would have been unnecessary (assuming, of course, that the reader has not forgotten chapter 6's definition by the time he or she got to chapter 8). Obviously the redactor, in an attempt to make his Shilonite source and his Mushite source appear as one document, inserted the words "Mushite—i.e.," into the original Shilonite source.⁷⁶ When we remove this insertion, we still end up with an intelligible sentence:

Moreover, the Shiloh priests were very possibly descended from Moses, and a family with such a famous, noble ancestor would be even more likely to be conscious of its heritage.

The Mushite passages contradict the Shilonite passages. Within the Shilonite passages is a contradiction concerning D's mention of the ark, a contradiction that was apparently cleaned up by a redactor who was, nevertheless, not concerned enough to clean up the other contradictions. In my analysis of chapter 8 of *Wrote*, we saw that the Mushite passages can be divided into two sources. If we were documentarians, we would be well on our way to finding four sources within this work by a single author.

Conflicting Theologies

Related to the category of contradictions is the category of conflicting theologies. E, D, and especially J are said to view God in anthropomorphic terms while P studiously avoids such terms.⁷⁷ J, E, and D are also said by Friedman to view God as personal and close while P sees him as transcendent and cosmic.⁷⁸ These differences are again used to justify the division of the Pentateuch. The unwarranted assumption here is that an author would never contradict his own theology.

⁷⁶ The terms "Shilonite" and "Mushite" occur together again on p. 220: "...the Shilonite (possibly Mushite) priesthood..." But the words within the parentheses could have been added by a redactor.

⁷⁷ *Sources*, 12; see also *Wrote*, 171.

⁷⁸ *Wrote*, 214-216.

To remain consistent to his argument, Friedman should have assigned all the anthropomorphic, “personal and close” passages to J, E, or D and all the nonanthropomorphic, “transcendent and cosmic” passages to P, but this is not what he has done. The following passage, for example, has been assigned to P: “I will set My tabernacle among you, and My soul shall not abhor you. I will walk among you...” (Lev. 26:11-12). This anthropomorphic picture sees God as personal and close. Elsewhere in the Pentateuch, God is seen walking only at Gen. 3:8 (J) and Deut. 23:14 (D). The style is that of P but the theology is that of J and D. This same mixture of style and theology appears again at Num. 35:34: “Therefore do not defile the land which you inhabit, in the midst of which I dwell; for I, Yahweh, dwell among the children of Israel.” Nor are these isolated examples: see also Ex. 25:8, 29:45-46 and Num. 5:3, all P passages.

After repeatedly emphasizing the differences between the two views, Friedman finally throws away the whole argument by conceding that both views can be found in all four documents: “Not to overstate the case, God is sometimes pictured as personal in P, and he is sometimes pictured as transcendent in J, E, and D.” He then tries to dismiss this concession by saying, “But the difference overall is still blatant and profound.”⁷⁹ This concession, however, cannot be so easily dismissed. A fair assessment of an author’s theology must account for everything he or she has said on the subject. To ignore one view because another view is emphasized more often is irresponsible and unscholarly. A fair handling of the Pentateuchal passages, even if we limit ourselves to the passages of one of the alleged sources, demonstrates that a single author *can* view God as both cosmic and personal, transcendent and close (see “The Author Has No Message” below). The only way the documentarians can escape this conclusion is to reassign the troublesome passages (such as Lev. 26:11-12 and Num. 35:34) to the “correct” documents, but they will never do so because the resultant documents would invalidate their other arguments, particularly the argument of style. Doing so would also be the equivalent of running P through a paper shredder.

Another alleged theological conflict involves the use of the divine names. The authors of E and P believed that God’s name, Yahweh, was not revealed until the time of Moses, so they avoided using

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 216.

that name until the story line reached the time of its revelation. The Yahwist, on the other hand, used Yahweh from the very beginning, as if God's name has been known since creation. This supposedly explains why God in Genesis is called sometimes Elohim, sometimes Yahweh.

However, in several instances this explanation runs afoul of the argument of repetition, for there are several doublets which use the same name. The story of Isaac's lie concerning Rebekah (Gen. 26:1-11) is said to be an alternative version of the story of Abram's lie concerning Sarai (12:10-20), but both have been given to J because Yahweh is used in both.⁸⁰ In this case, the documentarians allow the use of the divine name to override the argument of repetition, but the reverse is true in other doublets. Gen. 20:1-18 is also said to be an alternative version of Gen. 12, but this time Friedman gives Gen. 20 completely to E, even though Yahweh is used in v. 18.⁸¹ Friedman believes that Gen. 28:10-22 is a combination of "two stories of a revelation to Jacob at Beth-El,"⁸² one story coming from J, the other from E. Yet both names are used in v. 21 (E): "Yahweh shall be my Elohim." Gen. 2 (J) is thought to be a doublet of Gen. 1 (P), even though Gen. 2 *always* refers to God with the compound name Yahweh Elohim and never with Yahweh alone, a fact many documentarians neglect to mention. Some documentarians assign Gen. 21:1b ("And Yahweh did for Sarah as He had spoken,") to P because it is a doublet of 21:1a ("And Yahweh visited Sarah as He had said,") which they assign to J. Friedman, in *Narrative*, sees these two parts of the verse as forming a "rather clumsy repetition of the datum."⁸³ Yet both parts use the name Yahweh, something P is not supposed to have done before Ex. 6. Gen. 15 and 17 are thought to be "two stories of the covenant between God and the patriarch Abraham."⁸⁴ Friedman gives Gen. 15 to J and R and Gen. 17 to P—even though Yahweh is found in 17:1.⁸⁵ Once again, when two arguments clash, the documentarians allow one to prevail, then the other, producing inconsistent results.

⁸⁰ *Sources*, 51, 72-73.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 61-62.

⁸² *Wrote*, 8.

⁸³ *Narrative*, 86. Actually, this verse is using parallelism.

⁸⁴ *Wrote*, 8.

⁸⁵ *Sources*, 53-57.

In his third Argument in *Sources*, Friedman acknowledges that the name Yahweh does show up in the wrong documents, but he insists that the exceptions prove nothing because there are only three of them (Gen. 17:1 and 21:1, both P, and Gen. 28:21, E).⁸⁶ However, in his own translation of the Pentateuch, which also appears in *Sources*, the name YHWH El Olam appears in E at Gen. 21:33 and the name YHWH also appears in E at Gen. 20:18 and 31:49. This makes six exceptions, exceptions which prove that the anomaly still exists within the documents, for the name Yahweh is not supposed to appear in E or P, and certainly not in the stories that are supposed to be the doublets of stories in J, which also uses the name Yahweh. And yet it does.

Friedman would counter this argument by pointing out that the divine names occur more than two thousand times in the Pentateuch, so six exceptions are insignificant. Besides, the argument is missing the point. The issue is not terminology but theology. The issue is that the documents have different ideas of when the name “Yahweh” was revealed. Each document consistently uses “Yahweh” according to its idea of when it was revealed.⁸⁷

Actually, Friedman is committing a logical fallacy known as *base rate*. He is comparing the number of exceptions to the total number of uses of the divine names in the *entire* Pentateuch, which is incorrect because, by the documentarians’ own argumentation, the use of the names is no longer significant after Ex. 6:2. *Elohim* and *Yahweh* are used only 452 times before Ex. 6:2, which makes the number of exceptions more significant. Even so, in a sense, he is correct. If it were merely an issue of terminology, then, yes, the exceptions would be insignificant.⁸⁸ But then the whole divine name argument would be insignificant, for if it were merely an issue of terminology,

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 11, 56, 62, 77.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 10-11.

⁸⁸ In another sense, the exceptions are significant, for, as Baden points out (*Redaction*, 227), if the author of a document is allowed to use the “wrong” divine name even once, then he should be allowed to use it several times: “either we demand that the sources unerringly stick to their chosen terminology, or we admit that they can vary not only once, but as often as they want (or, more accurately, as often as it may happen).” This kind of thinking allows Baden to assign Gen. 15 to E even though the name Yahweh appears there. For Baden, the divine name criterion is not as absolute as it is for Friedman: “It is, however, necessary to accept that any *given* use of a divine name cannot automatically be linked to either J or E.”

then the divine names would be additional items in his word list (as they are in his article in the *Anchor Bible Dictionary*) and, as we have seen, word lists prove nothing.⁸⁹

However, since he insists that it is an issue of theology, he makes the exceptions rather significant. If it is an issue of theology, then it should not matter to the *narrators* of the documents which name they use in Genesis for they already know, of course, that God's name is Yahweh. Friedman then confuses his own argument by declaring that the narrator of J never uses the name "Elohim," even though the narrator clearly uses the compound name "Yahweh Elohim" in Gen. 2 and 3. As we saw earlier, to maintain his argument, he blames the redactor for inserting "Elohim" into those chapters. But if the issue is about theology and not terminology, then what difference does it make whether J uses the compound name or not?

However, if the issue really is about theology, then it does matter if the *characters* of the documents use the name "Yahweh" in Genesis. According to J, the characters in Genesis already know the name, so it should not matter if they call God Yahweh or Elohim or El Shaddai or any of the many other names he has. However, the characters in E⁹⁰ and P should *not* know the name "Yahweh," and yet, in E, they do. Jacob knows it in Gen. 28:21, Laban knows it in Gen. 31:49, and Abraham knows it in Gen. 21:33. And if we follow Baden's division of the text, Abram also knows it in Gen. 15:2 and 8 (and Yahweh even reminds Abram that his name is Yahweh in v. 7). The documentarians, therefore, need to come up with a different explanation for why E uses "Elohim" in Genesis, as well as a different explanation for Ex. 3:13-15, the E passage in which God supposedly reveals for the first time that his name is Yahweh.

Umberto Cassuto has provided an alternative explanation for why we see the alternation in the divine names. According to him, the authors of the Old Testament followed a set of rules which de-

⁸⁹ Friedman admits in *The Exodus* (Richard Elliott Friedman, *The Exodus* [N.Y.: HarperCollins Publishers, 2017], 246, n. 42) that in *Wrote* his argument concerning the divine names was a matter of terminology, not theology. They are also a matter of terminology in his article in the *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, where they appear first in his list of "characteristic terms and names that can be disproportionately or even unexceptionally identified with a particular division" (Friedman, "Torah (Penta-teuch)," 610).

⁹⁰ As Baden acknowledges in *Redaction*, 226-227.

terminated which name was used in which context and these rules seem to work in most, if not in all, instances, especially in the Pentateuch.⁹¹ However, given the unscientific imprecision of the artistic soul (see “The Author Thinks the Same Way that They Do” below), must there be a reason in every instance for why the author chose one name over the other? After all, Friedman has not told us why, in this doublet from *Wrote*, he used *deity* in one passage and *God* in the other:

Investigators found that in most cases one of the two versions of a doublet story would refer to the deity by the divine name, Yahweh (formerly mispronounced Jehovah), and the other version of the story would refer to the deity simply as “God.”⁹³

Then they noticed that, quite often, one of the two versions of a story would refer to God by one name and the other version would refer to God by a different name.⁹²

Or why, in this next doublet, he used *God* in one passage and *Yahweh* in the other:

In JE, God walks in the garden of Eden, God personally makes Adam’s and Eve’s clothes, personally closes Noah’s ark, smells Noah’s sacrifice, wrestles with Jacob, and speaks to Moses out of the burning bush.⁹⁵

In J’s story, Yahweh personally walks in the Garden of Eden, makes the humans’ first clothes, closes the ark, and smells Noah’s sacrifice.⁹⁴

Notice how the two passages not only form a doublet that uses different names for God but also employ different languages. In the first, the clothes are “Adam’s and Eve’s,” but in the second they are

⁹¹ Cassuto, 18-49, especially 36-38.

⁹² *Wrote*, 35.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 8.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 215.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 171.

simply “the humans’.” In the first, the ark is Noah’s, but in the second it is just the ark. The two also differ on actual details. The author of the first passage is aware that God also wrestled with Jacob and spoke to Moses. The author of the second is apparently unaware of those stories. The first passage says that God did all these things in JE; the second says Yahweh did all these things only in J. So these two passages use two different languages, form a doublet, contradict each other, and use different names for God. All of this from the hand of a single author, Richard Elliott Friedman.

Friedman is not the only documentarian who has created these kinds of anomalies. Cuthbert Simpson is one of the documentarians who argue that J should be divided into a J¹ and a J². He believes that the writing of J² was motivated by the split of Israel into a northern kingdom and a southern kingdom shortly after Solomon’s death. In his article, “The Growth of the Hexateuch,” which is found in *The Interpreter’s Bible* commentary, he states what he believes was J²’s purpose for writing:

Furthermore, the content of his narrative shows that he was also eager to preserve the spiritual unity of Israel. He saw that the real unity of the people inhered not in the state, but in the will of the Lord who had brought them into a unique relationship with himself.⁹⁶

Only two paragraphs later, he returns to discussing J²’s purpose for writing:

J² accordingly undertook the task of revising the J¹ narrative so that it would appeal more directly to the people of the north, and bring home to them the fact of the spiritual unity of the nation as a whole—a unity which inhered in the will of God.⁹⁷

Then, in his “Introduction” to Genesis in that same commentary, he again discusses J²’s purpose for writing:

⁹⁶ Cuthbert Simpson, “The Growth of the Hexateuch,” in George Arthur Buttrick, ed., *The Interpreter’s Bible*, Vol. I (N.Y.: Abingdon Press, 1953), 194.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 195.

J² was concerned to counter the blow which this event had administered to the unity of Israel. He set about providing a history which would show that this unity inhered not in the political framework in which it had for a time found partial expression, but in the relationship of the people to Yahweh.⁹⁸

These three passages are similar to each other, but their differences are striking. In the first passage, J² was “*eager to preserve* the spiritual unity of Israel.” In the third, J² was “*concerned to counter the blow* which this event had administered to the unity of Israel.” The same concept is expressed in both passages, but it is expressed in different styles. The unity for which J² was concerned is also described in different ways. In the first passage, it begins as “the spiritual unity of *Israel*,” then it becomes “the real unity of *the people*.” In the second passage, it is “the spiritual unity of *the nation as a whole*” and in the third it again becomes “the unity of *Israel*,” but with a difference: in the first two passages, the unity is a *spiritual* unity; in the third, it is simply a unity. In the first passage, this unity inhered “not in the *state*,” in the third, it inhered “not in the *political framework*.” In the first passage, this unity inhered “in the *will* of the Lord” and in the second, it inhered “in the *will* of God,” but in the third, it inhered “in the *relationship* of the people to Yahweh.” Notice also that Simpson uses three different names for God: in the first passage, he uses “the Lord;” in the second, “God;” in the third, “Yahweh.” Thus, Simpson, a single author, has created not just a doublet but a triplet that employs three different styles and three different names for God.

Theological conflicts within *Wrote* are admittedly rare for Friedman was much more interested in discussing the theologies of the documents than in discussing his own theology. What is perhaps more significant is that *Wrote* presents conflicting theologies, so to speak, concerning Wellhausen and his version of the Hypothesis. We have already seen that some very positive comments about Wellhausen found in the “Introduction” have been duplicated in chapter 9. In that chapter, other positive comments have been intermingled and even combined with negative statements such as these:

⁹⁸ Simpson, “Genesis,” in Buttrick, Vol. I, 445.

Once Wellhausen accepted Reuss' claim that the law was later than the prophets [a claim which Friedman earlier in the chapter had discounted as false], and he accepted Graf's claim that the Tabernacle was nothing more than a symbol of the Temple [another false claim], the scene was set.

Wellhausen's picture was...wrong.

Wellhausen's claim, that P assumes centralized religion, was also wrong.

Wellhausen's other interpretations of the evidence are not compelling arguments either.⁹⁹

What should we make of these conflicting statements? Was Wellhausen's theory "logical, coherent, persuasive," as Friedman states in one part of a sentence, or was it "wrong," as he states in the other part? Was Wellhausen an intelligent man, "a dominant figure of modern biblical scholarship," or was he a sheep, easily led into accepting false claims? Do we have here the work of two authors—one who admired Wellhausen and another who despised him? Or do we have here the admission from a single author that intelligent men can and do make simple mistakes that undermine their coherent and persuasive theories?

The Author Thinks the Same Way that They Do

Second, the documentarians make the unwarranted assumption that all authors, including the author of the Pentateuch, think the same way that they do. Bernhard W. Anderson represented all documentarians when he wrote,

One of the clearest evidences of disunity, at least according to our way of thinking, is the occurrence of the same material in different versions. In the Abraham story, for instance, on two different occasions the patriarch told a 'white lie' which almost

⁹⁹ *Wrote*, 146, 147-148, 152.

got his wife into sexual trouble with a foreign king (Gen. 12:10-17 and 20:1-18).¹⁰⁰

But that is precisely the problem: the repetition is evidence of disunity only to the documentarians' way of thinking. As we shall see, an ancient Oriental author, such as Moses, would gladly have employed repetition because it would have contributed to the overall structure and purpose of his work. Repetition within an ancient Oriental work, therefore, should be seen, not as an anomaly, but as a pointer to the author's purpose and message.

The documentarians miss this because they assume they know how an author—any author—goes about creating his work of art, as if certain, universal, unchanging, scientifically derived principles have governed the creative forces of all authors of all ages. Unfortunately, the documentarians assume that these principles are the same ones to which they have become accustomed. They have been trained in the conventions of modern Western scholarship. They have been trained to let science and logic govern their thoughts and writings. They have been trained to present their ideas objectively and to construct their arguments from basic truths to carefully derived conclusions. Accordingly, their writings are logical, thorough, precise, and well documented. And the documentarians expect the writings of other authors to possess the same qualities.

Because of this expectation, whenever they encounter a seemingly illogical work, they break it down into logical units and call these units "documents." The structure of the Pentateuch, for example, seems illogical at times. Stories seemingly repeat themselves for no logical reason. The writing style changes from passage to passage. Contradictions apparently abound. Faced with this seemingly illogical hodge-podge, the documentarians naturally broke it down into a series of "internally consistent documents." In short, they have treated the Pentateuch like it should have been written by Spock and have forgotten that it was written by McCoy.

But the expectations of the documentarians are unrealistic: Western logic did not necessarily govern Eastern authors. Nor, for that matter, does it always govern Western authors. This is true for

¹⁰⁰ Bernhard W. Anderson, *Understanding the Old Testament*, 3rd edition, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975), 18.

some of our poets¹⁰¹ and is especially evident in the writings of authors such as Lewis Carroll, James Joyce, Samuel Beckett, Albert Camus, and Franz Kafka. To use the sometimes illogical nature of these works to prove multiple authorship is to be absurd, especially since the histories of these works have been so thoroughly documented. Of all the genre available in Western literature, the thesis is the most logical. It is uniquely adapted for the presentation of evidence and argumentation in a logical order and, for this reason, it is the genre the documentarians use most often. But even in this genre the expectations of the documentarians are sometimes unfulfilled. Friedman's book, after all, is merely an extended thesis.

The problem is that the scientific mind does not always understand the artistic soul. This is not to say that one is antithetical to the other, merely that one differs from the other. The documentarians have not fully appreciated the complexity, the dynamism, the individuality, the imprecision, and even the unpredictability that are the hallmarks of the artistic soul.

Because of this unpredictability, even authors are not completely aware of all of the forces that shape the composition of their own works. Eudora Welty, winner of the Pulitzer Prize for her short stories, has testified that,

as further hindsight has told me, certain patterns in my work repeat themselves without my realizing. There would be no way to know this, for during the writing of any single story, there is no other existing. Each writer must find out for himself, I imagine, on what strange basis he lives with his own stories.¹⁰²

Or consider the testimony of Ray Bradbury, who had this to say about his book, *Fahrenheit 451*, fifty years after he wrote it:

A last discovery. I write all of my novels and stories, as you have seen, in a great surge of delightful passion. Only recently, glanc-

¹⁰¹ Carl Sandburg once said, "I've written some poetry I don't understand myself" (as quoted in Laurence J. Peter, *Peter's Quotations: Ideas for Our Time* [N.Y.: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1977], 390).

¹⁰² Eudora Welty, *One Writer's Beginnings* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), 98.

ing at the novel, I realized that Montag is named after a paper manufacturing company. And Faber, of course, is a maker of pencils! What a sly thing my subconscious was, to name them thus.

And not tell *me!*¹⁰³

Or consider the testimony of Lewis Carroll:

I was walking on a hill-side, alone, one bright summer day, when suddenly there came into my head one line of verse—one solitary line—“For the *Snark* was a Boojum, you see.” I knew not what it meant, then: I know not what it means, now; but I wrote it down: and some time afterwards, the rest of the stanza occurred to me, that being its last line: and so by degrees, at odd moments during the next year or two, the rest of the poem pieced itself together, that being its last stanza. And since then, periodically I have received courteous letters from strangers, begging to know whether “The Hunting of the Snark” is an allegory, or contains some hidden moral, or is a political satire: and for all such questions I have but one answer, “*I don’t know!*”¹⁰⁴

Simply because we do not know why an author has written what he or she has written does not mean that we should look for another author.

Because of their assumptions, the critics believe they can reconstruct the literary history of the Pentateuch. But C.S. Lewis, an author whose works have run the gamut of subjects and genre from scholarly studies in literature to science fiction, from theological treatises to children’s fantasies, from essays in literary criticism to radio speeches, had this to say in a speech he delivered to theological students at Cambridge University about critics who tried to reconstruct the histories of his works:

¹⁰³ Ray Bradbury, “Afterword,” in *Fahrenheit 451*, 50th anniversary edition (N.Y.: The Random House Publishing Group, 2003), 173.

¹⁰⁴ Lewis Carroll, “Alice on the Stage,” *The Theatre*, 1887, reproduced in Donald J. Gray, ed., *Alice in Wonderland* (N.Y.: W.W. Norton and Company, 1971), 282.

What the value of such reconstructions is I learned very early in my career. I had published a book of essays; and the one into which I had put most of my heart, the one I really cared about and in which I discharged a keen enthusiasm, was on William Morris. And in almost the first review I was told that this was obviously the only one in the book in which I had felt no interest. Now don't mistake. The critic was, I now believe, quite right in thinking it the worst essay in the book; at least everyone agreed with him. Where he was totally wrong was in his imaginary history of the causes which produced its dullness.

Well, this made me prick up my ears. Since then I have watched with some care similar imaginary histories both of my own books and of books by friends whose real history I knew. Reviewers, both friendly and hostile, will dash you off such histories with great confidence; will tell you what public events had directed the author's mind to this or that, what other authors had influenced him, what his over-all intention was, what sort of audience he principally addressed, why—and when—he did everything.

Now I must first record my impression; then, distinct from it, what I can say with certainty. My impression is that in the whole of my experience not one of these guesses has on any one point been right; that the method shows a record of 100 per cent. failure. You would expect that by mere chance they would hit as often as they miss. But it is my impression that they do no such thing. I can't remember a single hit. But as I have not kept a careful record my mere impression may be mistaken. What I think I can say with certainty is that they are usually wrong.

And yet they would often sound—if you didn't know the truth—extremely convincing. Many reviewers said that the Ring in Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings* was suggested by the atom bomb. What could be more plausible? Here is a book published when everyone was preoccupied by that sinister invention; here in the centre of the book is a weapon which it seems madness to throw away yet fatal to use. Yet in fact, the chronology of the book's composition makes the theory impossible. Only the other week a reviewer said that a fairy tale by my friend Roger Lancelyn Green was influenced by fairy tales of mine. Nothing could be more probable. I have an imaginary country with a beneficent

lion in it: Green, one with a beneficent tiger. Green and I can be proved to read one another's works; to be indeed in various ways closely associated. The case for an affiliation is far stronger than many which we accept as conclusive when dead authors are concerned. But it's all untrue nevertheless. I know the genesis of that Tiger and that Lion and they are quite independent.

Now this surely ought to give us pause. The reconstruction of the history of a text, when the text is ancient, sounds very convincing. But one is after all sailing by dead reckoning; the results cannot be checked by fact. In order to decide how reliable the method is, what more could you ask for than to be shown an instance where the same method is at work and we have facts to check it by? Well, that is what I have done. And we find, that when the check is available, the results are either always, or else nearly always, wrong. The 'assured results of modern scholarship', as to the way in which an old book was written, are 'assured', we may conclude, only because the men who knew the facts are dead and can't blow the gaff.¹⁰⁵

Lewis' reviewers could not reconstruct the history of his works because they assumed they knew how authors went about creating their works. But they were wrong, dead wrong.

Lewis went on to make the point that his reviewers also assume that authors write stories the way that the reviewers would write stories—which explains why his reviewers never wrote any stories.¹⁰⁶ But this brings me back to my original point: the documentarians assume that all authors write the same way that they write. They assume that the Pentateuch should have been written the way that they would have written a Pentateuch—which explains why

¹⁰⁵ C.S. Lewis, "Modern Theology and Biblical Criticism," in Walter Hooper, ed., *Christian Reflections* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2014), 196-198.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 199. When I read what Rendtorff says about the Isaac stories (46-47), that "they are to some extent not amplified as narratives in the usual way," that they contain "only two detailed narratives" (Gen. 26:7-11 and 26-31), that the two divine addresses "have no immediate connection with the narrative context," and that the stories about the wells "lack only the usual narrative shaping," I cannot escape the notion that he does not know what a narrative is or how one actually works (and certainly not how an ancient Near Eastern narrative works).

they have never written one. So, how are they supposed to know what the author of the Pentateuch was supposed to do if they have never written one themselves? Of course, the question can be thrown back at those who hold the conservative view, but that is why we study the Pentateuch *as is*. We study it to see what the author actually did, not to see what he should have done.

Before dividing up a text, the documentarians should be asking two questions. The first should not be, “Does this text make sense to us?” but, “Does this text make sense to the author?” What Baden says about the redactor, the documentarians should apply to the author of the Pentateuch: “When in doubt, we should assume that the redactor understood the texts much better than we, and try to adjust our own readings accordingly.”¹⁰⁷

It is a shame that Baden does not follow his own advice. He wants to divide Num. 11:1-34 into two stories because there are two complaints: the people are complaining because they want to eat meat and Moses is complaining because he does not feel competent to lead the people. Moses’ complaint, he says, “is a general one, not one about the issue of meat in particular.”¹⁰⁸ That is, the two stories have nothing to do with each other and, therefore, came from two sources.

What Baden, the scientific anatomist, is forgetting, but what Moses, the all too human author, is not—because he was there—is that the people have been complainers ever since Moses returned to Egypt. They complained when Pharaoh increased their work load (Ex. 5:20-21). They complained when Pharaoh’s army chased them (Ex. 14:11-12). They complained on the way to Sinai (Ex. 15:24; 16:2-3; 17:2-3). They made the golden calf at Sinai when he did not come down from the mountain soon enough for them (Ex. 32:1-6). They complained at Taberah (Num. 11:1-3). And now, here they are complaining again. Moses could not hold it in any more. Baden is right. Moses’ complaint has nothing to do with the fact that the people wanted meat. It would not have mattered what their complaint was. They could have complained that the sky was blue. This was simply the straw that broke the camel’s back. Perhaps from the

¹⁰⁷ *Redaction*, 229.

¹⁰⁸ *Composition*, 87.

literary critic's point of view, Num. 11 does not make sense, but from the human psychological point of view, it makes perfect sense.

Besides, if the two stories really did have nothing to do with each other, as Baden claims, then why did his compiler splice them together? Because, according to Baden, the people's complaint provided a "rationale for Moses's speech."¹⁰⁹ So, once again, Baden is talking in circles. The people's complaint was a sufficient rationale for the *compiler*, who conflated the two stories into one, but it was not a sufficient rationale for the *author* (meaning this is not what *Baden* as an author would have done), which is why the one story had to be split into two in the first place.¹¹⁰

The Hypothesis is Simpler and Therefore Better

Friedman cites Occam's razor in support of the Hypothesis:

Traditional rabbinic and Christian scholarship had offered explanations of the doublets, contradictions, and so on, all along, but it was doing it one verse at a time. If there were two thousand such problems, there were two thousand separate explanations for them. Critical scholarship explained it all with vastly fewer premises. The success of critical scholarship was a quintessential demonstration of the compelling qualities of Occam's razor.¹¹¹

Of course, Occam's razor can work against the Hypothesis as well. The supplementarians, for example, cite Occam's razor because they believe that their explanation for the Flood Story is simpler than the documentarian explanation. But that does not necessarily make it better. As Jan Christian Gertz notes,

[I]t must be pointed out that the reference to Ockham's razor is reasonable only when two competing hypotheses share the

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 101.

¹¹⁰ So, too, Rendtorff's discussion of the lack of links between the larger units within the Pentateuch (90-94) is based upon *his* ideas of what the links should have been. All he is really saying is, "This is not how *I* would have written the Pentateuch."

¹¹¹ *Hidden*, 351-352.

same explanatory potential. A more complex hypothesis that accounts for the facts in a better way can therefore be preferred to a simpler one.¹¹²

Or as Konrad Schmid says in his critique of Baden's position:

If someone argues that we should strive for a simpler model, then I would follow Albert Einstein in arguing that yes, the explanation of the Pentateuch indeed has to be as simple as possible, but not simpler.¹¹³

Friedman is operating on the unwarranted assumption that the Hypothesis is simpler—and therefore better—than the traditional view. Is it? If it is so much simpler, why, after two hundred years, are the documentarians still working out its details? And if it is so much simpler, why have hundreds of documentarians written thousands of papers and books trying to solve the problems raised by the Hypothesis? Did E ever exist as a separate document? Is P really a document or just a redactional layer? Where does P end anyway? And where does E start? Does J end in the Pentateuch or does it continue to 1 Kings 2, as Friedman would like to think? Were P and D written before, during, or after the Exile? Is there a Holiness Code inside P and if so, how extensive is it? Does Gen. 15 come from E only (Baden¹¹⁴) or is it a composite of J and E (Driver¹¹⁵) or is it a combination of J and R (Friedman¹¹⁶)? Why, as one moves through Exodus and especially Numbers, does it become progressively more difficult to divide the text into its sources? When were the documents redacted and how many stages were involved? And why, oh why, oh why are they constantly arguing over which verse belongs to which document? The documentarians must go through the Pentateuch verse by verse and explain how the Hypothesis solves the problems just as the traditionalists must do. If there are two thousand such

¹¹² Gertz, "Source Criticism in the Primeval History of Genesis," in *The Pentateuch*, 178.

¹¹³ Schmid, "Has European Scholarship Abandoned the Documentary Hypothesis?" in *The Pentateuch*, 30.

¹¹⁴ *Composition*, 287, n. 104.

¹¹⁵ *ILOT*, 15.

¹¹⁶ *Sources*, 53-55.

problems, then they too must offer two thousand explanations. Some of their explanations may be simpler than the traditional ones, but some of their explanations are definitely more complex. One cannot help but agree with Rendsburg when he says, after quoting Friedman's convoluted explanation for how R pieced together the Plague Stories,¹¹⁷ "With all due respect to an important contributor to biblical studies, the only words that come to mind when I read the long quotation above are 'too clever by half.'"¹¹⁸ And Baden's detailed explanation for how to divide Num. 32 between E, P, and the redactor is over a page long in *Redaction*.¹¹⁹ How is that simpler than saying that Moses thoroughly mixes the narrative elements from Num. 13-14 in Num. 32 because he wrote all three chapters?

In its attempt to simply solve the problems of the Pentateuch, the Hypothesis has *created* so many problems that the documentarians—as Baden has correctly pointed out—have forced the redactor to evolve from the compiler who merely cut and pasted the documents together to a problem solver to a historian and a theologically minded author. Yet, even Baden has missed the irony of this evolution. In an excellent example of Orwellian doublethink, the classic documentarians, including Friedman, argue that a single author, Moses, could not possibly be responsible for the final form of the Pentateuch while *at the very same time* they argue that a single author, the final redactor, *is* responsible for the final form of the Pentateuch. What the classic documentarians are actually picturing, then, is a redactor/author (whether R or H) who combined JED with P, each of which contradicted the other, by writing additional material that deliberately contradicted at least JED, even though his intent was to unite the documents and pass off the final product as the work of a single author. And if P was only a redactional layer, then the redactor/author wrote an extensive amount of material which deliberately contradicted JE and D, even though his intent was to unite the documents. In what way is this hypothesis better than the traditional view?

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 125, n. **.

¹¹⁸ Gary A. Rendsburg, "The Literary Unity of the Exodus Narrative," in James K. Hoffmeier, Alan R. Millard, and Gary A. Rendsburg, eds., *Did I Not Bring Israel Out of Egypt?* *Biblical, Archaeological, and Egyptological Perspectives on the Exodus Narratives* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2016), 124.

¹¹⁹ *Redaction*, 143-144.

The critics might respond by saying that there is a significant difference between their redactor/author and the traditional author, for the traditional author would have had more control over his material and therefore could have eliminated the doublets and the contradictions, etc., whereas the redactor/author was limited in his ability to eliminate material. This would have been especially true if the documents were considered sacred. But the analogues show that Near Eastern redactors did cut significant portions of their sources, especially when they were collating parallel sources.¹²⁰ And Tatian did not preserve 100% of any of the sacred Gospels when he conflated them. He cut out the genealogies from both Matthew and Luke. And he cut out 50% of Mark. Yes, we can detect contradictions in the final product. But they are there because of the material which Tatian chose to keep, not because he could not avoid them. If the anomalies within the Pentateuch exist because they were created when the final redactor collated the documents, they exist not because the redactor could not avoid creating them. They exist because of the material which he chose to keep. And because of the material which he chose to add. The question then is, why did he choose to create these anomalies?

In most cases, as soon as one answers why the redactor/author created the anomaly, one also explains why the traditional author would have done so. In the Plagues Story, there is the problem that P's usual ending to its stories sometimes appears at the end of JE's stories instead of JE's usual ending. Friedman's solution is that R replaced JE's ending with P's ending. There is also the problem that P's notation that God will harden Pharaoh's heart and JE's notation that Pharaoh will not let the people go both appear in Ex. 4:21. Friedman's solution is that R combined the two in this verse. Why would R do all of this?

The effect of this redactional design was to cause the Priestly notion of divine control of the chain of events to dominate the entire combined narrative. With the Priestly predictions that God would harden Pharaoh's heart now located at the beginning of the narrative, not only did the subsequent *Priestly* notations of this hardening portray fulfillment of this divine intention;

¹²⁰ *Formation*, 112.

now the *JE* expressions of hardening fell into this rubric as well. Every JE notation that Pharaoh hardened his heart now appeared to be the fulfillment of the original prediction, with the invisible power of Yhwh controlling Pharaoh's action. The JE picture of a confrontation between Pharaoh and the power of God in which the divine might proves victorious was now a part of a larger scheme in which the deity controls both sides of the dynamic, both Moses' challenge and Pharaoh's response....

Even as God controls both sides of the confrontation, owing to the Priestly text and the derivative framework, it is still the thinking, struggling Pharaoh of the JE texts who is thus controlled. The combined portrayal thus magnifies the power of the God of Israel, who now exercises supreme determinism over a more worthy opponent. And this picture is not the chance by-product of mechanical editing. The nature of the design rather points to a theological consciousness on the part of the designer.¹²¹

According to Friedman, RJE became an author when he added the words "after he had sent her back" to Ex. 18:2 to explain how Ziporah went from being with Moses in Egypt according to J (Ex. 4:20) to being with Jethro in Midian according to E (Ex. 18:2).¹²² Baden's compiler became a historian and a theologically minded redactor/author when he added material to Num. 13-14, Num. 32, and Deut. 1. His reason for doing so "was to create a single account of Israelite history."¹²³ The compiler spliced the two stories in Num. 11 because the people's complaint about the meat provided a rationale for Moses' complaint about the people.¹²⁴ And the compiler saw no difficulty in conflating two versions of Joseph's story in part because he saw the Ishmaelites and the Midianites as being the same group of merchants.¹²⁵ What Baden and Friedman fail to realize is that they have just explained why the traditional author would have done the same thing, which eliminates the need for multiple documents and

¹²¹ Friedman, "Sacred History and Theology," 33-34 (italics his).

¹²² *Sources*, 150, n. *.

¹²³ *Redaction*, 276.

¹²⁴ *Composition*, 101.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 264, n. 30.

a redactor/author in the first place. The traditional view is the better—and simplest—hypothesis after all.

The Author is Governed by Their Cultural Standards

Fourth, because the documentarians assume that all authors think like they do, they make the unwarranted assumption that all authors are governed by the same cultural standards that govern them, that is, they think that all authors follow the conventions of the modern Western culture, including its literary conventions.

Baden runs into this assumption every time a nonconservative scholar argues that P is not really a document but only a redactional layer because P's patriarchal narrative is sparse:

[W]e cannot judge P on the basis of whether it conforms to the modern expectation of the fullness of “narrative,” conditioned by our familiarity with the form of the novel—or, for that matter, to any externally imposed concept of what narrative should be. Not only is it possible that what we consider a satisfactory narrative is not what the ancient author or audience would have considered so (as if such a question would have been pressing for the ancient author/audience in any case), but more importantly there is no justification for the requirement that P conform to any given genre in the first place. Not all documents need to be full, novelistic narratives. We cannot judge P against a standard to which the author of P would have felt no obligation to adhere.¹²⁶

Yet Baden is open to the same criticism. He insists that the sources of the Pentateuch cannot be identified on the basis of the classical anomalies but only on “the basis of the narrative consistencies and contradictions.”¹²⁷ The narrative consistencies and contradictions within the Poem, however, which was written by a single author, demonstrate that those anomalies cannot be consistently used to divide a text into sources, especially an ancient Near Eastern text. Furthermore, they not only demonstrate that such anomalies

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 180-181.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 30.

apparently did not trouble the ancient Near Eastern author of the Poem, they also demonstrate that the author did not expect them to trouble his intended ancient Near Eastern audience.

Remarkably, Samuel Sandmel came to the same conclusion concerning RJE and P in his role as a redactor:

After P completed this work, he revised it by inserting such material as J, E, RJE, or H. Like RJE, he was not disturbed by the presence of contradictory elements.... The old legends he quoted were not inconsistent to his mind as they are to ours. He first told us (1:26-8) of the creation of man and woman. What looks to us like a repetition (2:4ff.) was to him only a filling in of details. And while in this repetition we moderns can see a view of God discordant with P's first presentation, no such discordancy troubled the author.¹²⁸

This admission, however, raises several questions. If these contradictory elements did not disturb RJE or P in his role as an ancient Near Eastern redactor, why would they disturb an ancient Near Eastern author? And if they did not disturb ancient Near Eastern redactors and authors, why do they disturb the documentarians? They do so because the documentarians are imposing modern Western conventions on an ancient Near Eastern work.

The documentarians also believe that a single author would never assign multiple names to a man or to a city or to a nation. This may be true of a modern Western author, but this was a common ancient Near Eastern practice. Tigay may retort that the ancient Near Eastern texts we could cite as examples to prove that this was a common Near Eastern practice are poetical or quasi-poetical, and "Poetry, particularly parallelistic poetry, values variety of expression, especially multiple designations of the gods."¹²⁹ The Pentateuch, however, is primarily prose. Yet, according to Friedman, the Pentateuch is the first work of ancient Near Eastern prose.¹³⁰ Therefore, we should *expect* to find many of the literary practices of an-

¹²⁸ Samuel Sandmel, *The Hebrew Scriptures: An Introduction to Their Literature and Religious Ideas* (N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1978), 339, 349.

¹²⁹ Tigay, "The Stylistic Criterion," in *Empirical*, 153.

¹³⁰ Friedman, "Foreword," in *Empirical*, [4].

cient Near Eastern poetry, including parallelism and multiple designations, in the Pentateuch because ancient Near Eastern prose did not suddenly appear fully formed *ex nihilo* in the Near Eastern poetic milieu: it evolved from it.

Perhaps this is why, according to James L. Kugel,

a particularly vexing problem for scholars has been that of distinguishing biblical “poetry” from “prose.” ...[T]here is an increasing awareness that in biblical Hebrew even more than in other languages, the precise distinction between poetry and prose is difficult to draw.

The distinction was blurred by Robert Lowth, who first systematized the types of poetic parallelisms employed by Biblical poetry. He demonstrated that those same parallelisms are often found in the supposedly prosaic prophetic books. Since then, scholars have come to learn that such parallelisms “can frequently be found here and there in ordinary narratives, particularly in dialogue, as well as in legal material, blessings and curses, oracles and prayers.”¹³¹

A simple example of this is Gen. 21:1, a prose passage:

And Yahweh visited Sarah as he had said,
And Yahweh did for Sarah as he had spoken.

Here, Moses uses complete synonymous parallelism to emphasize the fact that Yahweh faithfully keeps his promises. Friedman, however, condemns this verse as a “rather clumsy repetition of the datum.”¹³² So, he assigns the first line to J and the second to P, even though P is not supposed to have used “Yahweh” before Ex. 6:2. He does not see the Pentateuchal author elegantly employing an ancient Near Eastern literary device because he is looking at the verse through his modern Western documentarian lens.

The documentarians often forget that they are the products of the modern Western culture and that the author and the intended audience of the Pentateuch are not. We possess a certain cultural

¹³¹ James L. Kugel, “Poetry,” in Paul J. Achtemeier, ed., *Harper's Bible Dictionary* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1985), 806.

¹³² *Narrative*, 86.

literacy; so did they, but it was not the same cultural literacy as ours. They knew their history, their myths, their legends, their customs, their idioms, their languages, their international relations, their religions better than we could ever hope to do because we did not grow up in that culture. We do not understand the Pentateuch fully because we do not have that cultural literacy.

This is another reason why Lewis distrusted the reconstructions of modern scholarship. He and his reviewers shared a common cultural literacy, yet they were still unable to reconstruct the history behind his works. Think, then, of the obstacles that lie before the Biblical critics.

The superiority in judgement and diligence which you are going to attribute to the Biblical critics will have to be almost super-human if it is to offset the fact that they are everywhere faced with customs, language, race-characteristics, class-characteristics, a religious background, habits of composition, and basic assumptions, which no scholarship will ever enable any man now alive to know as surely and intimately and instinctively as the reviewer can know mine.¹³³

Our lack of knowledge of the Near Eastern culture of the second millennium BCE is tremendous. Archaeological discoveries are helping to fill in the gaps, but we still do not have a grasp of the basic knowledge of the cultural literacy of that era, let alone its nuances, like the Pentateuchal author and his audience did.

What's more, the author assumed that he and his audience shared that literacy, that he did not have to explain it to them. Thus, his audience immediately saw the parallelism in Gen. 21:1 and what it meant; it did not have to be explained to them. But it does have to be explained to us modern Westerners because that literary device does not exist in our culture.

This is why Baden's insistence that the text must make sense to the modern Western audience without the help of "externally derived hermeneutic" is itself senseless. Even Shakespeare's plays, though they were written in English, must be explained to today's English readers because much of the cultural literacy which Shake-

¹³³ Lewis, 199.

spere shared with his audience only four hundred years ago has been lost. Most of the cultural literacy in which the Pentateuch was produced vanished over two millennia ago. And how long will today's cultural literacy last? Will readers of this book four hundred years from now understand the references to Spock and McCoy without consulting outside sources?

The second question the documentarians need to ask is not, "Does this make sense to us?" but, "Does this make sense to the intended audience?" Baden rejects any attempts to reconcile the contradictions in Gen. 37 because "The solutions to the textual problems do not—indeed, apparently cannot—rest on the plain meaning of the passage alone." Any attempts to resolve the contradictions by referring to outside information (such as referring to Jud. 8:24 to prove that the Ishmaelites and the Midianites are the same group of merchants) are dismissed by him as "midrashic." Besides, Gen. 37 itself does not say that the Ishmaelites and the Midianites are the same group.¹³⁴ Now it is Baden who is obligating the author to adhere to an unrealistic standard: the text should have been written so that it would be understood by all audiences of all cultures of all ages.

Baden himself did not adhere to that standard when he wrote *Composition*. Anyone outside of Baden's intended audience would have to refer to an outside source to understand his book. For example, if the two groups are the same, then Gen. 37:28 would have to be understood this way: "Then Midianite traders passed by; so they [the brothers] pulled Joseph up and they [the brothers] lifted him out of the pit, and they [the brothers] sold him to the Ishmaelites for twenty shekels of silver. And they [the Midianites/Ishmaelites] took Joseph to Egypt." In an endnote, Baden rejects that understanding of that verse: "The Hebrew in v. 28 is a series of *wayyiqtol* verbs, only the first of which has a stated subject (the Midianites); this syntax suggests that the Midianites are indeed the subject throughout the verse."¹³⁵ The frontispiece of his book says that his intended audience are "scholars" and "the educated non-specialist." They would understand what "a series of *wayyiqtol* verbs" is. But someone outside his intended audience would have to refer to an

¹³⁴ *Composition*, 6-7, 12.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 251, n. 4.

outside source (such as a Hebrew grammar) to find out what that is before he or she could understand what Baden just said. The same is true of the Pentateuch. If the intended audience of Gen. 37, who were the Israelites of the thirteenth century BCE, already knew that the Ishmaelites and the Midianites were the same group, then the author did not need to say they were the same group.¹³⁶ However, we modern Westerners, who are not the intended audience and do not have that knowledge, have to pull that knowledge from somewhere else, such as Jud. 8:24, to understand the passage. Insisting that an ancient Near Eastern text explain itself to a modern Western reader is the same as insisting that a scholarly tome explain itself to the man on the street.

As a side note, Baden's argument is wrong. Gen. 29:29-30 (AT) is also a series of *wayyiqtol* verbs:

And Laban gave his maid Bilhah to his daughter Rachel as a maid. Then he also went in to Rachel, and he also loved Rachel more than Leah. And he served with him still another seven years.

Following Baden's argument, Laban should be the subject of all the verbs, but that would mean that Laban had relations with his daughter on her wedding day, then worked for himself for another seven years. Obviously, the subject of the other verbs is Jacob, who was last named in v. 28.

The Author Has No Message

The fifth reason why the documentarians do not believe the Pentateuch was written by a single author is that they make the unwarranted assumption that the author of the Pentateuch is not trying to convey a message. Most documentarians have never attempted to discern the overall message of the Pentateuch, an observation confirmed by the nonconservative scholar, David J.A. Clines: "Surprisingly, few scholars have studied the question of what thesis

¹³⁶ That knowledge was apparently slipping away by the time Judges was written, which is why the author of Judges had to say the two groups were the same.

the Pentateuch in its final form is attempting to sustain.”¹³⁷ Many documentarians do not believe that the final form of the Pentateuch is attempting to sustain any kind of message or thesis at all. For example, in his commentary *On Genesis*, Bruce Vawter proclaims,

The ideas proposed by Genesis are those of J and P, and, occasionally, of E.... It is this fact that justifies the procedure we follow in this commentary, taking Genesis piece by piece as it may be redivided into its sources. That is where the message of Genesis is.¹³⁸

Other documentarians believe that if the Pentateuch is conveying a message, it was created by mistake. Friedman says that when R combined P with JED, he created the view that God is both cosmic and personal and created the message that the cosmic God is concerned about each and every person. That view and that message have been essential parts of both Judaism and Christianity ever since. But that view and that message were created unintentionally. The authors of the documents never intended to convey that message and neither did R. It was the unintended by-product of the redaction process.¹³⁹ Though Friedman and Vawter may disagree on whether the Pentateuch is conveying a message, they do share something in common: they both see anomalies within a work as evidence of multiple authorship rather than as clues pointing to the author’s message and purpose.

Every writer writes because he has a message he wishes to convey. This is not to say that every story, like an Aesop’s fable, has a moral to it. The author’s message may be the story itself (which, presumably, is the message of Carroll’s “Snark”¹⁴⁰). Or his message may be a piece of information or an idea or even a joke. Related to

¹³⁷ David J.A. Clines, “Introduction to the Biblical Story: Genesis-Esther,” in James L. Mays, ed., *Harper’s Bible Commentary* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1988), 83.

¹³⁸ Bruce Vawter, *On Genesis* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1977), 23.

¹³⁹ *Wrote*, 216.

¹⁴⁰ This is precisely the view taken by Michael Holquist in his “What is a Boojum? Nonsense and Modernism,” *Yale French Studies*, XLIII (1969), 145-164, reprinted in Gray, 402-418.

the message is the author's purpose in conveying the message. His purpose may be to entertain us, to inform us, or to convince us. His purpose will lead him to choose his message and to shape it. If his purpose is to humor us, he will choose a story or joke that he feels is funny. If he decides that adding a few lines or rearranging some lines will make his message more effective, he will make those changes. The final product may not be funny at all—at least, *we* may not think so. But that's not the point. The point is, he chose the story and he made the changes because *he* thought it would fulfill his purpose. In short, anomalies may appear in a work because the author thought those anomalies would help him to convey his message.

Look, for example, at what Alexander Pope does in his famous *Essay on Criticism*. During his sermonizing on how in poetry “the sound must seem an Echo to the sense,” he says,

When Ajax strives some rock's vast weight to throw,
The line too labors, and the words move slow.

Most of his poem flows along in a steady iambic rhythm. This last line, however, breaks that rhythm. Is this evidence of multiple authorship? Is this evidence that a lesser poet added his own material to Pope's original poem? Not at all. Pope is merely practicing what he preaches. In the words of one set of scholars, “The slight pauses before and after ‘too’ and the pause after ‘labors’ serve to slow the line down, and slowness is what Pope is talking about.”¹⁴¹

Or look again at what he does only a few lines earlier when he deprecates predictable poetry:

Then, at the last and only couplet fraught
With some unmeaning thing they call a thought,
A needless Alexandrine ends the song
That, like a wounded snake, drags its slow length along.

The first three lines, as well as the lines in the rest of the poem, are written in iambic pentameter: they are each five feet long. But this last line is in iambic hexameter: it is six feet long. It even looks longer

¹⁴¹ Sylvan Barnet, Morton Berman, and William Burto, *An Introduction to Literature*, 2nd edition (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, Inc., 1963), 363.

than the other lines of the poem. Again, is this evidence of multiple authorship? Again, no. An Alexandrine is a poetic line written in iambic hexameter. Pope deliberately uses an Alexandrine to satirize the needless Alexandrines of other poets. His satiric wit stands out because the line itself, with its extra foot, stands out.

Pope's anomalies helped the author to fulfill his purpose and convey his message. The anomalies in the Pentateuch were intended to do the same. This is not to say that every anomaly identified by the documentarians is a real anomaly. Before we can hear the message of the Pentateuch, we need to determine which anomalies are real and which are mere illusions.

Contradictions

The documentarians contend that the only explanation for the presence of contradictions in a text is the conflation of documents. However, there are at least seven reasons why contradictions may appear in the work of a single author, three of them having to do with the author and four of them having to do with the reader.

1. *Incompetence*: The contradictions exist because of incompetence. The author was an inferior writer who did not know a contradiction from a benediction, or he was a lazy writer who simply did not care about the quality of his work. Since the Pentateuch is usually considered to be a literary work of art, this explanation need not concern us.

2. *Ignorance*: The contradictions exist because of ignorance. The author was simply unaware that he had contradicted himself. He may have been a literary genius, but in any work that is as complex and sprawling as the Pentateuch is, it is easy to forget details and inadvertently create contradictions. This, I believe, is why Friedman contradicted himself so often.

3. *Intention*: The contradictions exist because of intent, that is, the author deliberately contradicted himself. At first sight, this may seem unreasonable, but an author may contradict himself to create irony. For example, a satirical writer may pass himself off as an expert in a given field and then deliberately give contradictory or

otherwise incorrect information so that he may poke fun at the mistakes of real experts. Intentional contradictions do have their uses.

4. *Imagination*: The contradictions exist because the reader is imagining their existence. What the author does not see as a contradiction, the reader does because of a flaw in the reader's thinking. For example, the documentarians say that parts of the Pentateuch view God as transcendent and cosmic while other parts view him as personal and close. They assume that the theology of a single author would never encompass both views of God, for then it would contradict itself. So they give the passages with the first view to P and the other passages to J, E, and D.

However, they have yet to explain why a compassionate God, who has the power to control the cosmos and who can therefore be at any place at any time he desires, cannot at times be cosmic and transcendent and at other times be personal and close. After all, to draw an analogy, the President of the United States is a powerful, relatively inaccessible person who lives far away in Washington, D.C., but he still has the ability to visit me in my home.

A fair handling of the Pentateuchal passages, even if we limit ourselves to the passages of one of the alleged documents, demonstrates that a single author *can* view God as both cosmic and personal, transcendent and close. Friedman has pointed to passages in E which picture God as personal and close:

In E's story of Moses' striking the rock at Meribah, God is standing on the rock. In P's version of the story, he is not... In J and in E, Moses actually sees God. In P he does not... In E, as well, Moses pleads over the people's fate in the golden calf story, and later he pleads passionately and eloquently with a God he has come to know "the way a man talks to a fellow man." ...P never has humans speaking to God with such intimacy.¹⁴²

But Eissfeldt has pointed to passages in E which picture the reverse:

Thus E emphasizes the remoteness of God from the world and from man more strongly than does the *Yahweh* stratum. Where-

¹⁴² *Wrote*, 215.

as in J's Hagar story (Gen. xvi, 4-14) the angel of Yahweh sojourns on the earth and addresses Hagar there (v. 7), in the corresponding E narrative (Gen. xxi, 8-21) the angel of God speaks his words to Hagar from heaven (v. 17). Similarly in J's Bethel narrative (Gen. xxviii, 13-16, 19) Yahweh stands upon the earth before Jacob (v. 13), whereas according to E (vv. 10-12, 17-18, 20-2) a ladder bearing the angels of God represent the bond between the earth and heaven and God (v. 12).¹⁴³

The passages cited by Eissfeldt and Friedman demonstrate that J does see God as personal and close, but transcendence can be found there also: "Yahweh rained on Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from Yahweh, from heaven" (Gen. 19:24, AT). After the Israelites had exhausted their food supply during the exodus, Yahweh promised to "rain bread from heaven for you" (Ex. 16:4).

In Deuteronomy, Moses recalls that Yahweh spoke to the people at Mt. Sinai "out of heaven" (4:36), a reference to Ex. 20:22, another E passage. He also instructs the people to ask Yahweh to "look down from your holy habitation, from heaven" (26:15). He even combines the two pictures of God: Yahweh "is God in heaven above and on the earth beneath" (4:39).

P also combines these two pictures. It sees God as sometimes transcendent and cosmic, but, like J, E, and D, it also sees God as sometimes personal and close. P even sees God as wanting to live on the earth with his people.

And let them make Me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them (Ex. 25:8).

I will dwell among the children of Israel and will be their Elohim. And they shall know that I am Yahweh their Elohim, who brought them out of the land of Egypt, that I may dwell among them (Ex. 29:45-46).

I will set My tabernacle among you, and My soul shall not abhor you. I will walk among you... (Lev. 26:11-12)

¹⁴³ Eissfeldt, 184.

You shall put out both male and female [lepers]; you shall put them outside the camp, that they may not defile their camps in the midst of which I dwell (Num. 5:3).

Therefore do not defile the land which you inhabit, in the midst of which I dwell; for I, Yahweh, dwell among the children of Israel (Num. 35:34).

Contrary to Friedman's assertion, there are instances in P in which humans do speak to God intimately. Abraham, for example, pleaded for God's favor to come upon Ishmael in Gen. 17:18. When Korah and some other Levites rebelled against Moses and Aaron and claimed that they too should have the priesthood, Moses became very angry and expressed this anger directly to Yahweh (Num. 16:15). Yahweh decided to wipe out all the Israelites for this rebellion but relented after Moses and Aaron pleaded with him (Num. 16:20-24).

Furthermore, according to P, God did occasionally come down to speak personally and closely with his chosen people. He appeared to Abraham and then "went up" when he was done talking to him (Gen. 17:1, 22). He also appeared to Jacob and then, when his speech was ended, he "went up" (Gen. 35:9, 13). To go up, he obviously had to have come down first!

Thus, the evidence leads us to conclude that it is possible for a single author, whether that author is one of the theoretical authors of the theoretical documents or the single author of the Pentateuch, to see God as both cosmic and close, transcendent and personal. Friedman admits as much when he discusses the picture of God presented by the single author of *In the Day*:

In this work, God is sometimes manifest and sometimes hidden, sometimes just and sometimes merciful. One might be inclined to wonder whether these differences reflect multiple authors after all. But that is not the case. The different aspects of God fall within the texts that share the common terms and themes, the texts that connect to one another and allude to one another. The complexity of the divine in these works is not the result of mix-

ing texts by two or three authors. It is the result of one author's rich conception of God.¹⁴⁴

In Friedman's mind, the author of *In the Day* is the author of J. So he admits that the author of J sees God as both hidden and manifest, cosmic and close, transcendent and personal.

When the documentarians contend, therefore, that P's theology differs from the theology of J, E, and D, they are merely imagining things.

5. *Ignorance*: The contradictions exist because the reader is ignoring parts of the text. The reader sees a contradiction where none exists because he or she is not taking into account *everything* the author has to say. The documentarians often do this deliberately. We have seen how Friedman claims that there are no anthropomorphisms in P because he is simply ignoring the abundant anthropomorphisms in P. Baden gave Gen. 40:3, 5 to the compiler, thereby creating a contradiction (Joseph is in the prison according to J, he is in the house according to E) where there was none before.¹⁴⁵ The documentarians see a contradiction between Ex. 4:20, in which Moses takes Zipporah, his wife, to Egypt with him, and Ex. 18:2, in which Jethro brings Zipporah to Moses in the wilderness. Of course, the explanation in Ex. 18:2, "after he had sent her back," cannot be allowed to stand, so it is given to the redactor.¹⁴⁶ Once again, the documentarians have created a contradiction where there was none by "ignoring" everything the author has to say.

6. *Inference*: The contradictions exist because the reader is inferring ideas which the author never stated or implied. The reader is simply reading his own ideas into the text and making it say more than it really is. For example, the supposed rivalry between the Aaronids and the Shilonites exists partly because of this reason. Friedman postulates that the Shilonites wrote E and D, that they were descended from Moses, and that they claimed they were legitimate priests. Friedman has also said that P was written by an Aaronid to

¹⁴⁴ *Hidden*, 49.

¹⁴⁵ *Composition*, 222.

¹⁴⁶ *Sources*, 150.

disprove that claim. The Aaronid position was that only the descendants of Aaron were legitimate priests and that all other Levites, including the Shilonites, were secondary officials. We should expect, therefore, to find in P all the priestly functions being performed only by the Aaronids. And this, according to the documentarians, is exactly what we do find. The Priestly writer apparently believed that “only [an Aaronid] priest can enter the Tabernacle,” and he forbade “anyone but a priest to burn incense.” Furthermore, “all sacrifices in P are performed by Aaron or by his sons. The author of P, it seems, did not want to promote the idea that there was a precedent for anyone besides an Aaronid priest to offer a sacrifice.”¹⁴⁷ This is supposedly the reason why the author of P could not have written the scenes in which Noah, Abraham, and other non-priests offered sacrifices.

P does forbid non-priests from offering sacrifices, but those laws were instituted *after* Aaron was consecrated as Israel’s first official priest. Nowhere does P state or imply that these laws applied to non-priests who lived *before* Aaron’s consecration. The documentarians are simply inferring this to be so. Such a notion would have been absurd in real life in the ancient Near East. Animal sacrifices were an integral part of virtually all ancient Oriental religions. Sacrifices were made to placate the gods, to seek atonement, or to give thanks. When Noah was delivered from the flood, it behooved him to give thanks by offering sacrifices, but according to the story, there were no priests around to make the sacrifices for him! He had to offer them himself. It often behooved Abraham to offer sacrifices, but if he could not have offered them himself, to whom could he have gone? He was not about to go to the pagan priests who did not worship Yahweh, and he certainly was not going to live long enough to take them to Aaron!

Besides, P does have the precedent which the myth says is not there, and it is this precedent which also shatters Friedman’s myth that there was a rivalry between the Aaronids and the Shilonites. Of all people, P portrays *Moses* as offering sacrifices and performing several other priestly functions, even though he was never an Aaronid priest. Moses was the first to set up the Tabernacle and its related religious implements. After he placed the altar of incense,

¹⁴⁷ *Wrote*, 185, 176, 171.

“he burned the incense of fragrances on it, as YHWH had commanded Moses” (Ex. 40:27, FV). After he placed the altar of burnt offering, “he offered up the burnt offering and the grain offering on it, as YHWH had commanded Moses” (Ex. 40:29, FV). He then set up the laver and put water in it. According to P, Aaron and his sons were to use that water to wash their hands and feet before they entered the Tabernacle (Ex. 30:17-21). But who, according to P, actually used the laver?

And *Moses* and Aaron and his sons washed their hands and their feet from it. When they went to the Tent of Meeting and when they came forward to the altar they would wash, as YHWH had commanded Moses (Ex. 40:31-32, FV, emphasis added).

P, in fact, depicts Moses as entering the Tabernacle quite often (Num. 7:89), even though it specifically states several times that if non-priests came even close to the Tabernacle, they should be put to death.

On the day the Tabernacle was set up, Moses consecrated Aaron and his sons for the priesthood. As part of this consecration ritual, Moses first sacrificed a bull as a sin offering. He then sacrificed a ram as a burnt offering. Then he sacrificed a second ram, called the ram of ordination. Aaron and his sons were then told to stay in the Tabernacle for seven days (Ex. 29:1-35; Lev. 8:1-36). On each of those seven days, Moses offered a bull on the altar of burnt offering to consecrate the altar (Ex. 29:36-37). Only then was Aaron allowed to offer his first sacrifice—but by then Moses had been offering sacrifices for a week! True, Moses never offered a sacrifice once Aaron’s consecration was complete, but the Priestly writer, if he had been an Aaronid, would never have pictured Moses as offering *any* sacrifices if, in the author’s day, Moses’ descendants were claiming that they too were priests.

This portrait of Moses as a non-priest who nevertheless functioned as a priest is at least the kind of portrait we should have discovered in the allegedly Shilonite documents E and D, for such a portrait would have legitimized the Shilonites’ claim that Moses’ descendants were also priests. Yet these documents never claim that Moses had ever been a priest, nor do they convincingly picture him as having functioned as one. According to E, on one occasion

before Aaron's consecration, Moses did sprinkle the blood of sacrificed animals on an altar and on the people, but Moses himself did not sacrifice those animals: he had other men do it for him (Ex. 24:4-8).

Despite Friedman's assertions to the contrary, none of the biblical records supports his contention that there was a conflict between the Shilonites and the Aaronids. They never speak of a group of priests known as the Shilonites, nor do they ever say that Moses' descendants became legitimate priests. The book of Judges does give us a story which focuses on one of Moses' descendants and it is the only story in the entire Bible to do so (Judges 17-18). This descendant was named Jonathan and the story says he was a Levite. He did become a priest, but the author of Judges never accepts this priesthood as legitimate, for Jonathan became an idolatrous priest. Furthermore, Jonathan set up his priesthood in Dan, not Shiloh. The book of Deuteronomy threatens idolaters with exile. According to Judges, this event befell the Danites and Jonathan's idolatrous descendants. The author of Judges did not condone Jonathan's priesthood. He condemned it.

Indeed, every one of the books from Joshua through Second Kings fails to support his myth, even though, according to Friedman's theory, all of them (except Ruth) were written by a Shilonite. For example, they do not support his claim that the Shilonites originally possessed the Tabernacle and the ark in Shiloh while the Aaronids lived near Hebron. The book of Joshua does say that the Tabernacle was originally set up in Shiloh once the Israelites conquered Canaan, but it also says that the first high priest at Shiloh was Eleazar, the son of Aaron (Josh. 18:1; 19:51; 21:1-2). The book of Judges mentions only one legitimate priest: Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, and he is specifically said to have stood before the ark (Jud. 20:27-28). First Samuel gives us the story of Eli (1 S 1-4), who was a priest at Shiloh and who was the great-great-grandfather of Abiathar, the allegedly Shilonite high priest¹⁴⁸ who served during David's reign alongside Zadok, the Aaronid high priest. But First Samuel never says that Eli was a descendant of Moses. In First Kings, one man, Ahijah, is called a Shilonite, but he was a prophet and never a priest, and he too is never said to have been a descendant of Moses. He was

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 25.

called a Shilonite simply because he happened to live in Shiloh (1 K 11:29-39; 12:15; 14:1-16).

The books of Chronicles were written by someone who accepted the Aaronid viewpoint. He, like the author of Judges, classified Moses' descendants not as priests but as Levites, which is what we would have expected him to do (1 C 23:14). However, this author also tells us that Abiathar was a descendant of Ithamar, the son of Aaron (1 C 24:1-6), not a descendant of Moses, as Friedman would have us believe. The two high priests which David had were not a Shilonite and an Aaronid: they were both Aaronids.

Thus, the Priestly writer could also have been the author of the allegedly Shilonite documents E and D because Friedman's myth that the authors were members of rival priesthoods does not stand. And the Priestly writer could have been the author of the J stories in which Noah, Abraham, and others offered sacrifices for there is no reason why he would have been opposed to such sacrifices. Such opposition is never stated or even implied by the author of the Pentateuch; it is merely inferred by the documentarians.

7. *Interpretation:* The contradictions exist because the reader is incorrectly interpreting the text. The author has not really contradicted himself: the reader has simply misunderstood what the author has written. This does not happen often when one is reading a work originally written in one's native language, for both the reader and the author are familiar with its intricacies. It is far more likely to happen when one is reading a foreign language. If the reader does not completely understand the syntax, the idioms, the shades of meaning, or the other nuances of the language, the reader could easily misinterpret or mistranslate the text, thereby creating a contradiction where none exists.

Translated literally, Deut. 18:1 reads:

The Levitical priests, all the tribe of Levi, shall not have a portion or inheritance in Israel...

The phrase *all the tribe of Levi* seems to stand in apposition to *the Levitical priests*, thereby meaning that all of the Levites were Levitical priests, which is how the documentarians interpret this verse. This contradicts the rest of the Pentateuch, which clearly indicates

that only the descendants of Aaron could serve as priests; all the other Levites were to assist the Aaronid priests but could not serve as priests themselves. Because of this understanding of this verse, as part of his third Argument, Friedman says that in P only the Aaronids can serve as priests whereas D insists that all the Levites are priests.¹⁴⁹ However, the documentarians are ignoring the author's culture. The Hebrew culture has given this idiom a meaning far different from the meaning the documentarians have given it.¹⁵⁰

This idiom appears in many other portions of the law code, four of which are here translated literally:

You shall not plant for yourself an Asherah, all tree, beside the altar of Yahweh your God... (Deut.16:21).

But if it has in it a blemish, lameness, or blindness, all blemish whatsoever, you shall not sacrifice it to Yahweh your God (Deut. 15:21).

You shall not sacrifice to Yahweh your God an ox or sheep which has in it a blemish, all evil thing whatsoever... (Deut. 17:1)

You shall not charge interest to your brother, interest on money, interest on food, interest on all thing which may be charged with interest (Deut. 23:19).

In each verse, the author lists one, two, or three members of a group, then immediately expands the circle to include the entire group. In the first example, the author lists the Asherah, then immediately expands the circle to include all (that is, any) tree. The same thing happens in the other three verses and in 18:1. The author begins by listing one part of a group (the Levitical priests), then immediately expands the circle to include the entire group (all the tribe of Levi). Properly understood, then, Deut. 18:1 proves that the Levitical priests comprised only a part of the tribe of Levi, not the entire tribe.

¹⁴⁹ *Sources*, 11-12.

¹⁵⁰ The following argument is derived from A.H. Finn, *The Unity of the Pentateuch*, 2nd edition (London: Marshall Brothers, Ltd., n.d.), 188-190.

Understanding the Hebrew language and idioms helps to resolve many of the alleged contradictions. Gen. 1 clearly states that the animals were created before man was, while Gen. 2 apparently says that the animals were created *after* man was: “And Yahweh Elohim fashioned from the ground every animal of the field and every bird of the heavens and brought them to the man to see what he would call them” (verse 19, AT). But in the Hebrew language, many verbs that can be translated in the past tense (in this case, “fashioned”) can also be translated in the pluperfect tense (“had fashioned,” meaning that God had fashioned the animals *before* he created man, as Gen. 1 states). Context determines which translation is appropriate and the context in this case clearly dictates that the pluperfect is the perfect translation.¹⁵¹

Similarly, in Gen. 6:19 Elohim tells Noah to take a pair of each kind of animal aboard the ark, but later Yahweh tells him to take seven pairs of each clean animal and a pair of each unclean animal aboard the ark. However, the Hebrew word for “pair,” *šəṇayim*, is also the Hebrew word for “pairs.” So Gen. 6:19 could and should be translated as Elohim telling Noah to take “pairs” of animals aboard the ark. Elohim first spoke to him generally about the number of animals he should take onto the ark; later, Yahweh spoke more specifically. This pair of passages is therefore quite compatible, not contradictory.¹⁵²

Conflicting Theologies

As it is usually translated, Ex. 6:3 states: “I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob as El Shaddai, but by my name Yahweh I was not known to them.” The latter half of the verse conflicts with the book of Genesis, which clearly testifies that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob did know that God’s name was Yahweh. Faced with this contra-

¹⁵¹ Driver complains that translating Gen. 2:19 in the pluperfect tense is “contrary to idiom” (*ILOT*, 8, n. *). However, there are other places in the Old Testament that require translating the Hebrew with the English pluperfect: Jos. 2:22 (the pursuers *had* sought the spies before the pursuers returned), 1 K 13:12 (the sons *had* seen which way the prophet went before their father asked his question), and Is. 37:5 (the king’s servants *had* come to Isaiah before Isaiah spoke to them). See *AOOT*, 118, n. 19.

¹⁵² *AOOT*, 120. See also W.J. Martin, *Stylistic Criteria and the Analysis of the Pentateuch* (London: The Tyndale Press, 1955), 15-16.

diction, some scholars have devised an elaborate theory involving documents and redactors. They seem to have forgotten an important rule of translation,

namely that a passage should be interpreted in the light, not only of the local context, but also of the remote, for, to be fair to any statement, the mediate as well as the immediate must be taken into consideration. When it became clear that the translation conflicted with the tenor and sometimes the text of what had gone before, the first suspicion should have fallen on the accuracy of the translation.

The latter half of verse three should be translated as a rhetorical question, making the whole verse read as follows: "I allowed myself to appear to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob as El Shaddai, for did I not let myself be known to them by my name Yahweh?" The answer, of course, is yes, he did let himself be known to them by his name Yahweh. The verse now agrees with Genesis rather than contradicting it.¹⁵³

An objection to this translation may be that in Hebrew a question usually begins with an interrogative pronoun or adverb. The latter half of verse 3 has neither, which is why most scholars fall into translating the verse in the usual manner. But in the standard textbook on Hebrew grammar, Wilhelm Gesenius has stated:

A question need not necessarily be introduced by a special interrogative pronoun or adverb... So especially, when the interrogative clause is connected with a preceding sentence by וְ... or when (as in some of the examples just given) it is negative.¹⁵⁴

One of his examples is Jonah 4:11. This verse is connected with the preceding sentence by the particle, it is negative, and it is missing an interrogative pronoun. It could be translated, "And I should not have compassion on Nineveh, the great city," but this translation conflicts with the context. God was obviously explaining to Jonah why he,

¹⁵³ Martin, 16-19.

¹⁵⁴ Wilhelm Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 473.

God, *should* have compassion on Nineveh. This verse, therefore, must be translated as, “And should I not have compassion on Nineveh, the great city?” (AT). Translating verse 11 as a rhetorical question and not as a negative statement makes sense because the question better fits the context.

The latter half of Ex. 6:3 is also connected with the preceding sentence by the particle, it is also negative, and it is also missing an interrogative pronoun or adverb. Translating it as a rhetorical question and not as a negative statement makes sense because the question better fits the context and eliminates the contradiction.

Translating it as a rhetorical question and not as a negative statement also shifts the meaning of the sentence from denying the knowledge of God’s name in previous generations to emphasizing the importance of this name above that of his other name, El Shaddai. This emphasis is indicated in Genesis: Yahweh is used frequently, El Shaddai rarely. But, given the context of verse three, why would God want to emphasize this name above the other? To answer that, we need to turn to the other problem text.

In the famous story in Ex. 3, God calls to Moses out of a bush that is on fire but is not being consumed. God introduces himself as “the God of your father—the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.” He then commissions Moses to return to Egypt and deliver the Israelites from their slavery. Moses feels overwhelmed and tries to get God to change his mind by asking a series of questions that are intended to show God just how inadequate Moses is to the task. One of those questions is, “Indeed, when I come to the children of Israel and say to them, ‘The God of your fathers has sent me to you,’ and they say to me, ‘What is His name?’ what shall I say to them?” (Ex. 3:13).

God’s answer is, “I AM WHO I AM.” Then he tells Moses to say to the children of Israel that “I AM has sent me to you.” The words “I AM” in Hebrew is *’ehyeh*. The third person form of the word is *yahweh*, which is the name God chose for himself.

The problem with Moses’ question is that it seems to imply that Moses and the Israelites do not know God’s name. Until now, they have known him only as Elohim. Yet Genesis makes it clear that Moses’ ancestors, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, knew that God’s name was Yahweh. Surely this name would have been passed down through the generations to Moses and the Israelites of his time. So

why is Moses asking for God's name? The problem is rectified, according to the documentarians, if we assign this passage to E and all the passages in Genesis that use Yahweh to J. Thus, in E none of the Israelites, including their ancestors, knew God's name until God answers this question.

But the documentarian explanation does not rectify the problem at all, for in E Moses' ancestor, Jacob, knows that God's name is El Shaddai (Gen. 43:14). If nothing else, this name should have been passed on to Moses and the Israelites of his time. But E also tells us that Jacob knew of another name for God (Gen. 28:21), and that name was none other than Yahweh itself! E also tells us that Laban, for whom Jacob worked, also knew this name (Gen. 31:49), and so did Jacob's grandfather, Abraham (Gen. 21:33; and, if we follow Baden's division, Gen. 15:2, 8). So the problem remains: why is Moses asking for God's name?

The answer cannot be found in the Documentary Hypothesis. Rather, the answer is to be found in the Israelites' propensity to fall into idolatry on a moment's notice. Jacob buried the idols of his children under a tree on his way to meet God at Bethel, which shows that the Israelites practiced idolatry before they went into Egypt. The Israelites had Aaron make a golden calf which they worshiped simply because Moses had been gone for a long time, which shows that they practiced idolatry after they came out of Egypt. It is not surprising, therefore, to find they practiced idolatry while in Egypt. Near the end of his life, Joshua says to the Israelites, "Now therefore, fear Yahweh, serve Him in sincerity and in truth, and put away the gods which your fathers served on the other side of the River and *in Egypt*. Serve Yahweh!" (Josh. 24:14, emphasis added). Ezekiel pictures Yahweh as commanding the Israelites living in Egypt before the exodus to avoid defiling themselves with the idols of Egypt, but they refused (Ezek. 20:7-8). Indeed, Ezekiel says the Israelites of his day will go into exile to break the influence that the idolatry their ancestors had learned in Egypt still had over them (Ezek. 23). Since the Israelites had lived among the Egyptians for over four hundred years, they had plenty of time to learn and adopt the Egyptian system of beliefs.

The Israelites had also spent most of those four hundred years crying out to Yahweh to free them from their slavery, and by Moses' day they had become impatient with him. Asking him to deliver

them was not producing the desired results, so they were looking for some way to force him to deliver them. The Egyptian belief in the secret name seemed to offer them exactly what they wanted.

In the Hebrew language, the word “name” carries the same connotations that it does in English. It can mean the label given to objects and people (“The name of Abram’s wife was Sarai,” Gen. 11:29); a person’s reputation (“A good name is to be chosen rather than great riches,” Prov. 22:1); or a person’s authority (“And he wrote in the name of King Ahasuerus,” Esth. 8:10). But it also takes on one additional connotation: it represents the person’s character¹⁵⁵ (“Holy and awesome is His name,” Ps. 111:9). In fact, a person’s name *is* the person himself. To blaspheme God’s name (Lev. 24:11) is to blaspheme God. To worship God’s name is to worship God.

The Egyptians took it one step further. They believed that a person’s name was an integral part of his being. Where we might say that a man consists of his body, soul, and spirit, an ancient Egyptian would say that a man consists of his body, name, and *ka* (double). An inscription inside the tomb of Pepi I sees the king in his afterlife going “forward with his flesh, Pepi is happy with his name, and he liveth with his *ka*.”¹⁵⁶ Indeed, it was impossible to live without a name. They believed that “a man only came into being upon this earth when his name had been pronounced” and that “the future life could only be attained after the gods of the world beyond the grave had become acquainted with it and uttered it.”¹⁵⁷

This belief applied to the gods as well. According to one creation story, when the creator god Neb-er-tcher began to create everything, he said, “I brought (*i.e.*, fashioned) my mouth, and I uttered my own name as a word of power, and thus I developed myself out of the primeval matter which had evolved multitudes of evolutions

¹⁵⁵ By this I do not intend to say that the meaning of a person’s name is reflective of his character: not everyone named Charming is actually charming. What I do mean is that the word *name* is often used as an appositive for the person himself or his character.

¹⁵⁶ E.A. Wallis Budge, *Egyptian Magic*, Vol. II of *Books on Egypt and Chaldea* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., Ltd., 1901, repr., N.Y.: Dover Publications, Inc., 1971), 158.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid*, 161.

from the beginning of time.”¹⁵⁸ According to *The Book of the Dead*, the sun god Re (or Rā) was “the creator of the name[s] of his limbs, which came into being in the form of the gods who are in the following of Rā.” As E.A. Wallis Budge, the late Keeper of the Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum, noted, “From this we see that all the ‘gods’ of Egypt were merely personifications of the NAMES of Rā, and that each god was one of his members, and that a name of a god was the god himself.”¹⁵⁹

Conversely, blotting out a person’s name was the same as destroying that person. If anyone wished to destroy the evil power of a demon, then, in some cases, all one had to do was to make a wax figure of the demon, write its name on the figure and then destroy the figure, thereby destroying its name which was its power.¹⁶⁰ To the Egyptians, therefore, the name was a real, dynamic, active, even life-giving (or life-taking) force and was thus a source of great power.

Knowing this makes it easy to see why the Egyptians came to believe that if one retained a magical or secret name, a name which no one else knew, then one retained a source of power which no one else had. However, should someone happen to learn your secret name, then that person held that power over you and could make you do whatever he or she desired. Again, this belief also applied to the gods. Each god had a secret name. Should a person happen to learn the secret name of a god, the god would be forced by the power of magic to do whatever that person desired whenever that person spoke the name.

In a story which is a part of an Egyptian magic spell designed to counteract scorpion poison, Re is described as “abounding in names, unknown to that (god) and unknown to this (god).” Later in the story, Re himself says, “My father and my mother told me my name, (but) it was hidden in my body before I was born, in order that the power of a male or female magician might not be made to play against me.” The goddess Isis, who was especially skilled at casting magic spells, decides that she wants to know this name, and so she fashions a poisonous snake which ambushes Re and bites him. Re

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 162.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 171.

immediately calls upon the other gods to cure him. Isis, of course, offers to cure him, but only if he answers her one request: "Tell me thy name, my divine father."

Viewed out of context, Isis' request, like Moses' question, would seem absurd because Isis obviously knows Re's name. Even though the text does not have the words "secret" or "hidden name," the context makes it abundantly clear that this is what she wants.

Re, too, knows she wants this name, but he is not ready to give it to her. So he recites a list of his accomplishments and then ends it by saying, "I am Khepri in the morning, Re at noon, and Atum who is in the evening." But Isis is not fooled. She already knows those names, and besides, if his secret name had been among those he had listed, he would have recovered. So Isis says to him, "Thy name is not really among these which thou hast told me. If thou tellest it to me, the poison will come forth, for a person whose name is pronounced lives." Re finally reveals his secret name (which the author himself did not know or which he withheld from his Egyptian audience so only he would know!) and is cured.¹⁶¹

Moses, therefore, is not asking for God's name because he does not know what it is. He is asking for God's secret name.¹⁶² But notice that he is not wanting to learn God's name for himself. He is picturing the Israelites in Egypt as wanting to know God's name. He sees himself coming to the Israelites and telling them that he has met with God. He sees the Israelites as figuring this to be their golden opportunity, for if Moses has really met with God, then perhaps he has learned God's secret name. So he sees their first reaction to his news not as rejoicing that God has finally answered their prayers but as wanting to extract information so they can force God to do their bidding.

¹⁶¹ James B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts: Third Edition with Supplement* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969), 12-14.

¹⁶² Martin Buber, *The Kingship of God*, 3rd edition, translated by Richard Schiemann (N.Y.: Harper and Row, Publisher, 1967), 105-106. Friedman cites a study by Rendsburg in which he notes that this allusion to the Egyptian belief in the hidden name is one of seven allusions to Egyptian traditions found in Ex. 1-15. Friedman says these allusions are all found in the E and P texts, which is further evidence that the Levites (who wrote E and P) came from Egypt (*Exodus*, 57-58). Of course, I would say this is evidence that Moses knew the Egyptian traditions (because he grew up there), but my point is that Friedman agrees that Moses' question is an allusion to the Egyptian belief in the hidden name.

This is why God's answer, "I AM WHO I AM," is so appropriate. In English, it sounds like a tautology, a statement that unnecessarily repeats itself. Of course, God is who God is, but that does not tell us who he is in the first place. It sounds like God is trying to evade Moses' question, even as Re tried to avoid Isis'.

But God is not Re and he is not evading Moses' question. In Hebrew, this syntax is used to express determination. Thus, when Moses returns to Sinai, God says to him, "I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion" (Ex. 33:19), that is, God will determine to whom he will be gracious and to whom he will be compassionate.¹⁶³ What God is saying to the Israelites, therefore, is, "I determine who I am. I chose to have this personality and this character, which means that I chose my own name. Unlike Re, I was not given a secret name by someone else. So your attempt at manipulating me through the use of my secret name will be in vain."

His answer subtly—or perhaps not so subtly—reminds the Israelites that because he, and only he, determines who he is, he is a God who does not change. Ever changing circumstances do not determine who he is. Fleeting emotions do not determine who he is. And certainly their puny attempts at magic do not determine who he is. Nothing can make him change except himself. This fact may cause consternation among some of the Israelites who think he is not moving fast enough to free them from slavery, but it should also comfort them. For a God who does not change is a God who can be counted on to be there when you really need him and who can be counted on to follow through on his promises. He is not the kind of God who one day promises to do something and the next day changes his mind. He is an unchanging God, which means that he is a faithful God.

He reminds them of all of this in the next part of his answer to Moses when he says, "Thus you shall say to the children of Israel, 'I AM has sent me to you.' ... Thus you shall say to the children of Israel, 'Yahweh, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, has sent me to you'" (Ex. 3:14f). He is the same God who introduced himself to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. He

¹⁶³ Victor P. Hamilton, *Handbook on the Pentateuch* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1982), 150-151.

has not changed since then. He was faithful then; he is faithful now. But this answer is also a mild rebuke, for when he answers Moses' request to reveal his secret name by giving him the name the Israelites already knew, he was telling them, "I have already revealed to you who I really am. I have already revealed to you the deepest, innermost part of me. You should have already known that my heart belongs to you and that I would be faithful to you. You should have never doubted me."

Thus, God recalls for the Israelites not only his chosen name but also the meaning of that name. The name Yahweh does not simply mean "He is," but "He is unchanging and therefore faithful." And it is his faithfulness, more so than any other aspect of his character, that he wishes everyone to think of when they think of him: "This is my name forever, and this is My memorial to all generations" (Ex. 3:15).¹⁶⁴

This is also why in Ex. 6 (and in Genesis) he emphasizes the name Yahweh over his other name, El Shaddai. To be sure, God is El Shaddai, the Almighty One, which means that he is capable of delivering the Israelites from slavery. But just because someone is capable of doing something does not necessarily mean that he will actually do it. What the Israelites needed to know was that God is faithful, that he can be counted on to do what he said he would do. The deliverance was going to be a long process, and the march across the wilderness was going to be perilous. They needed to know that he could be trusted.

And so, he emphasizes his name again and again in his speech to Moses in Ex. 6:

"I am Yahweh, the Faithful One. I allowed myself to appear to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob as El Shaddai, for did I not let myself be known to them by my name Yahweh, the Faithful One? I have also established my covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage, in which they were strangers. And I have also heard the groaning of the children of Israel whom the Egyptians keep in bondage, and I have remem-

¹⁶⁴ Milgrom's interpretation of Ex. 3:13-15 ("The Desecration of YHWH's Name: Its Parameters and Significance," in Cohen, 69-81), which he presents "with trepidation," shares many points of similarity with my own.

bered my covenant. Therefore say to the children of Israel: 'I am Yahweh, the Faithful One; I will bring you out of from under the burdens of the Egyptians, I will rescue you from their bondage, and I will redeem you with an outstretched arm and with great judgments. I will take you as my people, and I will be your God. Then you shall know that I am Yahweh, the Faithful One, your God who brings you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians. And I will bring you into the land which I swore to give to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and I will give it to you as a heritage: I am Yahweh, the Faithful One" (Ex. 6:3-8, AT).

There is no need to manipulate a faithful God. One can simply trust that he will do what he said he will do.

Thus, an understanding of the Hebrew (and Egyptian) culture and language reveals that the contradictions are merely illusions. There is no contradiction between Ex. 3 and Genesis or Ex. 6 and Genesis. Indeed, there is no contradiction at all in either the text or the theology of the Pentateuch. The documentarians are simply seeing something that is not really there.

Differences in Style

The documentarians argue that there is only one explanation for a change in style: a change in authors—which is one reason why they assign these two passages from the Pentateuch to two authors:

And Yahweh spoke to Moses, saying, "...These are the feasts of Yahweh, holy convocations which you shall proclaim at their appointed times. On the fourteenth day of the first month at twilight is Yahweh's Passover. And on the fifteenth day of the same month is the Feast of Unleavened Bread to Yahweh; seven days you must eat unleavened bread. On the first day you shall have a holy convocation; you shall do no customary work on it. But you shall offer an offering made by fire to Yahweh for seven days. The seventh day shall be a holy convocation; you shall do no customary work on it" (Lev. 23:1, 4-8).

"Observe the month of Abib, and keep the Passover to Yahweh your God, for in the month of Abib Yahweh your God brought you out of Egypt by night.... You shall eat no leavened bread with

it; seven days you shall eat unleavened bread with it, that is, the bread of affliction (for you came out of the land of Egypt in haste), that you may remember the day in which you came out of the land of Egypt all the days of your life.... Six days you shall eat unleavened bread, and on the seventh day there shall be a sacred assembly to Yahweh your God. You shall do no work on it" (Deut. 16:1, 3, 8).

But the real explanation is that Moses has simply changed his style from one passage to the other—and for some very good reasons.

Style is the manner in which an author communicates his message to his audience. Many of us have read a book written so well that we have read it two or three times simply because of the enjoyment we received from its writing even though we knew how the story would end. Most of us have also read a book that was written so poorly that we tossed it after the first few pages. One of the differences between these two books is the style in which they were written. A good style helps an author to get his message across to his audience. A poor style prevents the audience from hearing the message at all.

This is why serious authors continually seek to improve their style. Benjamin Franklin saw early in his life the need for improving his style after he began corresponding with a friend of his.

Three or four Letters of a Side had pass'd, when my Father happen'd to find my Papers, and read them. Without entring into the Discussion, he took occasion to talk to me about the Manner of my Writing, observ'd that tho' I had the Advantage of my Antagonist in correct Spelling & pointing (which I ow'd to the Printing House) I fell far short in elegance of Expression, in Method and in Perspicuity, of which he convinc'd me by several Instances. I saw the Justice of his Remarks, & thence grew more attentive to the *Manner* in Writing, and determin'd to endeavour at Improvement.

About this time I met with an odd Volume of the Spectator. It was the third. I had never before seen any of them. I bought it, read it over and over, and was much delighted with it. I thought the Writing excellent, & wish'd if possible to imitate it. With that View, I took some of the Papers, & making short Hints of the

Sentiment in each Sentence, laid them by a few Days, and then without looking at the Book, try'd to compleat the Papers again, by expressing each hinted Sentiment at length & as fully as it had been express'd before, in any suitable Words, that should come to hand.

Then I compar'd my Spectator with the Original, discover'd some of my Faults & corrected them. But I found I wanted a Stock of Words or a Readiness in recollecting & using them, which I thought I should have acquir'd before that time, if I had gone on making Verses, since the continual Occasion for Words of the same Import but of different Length, to suit the Measure, or of different Sound for the Rhyme, would have laid me under a constant Necessity of searching for Variety, and also have tended to fix that Variety in my Mind, & make me Master of it. Therefore I took some of the Tales & turn'd them into Verse: And after a time, when I had pretty well forgotten the Prose, turn'd them back again.... By comparing my work afterwards with the original, I discover'd many faults and amended them; but I sometimes had the Pleasure of Fancying that in certain Particulars of small Import, I had been lucky enough to improve the Method or the Language and this encourag'd me to think I might possibly in time come to be a tolerable English Writer, of which I was extremely ambitious.¹⁶⁵

Back when classical education dominated Western schools, teachers of rhetoric would deliberately force their students to change their styles. Franklin's method, which he apparently stumbled upon by himself, was only one of several methods that these teachers employed to accomplish this goal. Louis T. Milic, Chairman of the Department of English at Cleveland State University at the time he compiled his *Stylists on Style*, also included this passage from Franklin in his book. "Franklin's method," he said, "is still one of the best ways of increasing one's skill in writing: practice moving from one medium to another and emulation of a model."¹⁶⁶

¹⁶⁵ Benjamin Franklin, *The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin* (Norwalk, CT: The Easton Press, 1976), 20-21.

¹⁶⁶ Louis T. Milic, ed., *Stylists on Style* (N.Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969), 504.

Franklin's method included, first of all, the imitation of a good style. Edward P.J. Corbett, who also included this passage from Franklin's *Autobiography* in his book, *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*, has pointed out that "Classical rhetoric books are filled with testimonies about the value of imitation for the refinement of the many skills involved in effective speaking or writing. Style is, after all, the most imitable of the skills that co-operate to produce effective discourse."¹⁶⁷ Imitation naturally forces the student to change his style, for to imitate the style of another author, one must first abandon his own.

Second, Franklin's method included writing the same ideas in two different genres; in this case, in both prose and poetry. The demands of poetry differ from the demands of prose. What can be expressed in one manner in prose must be expressed differently in poetry. A change in genre, therefore, *requires* the student to change his style.

Another method, which Corbett mentions but which Franklin did not,

was to set the students the task of saying something in a variety of ways. This process usually started out with a model sentence which had to be converted into a variety of forms each retaining the basic thought of the original. Erasmus, for instance, in Chapter 33 of his widely-used little book, *De duplici copia verborum ac rerum*, showed the students 150 ways of phrasing the Latin sentence, *Tuae literae me magnopere delectarunt* (Your letter has delighted me very much). This variety was achieved partly by the choice of different words, partly by different collocations of words.¹⁶⁸

Erasmus' exercise is interesting in itself, for if style is not what the author says but how he says it, then Erasmus has proven that an author can change his style some 150 times! But his exercise had a more important point to it than merely showing the students that they could express the same thought in a variety of ways.

¹⁶⁷ Edward P.J. Corbett, *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student* (N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1965), 448.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 449.

Obviously, not all of the 150 sentences were equally satisfactory or appropriate; in fact, some of them were monstrosities. But by artificially experimenting with various forms, the student becomes aware of the flexibility of the language in which he is working and learns to extend his own range. Ultimately he learns that although there is a variety of ways of saying something, there is a “best way” for his particular subject matter, occasion, or audience. What was “best” for one occasion or audience, he discovers, is not “best” for another occasion or audience.¹⁶⁹

In other words, the student learns that he is not and *must not be* bound by his inborn style. Several styles are available to him and like a master craftsman, who selects his tools according to the job at hand, a master author will select the style that is “best” for the situation in which he finds himself. A change in any one of a number of factors may require him to put away one style and select another.

A change in *subject* often requires a change in style. One does not write about the qualities of Shakespeare’s sonnets the way that one writes about the intricacies of differential calculus. The Pentateuch’s subject matter includes the creation of the world and the flood of the world, the enslavement of Israel and the deliverance of Israel, the making of a covenant and the breaking of that covenant, the blessing of Jacob’s sons and the rape of Jacob’s daughter. Naturally, we should not expect an author to write about rape the way he would write about the creation of the world. This is also one reason why Friedman changed his style within *Wrote*. For example, in most of the book, he avoided discussing the measurements of objects in cubits because his subjects did not require him to do so. In chapter ten, however, he devoted a considerable amount of space to the measurements of the Tabernacle in cubits because the point he wished to make did require him to do so.

A change in *the occasion* which prompted the author to write often requires a change in style. When the President appears at a friendly gathering seeking to garner voter support, he delivers a speech written in one manner; when he appears before Congress seeking a declaration of war, he delivers a speech written in a dif-

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

ferent manner. So, too, when Moses reprimanded the people for breaking the covenant by making an idol, he spoke to them in one style; when he gave them his farewell speech just before he died, he spoke to them in another style. This is one reason why the style of Deuteronomy, which was Moses' farewell speech, differs from the styles of the other books, including Leviticus.

A change in *the intended audience* often requires a change in style. The kind of letter a man would send to his sweetheart is definitely not the kind of letter he would send to his boss. This, too, helps explain why Deuteronomy's style differs from the style of Leviticus. Even though Deuteronomy repeats many of the laws already found in Leviticus, Deuteronomy was generally directed to all of the people, whereas many of the laws in Leviticus were specifically directed to only the priests. This also explains why Friedman's style changed from *Narrative* to *Wrote*. He wrote *Narrative* for the scholar who is familiar with the Hebrew language, the works of the documentarians, and the jargon of Old Testament scholars. *Wrote*, however, was intended for the lay person who is not familiar with any of these things at all.

A change in *genre* does require a change in style. As we saw earlier, this is why teachers of rhetoric had their students write the same ideas in different genres. Lists, legal materials, narratives, and poetry, all of which can be found in the Pentateuch, each have their own stylistic requirements. This, too, helps explain why Deuteronomy's style differs from that of Leviticus, for Deuteronomy is a different genre. Leviticus is a legal handbook, a list of laws; Deuteronomy is a speech, an exhortation delivered by Moses who is not merely repeating the laws but is encouraging the people to obey the laws with all of their heart.

A change in *character* requires a change in style, even within the same genre. Authors recognize that different people express themselves in different ways. When they move from one character to another, therefore, they change their writing style to match the speaking style of the new character. Again, this too helps explain why Deuteronomy's style differs from Leviticus. Most of the laws in Leviticus are given through speeches by Yahweh, who speaks to the people as their King and their Lord; the laws must be obeyed simply because he has said they must be obeyed. The laws in Deuteronomy, however, are given through a speech by Moses, who speaks to the

people as a dying father would speak to the children whom he loves, giving them his last words of wisdom and urging them to obey the laws because doing so would greatly benefit them. The radical change from one character to another required a radical change in the writing style.

These are only some of the reasons why an author would change his style. There are others. Some authors, for example, naturally avoid wordiness, while other authors habitually ramble on, redundantly repeating themselves, seemingly preferring to employ as many words as they possibly can use to express a charmingly simple idea when only one or two mere little words would have been sufficient to do the job.¹⁷⁰ However, succinct authors may resort to wordiness to prove a point. Indeed, Milic believes that a succinct author who is seeking emphasis should deliberately resort to wordiness—and *vice versa*.

The writer intent on effectiveness must overcome this tendency toward the entropy of his style by recourse to conscious means which will disappoint his reader's new expectations. Having established a new norm for the reader, the writer must find ways to achieve emphasis by departing from his norm. If he has a certain range of variation in his sentence-length, for example, he must, when he wants something to be specially noticeable, introduce a series of short sentences, perhaps even fragments. If his vocabulary has been steadily casual, he can use some formal or learned terms. He must strive to remain to some extent unpredictable. If there is a secret of good writing, perhaps that is it.¹⁷¹

In other words, an author should deliberately change his style often to keep his readers' interest. Variety is the spice of life, and the spice of very good writing.

¹⁷⁰ Thus, Williamson's comment on Whiston's translation of Josephus' works: "His principle seems to have been never to use one word if two or three will do" (Josephus, *The Jewish Wars*, translated by G.A. Williamson [Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1959], 16).

¹⁷¹ Milic, 16.

A change in subject and/or genre can not only dictate a change in style; it can also dictate a change in vocabulary. A legal document does not use the same vocabulary that a history written for the general public would use. This explains, for example, why the Pentateuch's legal vocabulary (usually given to P) differs from its narrative vocabulary (usually given to J and E).

An author also has good reasons for changing his vocabulary *within* a story or law, that is, he has good reasons for employing synonyms within a passage. One of those reasons is to keep the reader from becoming so bored that he or she throws the author's work away. Nobody really wants to have steak every night of his or her life, nor does anybody want to keep reading "the documentarians," "the documentarians," "the documentarians" again and again.

There are other reasons of course. Because each synonym has its own connotations attached to it (it is one thing to describe a man as "stout," quite another to describe him as "fat"), an author may switch from one word to its synonym because its connotation fits the new context better. In chapter two of *Wrote*, up to page 44, Friedman refers to J, E, P, and D as "sources." But on pages 44 and 45, in a section entitled "The Doorstep," he calls them "documents." After this section, he calls them "sources" again. A documentarian explanation of this change in terms would say that someone has inserted a "Document" source into the original "Source" document, but this explanation ignores the obvious reason for the change. Why Friedman used "sources" I cannot say, but he briefly switched to "documents" because in that section he introduces the term "the Documentary Hypothesis." Referring to them as documents and not as sources makes it clear why the theory is known as the *Documentary Hypothesis*.

The biblical critics like to divide Ex. 3:1-6 between J and E, in part because verses 2-4 use the root *r'h*, while verse 6b uses the hiphil form of *nbt*. Jean-Louis Ska points out, however, that both words are very often used in parallelism in both prose and poetry and that there is a nuance of meaning between the two. The first means "to see," whereas the second means "to look at, to gaze, to stare." The scene reaches its climax when Moses realizes that he is encountering not just a burning bush, but God himself, and becomes afraid to not just see God, but to look at, gaze at, or stare at God. So

the author switches terms because the new term is more appropriate—not because we have switched authors.¹⁷²

Sometimes skillful authors alternate terms to achieve alliteration. Rendsburg notes that the author of Genesis uses the Hebrew root *mll* (“said”) in 21:7, its only use outside of poetry, for its alliterative effect with the root *mul* (“circumcise”) in verse 4 and the root *nml* (“wean”) in verse 8 (twice) (not to mention, which he does not, its immediate alliteration within the verse, *mij millel*).¹⁷³ Yet Friedman assigns verse 7 to J, verse 4 to P, and verse 8 to E.¹⁷⁴

There are times when a good author will shun synonyms and repeat a particular word within a passage because only that word fits the context, or doing so effectively emphasizes his main point, or he is afraid that his readers will lose his train of thought if he changes terms. And when that author does use synonyms, he will use them judiciously. When the reader cannot see the text for the synonyms, when the reader begins to guess which synonym will appear next, synonyms lose their value. What the author is saying and how he is saying it must draw the reader’s attention to the author’s message, not turn him away from it.

The use of synonyms and different styles, therefore, does not necessarily denote diverse documents: it may be indicative of the writer’s purposes and preferences. Critical scholars are willing to concede that changes in style *alone* do not prove anything. They become significant only when they appear in conjunction with other anomalies such as repetitions. But the repetitions themselves, as McEvenue correctly contends, can also be a characteristic of the writer’s style. Repetitions are simply devices in the writer’s repertoire with which he communicates his message to his readers, which means that a writer has several legitimate reasons for repeating himself.

¹⁷² Jean-Louis Ska, “The Limits of Interpretation,” in *The Pentateuch*, 121-122.

¹⁷³ Gary Rendsburg, “Hurvitz Redux: On the Continued Scholarly Inattention to a Simple Principle of Hebrew Philology,” in *Biblical Hebrew*, 106-107. For more examples of alliteration in the Pentateuch, see his “Alliteration in the Exodus Narrative,” in Cohen, 83-100.

¹⁷⁴ *Sources*, 62-63.

Doublets

First, an author can have *literary* reasons for repeating himself, that is, he repeats himself to achieve certain literary goals. The author's first goal is to communicate his ideas to his readers. Sometimes his ideas may get lost in the unfolding plot of his story or in the plethora of evidence supporting his reasoning, so the author may use repetition to emphasize his main points, as Sandmel does in his book. During his explanation of the Documentary Hypothesis, he brings up what he feels is an important point:

That which is notable and still broadly adhered to in the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis is the amazing correspondence between the sequence of the documents (with D associated with Josiah, and P with the postexilic period) and the contents of the prophetic literature.

Then, after presenting his evidence to support this statement, he states it again: "To repeat, the pre-exilic prophets are in agreement with Graf-Wellhausen."¹⁷⁵

The thesis is a wonderfully efficient way for an author to communicate a particular point. The point he wishes to make (the thesis) is stated in the opening paragraph. The author then presents his reasoning and evidence in the body of the thesis. His main point is then repeated (usually with some variation in wording) in the conclusion. The repetition helps the reader to remember the author's main point. In a long work covering a large amount of material, the author may organize the work as if it were a series of related theses, each one designed to present one important point. Wright, for example, introduced his discussion of Deut. 31 by stating his main point ("The order of material in this chapter seems rather badly mixed."), then concluded his discussion by repeating that point ("...[I]t is something of a mystery why the heterogeneous contents of this chapter are so badly disarranged.") but with some variation because authors know that strict repetition will often bore their readers.¹⁷⁶ And an author cannot communicate his ideas to readers who have lost any interest in what he has to say.

¹⁷⁵ Sandmel, 332, 333.

¹⁷⁶ Wright, 513, 516.

When this device of introducing and concluding a section of a large work with the same idea or statement appears in biblical passages, it is called an *inclusio* because everything between the two statements is included within the same section. The device sets the passage apart from those before and after it and is intended by the author to communicate an important idea.

Gen. 36 provides us with two examples of this device. The chapter contains two genealogies of Esau, both of which begin with Genesis' usual introduction to genealogies: "These are the generations of Esau." The first genealogy, which emphasizes his role as the begetter of children, then begins and ends with "He is Edom." The second genealogy, which emphasizes his role as the founder of a nation, begins by tacking the phrase "the father of Edom" (meaning that he was the father of the Edomites) to the end of Genesis' usual introduction. It then concludes the genealogy by saying, "He is Esau, the father of Edom." Friedman assigns the first half of the second genealogy to P and the remainder to J,¹⁷⁷ thus splitting a passage that the author had obviously intended to be read as a single passage.

Besides trying to keep his readers' interest in such a long work as the Pentateuch, Moses had an additional hurdle to overcome in order to communicate his ideas to his readers. The majority of the people of his day could not afford to obtain a copy of the Five Books for themselves. Books back then had to be written by hand on long strips of parchment, a rather expensive process. Realizing this, Moses designed the Pentateuch not so much to be *read* as to be *heard*. In Deuteronomy, Moses says to the priests and elders, "At the end of every seven years...you shall read this law before all Israel in their hearing" (Deut. 31:10-11). The problem with having something read to you is that you might not catch everything the first time through—and you do not have the advantage the reader has of being able to flip back a few pages to catch what you may have missed. This is one reason why the Pentateuch has so many repetitions. As Robert Alter has observed,

If you were a Judean herdsman standing in the outer circle of listeners while the story of the Ten Plagues was being read, you might miss a few phrases when God instructs Moses about turn-

¹⁷⁷ *Sources*, 91-92.

ing the Nile into blood (Exodus 7:17-18), but you could easily pick up what you had lost when the instructions were almost immediately repeated verbatim as narrated action (Exod. 7:20-21). If you were close enough to the reader to catch every word, you could still enjoy the satisfaction of hearing each individual term of God's grim prediction, first stated in the prophetic future, then repeated as accomplished fact, with an occasional elegant variation of the verbatim repetition through the substitution of a synonym....¹⁷⁸

Thus, Moses repeated himself for the simple literary reason that the repetitions helped him to achieve his goal of communicating his ideas to his listeners.

Second, an author can have *pedagogical* reasons for repeating himself, that is, he repeats himself because he is trying to teach his readers. Moses also designed the Pentateuch not so much to *entertain* as to *educate*: he expected his hearers to learn from the Pentateuch. Thus, he goes on to say that the priests must read the law to the people "that they may learn to fear Yahweh your God and carefully observe all the words of this law" (Deut. 31:12, AT). The problem is that the majority of students do not automatically retain everything they have heard the first time they hear it. But the more often they hear it, the more likely they are to retain it.

Referring specifically to the laws of Deuteronomy, Calum Carmichael, Professor of Comparative Literature and Adjunct Professor of Law at Cornell University, has noted that

...the frequent repetition of rules for sacrifice and worship does not suggest a heterogeneous code of rules, composed at different times and places, but rather reflects a setting of instruction. Matters are repeated, especially in this opening part of instruction, in order to fix the teaching in the mind of the hearer.¹⁷⁹

Teachers and writers who wish to teach their readers know the value of repetition. Repetition is particularly useful when memoriz-

¹⁷⁸ Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (N.Y.: Basic Books, 1981), 90-91.

¹⁷⁹ Calum Carmichael, *The Laws of Deuteronomy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974), 69.

ing a large amount of data or when the information is new to the student. This is why teachers repeat the multiplication facts until everyone is sick of them—and knows them. This is also why the documentarians sometimes repeat themselves. Professor Sandmel, in a book which “assumes little or no previous knowledge on the part of the reader,” concludes his explanation of the Documentary Hypothesis by saying,

...since the contents of this chapter may be a burden for the student to retain, I shall deliberately repeat relevant portions of it, especially those dealing with the work of the P author or authors, in the ensuing discussion of the individual books of the Pentateuch.

And repeat himself he does. In the previous paragraph he says,

After P had completed this work, he revised it by inserting such material as J, E, RJE, or H. Like RJE, he was not disturbed by the presence of contradictory elements. Therefore, he can allow the proximity of two conflicting genealogies of the generations from Adam to Noah; he can allow two divergent stories of creation to appear side by side. Possibly, especially in view of the elasticity of the religious mind, he regarded divergencies as identities. Or perhaps he was not sufficiently concerned, not reckoning that subsequent generations, especially modern scholars, would examine his work minutely.

Then, only ten pages later, in the next chapter, he returns to this subject:

Since P was dealing with man, not with the Hebrews, he was constrained to set forth universal aspects of man. The old legends he quoted were not inconsistent to his mind as they are to ours. He first told us (1:26-8) of the creation of man and woman. What looks to us like a repetition (2:4ff.) was to him only a filling in of details. And while in this repetition we moderns can see a

view of God discordant with P's first presentation, no such discordancy troubled the author.¹⁸⁰

Notice that the two creation stories are "divergent" in the first passage but "discordant" in the second. Apparently, this divergent discordancy did not trouble Professor Sandmel.

Rote memorization is the simplest form of educational repetition. More sophisticated teaching methods also employ repetition. Educational psychologists tell us that our minds do not simply store information: they organize information into some sort of structure. New information is assimilated into the structure by relating it to something we already know. Unfortunately, the structure is not always sensible. A young child who has been bitten by a dog tends to stay away from *all* four-legged animals. His mind's structure lumps all animals into one category. When the child learns to differentiate between dogs and cats, the structure will expand to include the new category. Good teaching methods do not leave the structure to chance: they provide both the facts and the structure.

In one such method, the teacher will provide a small amount of information concerning a new subject. Then, days or weeks later, when the teacher is ready to present more information on the same subject, he or she will help the students to correctly relate the new information to the older information by first reminding them of the older information. Friedman employed this method in his discussion of Julius Wellhausen. In the Introduction to *Wrote*, he gives us some basic information about Wellhausen. He tells us that Wellhausen was a "powerful figure" in the history of biblical scholarship because he brought the ideas of his predecessors as well as his own ideas "into a clear, organized synthesis." Nine chapters later, Friedman wishes to present more information on Wellhausen. Specifically, he wants to critique Wellhausen's theory. But before he does so, he first repeats some of the information given in the Introduction (thereby creating a doublet). This helps us to recall who Wellhausen was and to connect the new information to the previous information. Notice, too, that I have just used the same method in this very discussion.

¹⁸⁰ Sandmel, vii, 339, 349.

In another method, the teacher will present an overview or summary of the subject. This becomes the structure for the subject. The teacher will then go through the overview again, filling in the details as he or she goes along. For example, a teacher may spend a day or two summarizing the Age of Discovery, briefly mentioning the names of several discoverers. During the following days, the teacher will repeat this information but give details concerning Columbus, Magellan, De Soto, and others. Or, after giving the overview, the teacher may emphasize only one part of the subject. For example, the teacher might give information on Columbus alone. The overview helps the students to view the part from the perspective of the whole.

Friedman employed this method also. In the Introduction to *Wrote*, he presents a brief history of the development of the Documentary Hypothesis. There he mentions H.B. Witter, Jean Astruc, and J.G. Eichhorn only in passing. In Chapter Two, he returns to only one part of that history and gives us much more information concerning these three men. The following outlines will help us to see what he has done:

Introduction

- A. Early Questions
- B. The First Stage
 - 1. Isaac ibn Yashush
 - 2. Abraham ibn Ezra
 - 3. Bonfils
 - 4. Tostatus and Carlstadt
- C. The Second Stage:
Andreas Van Maes
- D. The Third Stage
 - 1. Thomas Hobbes
 - 2. Isaac de la Peyrere
 - 3. Spinoza
 - 4. Simon and Hampden
- E. Doublets and the Names of God
- F. The Next Stage:

Chapter 2

- A. Doublets and the Names of God
- B. Two Sources

- | | |
|---|--|
| Two Sources (H.B. Witter, Jean Astruc, J.G. Eichhorn) | 1. Henning Bernard Witter
2. Jean Astruc
3. Johann Gottfried Eicchhorn |
| G. Two More Sources Discovered | C. Two More Sources Discovered |
| H. The Hypothesis | |
| 1. Karl Heinrich Graf and Wilhelm Vatke | |
| 2. Julius Wellhausen | |
| I. The Present State | |

Moses also employed this method when he wrote what appears to be two creation stories:

Genesis 1

Introduction

A. The First Day: Light

B. The Second Day:
Atmosphere

C. The Third Day:

1. Dry Land
2. Plants

D. The Fourth Day:

Sun, Moon, and Stars

E. The Fifth Day: Fish
and Birds

F. The Sixth Day

1. Animals
2. Man and Woman

G. The Seventh Day: Rest

Genesis 2

The Sixth Day

1. Man
2. Woman

Gen. 1 is an overview of the entire creation process from beginning to end. It is simple, concise, and cyclic. The events in each of the first six days follow a set pattern: God speaks, something is created, God sees that it is good, and then the day ends. The overview gives us the structure to which we can relate new information about the creation. But it provides us with very few details.

So, in Gen. 2, Moses returns to the one part of the process which interests him and his readers the most: the sixth day, when the man and woman were created. This retelling of the sixth day's events is much less rigid than Gen. 1 but is definitely more detailed. The flowing narrative presents the information which the strict structure of Gen. 1 could not. The two chapters are complementary, not contradictory.

Third, an author can have *historical* reasons for repeating himself, that is, he repeats himself because the events he is recording actually repeated themselves in history. For many of us, events repeat themselves because we are creatures of habit: we always go to the same place for vacation, we always visit the relatives at Christmas, we always eat at the same restaurant every Friday night. Those of us who have a regularly scheduled job get up at the same time every work day, go to work at the same time every day, perform the same set of tasks every day, and go home at the same time every day. Occasionally, however, other factors can change the routine. An accident may force us to take a different route, or friends invite us for a drink after work. So a set of events may repeat themselves over and over again, but sometimes with some variation. It should not be surprising, therefore, to find Abraham lying twice, but with some variation in the events the second time around.

Of course, it is easy for events to repeat themselves when one *plans* on making them happen again. In his defense before Abimelech, Abraham says, "And it came to pass, when God caused me to wander from my father's house, that I said to her, 'This is your kindness that you should do for me: in every place, wherever we go, say of me, 'He is my brother''" (Gen. 20:13). Thus, Abraham and Sarah had *planned* on instigating this subterfuge whenever they came to a new place. They instigated it when they entered Egypt and they instigated it again when they came to Gerar. They may have instigated it *more* than these two times, but these are the only two instances that have been recorded.

Habit and routine and even planning cannot account for all repetitive events. On May 9, 1961, James Gentile stepped up to the plate and hit a grand slam. A person, even a professional player, does not often get the privilege of doing this, but the next time Gentile stepped up to the plate in the same game, he hit another one. Habit and routine certainly did not load the bases for him or give him the perfect pitch each time. And yet, Gentile's achievement is not unique. James Northrup also hit back-to-back grand slams on June 24, 1968 and so did Frank Robinson on June 26, 1970, which proves that a series of events can occur to more than one person.

In fact, the same series of events can occur to a man and his son—or even to his grandson. From the records of ancient Egypt, we learn that some events which occurred during the reign of Tuthmosis I occurred again during the reign of his grandson, Tuthmosis III. Both men conducted similar military campaigns along the Euphrates River, both erected stelae there, and both then hunted elephants at Niy.¹⁸¹ From the records of sports statisticians we learn that Tom Morris, Sr., won the British Open four times, winning his last one in 1867 with a score of 170. His son, Tom Morris, Jr., won the Open the following year, also with a score of 170. He also went on to win a total of four British Opens.¹⁸²

John W. Haley recalls the remarkable stories of

the two Presidents Edwards, father and son. Both were named Jonathan Edwards, and were the grandsons of clergymen. "Both were pious in their youth, were distinguished scholars, and were tutors for equal periods in the colleges where they were respectively educated. Both were settled in the ministry as successors to their maternal grandfathers, were dismissed on account of their religious opinions, and were again settled in retired country towns, over congregations singularly attached to them, where they had leisure to pursue their favorite studies, and to prepare and publish their valuable works. Both were removed from these stations to become presidents of colleges, and both died shortly after their respective inaugurations; the one

¹⁸¹ *AOOT*, 121, n. 26.

¹⁸² Frank G. Menke, *The Encyclopedia of Sports*, 6th edition (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1977), 507, 522.

in the fifty-sixth, and the other in the fifty-seventh year of his age; each having preached, on the first Sabbath of the year of his death, on the text: "This year thou shalt die."¹⁸³

In our own time, we have witnessed a father and his son, the former named George H. W. Bush and the latter George W. Bush, become President of our country and then lead us into a war against Iraq. The two stories are similar, but they also vary from each other. The two wars were started for different reasons, the first to free Kuwait from Iraq's incursion, the second to eliminate Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. The two wars also produced different results. Iraq's leader, Saddam Hussein, was not deposed at the end of the first war, but was deposed during the second.

The similarities of these numerous events (down to the similarity of the names) seem uncanny because the sons or grandson could not possibly have deliberately imitated his father's or grandfather's life at every point, and one is tempted to think that in each case we have here two versions of the same story. Yet the historical records prove that the events which actually occurred in the life of the father or grandfather actually repeated themselves in the life of the son or grandson. Thus, the author who records the lives of both the man and his son or grandson will seem to be creating a doublet when all he is doing is faithfully recording actual history, as Moses did when he recorded the stories in which Abraham and his son Isaac lied about their wives.

Fourth, an author can have *cultural* reasons for repeating himself, that is, he repeats himself because his culture expects him to do so. One of the great principles of the ancient Israelite law was that a person could not be executed for a crime unless two or three witnesses confirmed his guilt. That same law hinted that this principle could be applied to other situations as well: "By the mouth of two or three witnesses the matter shall be established" (Deut. 19:15). Jesus referred to this principle when offering proof to the Israelites that the amazing things he was saying about himself were in fact true: "It is also written in your law that the testimony of two men is true. I am One who bears witness of Myself, and the Father who sent Me

¹⁸³ John W. Haley, *Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible*, reprint edition (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1977), 26-27.

bears witness of Me” (John 8:17-18). Joseph referred to this principle when he said to Pharaoh, “And the dream was repeated to Pharaoh twice because the thing is established by God, and God will shortly bring it to pass” (Gen. 41:32). Joseph’s future was established by the two dreams he had and his ability to interpret dreams was established by his successful interpretation of not just one, but two dreams, those of the cupbearer and the baker.

Genesis 24 is the longest chapter in Genesis, but its length is achieved in part by telling the complete story twice. Abraham sends his chief servant back to the town where his relatives live to find a wife for his son, Isaac. Upon his arrival, the servant prays to Yahweh that the woman intended to be Isaac’s wife would come to the well by which he is standing and water his camels. Rebekah comes to the well before he finishes his prayer and offers to water his camels. The miraculous element in this story was so extraordinary that Moses confirmed the truth of the matter by having the servant tell the whole story again to Rebekah’s relatives. He could have summarized the servant’s telling of the story in only one or two verses as he does at the end of the story when the servant tells the story once again, this time to Isaac. But by having the servant tell the whole story to Rebekah’s relatives, Moses makes himself, the narrator, the first witness and the servant the second witness, who confirms the truth of the story.

There is another cultural reason why Moses repeated himself, a far more prominent reason. It involves the use of a literary device known as *parallelism*. This literary device was used extensively throughout the ancient Near East. Examples have been found in Ugaritic, Egyptian, Sumerian, Akkadian, and Arabic texts,¹⁸⁴ as well

¹⁸⁴ For Ugaritic texts, see Stanislav Segert, “Parallelism in Ugaritic Poetry,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 103, No. 1 (Jan.-Mar., 1983), 295-306. For Egyptian, Sumerian, Akkadian, and Arabic texts see Louis Israel Newman, *Studies in Biblical Parallelism Part I: Parallelism in Amos* (1917; repr., Miami: Hardpress Publishing, n.d.), 76-110. For Egyptian texts, see Richard Abbott, “Forked Parallelism in Egyptian, Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetry,” *Tyndale Bulletin* 62 (2011), 41-64; Miriam Lichtheim, “Have the Principles of Ancient Egyptian Metrics Been Discovered?,” *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt*, Vol. 9 (1971-1972), 103-110. For examples of chiasmic parallelism in several ancient cultures, see John W. Welch, *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis*, Maxwell Institute Publications 22 (1998), available at <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/mi/22>. For the argument that Merenptah’s Israel Stela is a chiasm, see the PhD thesis by Richard

as in numerous poetic and prose passages throughout the Bible. At its simplest level, parallelism links two lines of poetry, the second line either stating again the basic thought of the first line in synonymous or otherwise related words or else stating the antithesis of the first line. This device allows the author to state his thought more fully than he could have done in one line alone. Of course, thoughts are expressed not only in words and sentences, but also in paragraphs, scenes, and even stories. When an author places these larger units of thought into a parallelistic structure, they often appear as doublets.

We have seen that the Poem which relates the battle between Ramesses II and the Hittites at Kadesh contains inconsistencies. Some of these inconsistencies are the result of Egyptian style: the Poem is not the only Egyptian work to combine both prose and poetry,¹⁸⁵ nor is it the only Egyptian work to combine the third-person point of view with the first-person point of view.¹⁸⁶ The doublets, however, are the result of the Poem's chiasmic structure:

Introduction: Pharaoh's Attributes (1-24)

A The march to Kadesh (25-40)

B The Hittite King gathers his troops, initiates attack (41-91)

C Pharaoh petitions Amun (92-127)

D Ramesses' first attack (128-165)

E Ramesses rebukes his troops (166-204)

F The dismay of his shield-bearer (205-219)

Abbott, *Triumphal Accounts in Hebrew and Egyptian* (Ebook, Matteh Publications, 2011), available at https://play.google.com/store/books/details?id=Hp4xGdqmw7MC&rdid=bookHp4xGdqmw7MC&rdot=1&source=gbs_vpt_read&pcampaignid=books_booksearch_viewport.

¹⁸⁵ Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, 59.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 72, n. 7.

G Ramesses' second attack (220-223)

F' Troops praise Ramesses (224-250)

E' Ramesses rebukes his troops (251-276)

D' Ramesses' third attack (277-294)

C' The Hittite King petitions Pharaoh (295-322)

B' Pharaoh gathers his troops, declaration of peace (323-330)

A' The march home (331-343)

It could be argued that this chiasmic structure merely reflects the natural order of events from the march to Kadesh to the battle to the march home. Three factors, however, tell us that this structure was artificially created. First, the story of the battle is told again in another inscription, known to scholars as the Bulletin. This inscription has been found in seven locations and in three of these it sits side-by-side with the Poem.¹⁸⁷ Yet the Bulletin does not tell of the march to Kadesh or of the march home, it does not tell of Pharaoh rebuking his troops, it does not tell of Pharaoh petitioning Amun or of the Hittite King petitioning the Pharaoh, and it records only one attack, not three as in the Poem.¹⁸⁸ Second, the first and third attacks are told in some detail, but the description of the second attack, in the center of the chiasm, is a summary statement, as if it were stating the theme of the Poem:

His majesty then rushed forward,
At a gallop he charged the midst of the foe,
For the sixth time he charged them.
I was after them like Baal in his moment of power,
I slew them without pause (lines 220-223).¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁷ *Inconsistency*, 20.

¹⁸⁸ Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, 60-62.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 69.

Moreover, it is in the first and third attacks that we find the cries of the warrior(s), which compare Ramesses to a god or gods and warn the other warriors not to approach the Pharaoh, lest they die. Third, Pharaoh rebukes his troops in E, which means that his troops have returned to him, but in F the shield-bearer and Pharaoh are alone, with the troops nowhere near them. The first rebuke is placed here, despite creating this inconsistency, because it corresponds to the rebuke in E', which follows the reappearance of the troops in F'. The chiasmic structure of the Poem, therefore, has been deliberately constructed, with the center stating the theme of the Poem: Pharaoh was so fearless and so mighty that he defeated Egypt's enemies all by himself.¹⁹⁰

Parallelism also explains why there are doublets in the Pentateuch. Take the two stories in which Abram/Abraham lies about his wife Sarai/Sarah. Anderson, thinking like a modern Western documentarian, sees them as evidence of disunity and explains their existence as the result of two documents being conflated together. But we, thinking like an ancient Near Eastern author, see them as two parts of a parallelistic structure which is intended to convey a message.

The overall Story of Abraham is a chiasm:

A Abram's Early Life (11:27-32)

B The Call of God (12:1-9)

C A Changed Man (12:10-21:34)

B' Confirmation of the Call (22:1-19)

A' Abraham's Later Life (22:20-25:11)

The units marked A and A' can be broken down further:

¹⁹⁰ Perhaps the correspondence between F and F' is not obvious. In F, the shield-bearer asks Pharaoh why he bothers to save his troops (line 212) and in F', the troops praise Pharaoh for doing exactly that (line 240). The shield-bearer's dismay in F assumes that Ramesses is incapable of defeating the enemy alone. The Pharaoh's answer assures the shield-bearer that he is, in fact, capable of defeating the enemy alone and again in F', the troops praise him for doing exactly that.

- A a Birth: Abram, Nahor and Haran are born (11:27)
b Death: Haran dies (11:28)
c Marriage: Abram and Nahor marry (11:29)
a' Birth (lack of): Sarai has no children (11:30)
b' Death: Family moves to Haran; Terah dies (11:31-32)
- A' a Birth: Nahor's children are born (22:20-24)
b Death: Sarah dies (23:1-20)
c Marriage: Isaac marries Rebekah (24:1-67)
a' Birth: Abraham's concubine gives birth (25:1-4)
b' Death: Abraham sends children away, he dies (25:5-11)

It is as if Moses is saying that marriage is what keeps the cycle of birth and death going.

The two stories about Abram/Abraham's lie occur in unit C. The documentarians see the two stories as a doublet, but this is not the only so-called "doublet" within this unit. There are also two stories about his nephew Lot. In the first, Abram rescues Lot from captivity after Sodom and Gomorrah are conquered by four kings. In the second, Abraham prays for Lot's rescue when he learns that Yahweh is about to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah. There are also two stories about a covenant being made with Abram/Abraham. In the first, God promises that Abram will have more descendants than there are stars in the sky. In the second, Abraham agrees not to harm the descendants of Abimelech. There are also two stories concerning Sarai's handmaiden, Hagar. In the first, Sarai gives Hagar to Abram so she can have children through her. Hagar gets pregnant, but then is treated so badly by Sarai that she runs away. An angel of Yahweh sends her back. In the second, Hagar's son mocks Sarah's son, so Sarah demands that Abraham send her away. Abraham does so after consulting with God.

What is interesting is that in each case the Israelites' ancestor is called Abram in the first story and Abraham in the second. And in each case, his wife is called Sarai in the first story and Sarah in the second. And in each case the first story comes before Gen. 17 and the second comes after Gen. 17, the very chapter in which both of them get their names changed. This would suggest that Moses is using a parallelism which has Gen. 17 as its center, and so he is:

- a 1 Abram lies about Sarai to Pharaoh (12:10-20)
2 Abram rescues Lot from the four kings (13:1-14:24)
- b 1 God makes a covenant with Abram (15:1-21)
2 Hagar runs away from Sarai (16:1-16)
- c Abram's and Sarai's names are changed (17:1-27)
- a' 2' Abraham prays for Lot's rescue (18:1-19:38)
1' Abraham lies about Sarah to Abimelech (20:1-18)
- b' 2' Sarah wants Hagar sent away (21:1-21)
1' Abimelech makes a covenant with Abraham (21:22-34)

Unit C has the same abca'b' pattern that units A and A' do, with these exceptions: all the units except unit c are further broken down into two stories each and the themes of birth and death are reversed. Notice that the two stories in a are reversed in a', and the two stories in b are reversed in b'. Arranging the stories this way makes unit c the center of not just one but two chiasms, that formed by aca' and that formed by bcb'. Units a and a' convey the death theme. Pharaoh's household suffers from a plague and Sodom is conquered by an army. Later, Sodom and Gomorrah and their inhabitants are destroyed by God and Abimelech's women suffer from barrenness, which, to the ancient Near Eastern mind, meant that Abimelech's life would not carry on in his descendants. Units b and b' convey the birth theme. Hagar gives birth to Ishmael at the end of b while Sarah gives birth to Isaac at the beginning of b'. The covenant God makes with Abram concerns Abram's descendants while the covenant Abimelech makes with Abraham concerns Abimelech's descendants.

That the themes found in A and A' are carried over to C suggests that unit c also conveys the theme of marriage, and indeed it does. It was the ancient Near Eastern custom for a person in authority, when he gained possession of another person, to change the name of that person, thereby signifying that that person now belonged to him. By changing Abram's name to Abraham, God was signifying that Abraham now belonged to God. But he also said that this possession worked both ways, for he said that he would be Abraham's God. He also said that this mutual possession would extend to Abraham's descendants: "I will be their God." This mutual possession is

precisely the type of relationship we find in a marriage. Notice that this concept of an intimate relationship with a personal God is being expressed in a passage supposedly written by P, which supposedly emphasizes the remoteness of a cosmic God, access to whom can supposedly be obtained only through the priests.

In Exodus through Deuteronomy, we see God making another covenant with Abraham's descendants. In that covenant, he again makes it clear that he and the people would mutually possess each other: "I... will be your God, and you shall be My people" (Lev. 26:12). Notice again that this concept is being expressed by another supposedly P passage. The prophet Hosea sees this covenant as a marriage relationship, to which Abraham's descendants have proven unfaithful. This is why God says to Israel through the prophet: "You are not My people, and I will not be your God" (Hos. 1:9). In fact, as far as God is concerned, the relationship has been completely severed: "She is not My wife, nor am I her Husband!" (Hos. 2:2). For this reason, "I will no longer have mercy on the house of Israel" (Hos. 1:6). However, Hosea sees God as renewing and restoring this relationship with Israel:

"And it shall be, in that day,"
Says Yahweh,
"That you will call Me 'My Husband,'
And no longer call Me 'My Master,'
I will betroth you to Me in faithfulness,
And you shall know Yahweh....
And I will have mercy on her who had not obtained mercy;
Then I will say to those who were not My people,
'You are My people!'
And they shall say, 'You are my God!'" (Hos. 2:16-23).

Jeremiah also sees this covenant as a marriage relationship to which Abraham's descendants have proven unfaithful and he also sees God as renewing this relationship through a new covenant which would replace the old:

"Behold, the days are coming, says Yahweh, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah—not according to the covenant that I made with their fa-

thers in the day that I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, My covenant which they broke, though I was a husband to them, says Yahweh. But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says Yahweh: I will put My law in their minds, and write it on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people. No more shall every man teach his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, 'Know Yahweh,' for they all shall know Me, from the least of them to the greatest of them, says Yahweh. For I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin I will remember no more" (Jer. 31:31-34).

As both Hosea and Jeremiah saw, the key to fulfilling the new covenant (and the old one as well) is knowing God. God did not want the Israelites to simply obey a set of rules and regulations. He wanted them to enter into a deep, intimate and personal relationship with him. He wanted them to become one with him, just like a man and a woman become one with each other in the marriage relationship.

This is the relationship that God was offering Abraham: a deep, intimate, personal, marriage relationship. And because a change in name not only signifies a change in ownership but also a change in character, God was saying that this relationship would change Abraham for the better.

Which is precisely why Moses related the two stories in which Abram/Abraham lied about his wife. It is also why he included the other so-called "doublets," for the similarities and the differences between the stories were designed to illustrate this change in Abraham's character. When Lot is captured in the first story, Abram takes matters into his own hands and rescues him. But in the second story, Abraham prays for Lot's rescue and leaves the matter in the hands of Yahweh. When Hagar despises Sarai because she is pregnant and Sarai is not, Sarai demands that Abram do something about it. Abram decides he really does not want to get involved and simply says, "Do to her as you please." So Sarai mistreats Hagar so badly that Hagar runs away. But when Hagar's son mocks the newborn Isaac and Sarah again demands that Abraham do something about it, Abraham is displeased with Sarah's request and is concerned for the safety of Hagar and her son. He sends them away only after he

prays and God assures him that he will take care of them. When Pharaoh rebukes Abram after he discovers that Abram has lied to him, Abram says nothing. He offers no defense for his actions but he also offers no apologies. He simply takes Pharaoh's gifts and leaves, apparently unconcerned that Pharaoh's household has suffered from plagues because of his subterfuge. Abraham lies to Abimelech as well, which means that he still has some changing to do, but this time he prays for Abimelech's household so that the women can again bear children. For the most part, Abram was a selfish person, but Abraham cared for the people around him.

It has been argued that the change in Abram's name is so subtle (in the Hebrew, Abram is changed to Abraham by adding only one letter) as to be almost meaningless, but this subtle change reflects the subtle yet real changes in Abraham's character. These changes apparently earned him the respect of the people among whom he lived. In the first covenant, Abram was the recipient, humbly submitting to what God required. But in the second covenant, Abimelech, the king of the Philistines, treated Abraham as if he were an equal, as if he too were a king.

What we have here in Abraham's Story, then, is not a loose collection of stories haphazardly spliced together by editors but a series of contrasting stories within a parallel structure constructed by a single author who knows how to get his message across. What we have here is form following function, the structure perfectly matching the message: If you want to change, you must have an intimate relationship with God at the center of your life. The anomalies are not evidence of disunity. They are pointers to the author's message.

The message of Abraham's Story contrasts with yet complements the message of the Story of the Fall. Many conservative and nonconservative scholars have assumed that the so-called Second Creation Story in Gen. 2 is a separate unit from the Story of the Fall which follows it. But Moses has left us some clues to show us that this is not so. For example, at the end of Gen. 2, after God brings Adam's wife to him, he names her "Woman" and then we are told that they were both naked. In the middle of the Story of the Fall, after God curses both the man and the woman, Adam again names his wife, this time calling her "Eve," and then we are told that God clothed them with animal skins. At the end of the Story of the Fall, Yahweh expels the man from the Garden of Eden. The woman was

obviously with him, but the text specifically mentions only the man. Why? Because at the beginning of the Second Creation Story, God places the man, and only the man, into the Garden of Eden. And these are the only two stories in which the narrator consistently refers to God by the compound name Yahweh Elohim. The two stories are really only one story which is unified by its chiastic parallelism:

A Yahweh Elohim places the man into the Garden of Eden (2:4-17)

B Yahweh Elohim blesses the man with a woman (2:18-25)

C The Fall (3:1-7)

-B' Yahweh Elohim curses the man and the woman (3:8-21)

-A' Yahweh Elohim expels the man from the Garden of Eden (3:22-24)

The tragic events of the last two units contrast with the idyllic setting of the first two units, making the center unit the turning point of the story. The message of the story is clear: sin brings with it tragic consequences. Yet the structure of the Story conveys another message which also becomes clear once we realize that Yahweh Elohim appears in all five units except the center one: Adam and Eve fell into sin because they were apart from God. The Story of the Fall, then, tells us what our problem is: we keep falling into sin because we are apart from God. Abraham's Story presents the solution: if we want to overcome sin, we must do the opposite. We must marry God and never divorce him again.

Abraham's Story and the Story of the Fall, in turn, are parts of the parallel structure uniting the book of Genesis. And once again, Moses has left us clues pointing us to this structure. The book, of course, begins with the Creation Story. Thereafter, we find repeated throughout the book the phrase, "These are the generations of." The Hebrew word for *generations* can also mean *history*, specifically a family history. So the phrase is telling us that what follows is a family history. It appears at the beginning of the Story of the Fall. It

appears at the beginning of Abraham's Story. In fact, it appears at the beginning of all the major stories and genealogies in Genesis. Altogether it appears eleven times, marking off eleven major units. Those eleven units, plus the Creation Story, make twelve units within the book of Genesis, a number which should not surprise us since twelve was an important number to the Israelites.

The twelve units are evenly divided between six units of stories and six units of genealogies. Genesis begins and ends with a story (the Creation and Joseph's Story). The ten units in between can be divided into two groups of five, each of which follows the pattern of story, genealogy, story, genealogy, genealogy. The overall structure of Genesis, then, is thus:

A The Creation (1:1-2:3)

B The History of the
Heavens and the
Earth (The Fall, 2:4-
3:24)
Appendix: Cain and
his brother (4:1-26)

B' The History of
Terah (Abraham's
Story, 11:27-25:11)

C The History of Adam
(Adam's Genealogy,
5:1-32)
Appendix: The Sons
of God (6:1-8)

C' The History of
Ishmael (Ishmael's
Genealogy, 25:12-18)

D The History of Noah
(The Flood, 6:9-9:19)

Appendix: Ham and
his brothers (9:20-29)

D' The History of Isaac
(Isaac and Jacob's
Story, 25:19-35:29)

E The History of the
Sons of Noah (Gene-
alogy of Noah's Sons,
10:1-32)
Appendix: The Tower
of Babel (11:1-9)

E' The History of Esau
(Esau's Genealogy,
36:1-8)

F The History of Shem
(Shem's Genealogy,
11:10-26)

F' The History of Esau
(Esau's Genealogy,
36:9-43)
Appendix: Jacob in
Canaan (37:1)

A' The History of Jacob
(Joseph's Story, 37:2-50:26)

Seeing the structure of Genesis laid out in this fashion helps us to see the points of similarity between the various units. Thus, we see that story lines up with story, genealogy lines up with genealogy. In A, the man and woman are commanded to “Be fruitful and multiply” (1:28). The command is repeated in D and D’ (9:1, 7; 35:11), both of which are the middle unit in their respective group. The command is finally fulfilled in A’ (47:27).

The structure also helps us to see the points of contrast. In the first group, the first four units have an appendix while the fifth does not. By contrast, the first four units in the second group do not have an appendix while the fifth does. The genealogies in the first group follow the chosen line of people from Adam through Noah and Shem to Terah, from whom Abraham came. By contrast, the genealogies in the second group follow the lines of the rejected sons (Ishmael and Esau), the ones to whom the covenant was not extended. The structure, therefore, demonstrates that the two groups are similar in some ways and yet opposite in other ways. This suggests that the themes of the two groups would also be similar yet opposite. In

other words, the theme of the second group would contrast yet complement the theme of the first group.

We have already seen how this is true of Abraham's Story and the Fall. The themes of the two stories contrast yet complement each other. The Fall tells us what the problem is; Abraham's Story tells us what the solution is. So it goes for the rest of the stories. The Flood reminds us that our problem does not lie outside of us but inside of us, for "the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth" (8:21). Notice that Yahweh says this *after* everything has been destroyed. Our problem is our heart, not our environment. By contrast, Jacob's name is changed not just once but twice, meaning that Abraham's covenant, which has been extended to him (35:9-13), is also changing him for the better. The first group tells us what our problem is; the second group tells us what the solution is. The overall theme of Genesis, then, is that we need to have an intimate relationship with God. We need to be married to God. We need to know God.

Genesis, in turn, is only one piece in the overall plan of the Pentateuch. And once again, Moses has left us some clues as to what that plan is. In the Hebrew, Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers all begin with the word "and," meaning that these books are a continuation of what came before them. It should not surprise us that Genesis does not begin with "and," but Deuteronomy also does not, even though it follows the other four books. Genesis ends with Jacob's blessing of his children, followed by a chapter in which he and Joseph die. Deuteronomy ends with Moses' blessing of the children of Israel, followed by a chapter in which he dies.

Genesis and Deuteronomy are also related to each other in another way. Genesis teaches us that we should have an intimate relationship with God, that we should know God. But an intimate relationship with God can only be maintained through love. To know him is to love him. That is precisely the theme of Deuteronomy. Moses repeatedly calls the Israelites to a relationship in which they love God, not just serve him (Deut. 6:5; 30:16, 20). Indeed, he tells the Israelites to cling to God because that is the only way they can obtain life:

I call heaven and earth as witnesses today against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life, that both you and your descendants may live;

that you may love Yahweh your God, that you may obey His voice, and that you may cling to Him, for He is your life and the length of your days (Deut. 30:19-20).

Obviously, the people to whom he was speaking already had life. He was telling them that if they enter into an intimate relationship with God, they would obtain a better quality of life. They would obtain a life full of blessings. They would obtain a life free of curses (see Deut. 28). They would, in fact, obtain *God's* life, for God does not just have life: he *is* life. To have this life, they must have God. Separation from God is death, but union with God is life.

And so, even though Genesis is a historical narrative, full of stories and very little law, and Deuteronomy is mostly a series of speeches which contain some stories and a large quantity of law, the themes of the two books are the same, for knowing God and loving God are the same thing.

Both Exodus and Numbers are a mixture of story and law. Their emphasis is on believing and obeying God. After Yahweh destroyed the Egyptian army in the sea, the people “believed Yahweh and his servant Moses” (Ex. 14:31). Yahweh gave the people specific instructions on when they were to gather the manna and how much they were to gather, but when some of the people fail to follow those instructions, Yahweh says to Moses, “How long do you refuse to keep My commandments and My laws?” (Ex. 16:28). When the spies return with a pessimistic view of their chances to conquer the Promised Land, Yahweh says to Moses, “How long will these people reject Me? And how long will they not believe Me, with all the signs which I have performed among them?” (Num. 14:11). When the people insist on invading the Promised Land anyway, Moses says, “Now why do you transgress the command of Yahweh?” (Num. 14:41). Yahweh tells Moses that he will not be allowed to enter the Promised Land after he struck the rock to get water out of it instead of speaking to it as Yahweh had told him to do “because you did not believe Me, to hallow Me in the eyes of the children of Israel” (Num. 20:12).

These two themes, however, are the same thing. The Bible equates believing God with obeying God, which means that disbelieving God is the same as disobeying God. Moses disobeyed God because he did not believe him. In the Gospel of John, John the Baptist

tells his disciples, “He who believes in the Son has everlasting life; but he who disobeys the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abides on him” (John 3:36, AT). The Jews once asked Jesus, “What shall we do, that we may work the works of God?” In other words, what must we do to obey God? Jesus’ answer was, “This is the work of God, that you believe in Him whom He sent” (John 6:28-29). People do not obey God if they do not believe that what he is telling them to do is the right thing to do. Obedience, therefore, is based on belief in the trustworthiness of God’s character.

Leviticus is virtually all law. Even the few stories in it serve only to remind the Israelites of the importance of obeying God’s law. The book makes it clear that the goal of the law is to make the people of Israel holy. In fact, God tells them that they should “be holy, for I am holy” (11:44-45; 19:2; 20:26).

Holiness is ultimately rooted in an intimate relationship with God. Because we love and know him, we know his character, which means we can believe him to be trustworthy. And because we believe he is trustworthy, we obey him. And when we obey him, we become holy. Two people who are locked into an intimate relationship eventually become like each other. When we lock ourselves into an intimate relationship with God, we will eventually become like he is. We will become holy because he is holy.

The message of the Pentateuch, then, is that the cosmic God desires to have a personal and intimate relationship with each and every one of us because that relationship will give us his life, thereby changing us for the better by replacing our sinfulness with his holiness. This message is not unintentional. The Pentateuch was deliberately constructed according to a specific structure to convey that message and that structure is:

A Genesis: Knowing God

B Exodus: Believing and Obeying God

C Leviticus: Being Holy Like God

B’ Numbers: Believing and Obeying God

A’ Deuteronomy: Loving God

The real anomalies, therefore, such as the doublets, are not evidence of multiple authorship. They are the clues pointing to the message of the Pentateuch. They helped Moses to fulfill his purpose and convey his message. When we discover real anomalies within any given Pentateuchal passage, we should be looking for the message to which they are pointing, not for multiple authors.

Chapter 5

Argumentum ad Logicam

The *argumentum ad logicam* (argument from logic) or the *fallacy fallacy* occurs when the arguer says that his or her opponent's position must be false because the arguments used to support the position contain fallacies. I have shown that many of the arguments used by the documentarians to support the Documentary Hypothesis contain logical fallacies. It does not necessarily follow that the Hypothesis itself is false. It may mean that the documentarians just need to come up with better arguments and evidence.

We have seen that the Hypothesis, so far, is not a fact but is sheer speculation. Because of this, there seems to be as many different versions of the Hypothesis as there are documentarians. Each documentarian divides the Pentateuchal text according to his or her subjective criteria and then justifies the division using circular reasoning. In reality, there is no objective standard by which one can divide the Pentateuchal text, just as there is no objective standard by which the children can sort the marbles. At first sight, the analogues supplied by Tigay *et al.* may provide a way out of the subjectivism. After all, they do show what is plausible. They do show what redactors do and do not do. However, as Tigay himself pointed out, the analogues do not prove anything conclusive. The analogues include some that were conflated, some that were supplemented, and some that were assimilated. Baden, therefore, could point to analogues to show that Num. 11 was conflated, but so could the scholars who say that it was supplemented.

The only way to move the Hypothesis off this merry-go-round of subjectivity and circularity is to provide truly scientific and objec-

tive evidence. The documentarians must provide evidence outside of their resultant documents. They must provide manuscript attestation. In other words, they must provide physical copies of J, E, P, and D.¹ The documentarians, of course, balk at this requirement. Baden says that such a requirement would bring an end to all Pentateuchal criticism.² No, it would not. It would only bring an end to all speculative Pentateuchal criticism. The finding of the physical copies would end the debates over which verses belong to which document. It would end the debates over the characteristics of the documents. It would confirm the continuities of the documents. It would confirm how much text was original and how much was redactional. It would confirm whether P was originally a document or a redactional layer. It would finally confirm whether the documents ever existed (though it would probably not end the debates over when they were written). And even Baden admits that finding the J document is the only way to finally prove that the Hypothesis is correct and Rendtorff is not.³

The real reason the documentarians balk at this requirement is that we have no manuscript attestation of the documents and we are not likely to ever have it. Archaeology has yet to uncover any copies of J, E, P, or D. Nor has any known ancient writer testified of their existence or even mentioned them in passing. What we do have is manuscript attestation of certain stages in the evolution of the Pentateuch *since* its creation. What we do not have is manuscript attestation of the stages leading up to its creation. This is why Friedman's Seven Main Arguments supporting the Hypothesis do not contain one piece of archaeological evidence. There is no objective evidence anywhere that the documents ever existed.

Some may counter that this is simply an argument from silence, for archaeology may yet unearth copies of the documents. Of course this is an argument from silence, but it is a particularly telling argument against the Hypothesis because the documentarians use the same argument to undermine the reliability of the Bible. Up to about

¹ Kitchen calls for the same requirement in *On the Reliability of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003, hereafter referred to as *OROT*), 492.

² *Redaction*, 66.

³ *Composition*, 67.

two hundred years ago, the Bible was the only witness to certain historical information. It was the only document to mention the existence of the Hittites and the city of Nineveh. It was the only one that knew that Belshazzar was reigning in Babylon when the Persians took it. Archaeology has since confirmed the validity of all of these statements and more.⁴ And yet, the documentarians insist that the Bible cannot be viewed as a trustworthy historical document until every detail has been verified by archaeological discoveries or the testimony of extra-biblical writers. As Sandmel states,

In recent decades there has developed, as I have said, a rather strong insistence on the historical reliability of the materials in Genesis. This insistence comes especially from some archaeologists. They point to the correspondence which they assert exists between what Genesis relates and what is known as a result of deciphering certain tablets and inscriptions and of the excavation of ancient sites.

What is overlooked in this misguided emphasis is that it is not the correspondence of the general backgrounds that would establish historical reliability, but rather the confirmation of the particular. I have already noted that no mementos of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob have been found. Perhaps the issue can be further clarified by asking some pointed questions. Can the archaeologists confirm for us that creation took place in six days? Can they confirm that the serpent spoke to Eve? Can they confirm that Noah brought two (or seven!) living creatures of each species into his ark? Can they confirm that Abraham bargained with Yahve to save Sodom? Can they confirm that with trimmed poplar rods Jacob controlled the kinds of animals born to the flocks? Can they confirm that Moses' rod became a snake? Can they confirm that Joshua made the sun stand still? There is, therefore, a limit to what archaeology can prove.

What archaeology has confirmed, however, is that the general picture of early Palestinian life as depicted in the Tanak is reliable. This confirmation has been desirable, or even necessary, to refute a skepticism found in some nineteenth century

⁴ For a thorough presentation of how archaeology has confirmed an overwhelming number of historical statements in the Old Testament, see *OROT*.

scholars who found absolutely nothing in Scripture credible. But we should not move from excessive skepticism to excessive credulity. The traditions in Genesis are folk tales modified and embellished by religious belief. To seek to authenticate these as historically valid in the form in which Genesis relates them is to misapply a useful science.⁵

Joachim Rehork puts it more bluntly: “Is the Bible always right? We shall certainly be able to answer in the affirmative for those passages which have been confirmed by non-Biblical parallel sources or by archaeological discoveries.”⁶

But archaeology has not been able to confirm the particulars of the Documentary Hypothesis. Can the archaeologists confirm the existence of J, E, P, or D? Can they confirm that the documents were written when the Hypothesis says they were written? Can they confirm the existence of a compiler or a series of redactors who combined these documents? Not at all. And if we were to apply Rehork’s standard to the Documentary Hypothesis (“Is the Documentary Hypothesis always right? We shall certainly be able to answer in the affirmative for those parts which have been confirmed by non-Biblical parallel sources or by archaeological discoveries.”), then we would have to conclude that the Hypothesis is the greatest myth ever concocted and perpetuated by Old Testament scholars.

Friedman thinks he has found a way around this lack of archaeological confirmation. He released the second edition of *Wrote* again in January 2019 with a new epilogue, and in that epilogue he states:

Some said they would not believe the documentary hypothesis unless we could find one of the source texts intact, prior to its being combined with the others, meaning a text of just J or just E. Such a text would have to be much older than the Dead Sea Scrolls (the oldest existing texts), so these skeptics must have figured that it would be impossible to produce such a text. But the scholar William Propp found a text in Ezekiel that quotes a

⁵ Sandmel, 347-348.

⁶ Joachim Rehork, “Postscript to the Revised Edition,” in Werner Keller, *The Bible as History*, 2nd Revised Edition, translated by William Neil and B. H. Rasmussen (N.Y.: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1980), 391.

Priestly text from the Pentateuch. The text is interrupted in the Pentateuch by other texts, but Ezekiel quotes the text intact, without the intervening texts.⁷

He also includes Propp's finding as part of his fifth Main Argument.⁸ However, Friedman is only telling us half of the story. What he is suppressing is what Propp himself concludes concerning his finding.

The Priestly text to which Friedman refers consists of Ex. 2:23b-25 (which, following Propp's translation, ends with the statement, "God made himself known to them.") and Ex. 6:2-9 (part of which, again following Propp's translation, says, I "shall bring you to the land that I raised my arm to give to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.... I am Yahweh"). In the Pentateuch as we now have it, these two passages are separated by material from J and E, but in the original P document (if it had existed), they would have appeared contiguously.

Propp's argument is that Ezekiel paraphrases the two passages in 20:5-9 of his book as if they were one passage in whatever text he had been reading. The passage in Ezekiel's book begins with:

On the day of my choosing Israel, when I raised my arm to the seed of Jacob's house and made myself known to them in the land of Egypt, I raised my arm to them, saying, "I am Yahweh your god" (Propp's translation).

This is evidence that an independent P document existed in Ezekiel's time before it was redacted to JE and D to form the Pentateuch.⁹

However, this is not the only possible explanation for why Ezekiel pulled these two passages together. Propp himself has noted how the documentarians have often noticed the thematic similarities between the two passages, despite the intervening material, which is one reason why they assign the two passages to the same document, namely P. Both speak of God hearing the groan of Israel's children and both speak of God remembering his covenant. Ezekiel, too, could have noted the thematic similarities, despite the interven-

⁷ *Wrote*, 226.

⁸ *Sources*, 16.

⁹ Propp, 458-478.

ing material, and simply conflated the passages into his paraphrase. If the two passages also speak of God making himself known to the Israelites, then conflating the two would have been all the more compelling.

For example, Deuteronomy has a law which commands the Israelites to release their Hebrew servants after six years of service:

If your brother, a Hebrew man, or a Hebrew woman, is sold to you and serves you six years, then in the seventh year you shall let him go free from you (Deut. 15:12).

Leviticus also has a law about releasing Hebrew servants:

And if one of your brethren who dwells by you becomes poor, and sells himself to you, you shall not compel him to serve as a slave. As a hired servant and a sojourner he shall be with you, and shall serve you until the Year of Jubilee (Lev. 25:39-40).

The Year of Jubilee occurred every fifty years. Leviticus says that the Israelites were to blow a trumpet that year and “proclaim liberty throughout all the land to all its inhabitants” (Lev. 25:10). The releasing of the Hebrew servants was a part of this proclamation.

Obviously, a considerable amount of material, including the entire book of Numbers, separates the two laws, but that did not stop Jeremiah from conflating the two.¹⁰ He tells us that King Zedekiah made a covenant with Judah’s leaders to “proclaim liberty” and set free every “male and female slave—a Hebrew man or woman.” But then the leaders changed their minds and enslaved them again (Jer. 34:8-11). Yahweh speaks through Jeremiah and rebukes them for doing this:

“Thus says Yahweh, Elohim of Israel: ‘I made a covenant with your fathers in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage, saying, “At the end of seven

¹⁰ Jeremiah, of course, did not see these two laws as contradicting each other. That they do not in fact contradict each other or Ex. 21:2-6 (contrary to most critical scholarship) can be seen in the light of Finn, 167-171, and *Inconsistency*, 122-128. See also Berman’s comments on Jer. 34:12-17 (*Inconsistency*, 153-154).

years let every man set free his Hebrew brother, who has been sold to him; and when he has served you six years, you shall let him go free from you." But your fathers did not obey Me nor incline their ear.

Then you recently turned and did what was right in My sight—every man proclaiming liberty to his neighbor; and you made a covenant before Me in the house which is called by My name. Then you turned around and profaned My name, and every one of you brought back his male and female slaves, whom he had set at liberty, at their pleasure, and brought them back into subjection, to be your male and female slaves" (Jer. 34:13-16).

Notice that Jeremiah quotes Deuteronomy's law almost verbatim, yet he refers to it by the phrase found only in Leviticus: proclaiming liberty.¹¹

Yahweh then ironically uses Leviticus' phrase to pronounce judgment on the leaders:

"Therefore thus says Yahweh: 'You have not obeyed Me in proclaiming liberty, every one to his brother and every one to his neighbor. Behold, I proclaim liberty to you,' says Yahweh—'to the sword, to pestilence, and to famine! And I will deliver you to trouble among all the kingdoms of the earth'" (Jer. 34:17).

This judgment fulfills a curse found only in Deut. 28:25: "You shall become a trouble among all the kingdoms of the earth" (AT).

Many of Deuteronomy's words and phrases appear throughout this passage from Jeremiah. He even quotes from Deuteronomy's law almost verbatim. Yet he keeps using Leviticus' phrase. Does this mean that he had found a document in which both of these laws had appeared in a single passage? Of course not. It simply means that Jeremiah had recognized their thematic similarities and conflated them in this passage, even as Ezekiel recognized the thematic simi-

¹¹ That Jeremiah conflates these two laws puts another nail into the coffin in which rests Friedman's myth that there was a rivalry between the Aaronids and the Shilonites. According to the myth, Jeremiah was a Shilonite who was "hostile to P" (*Wrote*, 149), yet here he is favorably using P's phrase, "proclaiming liberty."

larities of Ex. 2:23b-25 and 6:2-9 and conflated them—if he is even paraphrasing Ex. 2:23b-25 at all.

Propp's argument depends on the reading of Ex. 2:25 ("God made himself known to them") found in the Septuagint. He admits that not a single Hebrew manuscript supports this translation and to say that the translation must be correct because that is how it shows up in Ezekiel is to engage in circular reasoning. However, there is sufficient textual support for the Masoretic text reading ("God knew"). If this is the correct text for Ex. 2:25 (and Propp concedes that it most likely is), then Ezekiel is not paraphrasing that passage at all and Propp's argument completely falls apart.

There is another form of circular reasoning occurring here. Even if the Septuagint reading is correct after all, Propp's study does not prove the existence of the physical P document unless one proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that the two passages belong to the P document. He acknowledges in the first part of his study that the best proof of the Hypothesis would be the finding of a physical copy of the P document: "An ancient manuscript of P would for ever [*sic*] end debate on the scope and nature of the Priestly stratum, but is unlikely to surface." However,

Lacking such tangible proof, advocates for the Documentarian model of P rely on less direct evidence: contradictions between P and non-P, doublets between P and non-P, and the continuity of P when read without intervening non-Priestly matter.

In other words, because of the lack of archaeological confirmation, the documentarians must fall back on the anomalies for their proof that these passages belong to P. But the anomalies do not *necessarily* prove that there were documents in the first place. One cannot prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that the two passages belong to the P document without producing the physical P document. In short, Propp's study does not prove the existence of the physical P document unless one presupposes the existence of the physical P document. The study only affirms its presupposition, but without that presupposition, it affirms nothing.

Once again, as he did with the linguistic studies, Friedman tries to make this study say more than even what the author is willing to say. He wants his readers to believe that Propp's study definitely

proves that an independent P document existed in Ezekiel's time before it was redacted into the Pentateuch. But Propp himself says,

Have I recovered the intact Priestly Source and thereby proven part of the Documentary Hypothesis? Not really. Because my evidence is a disputed reading, the analysis has both the virtue (internal consistency) and liability (untestability) of any circular argument. The case for P as independent source must continue to rest primarily on the arguments advanced in the first part of this essay.

Those arguments, however, as we have seen, do not necessarily prove anything. And Ezekiel's paraphrase does not fill the void left by the lack of archaeological confirmation. Propp's study, therefore, does not prop up the Hypothesis after all.

Strangely enough, the documentarians' insistence on archaeological confirmation to prove the trustworthiness of the Bible means that they should reject the most important tenet of Karl Heinrich Graf's dating scheme, namely that D was written in 622 BC. This tenet is not based on archaeological confirmation, for archaeology has yet to confirm that Hilkiyah found D in 622 BC, let alone confirm that Josiah launched a religious reformation because of it. The only basis for this tenet is the testimony of the Scriptures—the very Scriptures which the documentarians themselves claim are not trustworthy. Yet, they are willing to accept the testimony of the Scriptures concerning Josiah and Hilkiyah because it can be made to fit their Hypothesis, but they reject the testimony of the Scriptures concerning the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch because it cannot be made to fit their Hypothesis. Thus, the texts are made to fit the Hypothesis and not the Hypothesis to the texts. The Hypothesis, not the texts themselves, has become the final determiner of truth.

Besides, the documentarians are willing to accept the testimony of the Scriptures concerning Josiah and Hilkiyah because they do not yet realize that the testimony provides more evidence against the Hypothesis than for it. The question we have to ask is, "Exactly what was in the Book of the *Torah* which Hilkiyah found?" Most documentarians identify the Book as Deuteronomy, at least the parts of Deuteronomy that belong to D. Several arguments support this identification.

Immediately after the Book's discovery, Josiah began to fulfill Deuteronomy's laws, particularly the law which states that all sacrifices must be made at the altar located in the place which Yahweh would choose; all other sacrificial sites must be destroyed. According to the books of First and Second Kings, the place Yahweh chose was the temple at Jerusalem. Josiah destroyed all the sacrificial sites throughout Judah and Samaria except one: the temple at Jerusalem.

Josiah's initial response after hearing the Book read to him was: "Great is the wrath of Yahweh that is aroused against us, because our fathers have not obeyed the words of this book" (2 K 22:13). This suggests that the Book included the curses now found in Deut. 28.

At the beginning of his reform, Josiah gathered all the people to the temple, he read the Book to them, and then he and they made a covenant in which they promised to obey the laws of the Book. This is precisely the format Deuteronomy follows. Moses gives a long speech in which he sets forth the covenant with its accompanying laws. Then, in chapters twenty-nine and thirty, he urges the people to accept the covenant by obeying those laws.

Perhaps the strongest argument supporting this identification is that Deuteronomy refers to this same Book of the *Torah*. It tells us that Moses wrote "the words of this *torah* in a book." Then it tells us that Moses handed this Book to the Levites with this commandment: "Take this Book of the *Torah*, and put it beside the ark of the covenant of Yahweh your God, that it may be there as a witness against you" (Deut. 31:24, 26, AT). While some traditionalists think that Deuteronomy is referring to the entire *Torah*, most scholars believe it is referring only to itself. Thus, the Book of the *Torah* that Hilkiyah found was Deuteronomy.

These are the arguments presented by the documentarians. To these I would add one more. While making his covenant with the people, Josiah made two promises. He promised "to walk after Yahweh." He also promised "to keep His [Yahweh's] commandments and His testimonies and His statutes, with all his heart and all his soul" (2 K 23:3, AT). These promises fulfill two commandments which can be found only in Deuteronomy: "You shall walk after Yahweh" (Deut. 13:4). "This day Yahweh your Elohim commands you to observe these statutes and judgments. You shall keep and do them with all your heart and all your soul" (Deut. 26:16, AT). These argu-

ments indicate that the Book of the *Torah* was D, or at least contained D.

The same kinds of arguments, however, prove that the Book of the *Torah* must also have contained J, E, and P. The Book is also known in Second Kings as “the Book of the Covenant.” Near the end of his reform, Josiah commanded the people to “Keep the Passover to Yahweh your Elohim, as it is written in this Book of the Covenant” (2 K 23:21). At the beginning of his reform, when Josiah gathered the people to the temple, “he read in their ears all the words of the Book of the Covenant, which was found in the house of Yahweh” (2 K 23:2, AT). This verse is repeated verbatim in 2 C 34:30. The name “the Book of the Covenant” appears in only one other place in the entire Old Testament:

Then he [Moses] took the Book of the Covenant and read it in the ears of the people (Ex. 24:7, AT).

According to the documentarians, this verse came from E. The Book which Moses read contained all the laws of Ex. 21–23, that is, all of E’s laws. Thus, the Book which Hilkiah found must have contained E as well.

The author of Second Kings also tells us that Josiah “smashed the sacred pillars and cut down (*krt*) the Asherim” (23:14, AT). This fulfills a law found only in Ex. 34:13, a J passage: “You shall smash their sacred pillars and cut down (*krt*) their Asherim” (NAS). (Deuteronomy has a similar law, but its law states, “You shall...smash their sacred pillars and *hew* down [*gd’*] their Asherim” [Deut. 7:5, NAS]).

That leaves only P. As part of his reform, Josiah

...brought all the priests from the cities of Judah, and defiled the high places where the priests had burned incense.... Nevertheless, the priests of the high places did not come up to the altar of Yahweh in Jerusalem, but they ate unleavened bread among their brethren (2 K 23:8–9).

Why did Josiah do this? In *Narrative*, Friedman himself noted that Josiah’s treatment of these priests was similar to the treatment of the physically blemished priests proscribed by a law in P:

He may eat the bread of his God, both the most holy and the holy; only he shall not go near the veil or approach the altar, because he has a defect, lest he profane My sanctuaries (Lev. 21:22-23).¹²

To this observation I might add that they could not have been denied the unleavened bread because of this law in P:

And the remainder of it [the grain offering] Aaron and his sons shall eat; with unleavened bread it shall be eaten in a holy place; in the court of the tabernacle of meeting they shall eat it... All the males among the children of Aaron may eat it. It shall be a statute forever in your generations (Lev. 6:16, 18).

Some scholars have suggested that the Hebrew word for “gates” in 2 K 23:8 should be translated as “satyrs,” in which case this verse would read, “And he [Josiah] broke down the high places of the satyrs...” If their suggestion is correct, then this verse could be alluding to Lev. 17:7: “And they shall no longer sacrifice their sacrifices to the satyrs with which they play the harlot” (AT). Again, Friedman himself noted this relationship in *Narrative*.¹³

But the strongest evidence that the Book of the *Torah* contained P occurs in a passage that Friedman does not discuss at all. Second Kings reports that Josiah “defiled Topheth, which is in the Valley of the Son of Hinnom, that no man might make his son or his daughter pass through the fire to Molech” (2 K 23:10). Significantly, this verse *combines* P and D, for only P says, “You shall not make your descendants pass through to Molech” (Lev. 18:21, AT) and only D says, “There shall not be found among you anyone who makes his son or his daughter pass through the fire” (Deut. 18:10),

Thus, the author of Second Kings declares that Hilkiah found both the Book of the *Torah* (D) and the Book of the Covenant (E). He also depicts Josiah as obeying laws that the documentarians claim were originally in J, P, and D. Or to rephrase that in traditional terms, he declares that Hilkiah found both Deuteronomy and Exodus and depicts Josiah as obeying laws found in Exodus, Leviticus, and Deu-

¹² *Narrative*, 65–66.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 65.

teronomy. There is only one conclusion left: the book which Hilkiah found in 622 BC was the entire Pentateuch. Part of Friedman's sixth Argument is that D stands apart from the other sources because of its special connection to Josiah's reign,¹⁴ but in fact, the entire Pentateuch has a special connection to Josiah's reign.

This conclusion is further confirmed by Jeremiah's conflation of the two laws governing the release of the Hebrew servants. The documentarians say that the law in Leviticus originally came from P and the law in Deuteronomy originally came from D. And they could argue that because Jeremiah conflated the two does not necessarily mean that he found the two already combined in the Pentateuch. Perhaps. But the fact that he treats them as belonging to the one and only covenant which Yahweh made with the fathers when he brought them out of Egypt shows that he found them not in two documents, a P and a D, but in one and only one document: the Pentateuch.¹⁵

This conclusion poses several problems for the Documentary Hypothesis, especially the classical version of it. This conclusion means that P could not have been written during or after the exile and that the Pentateuch could not have been redacted during that same time because the completed Pentateuch already existed before the exile. More importantly, this conclusion leads us to believe that the author of Second Kings thought that the title, "The Book of the *Torah*," was the title of not just Deuteronomy but of the entire Pentateuch. This raises the possibility that this has always been the

¹⁴ *Sources*, 24-26.

¹⁵ At this point I had intended to argue that Ezekiel did not combine Ex. 6:2-9 with Ex. 2:23b-25 but with Deuteronomy, using Kohn's translation of Eze. 20:5-9 (98-99), in which she highlights the Priestly terminology in boldface and Deuteronomistic language in italics, to support the argument. However, after further study, I found that her six examples of Deuteronomistic language in these five verses could not be substantiated. For example, she says, "Yahweh's election... of Israel is a concept predominantly found in D" (98, n. 12). Yet she lists five references from Deuteronomy, one from 1 Kings, and six from Isaiah (90). That is not predominance. She also favorably cites Propp's study to support one of her examples of Priestly terminology, understanding that identifying the phrase "made myself known to them" as Priestly rests primarily on the LXX *Vorlage* reading of Ex. 2:25, but seemingly failing to understand that Propp concedes that the MT is the better reading and seemingly failing to understand that he ultimately admits that he has not proven the existence of the P document (see 98, n. 15).

title of the Pentateuch from the very beginning. Joshua certainly thought so. In Josh. 23, he gathers the people together and says to them,

Therefore be very courageous to keep and to do all that is written in the Book of the *Torah* of Moses, lest you turn aside from it to the right hand or to the left, and lest you go among these nations, these who remain among you. *You shall not make mention of the name of their gods*, nor cause anyone to swear by them; you shall not serve them nor bow down to them (Josh. 23:6-7).

This passage is full of phrases from Deuteronomy, but the words in italics are a reference to Ex. 23:13. Joshua, therefore, knew that the Book of the *Torah* of Moses was the entire Pentateuch. Some may object to this understanding by saying that the reference to Ex. 23:13 or even the entire passage itself is a later insertion. But where is the manuscript attestation to support such a claim? Where is the proof? So when Deuteronomy tells us that Moses wrote “the words of this *torah* in a book” and then handed “this Book of the *Torah*” to the Levites, it is claiming that Moses wrote not just Deuteronomy, but the *entire* Pentateuch. Thus, if we let the biblical texts and not the Hypothesis be the final determiner of truth, we must accept the traditional view and reject the Hypothesis.

While archaeology does not support the Hypothesis, it does lend its support to the traditional view. First, whenever it turns up copies of the Pentateuch, they are copies of the *Pentateuch* as we have it, not copies of the documents. Second, as I noted earlier, archaeology has shown that the Bible has all along been telling us the truth about the things which we have confirmed, which gives us confidence that it is telling us the truth about the things which we have yet to confirm. Third, it turns out that Deuteronomy is the key to dating the entire Pentateuch, even as D was the key to dating the four documents in Graf’s scheme. As we have seen, of all the books in the Pentateuch, Deuteronomy is the one that most emphatically insists that Moses wrote the Five Books. If, therefore, we can place the date of Deuteronomy’s writing in the time of Moses, we have good reason to believe that it is telling us the truth about the authorship of the Pentateuch.

This is where archaeology comes in. Archaeology has recovered over 30 vassal treaties that were drawn up by Near Eastern kings (primarily the Hittite kings) in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries BC. These treaties followed a fixed format consisting of six parts:

1. *Preamble or title*, identifying the author of the covenant.
2. *Historical prologue* or retrospect, mentioning previous relations between the two parties involved; past benefactions by the suzerain are a basis for the vassal's gratitude and future obedience.
3. *Stipulations*, basic and detailed; the obligations laid upon the vassal by the sovereign.
4. (a). *Deposition* of a copy of the covenant in the vassal's sanctuary and
(b). *Periodic public reading* of the covenant terms to the people.
5. *Witnesses*, a long list of gods invoked to witness the covenant.
6. (a). *Curses*, invoked upon the vassal if he breaks the covenant, and
(b). *Blessings*, invoked upon the vassal if he keeps the covenant.¹⁶

The book of Deuteronomy has all six parts: (1) preamble: 1:1-5; (2) historical prologue: 1:6-4:40; (3) stipulations, basic: 4:44-11:32, and detailed: 12:1-26:19; (4) deposition of a copy: 31:9, 24-26, and a requirement for periodic public reading: 31:10-13; (5) witnesses: 30:19, 32:1-43; (6) curses: 28:15-68, and blessings: 28:1-14. Besides sharing the same format, Deuteronomy and the treaties also have similar stipulations and even the same vocabulary.¹⁷ This similarity between the vassal treaties and Deuteronomy means that Deuteronomy must have been written before 1200 BCE rather than during the first millennium BCE as the Documentary Hypothesis

¹⁶ AOOT, 92-93.

¹⁷ *Inconsistency*, 87-91; Joshua Berman, "CTH 133 and the Hittite Provenance of Deuteronomy 13," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 130, no. 1 (Spring 2011), 25-44; Joshua Berman, *Ani Maamin: Biblical Criticism, Historical Truth, and the Thirteen Principles of Faith* (Jerusalem: Maggid Books, 2020), 86-93; OROT, 283-294.

supposes, for the treaties of the first millennium lack the historical prologue and blessings. In other words, we can say that Deuteronomy must have been written during the time of Moses. Even Baden recognizes that Deuteronomy follows the treaty structure,¹⁸ though, of course, he denies the implications for Deuteronomy's date. But the documentarians are hard pressed to explain how the author (or authors) of D who supposedly lived in Josiah's time or in the Persian era or in the Hellenistic era could accurately reproduce a structure that ceased to be used over 600 years earlier (or why such an author would want to do so since his audience would not understand its significance).

And yes, I am citing analogues. The difference between this citation and the citation of the critical scholars is that for every one of their analogues which can explain the creation of the anomalies in the Pentateuch there are several counter-analogues which offer alternative explanations. There is no counter-analogue which can explain how Deuteronomy accurately reproduces the format of the vassal treaties.

Archaeology has also confirmed certain information in the Pentateuch which a second millennium author living in Egypt would have known but which a first millennium author living in Canaan would not have known. The author of Exodus knew that the Israelites built Raamses (Ex. 1:11), a city that was abandoned by the Pharaohs about 1130 BCE. The book of Exodus explicitly states that Elohim did not take the Israelites by the most direct route to the Promised Land (along the southern coast of the Mediterranean) because they would encounter war (Ex. 13:17-18). Archaeologists have uncovered a string of Egyptian forts along that route which operated during the first half of the thirteenth century BCE. The floor plan of the Tabernacle mimics the floor plan of the tent of Ramesses II (1279-1213 BCE) which he used on military campaigns.¹⁹ Milgrom points out that the design of the lampstand in the Tabernacle does not match the design of the lampstand in Solomon's Temple but does resemble the designs found in the late Bronze Age.²⁰ This

¹⁸ *Composition*, 137.

¹⁹ For these and other examples see Berman, *Ani Maamin*, 52-60, and *OROT*, 255-280.

²⁰ Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 10.

data again suggests that the Pentateuch was written before 1200 BCE.

Then there is the evidence that is stronger than any linguistic evidence, namely the cultural literacy which the author assumes his intended audience has. An author's casual references to geographical features, historical events, and cultural knowledge, which he assumes his intended audience to have, helps us to know who his intended audience was and when he wrote. For example, that I refer to President George W. Bush in passing means that I assume my intended audience knows who he is and that this book was written after he became President. Similarly, references within the Pentateuch tell us who the intended audience was and give us an idea as to when it was written. The author of Genesis did not describe the lushness of the Jordan Valley before the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah by comparing it to another site in Canaan. Instead, he described it as being "like the land of Egypt as you go toward Zoar" (Gen. 13:10). The author of Numbers told his readers that Hebron "was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt" (Num. 13:22). And Berman presents a strong case that the author of the *combined* prose and poetic versions of the crossing of the sea (Ex. 13:17-15:19) borrowed language and motifs from the Poem, replacing the Hittite alliance with the Egyptians and the Pharaoh with Yahweh, meaning that the author and his intended audience were very familiar with the Poem.²¹ These references tell us that the intended audience did not grow up in Canaan but in Egypt, that they were familiar with Egyptian geography, chronology, and culture, that they had seen Zoar and knew when Zoan had been built and had read the Poem. This would not have been true of the Israelites who lived during the first millennium, when the documents were supposedly written according to the Hypothesis, but it would have been true of the Israelites who had lived in Egypt before 1200 BCE.

It does not matter whether the linguistic data prove that the *copies* of the Pentateuch which we have were written in LBH or CBH. And it does not matter whether the MT or the LXX has the better reading of any given passage. Two incontrovertible facts remain. The vassal treaty can be found in all copies of Deuteronomy and the internal references can be found in all copies of the Pentateuch.

²¹ *Inconsistency*, 35-60.

These two features do not make sense if the Pentateuch had been written during the first millennium BCE, as the Hypothesis claims. But they do make sense if the Pentateuch had been written before 1200 BCE for an Israelite audience who had grown up in Egypt, not Canaan.

The critical scholars object to this date for the composition of the Pentateuch, partly because the Hebrew language uses the definite article, “the.” Since the languages similar to Hebrew did not develop the definite article until long after the exodus, they argue that Hebrew itself did the same. However, the Israelites could have picked it up from the Egyptians, whose language (which is not similar to Hebrew) did develop the definite article quite early. Its use in Egyptian literature became popular during the Eighteenth Dynasty (1580-1314 BCE), that is, just before the time of the exodus itself. Archaeological discoveries have also traced its use back to the Twelfth Dynasty (1991-1962 BCE), that is, about the time Jacob and his family moved to Egypt.²²

Another aspect of Hebrew syntax is also peculiar. Hebrew often introduces dialogue with the redundant formula, “And X spoke, saying.” The languages similar to Hebrew never developed the use of this extra “saying.” So why did Hebrew? Again, the Israelites must have picked it up from the Egyptians who again developed this very same syntax as early as the Twelfth Dynasty.²³

The Pentateuch also indicates that the Israelites picked up more than just syntax from the Egyptians. As Gleason L. Archer, Jr., points out,

a far greater number of Egyptian names and loan words are found in the Pentateuch than in any other section of Scripture. This is just what we would expect from an author who was brought up in Egypt, writing for a people who were reared in the same setting as he.²⁴

²² Gleason L. Archer, Jr., *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1974), 121.

²³ Jesse L. Boyd III, “An Example of the Influence of Egyptian on the Development of the Hebrew Language During the Second Millennium B.C.,” in Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., and Ronald F. Youngblood, eds., *A Tribute to Gleason Archer* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1986), 192-193.

²⁴ Archer, *Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties*, 48.

Thus, the peculiarities of the Pentateuch's language actually confirm the Israelites' own testimony that they had spent a considerable amount of time in Egypt before the exodus. And the peculiarities do not argue against the Pentateuch's having been written during the exodus.

Finally, there is the fact that Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers read as if they had been written by an eyewitness to the exodus. Thus, the author gives us the exact number of fountains and palm trees at Elim (Ex. 15:27). He also describes the appearance and even the taste of the manna which they ate during their journey (Ex. 16:31, Num. 11:7-8).

All of this archaeological and textual evidence confirms that the Pentateuch was written during the exodus, that is, during the time of Moses, who was the leader of the Israelites during the exodus. Add to this evidence the statements of Deuteronomy that Moses wrote the entire *Torah* and the statements of Exodus and Numbers that Moses wrote various portions of those books, and we have a good case that Moses was indeed the author of the Pentateuch:

Then Yahweh said to Moses, "Write this for a memorial in the book and recount it in the hearing of Joshua, that I will utterly blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven" (Ex. 17:14).

And Moses wrote all the words of Yahweh (Ex. 24:4).

Then Yahweh said to Moses, "Write these words, for according to the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with you and with Israel" (Ex. 34:27).

Now Moses wrote down the starting points of their journeys at the command of Yahweh (Num. 33:2).

Moses makes the perfect candidate for the author of the Pentateuch. He was familiar with the treaty format around which he built Deuteronomy because he had been reared in Pharaoh's household. He was familiar with Egyptian geography and chronology and the peculiarities of the Egyptian language because he had grown up there. He was an eyewitness to the exodus because he was the

leader of the Israelites during the exodus. And Deuteronomy pointedly says that Moses wrote it.

This is not to say that Moses did not use sources of information when he wrote the Pentateuch. He quotes from the Book of the Wars of Yahweh in Num. 21:14-15. And he obviously was not an eyewitness to the events in Genesis. He wrote that book using sources of information, oral or written or both, that had been handed down to him. What those sources were, what they contained, and whether he reworked them is, of course, impossible to say. Answering those questions without manuscript attestation would only lead us into sheer speculation. The fact that he used sources of information, however, does not make him any less the author of the Pentateuch than does a modern historian's reliance on sources of information to determine "what actually happened" makes him or her any less the author of his or her books.

Thus, there is more objective evidence supporting the traditional view than there is supporting the Documentary Hypothesis. The traditional view is not some unconfirmed legend that has been handed down through the generations, as some allege, but is a statement supported by objective evidence and argumentation. And the traditional view does not require "doctoring" the text to make it fit the theory. The Hypothesis, however, is sheer speculation with no objective evidence to support it whatsoever.

As for Friedman's Seven Main Arguments, as I have said several times, they fail to support the Hypothesis. He argues that each of the first six Arguments, by themselves, may not be significant, that there may be alternative explanations for them. However, together they become significant. Together, they converge and point in the same direction. Together, they support the Hypothesis. This is the seventh and the strongest Argument of all.²⁵

Perhaps his argument would still hold true if I had gone Argument by Argument and provided alternative explanations for them. But this is not what I have done. Rather, I have shown that his Arguments are in fact nonarguments. JE, P, and D were not written during the three stages of CBH because there never were three stages of CBH. His word list was derived from circular reasoning and word lists can be used to justify the division of any unified text or the

²⁵ *Sources*, 27-28. See also Friedman, "Foreword," in *Empirical*, [4].

unification of any divided text. The names of God mean nothing because the characters in E knew God's name before Moses did. The one mark that separates the Hypothesis from all other hypotheses is its contention that the documents are continuous, yet the only thing supporting that contention is opinion, not hard evidence, and even Friedman ultimately concedes that the documents are not continuous. Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Hosea knew the entire Pentateuch, which means that they knew a single Pentateuch, not four documents. Hilkiah found, not just D, but the entire Pentateuch. The supposedly consistent characteristics of the documents are subjectively derived and maintained with the help of a convenient redactor. The Arguments are based on *his* idiosyncratic assignment of the verses: change the assignment, and the Arguments fall apart. Indeed, the Arguments are an exercise in circular reasoning, for their purpose is to prove the existence of the documents but they, in fact, presuppose the existence of those documents. And if his Arguments prove that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, then they also prove that Friedman did not write *Wrote*. Since the first six Arguments are in fact nonarguments, the seventh Argument is also, by default, a nonargument. Hence, what Kitchen said about the convergence argument back in 1966, long before *Sources* was published, is still relevant today:

It is a waste of time to talk about the 'cumulative force' of arguments that are each invalid; $0+0+0+0=0$ on any reckoning.²⁶

If the documentarians wish to go on supporting the Documentary Hypothesis, they need to present arguments free of logical fallacies. Even better, they need to present more than just arguments.

²⁶ *AOOT*, 125, n. 51. Cassuto (120-121) said the same thing about the convergence argument a generation earlier: "I did not prove that the pillars were weak or that each one failed to give decisive support, but I established that they were not pillars at all, that they did not exist, that they were purely imaginary.... The sum of nought plus nought plus nought *ad infinitum* is only nought."

The Appendices

Appendix A lists words and phrases that can be found only or primarily within each of the Five Books and nowhere else in the Old Testament. Appendix B lists words and phrases that may be found elsewhere within the Old Testament, but within the Pentateuch they can be found only or primarily within each of the Five Books. Appendix C lists words and phrases that can be found only or primarily within the Pentateuch. Appendix D lists words and phrases that can be found in J but not in K or in K but not in J. Nine of the words and phrases in K's list are from Friedman's list in *Hidden*. Those words and phrases are marked with an asterisk. Following Friedman's practice for *In the Day*, the references in Appendix D are only for the narrative portions of Scripture. The words and phrases may also appear in legal, poetic, and/or prophetic passages, but those references are not included. Also following Friedman's practice, the verses in Chronicles that are in parentheses repeat verses from Samuel and Kings. Appendix E lists additional words in Old Testament narrative that appear only or primarily in both J and K. For the sake of the non-specialist, the Scripture references are those used in the translations, not in the Hebrew. The lists are based on Wigram's *Concordance*.¹ Phrases were also compiled with the assistance of the concordance at blueletterbible.org.

To appear in one of these appendices, the word or phrase must appear a minimum of three times in the text since that is the lowest number of occurrences for any of the words and phrases in Fried-

¹ George V. Wigram, *The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament* (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1843, reprinted as *The New Englishman's Hebrew/Aramaic Concordance to the Old Testament* [no location: Christian Copyrights, Inc., 1983]).

man's Second Main Argument. The exceptions are Friedman's words in Appendix D, since he required only two occurrences for his list in *Hidden*. The source designations are Friedman's as they are found in *Sources*. I have included the source designations so that the reader can see when words cross documents.

The reader will also notice that many of the words appear in only one of the documents, which gives the impression that maybe the documentarians are correct after all. Many words, for example, appear only in P. That is because P, by far, is larger than any of the other documents, so, by default, more words will appear there. Plus P discusses topics that are not discussed in the other documents, such as detailed instructions on how to build the Tabernacle and what to do in cases of leprosy, so the words related to those topics will appear in P and not in the other documents. But those same words also appear in only one book (such as Leviticus) or only the Pentateuch (because only the Pentateuch discusses these things). Thus, "reddish" (*'ădamdām*) in Appendix A appears only in P, which means it could be used to prove that P was written by its own author. But it also appears only in Leviticus and only in the Pentateuch, which means it could also be used to prove that Leviticus was written by its own author and that the Pentateuch was written by only one author. The point is that word lists can be used to justify any division or unification of the text, which means that word lists do not prove anything.

Appendices

Appendix A							
Words within the Old Testament that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books							
Genesis							
Word	J	E	P	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
אות, consent	34:15, 22, 23					2 K 12:8	3
אות(-) הברית, sign of the covenant			9:12, 13, 17; 17:11				4
אחזתי־קבר, possession of a grave			23:4, 9, 20; 49:30; 50:13				5
אלמה, sheaf	37:7(4)					Ps. 126:6	4
אמתחת, sack	42:27, 28; 43:12, 18, 21(2), 22, 23; 44:1(2), 2, 8, 11, 12						14
אנשי המקום, men of the place	26:7(2); 29:22; 38:22					Jud. 19:16	4
בית הסהר, prison (house of the tower)	39:20(2), 22	40:3, 5					5
בכירה, firstborn	19:31, 33, 34, 37; 29:26					1 S 14:49	5
דודי, mandrake		30:14(2), 15(2), 16				Cant. 7:13; Jer. 24:1	5
זכר ונקבה, male and female	7:3		1:27; 6:19; 7:9, 16		5:2		6
זקנימ, old age	21:2, 7; 44:20	37:3					4
חום, brown	30:32, 33, 35, 40						4
חמת, bottle		21:14, 15, 19				Hab. 2:15	3
חנט, embalm	50:2(2), 3	50:26				Cant. 2:13	4
טלא, spotted	30:32(2), 33, 35(2), 39					Josh. 9:5; Eze. 16:16	6

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix A							
Words within the Old Testament that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books							
Genesis							
Word	J	E	P	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
ילד, Hiphil Infinitive, begot					5:4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19, 22, 26, 30; 11:11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25	Is. 59:4	17
כִּי־כבד הרעב, for the famine was heavy	12:10; 47:4	47:13					3
כנים, true	42:11, 19, 31, 33, 34						5
מבול, flood	7:7, 17		6:17; 7:10; 9:11(2), 15; 10:1, 32		7:6; 9:28; 11:10	Ps. 29:10	12
מטעמים, savoury meat	27:4, 7, 9, 14, 17, 31						6
מלט, Niphal Imperative, escape	19:17(2), 22					Zec. 2:7	3
מספוא, provender	24:25, 32; 42:27; 43:24					Jud. 19:19	4
משכרת, wages	29:15	31:7, 41				Ru. 2:12	3
נכר, Hiphil Imperative, recognize	37:32; 38:25	31:32					3
נפש חיה, living soul	Gen. 2:7, 19		1:20, 24, 30; 9:12, 15, 16			Eze. 47:9	8
נקד, speckled	30:32(2), 33, 35, 39	31:8(2), 10, 12					9
נשק, Piel Future, kiss	29:13; 45:15	31:55					3
עצבון, sorrow	3:16, 17			5:29			3
עקד, streaked	30:35, 39, 40	31:8(2), 10, 12					7

Appendices

Appendix A							
Words within the Old Testament that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books							
Genesis							
Word	J	E	P	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
ערבון, pledge	38:17, 18, 20						3
פצל, peel, peelings	30:37(2), 38						3
פרו ורבו, be fruitful and multiply			1:22, 28; 9:1, 7; 35:11 (פרה ורבה)				5
פתר, interpret		40:8, 16, 22; 41:8, 12(2), 13, 15(2)					9
פתרון, interpretation		40:5, 8, 12, 18; 41:11					5
צעיף, veil	24:65; 38:14, 19						3
קבר, Qal Imperative, bury	50:6		23:6, 11, 15; 49:29			2 K 9:34	5
רכש, acquire			12:5; 31:18(2); 36:6; 46:6				5
רק, lean		41:19, 20, 27					3
שבע, plenty		41:29, 30, 31, 34, 47, 53				Prov. 3:10; Ecc. 5:11	6
שר בית־הסהר, keeper of the prison	39:21, 22, 23						3
שר הטבחים, captain of the guard	39:1	37:36; 40:3, 4; 41:10, 12					6
שבר, corn	42:1, 2, 19, 26; 43:2; 44:2	47:14				Neh. 10:31; Am. 8:5	7
שדף, blighted		41:6, 23, 27					3

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix A							
Words within the Old Testament that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books							
Genesis							
Word	J	E	P	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
שכב, Qal Imperative, lie (sexually)	19:34; 39:7, 12					2 S 13:11	3
44							231
Exodus							
אם־מאן אתה לשלח, if you refuse to let go		8:2; 9:2; 10:4					3
בגדי השרד, garments of ministry			31:10; 35:19; 39:41				3
גַּר, by himself		21:3(2), 4					3
וּ, hook			26:32, 37; 27:10, 11, 17; 36:36, 38; 38:10, 11, 12, 17, 19, 28				13
זהב טהור, pure gold			25:11, 17, 24, 29, 31, 36, 38, 39; 28:14, 22, 36; 30:3; 37:2, 6, 11, 16, 17, 22, 23, 24, 26; 39:15, 25, 30			1 C 28:17; 2 C 3:4; 9:17	24
זהב תכלת וארגמן ותולעת שני, gold, blue, and purple, and scarlet (thread)			28:6, 8, 15; 39:2, 5, 8				6
זר, border			25:11, 24, 25; 30:3, 4; 37:2, 11, 12, 26, 27				10
חבר, Piel Preterite, to couple			26:6, 9, 11; 36:10				4
חבר, Piel Future, coupled			36:10, 13, 16			2 C 20:36	3

Appendices

Appendix A							
Words within the Old Testament that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books							
Exodus							
Word	J	E	P	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
חברת, coupling			26:4, 10(2); 36:17				4
חרשת, carving, cutting			31:5(2); 35:33(2)				4
חשקים, fillets			27:10, 11; 36:38; 38:10, 11, 12, 17, 19				8
כהן, Piel Preterite, minister in the priest's office			28:41; 40:13, 15			1 C 6:10	3
כנע, כן, lice			8:16, 17(2), 18(2)			Ps. 105:31; Is. 51:6	5
כפתור, knop			25:31, 33(2), 34, 35(3), 36; 37:17, 19(2), 20, 21(3), 22			Am. 9:1; Zep. 2:14	16
לט, enchantment			7:22; 8:7, 18				3
ללאת, loop			26:4, 5(3), 10(2), 11; 36:11, 12(3), 17(2)				13
לפי אכלו, according to his eating			12:4; 16:16, 18				3
לקט, Qal Future, gather	16:5		16:17, 21, 26			Ps. 104:28	4
מ(ו)סבת משבצות זהב, inclosed in ouches of gold			28:11; 39:6, 13				3
מחברת, coupling			26:4, 5; 28:27; 36:11(2), 12, 17; 39:20				8
מכבר, grate			27:4; 35:16; 38:4, 5, 30; 39:39				6
מלאה, setting			28:17, 20; 39:13				3
מסוה, veil			34:33, 34, 35				3
משבצות, ouches			28:13, 14, 25; 39:16, 18			Ps. 45:13	5
משקוף, lintel		12:22, 23	12:7				3

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix A							
Words within the Old Testament that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books							
Exodus							
Word	J	E	P	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
נגף, Qal Infinitive, to smite		12:23(2), 27				Is. 19:22	3
נטה (את-)ידיך, Qal Imperative, stretch out your hand		9:22; 10:12, 21	7:19; 8:5; 14:16, 26				7
סבלה, burden	2:11	1:11; 5:4, 5	6:6, 7				6
סקל, Niphal Future, stone	19:13	21:28, 29, 32					4
עמר, omer			16:16, 18, 22, 32, 33, 36				6
ערב, swarm		8:21(2), 22, 24(2), 29, 31				Ps. 78:45; 105:31	7
ערת אילים מאדמים, rams' skins dyed red			25:5; 26:14; 35:7, 23; 36:19				5
פסח, Qal Preterite, passover		12:23, 27	12:13				3
פצמון, bell			28:33, 34(2); 39:25(2), 26(2)				7
פתוחי ח(ו)תם, engravings of a signet			28:11, 21, 36; 39:6, 14, 30				6
צפרדע, frog		8:2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13	8:5, 6			Ps. 78:45; 105:30	11
קיצון, end			26:4, 10; 36:11, 17				4
קרן, Qal Preterite, shine			34:29, 30, 35				3
קרסים, clasps			26:6(2), 11(2), 33; 35:11; 36:13(2), 18; 39:33				10
רקם, Qal Participle Poel, embroiderer			26:36; 27:16; 28:39; 35:35; 36:37; 38:18, 23; 39:29				8

Appendices

Appendix A							
Words within the Old Testament that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books							
Exodus							
Word	J	E	P	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
שזר, twined			26:1, 31, 36; 27:9, 16, 18; 28:6, 8, 15; 36:8, 35, 37; 38:9, 16, 18; 39:2, 5, 8, 24, 28, 29				21
שקד, like almonds			25:33(2), 34; 37:19(2), 20				6
תכלית וארגמן ותולעת שני, blue, purple, and scarlet			25:4; 26:1, 31, 36; 27:16; 28:33; 35:6, 23; 36:8, 35, 37; 38:18; 39:24, 29				14
44							294
Leviticus							
אדמדם, reddish			13:19, 24, 42, 43, 49; 14:37				6
אל־יסוד מזבח העלה, bottom of the altar of the burnt offering			4:7, 18, 25				3
אפה, Niphal Future, bake			6:17; 7:9; 23:17				3
בהרת, bright spot			13:2, 4, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 38(2), 39; 14:56				12
גאל, Niphal Future, redeem			25:30, 54; 27:20, 27, 28, 33			Is. 52:3	6
גבחת, bald forehead			13:42(2), 43, 55				4
גלה, Piel Infinitive, uncover			18:6, 17, 18, 19				4
והגר הגר בתוכם, and the stranger who sojourns among you			16:29; 17:12; 18:26				3

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix A							
Words within the Old Testament that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books							
Leviticus							
Word	J	E	P	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
ועל־בהן ידו הימנית ועל־בהן רגלו הימנית upon the thumb of his right hand and upon the great toe of his right foot			8:23; 14:14, 17, 25, 28				5
זוב, issue			15:2, 3(3), 13, 15, 19, 25(2), 26, 28, 30, 33				13
טהר, Hithpael Participle, cleanse			14:4, 7, 8, 11, 14, 17, 18, 19, 25, 28, 29, 31			Neh. 13:22; Is. 66:17	12
טמא, Piel In- finitive, defile			13:44, 59; 15:31; 18:28; 20:3, 25			Jer. 7:30; 32:34	6
לג, log			14:10, 12, 15, 21, 24				5
מאר, malignant			13:51, 52; 14:44			Eze. 28:24	3
מוך, become poor			25:25, 35, 39, 47: 27:8				5
מכה, burn			13:24(2), 25, 28(2)				5
מספחת, scab			13:6, 7, 8				3
נזה, Hiphil Future, sprinkle			8:11, 30; 16:14			Is. 52:15	3
נפש געל abhor			26:11, 15, 30	26:43		Jer. 14:19	4
נתח, Piel Preterite, cut			1:6, 12; 8:20				3
נתק, scall			13:30, 31(2), 32(2), 33(2), 34(2), 35, 36, 37(2); 14:54				14
עזאזל, scapegoat			16:8, 10(2), 26				4
על־תנוך אזן־ המטהר הימנית upon the tip of the right ear of him that is to be cleansed			14:14, 17, 25, 28				4

Appendices

Appendix A							
Words within the Old Testament that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books							
Leviticus							
Word	J	E	P	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
עמית, neighbor			6:2(2); 18:20; 19:11, 15, 17; 24:19; 25:14(2), 15, 17			Zec. 13:7	11
ערב, woof			13:48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 56, 57, 58, 59				9
ערך, Hiphil Preterite, value			27:8, 12, 14			2 K. 23:35	3
פדר, fat			1:8, 12; 8:20				3
פרם, rend			10:6; 13:45; 21:10				3
פשה, spread			13:5, 6, 7(2), 8, 22(2), 23, 27(2), 28, 32, 34, 35(2), 36, 51, 53, 55; 14:39, 44, 48				22
צהב, yellow			13:30, 32, 36				3
צרעת, leprosy			13:8, 11, 12(2), 13, 15, 25, 30, 42, 43, 51, 52; 14:7, 44, 55, 57			2 K 5:3, 6, 7, 27; 2 C 26:19	16
קרחת, bald head			13:42(2), 43, 55				4
קרי, contrary			26:21, 23, 24, 27, 28	26:40, 41			7
רבע, lie down (sexually)			18:23; 19:19; 20:16				3
רצה, Niphal Future, accepted			7:18; 19:7; 22:23, 25, 27				5
שקץ, abominable, abomination			7:21; 11:10, 11, 12, 13, 20, 23, 41, 42			Is. 66:17; Eze. 8:10	9
שתי, warp			13:48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 56, 57, 58, 59				9
37							237

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix A							
Words within the Old Testament that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books							
Numbers							
Word	J	E	P	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
אָסַר, bond			30:2, 3, 4(2), 5, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14				11
גָּרַע, Niphal Future, diminish			9:7; 27:4; 36:3, 4				4
דָּגַל, standard			1:52; 2:2, 3, 10, 17, 18, 25, 31, 34; 10:14, 18, 22, 25			Cant. 2:4	13
חָטַא, Hithpael Future, purify			8:21; 19:12(2), 13, 20; 31:19, 20, 23			Job 41:25	8
וְהַזְרֵם הַקָּרִיב יוֹמֵת, the stranger that comes near shall be put to death			1:51; 3:10, 38; 18:7				4
וַיִּשָּׂא מִשְׁלוֹ וַיֹּאמֶר, and he took up a parable and said		23:7, 18; 24:3, 15, 20, 21, 23					7
וְלִגְרֵם הַגֵּר בְּתוֹכְכֶם, and unto the stranger who sojourns among them			19:10	15:26, 29		Josh. 20:9	3
כָּבַד, Piel Infinitive, honor		22:17, 37; 24:11					3
כָּל־יֹצֵא צִבָּא (all that are able to go forth to war			1:3, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 45; 26:2				15
מִבְּנֵי־חֹדֶשׁ וּמֵעֵלָה, one month old and above			3:15, 22, 28, 34, 39, 40, 43; 26:62				8
מַסֵּה, tribute			31:28, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41				6
נָא, disallow, discourage	32:7, 9		30:5(2), 8, 11			Ps. 33:10; 141:5	6
פְּדוּיִים, the redeemed			3:46, 48, 49, 51				4
פָּקַד, Hothpael Preterite, numbered			1:47; 2:33; 26:62			1 K 20:27	3

Appendices

Appendix A							
Words within the Old Testament that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books							
Numbers							
Word	J	E	P	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
מצית, fringe			15:38(2), 39			Eze. 8:3	3
קבב, curse		22:11, 17; 23:8, 11, 13, 25, 27; 24:10					8
קרה, Niphal Future, meet		23:3, 4, 15, 16					4
רוח(-)קנאה, spirit of jealousy			5:14(2), 30				3
18							113
Totals							
143							875

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Genesis								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
אבל, mourning	27:41; 50:10, 11(2)						Deut. 34:8 (Dtr2)	4
אהב Qal Future, love	24:67; 25:28; 29:18, 30, 32; 34:3							6
אור, light			1:3(2), 4(2), 5, 18				Ex. 10:23 (E)	6
אלון, oak, plain	12:6; 13:18; 18:1					14:13	Deut. 11:30 (Dtr 1)	4
אלוף, duke	36:40(4), 41(3), 42(3), 43(3)		36:15(5), 16(4), 17(5), 18(4), 19, 21, 29(5), 30(5)				Ex. 15:15 (J)	43
אפה, Qal Participle Poel, baker		40:1, 2, 5, 16, 17, 20, 22; 41:10						8
אפוא, where, now, here	27:33, 37; 43:11						Ex. 33:16 (E)	3

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Genesis								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
בלעדיו, apart from, except, besides		41:16, 44				14:24	Num. 5:20 (P)	3
בר, corn	42:3; 45:23	41:35, 49; 42:25						5
ברא, create	6:7		1:1, 21, 27(3); 2:3	2:4		5:1, 2(2)	Ex. 34:10 (J); Num. 16:30 (J); Deut. 4:32 (Dtr1)	11
ברח, Qal Infinitive, flee		31:27; 35:1, 7					Ex. 36:33 (P)	3
בריא, fat		41:2, 4, 5, 7, 18, 20						6
ברך, knees		30:3; 48:12; 50:23					Deut. 28:35 (Dtr1)	3
גבור, mighty	6:4; 10:8, 9(2)						Deut. 10:17 (Dtr1)	4
גברת, mistress	16:4, 8, 9							3
גדל, grow	12:2; 19:13, 19; 24:35; 25:27; 26:13(2); 38:11, 14	21:8, 20; 41:40; 48:19(2)					Ex. 2:10, 11 (J); Num. 6:5 (P); 14:17 (J)	14
גוע, Qal Future, perish			6:17; 7:21; 25:8, 17; 35:29; 49:33					6
גור, Qal Preterite, sojourn	32:4	21:23	35:27				Ex. 6:4 (P)	3
גור, Qal Infinitive, sojourn	12:10; 19:9; 47:4							3
גל, heap		31:46(2), 47, 48(2), 51, 52(3)						9

Appendices

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Genesis								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
גמל, camel	12:16; 24:10(2), 11, 14, 19, 20, 22, 30, 31, 32(2), 35, 44, 46(2), 61, 63, 64; 30:43; 31:17; 32:7; 37:25	31:34; 32:15					Ex. 9:3 (E); Lev. 11:4 (P); Deut. 14:7 (Dtn)	25
גן, garden	2:8, 9, 10, 15, 16; 3:1, 2, 3, 8(2), 10, 23, 24; 13:10						Deut. 11:10 (Dtr1)	14
דמות, likeness			1:26			5:1, 3		3
הרה, conceive	4:1, 17; 16:4(2), 5; 19:36; 21:2; 25:21; 29:32, 33, 34, 35; 38:3, 4, 18; 49:26	30:5, 7, 17, 19, 23					Ex. 2:2 (J), Num. 11:12 (E)	21
הרה, with child	16:11; 38:24, 25						Ex. 21:22 (E)	3
זקן, be old	18:12, 13; 19:31; 24:1; 27:1, 2							6
חבק, Piel Future, embrace	29:13	33:4; 48:10						3

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Genesis								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
חלום, dream	37:5, 6, 8, 9(2), 10, 19, 20; 42:9	20:3, 6; 31:10, 11, 24; 40:5(3), 8, 9(2), 16; 41:7, 8, 11(2), 12(2), 15(2), 17, 22, 25, 26, 32					Num. 12:6 (E); Deut. 13:1, 3, 5 (Dtn)	34
חלייה, far be it	18:25(2); 44:7, 17							4
חשך, withhold	39:9	20:6; 22:16			22:12			4
יחיד, thine only		22:2, 16			22:12			3
יהם, conceive	30:38, 39, 41(2)	31:10					Deut. 19:6 (Dtn)	5
יכה, reprove	24:14, 44	20:16; 21:25; 31:37, 42					Lev. 19:17(2) (P)	6
ילד, Qal Preterite, beget	4:18(3), 22; 6:4; 10:8, 13, 15, 24(2), 26; 16:1; 19:38; 21:7; 22:20, 23(2); 24:24, 47; 29:34; 30:1; 31:25; 34:1; 44:27	21:9; 25:3; 30:20, 21; 31:8(2), 43; 41:50	16:15; 21:3; 36:4, 5; 46:15, 20	25:12			Ex. 1:19; 21:4 (E); Lev. 12:2 (P); Num. 11:12 (E); 26:59 (P); Deut. 21:15 (Dtn); 32:18 (Dtr2)	39
ילד, Qal Infinitive, to bear	4:2; 16:2; 25:24, 26; 29:35; 38:5, 27, 28	16:16; 30:9; 35:16, 17						12
ילד, Pual Preterite, was born	6:1; 10:21, 25; 24:15	41:50; 50:23	35:26; 36:5; 46:22, 27	4:26				11

Appendices

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Genesis								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
ילך, Hiphil Future, shall beget			6:10; 17:20			5:3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 25, 26, 28, 30, 32; 11:10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26	Deut. 4:25 (Dtr2); 28:41 (Dtr1)	38
יפה, fair	12:11, 14; 29:17(2); 39:6(2)	41:2, 4, 18					Deut. 21:11 (Dtn)	9
יצג, Hiphil Future, to place	30:38; 47:2	33:15						3
יצר, to form	2:7, 8, 19							3
יקץ, awake	9:24; 28:16	41:4, 7, 21						5
ירד, Hiphil Imperative, bring	43:7, 11; 44:21						Ex. 33:5 (E)	3
כבד, Qal Preterite, heavy	13:2; 18:20	48:10						3
כד, pitcher	24:14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 43, 45, 46							9
כול, to nourish	45:11	50:21	47:12					3
כוס, cup		40:11(3), 13, 21						5

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Genesis								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
כפר, plain	13:10, 11; 19:17, 25, 28		13:12; 19:29				Deut. 34:3 (Dtr1)	7
לאם, people	25:23(3); 27:29							4
לקח, Pual Preterite, taken out	2:23; 3:19, 23							3
מגדל, tower	11:4, 5; 35:21							3
מגור, sojourning			17:8; 28:4; 36:7; 37:1; 47:9(2)				Ex. 6:4 (P)	6
מהר, Piel Imperative, haste	18:6; 19:22; 45:9							3
מהר, Piel Future, hastened	18:6, 7; 24:18, 20, 46; 43:30; 44:11						Ex. 10:16 (E); 34:8 (J)	7
מטה, bed	47:31	48:2	49:33				Ex. 8:3 (E)	3
מלא, Qal Imperative, fill			1:22, 28; 9:1				Ex. 32:29 (E)	3
מלא, Qal Future, shall be filled	25:24; 50:3(2)						Ex. 15:9 (J)	3
מלך, reign	36:31(2), 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39; 37:8(2)						Ex. 15:18 (J)	12
מערה, cave	19:30		23:9, 11, 17, 19, 20; 25:9; 49:29, 30, 32; 50:13					11
מצא, Qal Infinitive, to find	19:11; 27:20; 32:5	32:19; 33:8						5

Appendices

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Genesis								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
מַקֵּל, rod, staff	30:37(2), 38, 39, 41(2); 32:10						Ex. 12:11 (P); Num. 22:27 (E)	7
מַשֵּׁל, Qal Participle Poel, ruler	24:2; 45:8, 26							3
מִשְׁתָּה, feast	19:3; 26:30; 29:22	21:8; 40:20						5
נָגַד, Hiphil Imperative, tell	24:23, 49(2); 29:15	32:29; 37:16						6
נָגַד, Hophal Future, told	22:20; 27:42; 38:13, 24	31:22					Ex. 14:5 (J)	5
נָשָׂא, Qal Imperative, come	19:9; 27:21, 26; 45:4							4
נָצַב, Hiphil Future, set		21:28; 33:20; 35:20	35:14				Deut. 32:8 (Dtr2)	4
נָשַׁק, Qal Future, kiss	27:27; 29:11; 50:1	33:4; 41:40; 48:10					Ex. 4:27 (E); 18:7 (E)	6
סָוַר, trade	34:10, 21; 42:34	37:28	23:16					5
סָרִיס, officer	39:1	37:36; 40:2, 7						4
עֵדָר, flock	29:2(2), 3, 8; 30:40	32:16(4), 19						10
עֵרָם, naked	3:7, 10, 11						Deut. 28:48 (Dtr1)	3
עָלָה, Qal Participle Poel, ascend	38:13; 50:14	28:12; 31:10, 12; 41:2, 3, 5, 18, 19, 22, 27					Num. 32:11 (J); Deut. 1:28 (Dtr1); 32:50 (R)	12
עַמְקַי, valley		37:14				14:3, 8, 10, 17	Num. 14:25 (J)	5

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Genesis								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
עצב, grieve	6:6; 34:7; 45:5							3
עקב, heel	3:15; 25:26; 49:17, 19							4
פילגש, concubine	22:24; 35:22		36:12			25:6		4
פסים, (many) colors	37:3, 23, 32							3
פצר, to press	19:3, 9	33:11						3
פקח, to open (eyes)	3:5, 7	21:19						3
פרד, to separate	2:10; 13:9, 14; 25:23; 30:40		10:5, 32; 13:11				Deut. 32:8 (Dtr2)	8
פרה, to be fruitful	26:22; 49:22(2)	41:52	8:17; 17:6, 20; 28:3; 47:27; 48:4				Ex. 1:7 (P); 23:30 (E); Lev. 26:9 (P); Deut. 29:18 (Dtr1)	10
צוואר, neck	27:16, 40; 45:14(2); 46:29(2)	33:4; 41:42					Deut. 28:48 (Dtr1)	8
צוד, hunt	27:3, 5, 33						Lev. 17:13 (P)	3
ציד, hunter, venison	10:9(2); 25:27, 28; 27:3, 5, 7, 19, 25, 30, 31, 33						Lev. 17:13 (P)	12
צלח, prosper	24:21, 40, 42, 56; 39:2, 3, 23						Num. 14:41 (J); Deut. 28:29 (Dtr1)	7
צלם, image			1:26, 27(2); 9:6			5:3	Num. 33:52 (P)	5
צעיר, younger	19:31, 34, 35, 38; 25:23; 29:26; 43:33	48:14						8
קבורה, grave	47:30	35:20(2)					Deut. 34:6 (J)	3

Appendices

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Genesis								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
קבר, Qal Preterite, bury	47:30		23:19; 49:31(3)				Num. 11:34 (E)	5
קבר, Qal Infinitive, bury	50:7, 14(2)		23:6, 8				Deut. 21:23 (Dtn)	5
קבר, Qal Future, bury	47:29; 50:5(2)		23:4, 13; 25:9; 35:29; 48:7; 50:13				Deut. 21:23 (Dtn); 34:6 (J)	9
קטן, lesser, younger	19:11; 42:13, 15, 20, 32, 34; 43:29; 44:2, 12, 23, 26(2)	48:19	1:16				Ex. 18:22, 26 (E); Deut. 1:17 (Dtr1)	14
קנא, Piel Future, envied	26:14; 37:11	30:1						3
קנין, possession	34:23		31:18; 36:6				Lev. 22:11 (P)	3
קרא, Niphal Future, called	2:23	21:12; 48:16	17:5; 35:10; 48:6				Deut. 3:13 (Dtr1)	6
קרע, Qal Future, rend	37:34; 44:13	37:29						3
קשת, bow	27:3; 49:24	21:16; 48:22	9:13, 14, 16					7
רגל, Piel Participle, spy	42:9, 11, 14, 16, 30, 31, 34							7
רוץ, to run	18:2, 7; 24:17, 20, 28, 29; 29:12, 13	33:4; 41:14					Num. 11:27 (E); 16:47 (P)	10
רכוש, property			12:5; 13:6; 31:18; 36:7; 46:6	15:14		14:11, 12, 16(2), 21	Num. 16:32; 35:3 (P)	11

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Genesis								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
רמש, creeping thing	6:7; 7:23		1:24, 25, 26; 6:20; 7:14; 8:17, 19; 9:3					10
רעב, famine	12:10; 26:1(2); 43:1; 45:6, 11	41:27, 30(2), 31, 36(2), 50, 54(2), 56(2), 57; 42:5; 47:13, 20					Ex. 16:3 (P); Deut. 28:48 (Dtr1); 32:24 (Dtr2)	21
רקיע, firmament			1:6, 7(3), 8, 14, 15, 17, 20					9
שטם, to hate	27:41; 49:23	50:15						3
שק, sack, sackcloth	37:34; 42:27	42:25, 35(2)					Lev. 11:32 (P)	5
שאב, to draw	24:11, 13, 19, 20(2), 43, 44, 45						Deut. 29:11 (Dtr1)	8
שבלת, ear (of corn)		41:5, 6, 7(2), 22, 23, 24(2), 26, 27						10
שבע, Niphal Imperative, swear	25:33; 47:31	21:23						3
שבע, Hiphil Future, swear	24:3, 37	50:25						3
שחר, morning	19:15	32:24, 26						3
שחת, Piel Infinitive, to destroy	13:10; 19:13		6:17; 9:11, 15; 19:29					6
שחת, Hiphil Participle, will destroy	19:13, 14		6:13				Ex. 12:23 (E)	3
שכם, shoulder	9:23; 24:15, 45; 49:15	21:14; 48:22					Ex. 12:34 (E)	6

Appendices

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Genesis								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
שָׁלֹשׁ, Pual Participle, three years old	15:9(3)							3
שִׁפְחָה, maidservant	12:16; 16:1, 2, 5, 6, 8; 24:35; 29:24(2), 29(2); 30:4, 43; 32:5	20:14; 30:7, 9, 10, 12, 18; 32:22; 33:1, 2, 6	16:3; 35:25, 26	25:12			Ex. 11:5 (E); Lev. 19:20 (P); Deut. 28:68 (Dtr2)	28
שָׁקָה, Hiphil Imperative, give drink	24:43, 45; 29:7							3
שָׁקָה, Hiphil Participle, butler		40:1, 2, 5, 9, 13, 20, 21, 23; 41:9						9
שָׁתָה, Qal Imperative, drink	24:14, 18, 44, 46							4
תְּחִלָּה, at the beginning, the first time	13:3; 43:18, 20	41:21						4
תָּלָה, Qal Preterite, hang		40:19, 22; 41:13					Deut. 21:22 (Dtn)	3
תָּעָה, wander		20:13; 21:14; 37:15					Ex. 23:4 (E)	3
תְּרָפִים, images		31:19, 34, 35						3
122								887

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Exodus								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
אמן, Hiphil Future, believe	14:31	4:1, 5, 8, 9, 31; 19:9					Num. 14:11 (J); Deut. 28:66 (Dtr2)	7
אפוד, אפוד, ephod			25:7; 28:4, 6, 12, 15, 25, 26, 27(2), 28(3), 31; 29:5(3); 35:9, 27; 39:2, 7, 8, 18, 19, 20(2), 21(3), 22				Lev. 8:7(2) (P)	29
ארבה, locust		10:4, 12, 13, 14(2), 19(2)					Lev. 11:22 (P); Deut. 28:38 (Dtr1)	7
ארג, Qal Participle Poel, weaver			28:32; 35:35; 39:22, 27					4
ברד, hail		9:18, 19, 22, 23(2), 24(2), 25(2), 26, 28, 29, 33, 34; 10:5, 12, 15						17
בריה, bar			26:26, 27(2), 28, 29(2); 35:11, 36:31, 32(2), 33, 34(2); 39:33; 40:18				Num. 3:36; 4:31 (P); Deut. 3:5 (Dtr1)	15
גנב, thief		22:2, 7, 8					Deut. 24:7 (Dtn)	3
חבר, Qal Participle Poel, to couple			26:3(2); 28:7; 39:4					4

Appendices

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Exodus								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
חזק, Qal Future, harden		12:33	7:13, 22; 8:19	9:35			Gen. 41:56 (E); Deut. 11:8 (Dtr1)	5
חזק, Piel Future, will harden			9:12; 14:8	4:21; 10:20, 27; 11:10				6
חכמה, wisdom			28:3; 31:3, 6; 35:26, 31, 35; 36:1, 2				Deut. 4:6 (Dtr1); 34:9 (P)	8
חרש, engraver			28:11; 35:35; 38:23				Deut. 27:15 (Dtr1)	3
חתן, in law		3:1; 4:18; 18:1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12(2), 14, 15, 17, 24, 27					Num. 10:29 (J); Deut. 27:23 (Dtr1)	15
טור, row			28:17(3), 18, 19, 20; 39:10(3), 11, 12, 13					12
יבשה, יבשת, dry (land)		4:9(2)	14:16, 22, 29	15:19			Gen. 1:9, 10 (P)	6
ינח, Hiphil Imperative, leave		32:10	16:23, 33				Gen. 42:33 (J)	3
יריעה, curtain			26:1, 2(3), 3(2), 4(2), 5(2), 6, 7(2), 8(3), 9(3), 10(2), 12(2), 13; 36:8, 9(3), 10(2), 11(2), 12(2), 13, 14(2), 15(3), 16(2), 17(2)				Num. 4:25 (P)	44
ירכה, side			26:22, 23, 27; 36:27, 28, 32					6

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Exodus								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
יתד, pin			27:19(2); 35:18(2); 38:20; 31(2); 39:40				Num. 3:37; 4:32 (P)	8
כהן, Piel Infinitive, minister in the priest's office			28:1, 3, 4; 29:1, 44; 30:30; 31:10; 35:19; 39:41				Lev. 7:35; 16:32 (P); Num. 3:3 (P)	9
כיור, laver			30:18; 38:8; 40:7, 11, 30					5
ככר, talent			25:39; 37:24; 38:24, 25, 27(3), 29					8
כרוב, cherub			25:18, 19(3), 20(2), 22; 26:1, 31; 36:8, 35; 37:7, 8(3), 9(2)				Gen. 3:24 (J); Num. 7:89 (P)	17
לבנה, brick		5:7, 8, 16, 18, 19	1:14				Gen. 11:3(2) (J)	6
מוקש, snare	34:12	10:7; 23:33					Deut. 7:16 (Dtr1)	3
מחשבת, cunning work			31:4; 35:32, 33, 35				Gen. 6:5 (J)	4
מטה, beneath			26:24; 27:5; 28:27; 36:29; 38:4; 39:20				Deut. 28:13, 43(2) (Dtr1)	6
מלא, Piel Infinitive, to be consecrated, to set			29:29, 33; 31:5; 35:33					4
מסגרת, border			25:25(2), 27; 37:12(2), 14					6

Appendices

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Exodus								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
מעיל, robe			28:4, 31, 34; 29:5; 39:22, 23, 24, 25, 26				Lev. 8:7 (P)	9
משח, Qal Preterite, anoint			28:41; 29:7, 36; 30:26; 40:9, 10, 11, 13, 15(2)				Gen. 31:13 (E); Num. 35:25 (P)	10
מתכנת, composition		5:8	30:32, 37					3
נגח, Qal Future, gore		21:28, 31(2), 32						4
נגש, taskmaster	3:7	5:6, 10, 13, 14						5
נחל, Qal Preterite, inherit	34:9	23:30; 32:13						3
נצל, Hiphil Preterite, deliver	2:19	5:23; 12:27; 18:9, 10(2)	6:6				Gen. 31:16 (E); Num. 35:25 (P)	7
סיר, pot			16:3; 27:3; 38:3					3
סכך, to cover			25:20; 37:9; 40:3, 21					4
עבת, wreathen			28:14(2), 22, 24, 25; 39:15, 17, 18					8
עדי, ornament		33:4, 5, 6						3
עמה, over against			25:27; 28:27; 37:14; 38:18; 39:20				Lev. 3:9 (P)	5
עתר, intreat		8:8, 9, 28, 29, 30; 9:28; 10:17, 18					Gen. 25:21(2) (J)	8
פלה, separate		8:22; 9:4; 11:7; 33:16						4

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Exodus								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
פרח, flower			25:31, 33(2), 34; 37:17, 19(2), 20				Num. 8:4; 17:8 (P)	8
פרק, break		32:2, 3, 24					Gen. 27:40 (J)	3
פרש, horseman			14:9, 17, 18, 23, 26, 28	15:19			Gen. 50:9 (J)	7
צלע, rib, side			25:12(2), 14; 26:20, 26, 27(2), 35(2); 27:7; 30:4; 36:25, 31, 32; 37:3(2), 5, 27; 38:7				Gen. 2:21, 22 (J)	19
צפה, Piel Preterite, overlay			25:11, 13, 24, 28; 26:29, 37; 27:2, 6; 30:3, 5; 36:34, 38; 38:28					13
צפה, Piel Future, overlay			25:11; 26:29; 36:34, 36; 37:2, 4, 11, 15, 26, 28; 38:2, 6					12
קומה, height			25:10, 23; 27:1, 18; 30:2; 37:1, 10, 25; 38:1, 18				Gen. 6:15 (P)	10
קנה, stalk, branch			25:31, 32(3), 33(3), 35(4), 36; 37:17, 18(3), 19(3), 21(4), 22				Gen. 41:5, 22 (E)	24

Appendices

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Exodus								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
קצה, end, edge			25:18, 19(3); 26:4; 27:4; 28:7, 23, 24, 25, 26; 36:11; 37:7, 8(3); 39:4, 16, 17, 18, 19					21
רבה, Hiphil Participle, multiply			16:17, 18; 36:5				Lev. 11:42 (P)	3
רבע, Qal Part- iciple Pa'ul, foursquare			27:1; 28:16; 30:2; 37:25; 38:1; 39:9					6
רחב, breadth			25:10, 17, 23; 26:2, 8, 16; 27:1, 12, 13, 18; 28:16; 30:2; 36:9, 15, 21; 37:1, 6, 10, 25; 38:1, 18; 39:9				Gen. 6:15 (P); 13:17 (J); Deut. 3:11 (Dtr1)	22
רחץ, Qal Infinitive, wash	2:5		30:18; 40:30				Gen. 24:32 (J)	3
רקח, mix, perfumer			30:25, 33, 35; 37:29					4
רשת, network			27:4(2), 5; 38:4					4
שהם, onyx			25:7; 28:9, 20; 35:9, 27; 39:6, 13				Gen. 2:12 (J)	7
שול, hem			28:33(2), 34; 39:24, 25, 26					6
שיר, sing	15:1(2)	15:21					Num. 21:17 (J)	3

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Exodus								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
שֶׁלֶחַ, table			25:23, 27, 28, 30; 26:35(3); 30:27; 31:8; 35:13; 37:10, 14, 15, 16; 39:36; 40:4, 22, 24				Lev. 24:6 (P); Num. 3:31; 4:7 (P)	18
שָׁלַח, Piel Infinitive, pay		21:36; 22:3, 6, 14					Deut. 23:21 (Dtn)	4
שִׁפְטִים, judgments			6:6; 7:4; 12:12				Num. 33:4 (Other)	3
תְּבוּנָה, understanding			31:3; 35:31; 36:1				Deut. 32:28 (Dtr2)	3
65								549
Leviticus								
אֹבֹב, familiar spirit			19:31; 20:6, 27				Deut. 18:11 (Dtn)	3
בִּד, linen			6:10(2); 16:4(4), 23, 32				Ex. 28:42; 39:28 (P)	8
גָּאֵל, Qal Infinitive, redeem			27:13, 19, 31					3
גָּאֵל, Qal Future, redeem			25:33, 48, 49(2); 27:13, 15, 19, 20, 31					9
גְּאֻלָּה, redemption			25:24, 26, 29(2), 31, 32, 48, 51, 52					9
גָּלָה, Piel Preterite, uncover			20:11, 17, 18(2), 20, 21				Deut. 27:20 (Dtr1)	6

Appendices

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Leviticus								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
גלה, Piel Future, uncover			18:7(2), 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15(2), 16, 17; 20:19				Num. 22:31 (E); Deut. 22:30 (Dtn)	14
דוד, uncle			10:4; 20:20; 25:49(2)				Num. 36:11 (P)	4
הפך, Qal Preterite, turn			13:3, 4, 10, 13, 20, 55					6
זמה, wickedness			18:17; 19:29; 20:14(2)					4
זקן, beard			13:29, 30; 14:9; 19:27; 21:5					5
חגר, Qal Future, gird			8:7(2), 13; 16:4				Deut. 1:41 (Dtr1)	4
חרש, earthen			6:28; 11:33; 14:5, 50; 15:12				Num. 5:17 (P)	5
טהר, Piel Preterite, pronounce clean, cleanse			13:6, 13, 17, 23, 28, 34, 37; 14:7, 48; 16:19				Num. 8:6, 15 (P)	10
טהרה, cleansing			12:4, 5; 13:7, 35; 14:2, 23, 32; 15:13				Num. 6:9 (P)	8
טמא, Hithpael Future, defile			11:24, 43; 18:24, 30; 21:1, 3, 4, 11				Num. 6:7 (P)	8
טמאה, uncleanness			5:3(2); 7:20, 21; 14:19; 15:3(2), 25, 26, 30, 31(2); 16:16(2), 19; 18:19; 22:3, 5				Num. 5:19; 19:13 (P)	18
ידעני, wizard			19:31; 20:6, 27				Deut. 18:11 (Dtn)	3

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Leviticus								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
ישן, old			25:22(2); 26:10(2)					4
יתר, Niphal Participle, remain			2:3, 10; 6:16; 7:16, 17; 8:32; 10:12(2), 16; 14:18, 29; 19:6; 27:18				Gen. 30:36 (J); Ex. 12:10; 28:10; 29:34 (P)	13
כבד, liver			8:16, 25; 9:10, 19				Ex. 29:22 (P)	4
כהה, somewhat dark			13:6, 21, 26, 28, 39, 56					6
כליות, kidney			3:4(2), 10(2), 15(2); 4:9(2); 7:4(2); 8:16, 25; 9:10, 19				Ex. 29:13, 22 (P); Deut. 32:14 (Dtr2)	14
כסל, flank			3:4, 10, 15; 4:9; 7:4					5
לבונה, frankincense			2:1, 2, 15, 16; 5:11; 6:15; 24:7				Ex. 30:34 (P); Num. 5:15 (P)	7
לבש, Qal Preterite, put on			6:10, 11; 16:4, 23, 24, 32					6
לקט, Piel Future, gather			19:9, 10; 23:22				Gen. 47:14 (E)	3
מקור, source			12:7; 20:18(2)					3
משיח, anointed			4:3, 5, 16; 6:22					4

Appendices

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Leviticus								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
נגע, plague			13:3(3), 4, 5(2), 6(2), 12, 13, 17(2), 22, 29, 30, 31(2), 32, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50(2), 51(3), 52, 53, 54, 55(3), 56, 57, 58; 14:35, 36, 37(2), 39, 40, 43, 44, 48(2)				Gen. 12:17 (J); Ex. 11:1 (E); Deut. 17:8(2); 21:5 (Dtn)	48
נתח, pieces			1:6, 8, 12; 8:20(2); 9:13				Ex. 29:17(2) (P)	6
סגר, Hiphil Preterite, shut שָׁטַח			13:4, 5, 21, 26, 31, 33, 50, 54; 14:38, 46				Deut. 32:30 (Dtr2)	10
ספר, Qal Preterite, count			15:13, 28; 23:15; 25:8					4
עלם, Niphal Preterite, be hid			4:13; 5:2, 3, 4				Num. 5:13 (P)	4
עמק, deeper			13:3, 4, 25, 30, 31, 32, 34					7
עמר, sheaf			23:10, 11, 12, 15				Deut. 24:19 (Dtn)	4
ערך, estimation			5:15, 18; 6:6; 27:2, 3(2), 4, 5, 6(2), 7, 8, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23(2), 25, 27(2)				Num. 18:16 (P)	24
פרח, Qal Preterite, broken out			13:20, 25, 39; 14:43				Num. 17:8 (P)	4
פשתה, linen			13:47, 48, 52, 59				Deut. 22:11 (Dtn)	4

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Leviticus								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
צמר, woolen			13:47, 48, 52, 59				Deut. 22:11 (Dtn)	4
קוא, vomit			18:25, 28(2); 20:22					4
רגם, Qal Future, stone			20:2, 27; 24:16, 23				Num. 15:36 (P)	4
רדף, Qal Participle Poel, pursue			26:17, 36, 37					3
רפא, Niphil Preterite, heal			13:18, 37; 14:3, 48					4
שמאלי, left			14:15, 16, 26, 27					4
שרף, Niphil Future, burn			4:12; 6:30; 7:17, 19; 13:52; 19:6; 21:9				Gen. 38:24 (J)	7
שבר, broken, breach			21:19(2); 24:20(2)					4
שחט, Qal Future, kill			4:24, 33; 7:2(2); 8:15, 19, 23; 9:8, 12, 15, 18; 14:13, 19; 17:3(2); 22:28				Gen. 37:31 (J); Ex. 34:25 (J); Num. 14:16 (J)	16
שטף, rinse			6:28; 15:11, 12					3
שפל, lower			13:20, 21, 26; 14:37					4
תודה, thanksgiving			7:12(2), 13, 15; 22:29					5
51								373
Numbers								
אסר, Qal Preterite, bind			30:3, 4(2), 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11					10
בז, prey			14:3, 31: 31:32				Deut. 1:39 (Dtr1)	3
גבולה, border	32:33		34:2, 12				Deut. 32:8 (Dtr2)	3

Appendices

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Numbers								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
גדרה, fold (for sheep)	32:36		32:16, 24					3
תגלת, head			1:2, 18, 20, 22; 3:47				Ex. 16:16; 38:26 (P)	5
דבה, evil report			13:32; 14:36, 37				Gen. 37:2 (J)	3
חלץ, armed for war	32:27		31:3, 5; 32:17, 20, 21, 29, 30, 32				Deut. 3:18 (Dtr1)	9
תונה, dedication			7:10, 11, 84, 88					4
תצרה, trumpet			10:2, 8, 9, 10; 31:6					5
יכל, Qal Infinitive, overcome			13:30; 14:16; 22:38				Deut. 9:28 (Dtr1)	3
ירש, Hiphil Future, drive out	14:12, 24; 21:32; 32:39		33:55				Ex. 15:9; 34:24 (J)	5
כהונה, priesthood			3:10; 16:10; 18:1, 7(2); 25:13				Ex. 29:9; 40:15 (P)	6
מבצר, fenced	13:19; 32:36		32:17					3
מגפה, plague			14:37; 16:48, 49, 50; 25:8, 9, 18; 26:1; 31:16				Ex. 9:14 (E)	9
מגרש, suburb			35:2, 3, 4, 5, 7				Lev. 25:34 (P)	5
מוט, bar, pole	13:23		4:10, 12					3
מלקוח, prey			31:11, 12, 26, 27, 32					5
מקלט, refuge			35:6, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 25, 26, 27, 28, 32					11
משא, burden		11:11, 17	4:15, 19, 24, 27(2), 31, 32, 47, 49				Ex. 23:5 (E); Deut. 1:12 (Dtr1)	11

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Numbers								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
נאם, says		24:3(2), 4, 15(2), 16	14:28				Gen. 22:16 (RJE)	7
נחל, Qal Future, inherit			18:20, 23, 24; 26:55; 32:19; 34:17; 35:8				Deut. 19:14 (Dtn)	7
נסע, Qal Preterite, journey	21:12, 13	11:35; 12:15, 16	2:17, 34; 10:5, 6, 17, 18, 21, 22, 25	9:21(2)			Gen. 33:17; 37:17 (E); Deut. 10:6, 7 (Dtr1)	16
סלע, rock		24:21	20:8(2), 10(2), 11				Deut. 32:13 (Dtr2)	6
עלה, Niphal Preterite, take up			10:11	9:21(2)				3
עטוד, he-goat			7:17, 23, 29, 35, 41, 47, 53, 59, 65, 71, 77, 83, 88				Gen. 31:10, 12 (E); Deut. 32:14 (Dtr2)	13
פקדה, oversight			3:32, 36; 4:16(2)					5
פרר, Hiphil Future, make void			30:12, 13, 15					3
פרש, Qal Preterite, spread			4:6, 8, 13, 14				Deut. 22:17 (Dtn)	4
קנא, Piel Preterite, jealous			5:14(2), 30; 25:13				Deut. 32:21 (Dtr2)	4
קנאה, jealousy			5:15, 18, 25, 29; 25:11(2)				Deut. 29:20 (Dtr1)	6
קצר, wrath			1:53; 16:46; 18:5				Deut. 29:28 (Dtr2)	3
שבה, Qal Future, took captive	21:1	24:22	31:9					3
תוצאות, going forth			34:4, 5, 8, 9, 12					5
תור, search	10:33; 13:21		13:2, 16, 25, 32(2); 14:6, 7, 34, 36, 38; 15:39	13:17			Deut. 1:33 (Dtr1)	14

Appendices

Appendix B								
Words within the Pentateuch that appear only or primarily in one of the Five Books								
Numbers								
Word	J	E	P	R	RJE	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
תקע, Qal Preterite, blow			10:3, 5, 6, 10					4
תקע, Qal Future, blow			10:4, 6, 7, 8					4
36								213
Totals								274
274								2022

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
אבדה, lost thing		Ex. 22:9	Lev. 6:3, 4	Deut. 22:3 (Dtn)				4
אביב, Abib	Ex. 34:18(2)	Ex. 13:4; 23:15		Deut. 16:1(2) (Dtn)				6
אבנט, girdle			Ex. 28:4, 39, 40; 29:9; 39:29; Lev. 8:7, 13; 16:4				Is. 22:21	8

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
סֶדֶק, socket			Ex. 26:19(3), 21(3), 25(4), 32, 37; 27:10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18; 35:11, 17; 36:24(3), 26(3), 30(3), 36, 38; 38:10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19, 27(4), 30, 31(2); 39:33, 40; 40:18; Num. 3:36, 37; 4:31, 32				Job 38:6; Cant. 5:15	54
אֶזוֹב, hyssop		Ex. 12:22	Lev. 14:4, 6, 49, 51, 52; Num. 19:6, 18				1 K 4:33; Ps. 51:7	8
אֶזְכָּרָה, memorial			Lev. 2:2, 9, 16; 5:12; 6:15; 24:7; Num. 5:26					7
אֵל, these, those	Gen. 19:8, 25; 26:3, 4		Lev. 18:27	Deut. 4:42; 7:22 (Dtr1); 19:11 (Dtn)			1 C 20:8	8
אֶל־אֶרֶץ זָבַת חֵלֶב וְדֹבֶשׁ, (unto) a land flowing with milk and honey	Ex. 3:8; Num. 16:14	Ex. 3:17; 13:5; 33:3	Lev. 20:24	Deut. 6:3; 11:9 (Dtr1); 26:9, 15 (Dtn); 27:3 (Dtr1)			Josh. 5:6; Jer. 11:5; 32:22	11
אֶל־יְסוֹד הַמִּזְבֵּחַ, bottom of the altar			Ex. 29:12; Lev. 4:30, 34; 5:9; 8:15; 9:9					6
אֱלֹהֵי שָׁמַיִם, God Almighty (in narrative)		Gen. 43:14	Gen. 17:1; 28:3; 35:11; 48:3; Ex. 6:3				Eze. 10:5	6

Appendices

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
אלה תולד(ו)ת these are the generations			Gen. 36:9		Gen. 2:4; 6:9; 10:1; 11:10, 27; 25:12, 19; 36:1; 37:2; Num. 3:1		Ru. 4:18	11
אליה, rump			Ex. 29:22; Lev. 3:9; 7:3; 8:25; 9:19					5
אסון, mischief	Gen. 42:4, 38; 44:29	Ex. 21:22, 23						5
אסף אל-עם gather to his/my/your people			Gen. 25:8, 17; 35:29; 49:29, 33; Num 20:24; 27:13; 31:2		Deut. 32:50(2)			10
ארבעים יום וארבעים לילה forty days and forty nights	Gen. 7:4, 12; Ex. 24:18; 34:28			Deut. 9:9, 11, 18; 10:10 (Dtr1)			1 K 19:8	8
אשה, offering by fire			Ex. 29:18, 25, 41; 30:20; Lev. 2:3, 10, 11, 16; 3:3, 9, 11, 14, 16; 4:35; 5:12; 6:17, 18; 7:5, 25, 30, 35; 8:21, 28; 10:12, 13, 15; 21:6, 21; 22:22, 27; 23:8, 13, 25, 27, 36(2), 37; 24:7, 9; Num. 18:17	Deut. 18:1 (Dtn)	Num. 15:3, 25; 28:2, 3, 6, 13, 19; 29:6		Josh. 13:14; 1 S 2:28	49
אשה ריח(־) ניח(ו)ח ליהוה offering by fire, a sweet savour unto the Lord			Lev. 1:9, 13, 17; 2:2, 9; 3:5; 23:18		Num. 15:10, 13, 14; 28:8, 24; 29:13, 36			14

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
אשר אועד where I will meet			Ex. 29:42; 30:6, 36; Num. 17:4					4
את־הכיר ואת־ כנו, laver and his foot			Ex. 30:28; 31:9; 35:16; 39:39; 40:11; Lev. 8:11					6
בגדי־(-)(ה)קדש, holy garments			Ex. 28:2, 4; 29:29; 31:10; 35:19, 21; 39:1, 41; 40:13; Lev. 16:4, 32					11
בדל, Hiphil Preterite, divide			Ex. 26:33; Lev. 20:24, 25(2); Num. 8:14; 16:9	Deut. 10:8; 29:21 (Dtr1)			1 K 8:53; Eze. 22:26	8
בהמה (ה)טמאה, unclean beast			Lev. 5:2; 7:21; 27:11, 27; Num. 18:15					5
בין הערבים between the two evenings			Ex. 12:6; 16:12; 29:39, 41; 30:8; Lev. 23:5; Num. 9:3, 5, 11			Num. 28:4, 8		11
בלל, Qal Participle Paul, mingled			Ex. 29:2, 40; Lev. 2:4, 5; 7:10, 12(2); 9:4; 14:10, 21; 23:13; Num. 6:15; 7:13, 19, 25, 31, 37, 43, 49, 55, 61, 67, 73, 79; 8:8			Num. 15:4, 6, 9; 28:5, 9, 12(2), 13, 20, 28; 29:3, 9, 14		38
בן־(-)(ה)בקר calf	Gen. 18:7, 8		Lev. 1:5			Num. 15:8, 9		5
בעיר, beast	Gen. 45:17	Ex. 22:5	Num. 20:4, 8, 11				Ps. 78:48	5

Appendices

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
בעצם הזיה הזה, on that very day			Gen. 7:13; 17:23, 26; Ex. 12:17, 41; Lev. 23:21, 28, 29, 30		Ex. 12:51; Deut. 32:48		Josh. 5:11; Eze. 24:2; 40:1	11
בערב(ו)ת מואב, plains of Moab			Num. 26:3, 63; 33:50; 35:1; 36:13	Deut. 34:8 (Dtr2)	Num. 22:1	Num. 33:48, 49	Josh. 13:32	9
ברא, Qal Future, create	Num. 16:30		Gen. 1:21, 27					3
ברך, Hithpael Preterite, bless himself, themselves	Gen. 26:4	Gen. 22:18		Deut. 29:19 (Dtr1)			Jer. 4:2	3
בשקל(־)הקדש according to the shekel of the sanctuary			Ex. 30:13, 24; 38:24, 25, 26; Lev. 5:15; 27:3, 25; Num. 3:47, 50; 7:13, 19, 25, 31, 37, 43, 49, 55, 61, 67, 73, 79, 85, 86; 18:16					25
גביע, cup	Gen. 44:2, 12, 16, 17		Ex. 25:31, 33(2), 34; 37:17, 19(2), 20				Jer. 35:5	12
גרב, scurvy			Lev. 21:20; 22:22	Deut. 28:27 (Dtr1)				3
גרה, cud			Lev. 11:3, 4(2), 5, 6, 7, 26	Deut. 14:6, 7(2), 8 (Dtn)				11
גרה, gerah			Ex. 30:13; Lev. 27:25; Num. 3:47; 18:16				Eze. 45:12	4
גרש, Qal Participle Paül, divorced			Lev. 21:7, 14; 22:13; Num. 30:9				Eze. 44:22	4

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
גרש, Piel Preterite, drive out	Gen. 4:14	Ex. 23:28, 31; 33:2; Num. 22:11					1 S 26:19; Eze. 31:11	5
דודה, aunt			Lev. 18:14; 20:20			Ex. 6:20		3
קָדָק, thin, small		Gen. 41:3, 4, 6, 7, 23, 24	Ex. 16:14(2); Lev. 13:30; 16:12; 21:20				1 K 19:12; Is 29:5; 40:15	11
הבהמה הטטה(ו)רה, clean beast	Gen. 7:2; 8:20		Gen. 7:8; Lev. 20:25					4
החלב המכסה את־הקרב, the fat that covers the inward parts			Ex. 29:13, 22; Lev. 3:3, 9, 14; 4:8; 7:3					7
המנרה הטהרה, the pure candlestick			Ex. 31:8; 39:37; Lev. 24:4					3
הרג, Qal Imperative, slay	Num. 25:5	Ex. 32:27; Num. 11:15	Num. 31:17(2)				Jud. 8:20	5
ואת־היתרת ועל־הכבד, the caul of the liver			Ex. 29:13; Lev. 3:4, 10, 15; 4:9; 7:4					6
ולגר הגר בתוכם, and for the stranger that sojourns among you (them)			Ex. 12:49; Num. 19:10			Num. 15:26, 29	Josh. 20:9	4
ועניתם את־נפשתיכם, and you shall afflict your souls			Lev. 16:31; 23:27, 32			Num. 29:7		4

Appendices

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
ורקיקי מצות משחים בשמן wafers of unleavened bread anointed with oil			Ex. 29:2; Lev. 2:4; 7:12; Num. 6:15					4
זיד, Hiphil Future, act presump- tuously		Ex. 21:14		Deut. 1:43 (Dtr1); 17:13; 18:20 (Dtn)				4
זנה, Qal Infinitve, commit whoredom	Num. 25:1		Lev. 20:5, 6; 21:9	Deut. 22:21 (Dtn)			Eze. 23:30; Hos. 1:2	5
זרע, Niphal Future, sown			Lev. 11:37	Deut. 21:4 (Dtn); 29:23 (Dtr2)			Nah. 1:14	3
זרק, Qal Preterite, sprinkle		Ex. 24:6	Ex. 9:8; 29:16, 20; Lev. 1:5, 11; 3:2, 8, 13; 17:6				Eze. 36:25; Hos. 7:9	10
חג (ה)שבוע(ו)ת feast of weeks	Ex. 34:22			Deut. 16:10, 16 (Dtn)			2 C 8:13	3
חגג, Qal Preterite, keep a feast			Ex. 12:14		Lev. 23:41; Num. 29:12			3
חגג, Qal Future, keep a feast	Ex. 5:1	Ex. 23:14	Ex. 12:14	Deut. 16:15 (Dtn)	Lev. 23:39, 41		Ps. 107:27	6
חזה, breast			Ex. 29:26, 27; Lev. 7:30(2), 31, 34; 8:29; 9:20, 21; 10:14, 15; Num. 6:20; 18:18					13

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
חלה, cake			Ex. 29:2, 23; Lev. 2:4; 7:12(2), 13; 8:26(2); 24:5(2); Num. 6:15, 19		Num. 15:20		2 S 6:19	13
חלם, Qal Participle Poel, dream		Gen. 41:1		Deut. 13:1, 3, 5 (Dtn)			Ps. 126:1	4
חמץ, leavened bread	Ex. 34:25	Ex. 13:3, 7; 23:18	Ex. 12:15; Lev. 2:11; 6:17; 7:13; 23:17	Deut. 16:3 (Dtn)			Am. 4:5	10
חמר, bitumen	Gen. 11:3; Ex. 2:3					Gen. 14:10		3
חנה, Qal Infinitive, pitch	Num. 10:31		Num. 1:51	Deut. 1:33 (Dtr1)			Jud. 19:9	3
חצה, Qal Preterite, divide		Ex. 21:35	Num. 31:27, 42					3
חרטמים, magicians		Gen. 41:8, 24	Ex. 7:11, 22; 8:7, 18, 19; 9:11(2)				Dan. 1:20; 2:2	9
חשב, embroidered belt			Ex. 28:8, 27, 28; 29:5; 39:5, 20, 21; Lev. 8:7					8
חשן, breastplate			Ex. 25:7; 28:4, 15, 22, 23(2), 24, 26, 28(2), 29, 30; 29:5; 35:9, 27; 39:8, 9, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21(2); Lev. 8:8(2)					25
טבל, Qal Preterite, dip		Ex. 12:22	Lev. 4:6, 17; 14:6, 16, 51; Num. 19:18				Ru. 2:14	7

Appendices

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
טהר, Qal Preterite, cleanse			Lev. 11:32; 12:7, 8; 13:6, 34, 58; 14:8, 9, 20, 53; 15:13, 28; 17:15; 22:7; Num. 19:19; 31:23, 24				2 K 5:12; Prov. 20:9; Eze. 24:13; 36:25	17
טהר, purity		Ex. 24:10	Lev. 12:4, 6					3
טוטפות, frontlet		Ex. 13:16		Deut. 6:8; 11:18 (Dtr1)				3
טמא, Qal Preterite, be unclean			Lev. 11:25, 28, 32, 40(2); 12:2, 5; 15:5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24, 27; 17:15, 22:6; Num. 6:12; 19:7, 8, 10, 11				Eze. 22:4	27
טמא, Qal Future, shall be unclean			Lev. 5:3; 11:24, 26, 27, 31, 32, 33, 34(2), 35, 36, 39; 12:2; 13:14, 46; 14:36, 46; 15:4(2), 9, 10, 19, 20(2), 23, 24, 27; 18:25, 27; 22:5(2); Num. 19:14, 16, 20, 21, 22(2)				Ps. 106:39; Eze. 23:17; Hag. 2:13(2)	37
יבם, perform the duty of the husband's brother	Gen. 38:8			Deut. 25:5, 7 (Dtn)				3

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
יָדָה, Hithpa'el Preterite, confess			Lev. 5:5; 16:21; Num. 5:7		Lev. 26:40			4
יָהַב, Qal Imperative, go to (followed by "let us")	Gen. 11:3, 4, 7	Ex. 1:10						4
יובל, jubilee			Lev. 25:10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 28(2), 30, 31, 33, 40, 50, 52, 54; 27:17, 18(2), 21, 23, 24; Num. 36:4					21
יָלַד, Piel Participle, midwife	Gen. 38:28	Gen. 35:17; Ex. 1:15, 17, 18, 19(2), 20, 21						9
יָלַד, born in the, your, his house			Gen. 17:12, 13, 23, 27; Lev. 22:11			Gen. 14:14	Jer. 2:14	6
יָקוּם, living substance	Gen. 7:4, 23			Deut. 11:6 (Dtr1)				3
יָרָה, Hiphil Infinitive, to teach		Ex. 24:12	Ex. 35:34; Lev. 10:11; 14:57					4
יָרַק, spit		Num. 12:14(2)		Deut. 25:9 (Dtn)				3
יָשַׁן, become old			Lev. 13:11; 26:10	Deut. 4:25 (Dtr2)				3
יָתַר, caul			Ex. 29:22; Lev. 8:16, 25; 9:10, 19					5

Appendices

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
כבס, wash	Gen. 49:11; Ex. 19:10, 14		Lev. 6:27; 11:25, 28, 40(2); 13:6, 34, 54, 55, 56, 58(2); 14:8, 9, 47(2); 15:5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 17, 21, 22, 27; 16:26, 28; 17:15, 16; Num. 8:7, 21; 19:7, 8, 10, 19, 21; 31:24				2 S 19:24; 2 K 18:17; Ps. 51:2, 7; Is. 7:3; 36:2; Jer. 2:22; 4:14; Mal. 3:2	42
כבשן, furnace	Gen. 19:28; Ex. 19:18		Ex. 9:8, 10					4
כלאים, diverse kind			Lev. 19:19(3)	Deut. 22:9 (Dtn)				4
כפר, Piel Preterite, make an atonement			Ex. 30:10; Lev. 4:20, 26, 31, 35; 5:6, 10, 13, 18; 6:7; 12:7, 8; 14:18, 19, 20, 31, 53; 15:15, 30; 16:6, 11, 16, 17, 18, 24, 32, 33; 19:22; Num. 6:11	Deut. 32:43 (Dtr2)	Num. 15:25, 28		Eze. 43:20; 45:20	32
כפרים, atonement			Ex. 29:36; 30:10, 16; Lev. 23:27, 28; 25:9; Num. 5:8		Num. 29:11			8

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
כפרת, mercy seat			Ex. 25:17, 18, 19, 20(2), 21, 22; 26:34; 30:6; 31:7; 35:12; 37:6, 7, 8, 9(2); 39:35; 40:20; Lev. 16:2(2), 13, 14(2), 15(2); Num. 7:89				1 C 28:11	26
כרעים, legs			Ex. 12:9; 29:17; Lev. 1:9, 13; 4:11; 8:21; 9:14; 11:21				Am. 3:12	8
כשב, sheep	Gen. 30:32, 33, 35, 40		Lev. 1:10; 3:7; 4:35; 7:23; 17:3; 22:19, 27; Num. 18:17	Deut. 14:4 (Dtn)				13
כתית, beaten			Ex. 27:20; 29:40; Lev. 24:2		Num. 28:5		1 K 5:11	4
לא-יתבשל גדי בחלב אמו, You shall not boil a young goat in its mother's milk	Ex. 34:26	Ex. 23:19		Deut. 14:21 (Dtn)				3
לבן, white	Gen. 30:35, 37(2)		Ex. 16:31; Lev. 13:3, 4(2), 10(2), 13, 16, 17, 19(2), 20, 21, 24(2), 25, 26, 38, 39, 42, 43				Ecc. 9:8; Zec. 1:8; 6:3, 6	24
ליון, murmur	Ex. 15:24	Ex. 17:3	Ex. 16:2, 7, 8; Num. 14:2, 27(2), 29, 36; 16:11, 41; 17:5				Jos. 9:18	13
לקט, Qal Preterite, gather	Ex. 16:4	Num. 11:8	Ex. 16:18, 22					4

Appendices

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
מאור, light			Gen. 1:14, 15, 16(3); Ex. 25:6; 27:20; 35:8, 14(2), 28; 39:37; Lev. 24:2; Num. 4:9, 16				Ps. 74:16; 90:8; Prov. 15:30; Eze. 32:8	15
מבן שנה ומעלה, years old and above	Num. 32:11		Ex. 30:14; 38:26; Lev. 27:7; Num. 1:3, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 45; 4:3, 23, 30, 35, 39, 43, 47; 8:24; 14:29; 26:2, 4				1 C 23:3, 24; Ezra 3:8	30
מגבעות, bonnets			Ex. 28:40; 29:9; 39:28; Lev. 8:13					4
מול, Niphal Infinitive, be circumcised	Gen. 34:15, 17, 22		Gen. 17:10, 13, 24, 25; Ex. 12:48				Josh. 5:8	8
מול, Niphal Future, be circumcised	Gen. 34:24		Gen. 17:12, 13, 14; Lev. 12:3					5
מום, blemish			Lev. 21:17, 18, 21(2), 23; 22:20, 21, 25; 24:19, 20; Num. 19:2	Deut. 15:21(2); 17:1 (Dtn); 32:5 (Dtr2)			2 S 14:25; Job 11:15; Prov. 9:7; Cant. 4:7; Dan. 1:4	15
מחה, Qal Future, blot out	Gen. 6:7	Ex. 17:14; 32:33		Deut. 9:14 (Dtr1); 25:19 (Dtn)			2 K 21:13	5
מחזה, vision	Gen. 15:1	Num. 24:4, 16					Eze. 13:7	3
מטר, Hiphil Participle, cause to rain	Gen. 7:4; Ex. 16:4	Ex. 9:18						3

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
מיון, after his kind			Gen. 1:11, 12(2), 21(2), 24(2), 25(3); 6:20(3); 7:14(4); Lev. 11:14, 15, 16, 19, 22(4), 29	Deut. 14:13, 14, 15, 18 (Dtn)			Eze. 47:10	30
מכנסים, breeches			Ex. 28:42; 39:28; Lev. 6:10; 16:4				Eze. 44:18	4
מכסה, covering	Gen. 8:13		Ex. 26:14(2); 35:11; 36:19(2); 39:34(2); 40:19; Num. 3:25; 4:8, 10, 11, 12, 25(2)					16
מכר, Niphal Future, be sold			Lev. 25:23, 34, 42; 27:28	Deut. 15:12 (Dtn)			Jer. 34:14	5
מלאה, fullness		Ex. 22:29	Num. 18:27	Deut. 22:9 (Dtn)				3
מלאים, consecration			Ex. 25:7; 29:22, 26, 27, 31, 34; 35:9, 27; Lev. 7:37; 8:22, 28, 29, 31, 33				1 C 29:2	14
מלקחים, tongs			Ex. 25:38; 37:23; Num. 4:9					3
ממכר, sale			Lev. 25:14, 25, 27, 28, 29, 33, 50	Deut. 18:8 (Dtn)			Neh. 13:20; Eze. 7:13	8
מנקיות, bowls			Ex. 25:29; 37:16; Num. 4:7				Jer. 52:19	3

Appendices

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
נסה, Massah, temptation		Ex. 17:7		Deut. 4:34; 6:16; 7:19; 9:22; 29:3; 33:8 (Dtr1)			Job 9:23; Ps. 95:8	7
מסך, hanging			Ex. 26:36, 37; 27:16; 35:12, 15, 17; 36:37; 38:18; 39:34, 38, 40; 40:5, 8, 21, 28, 33; Num. 3:25, 26, 31; 4:5, 25, 26				2 S 17:19; Ps. 105:39; Is. 22:8	22
מסע, journey	Gen. 13:3		Ex. 40:36, 38; Num. 10:2, 6, 12	Deut. 10:11 (Dtr1)	Ex. 17:1; Num. 10:28; 33:2(2)	Num. 33:1		12
מטע, Hiphil Participle, gather little		Num. 11:32	Ex. 16:17, 18					3
מצנפת, mitre			Ex. 28:4, 37(2), 39; 29:6(2); 39:28, 31; Lev. 8:9(2); 16:4				Eze. 21:26	11
מקרא, convocation			Ex. 12:16(2); Lev. 23:2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 21, 24, 27, 35, 36, 37; Num. 10:2		Num. 28:18, 25, 26; 29:1, 7, 12		Neh. 8:8; Is. 1:13; 4:5	20
משארט, bowls		Ex. 8:3; 12:34		Deut. 28:5, 17 (Dtr1)				4
משח, Niphal Infinitive, was anointed			Lev. 6:20; Num. 7:10, 84, 88					4

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
משחה, anointing			Ex. 25:6; 29:7, 21; 30:25(2), 31; 31:11; 35:8, 15, 28; 37:29; 39:38; 40:9; Lev. 7:35(2); 8:2, 10, 12, 30; 10:7; 21:10, 12; Num. 4:16					23
משחה, anointing			Ex. 29:29; 40:15; Num. 18:8					3
משש, feel	Gen. 27:12, 22	Gen. 31:34, 37; Ex. 10:21		Deut. 28:29(2) (Dtr1)			Job 5:14; 12:25	7
נגע(ה)(-)צרת, plague of leprosy			Lev. 13:2, 3, 9, 20, 25, 27, 47, 49, 59; 14:3, 32, 34, 54	Deut. 24:8 (Dtn)				14
דג, plague			Ex. 12:13; 30:12; Num. 8:19; 16:46, 47				Josh. 22:17	5
נדה, sprinkle			Ex. 29:21; Lev. 4:6, 17; 5:9; 6:27(2); 8:11, 30; 14:7, 16, 27, 51; 16:14(2), 15, 19; Num. 8:7; 19:4, 18, 19, 21				2 K 9:33; Is. 52:15; 63:3	21
נחנו, we	Gen. 42:11		Ex. 16:7, 8; Num. 32:32				2 S 17:21; Lam. 3:42	4
נסע, Qal Infinitive, journeyed	Gen. 11:2; 12:9; Num. 10:34, 35		Num. 1:51; 4:5, 15				Josh. 3:14	7

Appendices

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
נסע, Qal Imperative, journey	Num. 14:25			Deut. 1:7, 40:2:24 (Dtr1)				4
נסע, Qal Participle Poel, journeyed	Ex. 14:10; Num. 10:29, 33							3
גופילים, giants	Gen. 6:4; Num. 13:33(2)							3
נפש (ה) חיה, living soul			Gen. 1:20, 21, 24, 30; 2:7, 19; 9:10, 12, 15, 16; Lev. 11:10, 46					12
נצה, strive	Ex. 2:13	Ex. 21:22	Lev. 24:10	Deut. 25:11 (Dtn)	Num. 26:9(2)		2 S 14:6; Ps. 60:title	6
נקבה, female			Lev. 3:1, 6; 4:28, 32; 5:6; 12:5, 7; 15:33; 27:4, 5, 6, 7; Num. 5:3; 31:15	Deut. 4:16 (Dtr1)			Jer. 31:22	15
נקם, Hophal Future, avenge	Gen. 4:15, 24	Ex. 21:21						3
סל, basket		Gen. 40:16, 17(2), 18	Ex. 29:3(2), 23, 32; Lev. 8:2, 26, 31; Num. 6:15, 17, 19				Jud. 6:19	14
סלח, Niphal Preterite, shall be forgiven			Lev. 4:20, 26, 31, 35; 5:10, 13, 16, 18; 6:7; 19:22		Num. 15:25, 26, 28			13
סמים, sweet			Ex. 25:6; 30:7, 34(2); 31:11; 35:8, 15, 28; 37:29; 39:28; 40:27; Lev. 4:7; 16:12; Num. 4:16				2 C 2:4; 13:11	14

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
בֹּשֶׂת, bush	Ex. 3:2(3), 3	Ex. 3:4		Deut. 33:16 (Dtr1)				6
פִּינִי, fin			Lev. 11:9, 10, 12	Deut. 14:9, 10 (Dtn)				5
סֹפֵר, Qal Infinitive, number	Gen. 15:5	Gen. 41:49		Deut. 16:9 (Dtn)				3
סֶלֶה, Qal Preterite, stone		Ex. 17:4		Deut. 13:10; 17:5; 22:21, 24 (Dtn)				5
עָבַד, Hophal Future, serve		Ex. 23:24		Deut. 5:9 (Dtr1); 13:2 (Dtn)		Ex. 20:5		4
עָדָה, remain			Ex. 16:18, 23; 26:12(2), 13; Lev. 25:27; Num. 3:46, 48, 49					9
עַם־קָשָׁה־עֵרָף, a stiff-necked people	Ex. 34:9	Ex. 32:9; 33:3, 5		Deut. 9:6, 13 (Dtr1)				6
עֵרֵירִי, childless	Gen. 15:2		Lev. 20:20, 21				Jer. 22:30	3
עָרַף, Qal Preterite, break the neck	Ex. 34:20	Ex. 13:13		Deut. 21:4 (Dtn)				3
עֶשְׂרֹן, tenth			Ex. 29:40; Lev. 14:10, 21; 23:13, 17; 24:5		Num. 15:4, 6, 9; 28:9, 12(2), 13(2), 20(2), 21(2), 28(2), 29(2); 29:3(2), 4, 9(2), 10(2), 14(2), 15(2)			33

Appendices

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
פטר, opens (the womb), firstborn	Ex. 34:19(2), 20	Ex. 13:2, 12(2), 13, 15	Num. 3:12; 18:15				Eze. 20:26	10
פקד, Qal Participle Pa'ul, numbered			Ex. 30:12, 13, 14; 38:21, 25, 26; Num. 1:21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46; 2:4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28, 30, 31, 32(2); 3:22(2), 34, 39, 43; 4:36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49; 7:2; 14:29; 26:7, 18, 22, 25, 27, 34, 37, 41, 43, 47, 50, 51, 54, 57, 62, 63, 64				1 C 23:24	75
פקדון עון אב(ו)ת על-בנים (ו)על-שלשים ועל-רבעים, visiting the iniquity of the father upon the children to the third and fourth (generation)	Num. 14:18			Deut. 5:9 (Dtr1)		Ex. 20:5		3
פקדון, a deposit		Gen. 41:36	Lev. 6:2, 4					3
פרה, Hiphil Preterite, make fruitful		Gen. 41:52	Gen. 17:6, 20; Lev. 26:9					4

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
פרך, with rigour			Ex. 1:13, 14; Lev. 25:43, 46, 53				Eze. 34:4	5
פרכת, veil			Ex. 26:31, 33(3), 35; 27:21; 30:6; 35:12; 36:35; 38:27; 39:34; 40:3, 21, 22, 26; Lev. 4:6, 17; 16:2, 12, 15; 21:23; 24:3; Num. 4:5; 18:7				2 C 3:14	24
פרסה, (divide) (not) the hoof			Lev. 11:3, 4(2), 5, 6, 7, 26	Deut. 14:6, 7(2), 8 (Dtn)				11
פרש, dung			Ex. 29:14; Lev. 4:11; 8:17; 16:27; Num. 19:5				Mal. 2:3(2)	5
פתיל, cord, cover	Gen. 38:18, 25		Ex. 28:28, 37; 39:3, 21, 31; Num. 15:38; 19:15				Jud. 16:9; Eze. 40:3	9
צחק, laugh	Gen. 18:12, 13, 15(2); 19:14; 26:8; 39:14, 17	Gen. 21:6, 9; Ex. 32:6	Gen. 17:17				Jud. 16:25	12
צמיד, bracelet, cover	Gen. 24:22, 30, 47		Num. 19:15; 31:50				Eze. 16:11; 23:42	5
צפוי, covering			Ex. 38:17, 19; Num. 16:38, 39				Is. 30:22	4
צרע, Qal Participle Paul, leper			Lev. 13:44, 45; 14:3; 22:4; Num. 5:2					5

Appendices

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
קדוש, holy place			Ex. 29:31; Lev. 6:16, 26, 27; 7:6; 10:13; 16:24; 24:9				Ecc. 8:10; Eze. 42:13	8
קדשה, harlot	Gen. 38:21(2), 22			Deut. 23:17 (Dtn)			Hos. 4:14	4
קטר, Hiphil Preterite, burn			Ex. 29:13, 18, 25; 30:7; Lev. 1:9, 13, 15, 17; 2:2, 9, 16; 3:5, 11, 16; 4:10, 19, 31, 35; 5:12; 6:12, 15; 7:5, 31; 9:10; 17:6; Num. 5:26				2 C 28:3; 29:7	26
קלעים, hangings			Ex. 27:9, 11, 12, 14, 15; 35:17; 38:9, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18; 39:40; Num. 3:26; 4:26				1 K 6:34	15
קמץ, take			Lev. 2:2; 5:12; Num. 5:26					3
קמץ, handful		Gen. 41:47	Lev. 2:2; 5:12; 6:15					4
קנא, jealous	Ex. 34:14(2)			Deut. 4:24; 5:9; 6:15 (Dtr1)		Ex. 20:5		6
קערה, dish			Ex. 25:29; 37:16; Num. 4:7; 7:13, 19, 25, 31, 37, 43, 49, 55, 61, 67, 73, 79, 84, 85					17
קרא, Qal Future, befall	Gen. 42:4; 49:1	Ex. 1:10	Lev. 10:19					4

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
קרב, Hiphil Preterite, come or bring	Gen. 12:11		Ex. 14:10; 29:3, 10; 40:12; Lev. 1:5, 13, 14, 15; 2:8; 4:3; 7:35; 16:9, 11, 20; Num. 5:16; 6:16; 8:9, 10; 9:13; 16:5, 17		Num. 15:4, 9, 27		Jud. 5:25; Jer. 30:21	25
קרב, Hiphil Preterite, offer			Lev. 3:3, 7, 9, 12, 14; 4:14; 5:8; 7:8, 12, 14; 10:19; 12:7; 14:12; 16:6; 23:8, 16, 18, 25, 27, 36; Num. 5:25; 6:14; 7:18, 19; 16:38, 39		Num. 28:19, 27; 29:8, 13, 36		Ezra 8:35; Eze. 43:24	31
קרב, Hiphil Infinitive, offer			Lev. 7:16, 38; 17:4; 21:17, 21(2); 23:37; Num. 3:4; 9:7; 26:61		Num. 15:13; 28:2		Jud. 3:18; 2 C 35:12; Eze. 44:7, 15	12
קרב, Hiphil Participle, offer			Lev. 3:1, 7; 7:8, 9, 18, 29, 33; 21:6, 8; Num. 7:12; 16:35		Num. 15:4			12

Appendices

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
קרבן, offering			Lev. 1:2(2), 3, 10, 14(2); 2:1(2), 4, 5, 7, 12, 13(2); 3:1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 12, 14; 4:23, 28, 32; 5:11; 6:20; 7:13, 14, 15, 16, 29, 38; 9:7, 15; 17:4; 22:18, 27; 23:14; 27:9, 11; Num. 5:15; 6:14, 21; 7:3, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 19, 23, 25, 29, 31, 35, 37, 41, 43, 47, 49, 53, 55, 59, 61, 65, 67, 71, 73, 77, 79, 83; 9:7, 13; 18:9; 31:50		Num. 15:4, 25; 28:2		Eze. 20:28; 40:43	78
קראש, board			Ex. 26:15, 16(2), 17(2), 18(2), 19(3), 20, 21(2), 22, 23, 25(3), 26, 27(2), 28, 29; 35:11; 36:20, 21(2), 22(2), 23(2), 24(3), 25, 26(2), 27, 28, 30(2), 31, 32(2), 33, 34; 39:33; 40:18; Num. 3:36, 4:31				Eze. 27:6	50

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
קִשּׁוֹה, קִשּׁוֹה, cover			Ex. 25:29; 37:16; Num. 4:7				1 C 28:17	3
ראה, Hophal Preterite, see			Ex. 26:30; Lev. 13:49	Deut. 4:35 (Dtr1)				3
רָבַץ, Qal Participle Poel, lie	Gen. 4:7; 29:2; 49:14, 25	Ex. 23:5		Deut. 22:6 (Dtn); 33:13 (Dtr1)			Eze. 29:3	7
רָגַם, Qal Infinitive, stone			Lev. 24:16; Num. 14:10; 15:35					3
רָהַט, trough	Gen. 30:38, 41; Ex. 2:16							3
חֶלְבֵּן (ל)רִיחַ נִיחּוֹחַ			Ex. 29:18, 25, 41; Lev. 2:12; 3:16; 6:15; 8:21, 28; 23:13		Num. 28:6, 13; 29:6, 8		Eze. 6:13; 16:19	13
חֶלְבֵּן (ל)רִיחַ לַיהוָה			Lev. 4:31; 6:21; 17:6; Num. 18:17		Num. 15:3, 7, 24; 28:27; 29:2, 8			10
רָמַשׁ, creep			Gen. 1:21, 26, 28, 30; 7:8, 14, 21; 8:17, 19; 9:2; Lev. 11:44, 46; 20:25	Deut. 4:18 (Dtr1)			Ps. 69:34; 104:20; Eze. 38:20	14
רָצַח, Qal Future, murder			Num. 35:30	Deut. 4:42; 5:17 (Dtr1)		Ex. 20:13		4
רָקִיק, wafer			Ex. 29:2, 23; Lev. 2:4; 7:12; 8:26; Num. 6:15, 19				1 C 23:29	7
שָׂאֵר, leaven		Ex. 13:7	Ex. 12:15, 19; Lev. 2:11	Deut. 16:4 (Dtn)				5

Appendices

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
שלי (kethib), שליו (qere), quail		Num. 11:31, 32	Ex. 16:13				Ps. 105:40	3
שעיר, goat			Lev. 4:24; 9:15; 10:16; 16:7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 18, 20, 21(2), 22(2), 26, 27		Num. 28:22; 29:22, 28, 31, 34, 38		2 C 29:23; Eze. 43:25	22
שעיר(־)עזים, kid of the goats	Gen. 37:31		Lev. 4:23; 9:3; 16:5; 23:19; Num. 7:16, 22, 28, 34, 40, 46, 52, 58, 64, 70, 76, 82		Num. 15:24; 28:15, 30; 29:5, 11, 16, 19, 25		Eze. 43:22; 45:23	25
שאר, kinsman			Lev. 18:6, 12, 13; 20:19; 21:2; 25:49; Num. 27:11					7
שבר, buy	Gen. 42:2, 3, 6, 10; 43:2, 4, 20, 22; 44:25	Gen. 41:56, 57; 42:5, 7; 47:14		Deut. 2:6, 28 (Dtr1)			Prov. 11:26; Is. 55:1(2); Am. 8:5, 6	16
שבת שבתון, sabbath of rest			Ex. 31:15; 35:2; Lev. 16:31; 23:3, 32; 25:4					6
שבתון, sabbath			Ex. 16:23; Lev. 23:24, 39(2); 25:5					5
שגר, offspring		Ex. 13:12		Deut. 7:13; 28:4, 18, 51 (Dtr1)				5
שחין, boil			Ex. 9:9, 10, 11(2); Lev. 13:18, 19, 20, 23	Deut. 28:27, 35 (Dtr1)			2 K 20:7; Job 2:7; Is. 38:21	10

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
שטה, shittim			Ex. 25:5, 10, 13, 23, 28; 26:15, 26, 32, 37; 27:1, 6; 30:1, 5; 35:7, 24; 36:20, 31, 36; 37:1, 4, 10, 15, 25, 28; 38:1, 6	Deut. 10:3 (Dtr1)			Is. 41:19	27
שכבה, lying (carnally)			Lev. 15:16, 17, 18, 32; 19:20; 22:4; Num. 5:13					7
שכבת, lying (carnally)			Lev. 18:20, 23; 20:15; Num. 5:20					4
שכן, Piel Infinitive, dwell, place			Num. 14:30	Deut. 12:11; 14:23; 16:2, 6, 11; 26:2 (Dtn)			Neh. 1:9	7
של(ו)ש פעמים בשנה יראה כל-זכורך את-פני three times in the year all of your males shall appear before	Ex. 34:23	Ex. 23:17		Deut. 16:16 (Dtn)				3
שטע, cleft			Lev. 11:3, 7, 26	Deut. 14:6 (Dtn)				4
שרץ, bring forth abundantly		Ex. 8:3	Gen. 1:20, 21; 8:17; 9:7; Ex. 1:7				Ps. 105:30	6
שרץ, creep			Gen. 7:21; Lev. 11:29, 41, 42, 43, 46				Eze. 47:9	6
שרץ, creeping thing			Gen. 1:20; 7:21; Lev. 5:2; 11:10, 20, 21, 23, 29, 31, 41, 42, 43, 44; 22:5	Deut. 14:19 (Dtn)				15

Appendices

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
שש, fine linen		Gen. 41:42	Ex. 25:4; 26:1, 31, 36; 27:9, 16, 18; 28:5, 6, 8, 15, 39(2); 35:6, 23, 25, 35; 36:8, 35, 37; 38:9, 16, 18, 23; 39:2, 3, 5, 8, 27, 28(3), 29				Prov. 31:22; Eze. 16:10, 13; 27:7	34
שתי(-) תרים או(-) שני בני(-) יונה, two turtledoves or two young pigeons			Lev. 5:7; 12:18; 14:22; 15:14, 29; Num. 6:10					6
תבה, ark	Gen. 7:1, 7, 17, 18, 23; 8:6, 9(2), 10, 13; 9:18; Ex. 2:3, 5		Gen. 6:14(2), 15, 16(2), 18, 19; 7:9, 13, 15; 8:1, 4, 16, 19; 9:10					28
תושב, sojourner			Gen. 23:4; Ex. 12:45; Lev. 22:10; 25:6, 23, 35, 40, 45, 47(2); Num. 35:15				1 K 17:1; 1 C 29:15; Ps. 39:12	11
תחש, badger			Ex. 25:5; 26:14; 35:7, 23; 36:19; 39:34; Num. 4:6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 25				Eze. 16:10	13
תחת אשר, because			Num. 25:13	Deut. 21:14 (Dtn); 28:62 (Dtr1)				3
תלנות, murmuring			Ex. 16:7, 8(2), 9, 12; Num. 14:27; 17:5, 10					8

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix C								
Words that appear only or primarily in the Pentateuch								
Word	J	E	P	D	R	Other	Elsewhere	Occurs
תמונה, likeness		Num. 12:8		Deut. 4:12, 15, 16, 23 (Dtr1), 25 (Dtr2); 5:8 (Dtr1)		Ex. 20:4	Job 4:16; Ps. 17:15	8
תנוך, tip			Ex. 29:20(2); Lev. 8:23, 24					4
תנופה, wave offering			Ex. 29:24, 26, 27; 35:22; 38:24, 29; Lev. 7:30, 34; 8:27, 29; 9:21; 10:14, 15(2); 14:12, 21, 24; 23:15, 17, 20; Num. 6:20(2); 8:11, 13, 15, 21; 18:11, 18					28
Totals								
216								2291

Appendix D							
Words that appear in J but not in K or in K but not in J							
Words that appear only or primarily in J				Words that appear only or primarily in K			
Word	References	Elsewhere	Occurs	Word	References	Elsewhere	Occurs
אות, consent	Gen. 34:15, 22, 23	2 K 12:8	3	אל תכחד ממי, Don't hide it from me*	Josh. 7:19; 1 S 3:17; 2 S 14:18	Jer. 38:14, 25	3
אלמה, sheaf	Gen. 37:7(4)		4	אסר, Qal Infinitive, bind	Jud. 15:10, 12, 13; 16:11		4

Appendices

Appendix D							
Words that appear in J but not in K or in K but not in J							
Words that appear only or primarily in J				Words that appear only or primarily in K			
Word	References	Elsewhere	Occurs	Word	References	Elsewhere	Occurs
אמתחת, sack	Gen. 42:27, 28; 43:12, 18, 21(2), 22, 23; 44:1(2), 2, 8, 11, 12		14	ארב, Qal Participle Pöel, lie in wait	Josh. 8:2, 4, 7, 12, 14, 19, 21; Jud. 16:9, 12; 20:29, 33, 36, 37(2), 38	1 S 22:8, 13; Ezz. 8:31	15
בכירה, firstborn	Gen. 19:31, 33, 34, 37; 29:26	1 S 14:49	5	ארגז, coffer	1 S 6:8, 11, 15		3
גברת, mistress	Gen. 16:4, 8, 9	2 K 5:3	3	בלה, old	Josh. 9:4(2), 5(2)		4
זקנימ, old age	Gen. 21:2, 7; 44:20	Gen. 37:3 (E)	3	בליעל, good-for-nothing*	Jud. 19:22; 20:13; 1 S 1:16; 2:12; 10:27; 25:17, 25; 30:22; 2 S 16:7; 20:1	1 K 21:10, 13; 2 C 13:7	10
חומ, brown	Gen. 30:32, 33, 35, 40		4	בריה, meat	2 S 13:5, 7, 10		3
חנט, embalm	Gen. 50:2(2), 3	Gen. 50:26 (E)	3	בשר, news*	1 S 4:17; 31:9; 2 S 4:10; 18:19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 27, 31; 1 K 1:42	2 K 7:9; (1 C 10:9)	11
טלא, spotted	Gen. 30:32(2), 33, 35(2), 39	Josh. 9:5	6	גג, roof (as setting)*	Josh. 2:6 (bis), 8; Jud. 9:51; 16:27; 2 S 11:2; 16:22; 18:24	1 S 9:25f	8
כורים, true	Gen. 42:11, 19, 31, 33, 34		5	(ל)התחתן במלך, be the king's son-in-law	1 S 18:22, 23, 26, 27		4
לאם, people	Gen. 25:23(3); 27:29		4	ויהי איש אחד מן, and there was a man from*	Jud. 13:2; 1 S 1:1		2
מטעמים, savoury meat	Gen. 27:4, 7, 9, 14, 17, 31		6	וי(י)שר הדבר בעיני, and the thing was right in the eyes of	1 S 18:20, 26; 2 S 17:4	2 C 30:4	3

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix D							
Words that appear in J but not in K or in K but not in J							
Words that appear only or primarily in J				Words that appear only or primarily in K			
Word	References	Elsewhere	Occurs	Word	References	Elsewhere	Occurs
מלט, niphatal imperative, escape	Gen. 19:17(2), 22		3	ותצלה רוחו (יהוה), and the Spirit of the Lord came	Jud. 14:6, 19; 15:14; 1 S 16:13		4
נסע, Qal Participle Poel, journeyed	Ex. 14:10; Num. 10:29, 33		3	חבא, Niphatal Participle, hid	Josh. 10:17; 1 S 10:22; 2 S 17:9		3
נפילים, giants	Gen. 6:4; Num. 13:33(2)		3	חגר, Qal Participle Pa'ul, girded	Jud. 18:11, 16, 17; 1 S 2:18; 2 S 6:14; 20:8; 21:16	Ex. 12:11 (P)	7
עירם, naked	Gen. 3:7, 10, 11		3	חוד, put forth (a riddle)	Jud. 14:12, 13, 16		3
עקב, heel	Gen. 3:15; 25:26; 49:17, 19	Jud. 5:22	4	חמש, fifth (rib)	2 S 2:23; 3:27; 4:6; 20:10		4
ערבון, pledge	Gen. 38:17, 18, 20		3	טחורים, hemorrhoids	1 S 5:6, 9, 12; 6:4, 5, 11, 17		7
פצל פצלות, to peel, peelings	Gen. 30:37(2), 38		3	יתר, cord	Jud. 16:7, 8, 9		3
ציד, hunter, venison	Gen. 10:9(2); 25:27, 28; 27:3, 5, 7, 19, 25, 30, 31, 33		12	כרתית, Cherethites	2 S 8:18; 15:18; 20:7, 23; 1 K 1:38, 44	(1 C 18:17)	6
צעיף, veil	Gen. 24:65; 38:14, 19		3	לבבות, cakes	2 S 13:6, 8, 10		3
קדשה, harlot	Gen. 38:21(2), 22		3	לחי, jawbone	Jud. 15:15, 16(2), 17(2), 19(2)	Deut. 18:3 (Dtn); 1 K 22:24; (2 C 18:23)	7
רהט, trough	Gen. 30:38, 41; Ex. 2:16		3	לקח, Niphatal Preterite, is taken	1 S 4:11, 17, 22		3
שר בית, הסהר, keeper of the prison	Gen. 39:21, 22, 23		3	מורה, razor	Jud. 13:5; 16:17; 1 S 1:11		3

Appendices

Appendix D							
Words that appear in J but not in K or in K but not in J							
Words that appear only or primarily in J				Words that appear only or primarily in K			
Word	References	Elsewhere	Occurs	Word	References	Elsewhere	Occurs
שבר, corn	Gen. 42:1, 2, 19, 26; 43:2; 44:2	Gen. 47:14 (E); Neh. 10:31	6	מחסור, want	Jud. 18:10; 19:19, 20		3
שלוש, Pual Participle, three years old	Gen. 15:9(3)		3	מימים ימימה, regularly*	Jud. 11:40; 21:19; 1 S 1:3; 2:19		4
שקה, Hiphil Imperative, give drink	Gen. 24:43, 45; 29:7	Jud. 4:19	3	מלך, Qal Imperative, reign	Jud. 9:8, 10, 12, 14		4
				נאד, bottle	Josh. 9:4, 13; 1 S 16:20	Jud. 4:19	3
Totals				נבל, bottle	1 S 1:24; 25:18; 2 S 16:1	1 S 10:3	3
27			118	נגן, play music	1 S 16:16(2), 17, 18, 23; 18:10; 19:9	1 K 3:15(3)	7
				נוע, Qal Infinitive, to be promoted	Jud. 9:9, 11, 13		3
				־(ל)סרני־, פלשתים, lords of the Philistines	Josh. 13:3; Jud. 16:5, 8, 18(2), 23, 27; 1 S 5:8, 11; 6:4, 12, 16; 7:7; 29:2, 7	Jud. 3:3; 1 C 12:19	15
				עור, blind	2 S 5:6, 8(2)	Ex. 4:11 (E)	3
				עכבר, mouse	1 S 6:4, 5, 11, 18		4
				פלתי, Pelethites	2 S 8:18; 15:18; 20:7, 23; 1 K 1:38, 44	(1 C 18:17)	6
				פסל, graven image	Jud. 17:3, 4; 18:14, 17, 18, 20, 30, 31	2 K 21:7; (2 C 33:7)	8
				פרדה, mule	1 K 1:33, 38, 44		3

The Logical Fallacies of the Documentary Hypothesis

Appendix D							
Words that appear in J but not in K or in K but not in J							
Words that appear only or primarily in J				Words that appear only or primarily in K			
Word	References	Elsewhere	Occurs	Word	References	Elsewhere	Occurs
				צמוקים, clusters of raisins	1 S 25:18; 30:12; 2 S 16:1	1 C 12:40	3
				צמח, Piel, hair grows out*	Jud. 16:22; 2 S 10:5	(1 C 19:5)	2
				צריך, hold	Jud. 9:46, 49(2)	1 S 13:6	3
				קצין, captain	Josh. 10:24; Jud. 11:6, 11		3
				רוש, poor	1 S 18:23; 2 S 12:1, 3, 4		4
				רפה, giant	2 S 21:16, 18, 20, 22		4
				שחק, perform*	Jud. 16:25, 27; 1 S 18:7; 2 S 2:14; 6:5, 21	(1 C 13:8); (15:29); 30:10	6
				שכר, strong drink	Jud. 13:4, 7, 14; 1 S 1:15		4
				שמועה, report	1 S 2:24; 4:19; 2 S 4:4; 13:30; 1 K 2:28	1 K 19:7; (2 C 9:6)	5
				תרפים, teraphim*	Jud. 17:5; 18:14, 17, 18, 20; 1 S 15:23; 19:13, 16	Gen. 31:19, 34f (E); 2 K 23:24	8
				Totals			
				47			231

Appendices

Appendix E			
Additional words that appear only or primarily in both J and K			
Word	References	Elsewhere	Occurs
אנשי המקום, men of the place	Gen. 26:7(2); 29:22; 38:22; Jud. 19:16		5
לה, green	Gen. 30:37; Jud. 16:7, 8	Num. 6:3 (P)	3
לקח, Pual Preterite, taken out	Gen. 2:23; 3:19, 23; Jud. 17:2	2 K 2:10	4
מלא, Qal Future, shall be filled	Gen. 25:24; 50:3(2); Ex. 15:9; 2 S 7:12	Est. 2:12	5
נגד, Hophal Future, told	Gen. 22:20; 27:42; 38:13, 24; Ex. 14:5; Jos. 10:17; Jud. 9:25, 47; 1 S 15:12; 19:19; 27:4; 2 S 6:12; 10:17; 19:1; 21:11; 1 K 1:51; 2:29, 41	Gen. 31:22 (E); 1 S 23:7; 2 K 6:13; 8:7; (1 C 19:17)	18
צחק, laugh	Gen. 18:12, 13, 15(2); 19:14; 26:8; 39:14, 17; Jud. 16:25	Gen. 17:17 (P); 21:6, 9; Ex. 32:6 (E)	9
שבע, Niphal Imperative, swear	Gen. 25:33; 47:31; Jos. 2:12; Jud. 15:12; 1 S 30:15	Gen. 21:23 (E); 1 S 24:21	5
Totals			
7			49

Bibliography

- Abbott, R.
2011 Forked Parallelism in Egyptian, Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetry. *Tyndale Bulletin* 62: 41-64.
2011 *Triumphal Accounts in Hebrew and Egyptian*. No Location: Matteh Publications. https://play.google.com/store/books/details?id=Hp4xGdqmw7MC&rdid=bookHp4xGdqmw7MC&rdot=1&source=gbs_vpt_read&pcampaignid=books_booksearch_viewport.
- Abeles, F. F.
1994 *The Mathematical Pamphlets of Charles Lutwidge Dodgson and Related Pieces*, Vol. 2 of *The Pamphlets of Lewis Carroll*, ed. S. Marx and E. Guiliano. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia.
- Allis, O. T.
1943 *The Five Books of Moses*. Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co. [Repr. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2001]
- Alter, R.
1981 *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. N.Y.: Basic Books.
- Anderson, B. W.
1975 *Understanding the Old Testament*, 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Archer, Jr., G. L.
1974 *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*. Chicago: Moody Press.
1982 *Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.

- Arp, R., Barbone, S. and Bruce, M., ed.
2019 *Bad Arguments: 100 of the Most Important Fallacies in Western Philosophy*. Oxford: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Baden, J. S.
2009 *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*. FAT 68. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck.
2012 *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Barnet, S., Berman, M. and Burto, W.
1963 *An Introduction to Literature*, 2nd ed. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, Inc.
- Berman, J. A.
2011 CTH 133 and the Hittite Provenance of Deuteronomy 13. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130: 25-44.
2017 *Inconsistency in the Torah: Ancient Literary Convention and the Limits of Source Criticism*. N.Y.: Oxford University Press.
2020 *Ani Maamin: Biblical Criticism, Historical Truth, and the Thirteen Principles of Faith*. Jerusalem: Maggid Books.
- Bloch, Y.
2012 The Third-Person Masculine Plural Suffixed Pronoun *-mw* and Its Implications for the Dating of Biblical Hebrew Poetry. Pp. 147-170 in *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*, ed. C. Miller-Naudé and Z. Zevit. Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic 8. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Boyd III, J. L.
1986 An Example of the Influence of Egyptian on the Development of the Hebrew Language During the Second Millennium B.C. Pp. 191-195 in *A Tribute to Gleason Archer*, ed. W. C. Kaiser, Jr., and R. F. Youngblood. Chicago: Moody Press.
- Bradbury, R.
2003 *Fahrenheit 451*, 50th anniversary ed. N.Y.: The Random House Publishing Group.
- Buber, M.
1967 *The Kingship of God*, 3rd ed., trans. R. Schiemann. N.Y.: Harper and Row, Publisher.

Bibliography

- Budge, E. A.
1901 *Egyptian Magic*, Vol. II of *Books on Egypt and Chaldea*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., Ltd. [Repr. N.Y.: Dover Publications, Inc., 1971]
- Carmichael, C.
1974 *The Laws of Deuteronomy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Carr, D. M.
2011 *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2011 Scribal Processes of Coordination/Harmonization and the Formation of the First Hexateuch(s). Pp. 63-83 in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*, ed. T. B. Dozeman, K. Schmid and B. J. Schwartz. FAT 78. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck.
- Carroll, L.
1887 *Alice on the Stage. The Theatre*. [Reproduced in *Alice in Wonderland*, ed. D. J. Gray. N.Y.: W.W. Norton and Company, 1971]
1965 *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland and Through the Looking Glass*. N.Y.: Airmont Publishing Company, Inc.
- Cassuto, U.
1941 *Torath HaTeudoth*. The Hebrew University: Magnes Press. [Repr. as *The Documentary Hypothesis and the Composition of the Pentateuch*, trans. I. Abrahams. Jerusalem: Shalem Press, 2006]
- Clines, D. J. A.
1988 Introduction to the Biblical Story: Genesis-Esther. Pp. 74-84 in *Harper's Bible Commentary*, ed. J. L. Mays. San Francisco: Harper and Row, Publishers.
- Cohen, C.
2012 Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew Lexicography and Its Ramifications for Textual Analysis. Pp. 361-375 in *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*, ed. C. Miller-Naudé and Z. Zevit. Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic 8. Winoona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Corbett, E. P. J.
1965 *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*. N.Y.: Oxford University Press.

- Davies, P. R.
2003 Biblical Hebrew and the History of Ancient Judah: Typology, Chronology and Common Sense. Pp. 150-163 in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. I. Young. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 369. London: T&T Clark International.
- Dresher, B. E.
2012 Methodological Issues in the Dating of Linguistic Forms: Considerations from the Perspective of Contemporary Linguistic Theory. Pp. 19-38 in *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*, ed. C. Miller-Naudé and Z. Zevit. Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic 8. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Driver, S. R.
1898 *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 8th ed. N.Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Ehrensward, M.
2003 Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts. Pp. 164-188 in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. I. Young. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 369. London: T&T Clark International.
- Eissfeldt, O.
1965 *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, trans. P. R. Ackroyd. N.Y.: Harper and Row, Publishers.
- Emerton, J. A.
1987 An Examination of Some Attempts to Defend the Unity of the Flood Narrative in Genesis: Part 1. *Vetus Testamentum* 37: 401-420.
- Finn, A. H.
N.D. *The Unity of the Pentateuch*, 2nd ed. London: Marshall Brothers, Ltd.
- Ford, C. H.
2021 *Who Really Wrote the Bible? A Response to the Documentary Hypothesis*. No Location: Kindle Publishing.
- Franklin, B.
1976 *The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin*. Norwalk, CT: The Easton Press.

Bibliography

Freeman, H.

- 1968 *An Introduction to the Old Testament Prophets*. Chicago: Moody Press.

Friedman, R. E.

- 1981 Sacred History and Theology: The Redaction of Torah. Pp. 25-34 in *The Creation of Sacred Literature*, ed. R. E. Friedman. University of California Publications: Near Eastern Studies 22. Berkeley: University of California Press. [Repr. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1995]
- 1981 *The Exile and Biblical Narrative: The Formation of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly Works*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 22. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.
- 1987 Review of *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*. *Journal of Religion* 67: 539-540.
- 1987 *Who Wrote the Bible?* N.Y.: Summit Books.
- 1992 Torah (Pentateuch). Pp. 605-622 in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Vol. 6, ed. D. N. Freedman. N.Y.: Doubleday.
- 1996 Some Recent Non-arguments Concerning the Documentary Hypothesis. Pp. 87-101 in *Texts, Temples, and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran*, ed. M. V. Fox, et al. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- 1997 *Who Wrote the Bible?* 2nd ed. N.Y.: HarperSanFrancisco.
- 1999 *The Hidden Book in the Bible*. N.Y.: HarperCollins Publishers.
- 2003 *The Bible with Sources Revealed*. N.Y.: HarperCollins Publishers.
- 2005 Foreword. Ten unnumbered pages in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, ed. J. H. Tigay. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- 2008 Three Major Redactors of the Torah. Pp. 31-44 in *Birkat Shalom: Studies in the Bible, Ancient Near Eastern Literature, and Postbiblical Judaism Presented to Shalom M. Paul on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. C. Cohen, et al. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- 2017 *The Exodus*. N.Y.: HarperCollins Publishers.
- 2019 *Who Wrote the Bible?*, 2nd ed., with a new Epilogue. N.Y.: Simon & Schuster.

- Gaines, J. M. H.
2015 *The Poetic Priestly Source*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- Gertz, J. C.
2011 Source Criticism in the Primeval History of Genesis: An Outdated Paradigm for the Study of the Pentateuch? Pp. 169-180 in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*, ed. T. B. Dozeman, K. Schmid and B. J. Schwartz. FAT 78. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck.
- Gesenius, W., Kautzsch, E., and Cowley, A. E.
1988 *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gile, J.
2011 Ezekiel 16 and the Song of Moses: A Prophetic Transformation? *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130: 87-108.
- Grossman, M. L.
2016 Community Rule or Community Rules: Examining a Supplementary Approach in Light of the Sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls. Pp. 303-330 in *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism*, ed. R. F. Person, Jr., and R. Rezetko. Ancient Israel and Its Literature 25. Atlanta: SBL Press.
- Guthrie, Jr., H. H.
1971 The Book of Numbers. Pp. 85-99 in *The Interpreter's One-Volume Commentary on the Bible*, ed. C. M. Laymon. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Haley, J. W.
1977 *Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible*, reprint ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- Hamilton, V. P.
1982 *Handbook on the Pentateuch*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- Hendel, R.
2000 "Begetting" and "Being Born" in the Pentateuch: Notes on Historical Linguistics and Source Criticism. *Vetus Testamentum* 50: 38-46.
- Holquist, M.
1969 What is a Boojum? Nonsense and Modernism. *Yale French Studies*, XLIII: 145-164. [Reproduced in *Alice in*

- Wonderland*, ed. D. J. Gray. N.Y.: W.W. Norton and Company, 1971]
- Hurvitz, A.
 1967 The Usage of שש and בּוּי in the Bible and Its Implication for the Date of P. *Harvard Theological Review* 60: 117–121.
 1972 בין לשון ללשון Jerusalem: Bialik Institute.
 1974 The Evidence of Language in Dating the Priestly Code. *Revue Biblique* 81: 24–56.
 1982 *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship Between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel*. Paris: Gabalda.
 1995 Continuity and Innovation in Biblical Hebrew—The Case of “Semantic Change” in Post-Exilic Writings. Pp. 1–10 in *Abr-Nahrain*, Supp. 4. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters Publishers.
 1999 The Relevance of Biblical Hebrew Linguistics for the Historical Study of Ancient Israel. Pp. 21*–33* in *Proceedings of the Twelfth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, July 29-August 5, 1997: Division A: The Bible and Its World*. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies.
- Hyatt, J. P.
 1971 The Compiling of Israel’s Story. Pp. 1082–1089 in *The Interpreter’s One-Volume Commentary on the Bible*, ed. C. M. Laymon. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Josephus
 1959 *The Jewish Wars*, trans. by G. A. Williamson. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd.
- Kaufman, S. A.
 1982 The Temple Scroll and Higher Criticism. *Hebrew Union College Annual* 53: 29–43.
- Kitchen, K. A.
 1966 *Ancient Orient and Old Testament*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
 1996 *Ramesside Inscriptions Translated & Annotated: Translations*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. [Repr. Wallasey, Great Britain: Abercromby Press, 2019]
 2003 *On the Reliability of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

- Kohn, R. L.
2002 *A New Heart and A New Soul: Ezekiel, the Exile and the Torah*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 358. London: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Kugel, J. L.
1985 Poetry. Pp. 804-806 in *Harper's Bible Dictionary*, ed. P. J. Achtemeier. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Lenzi, A.
2016 Scribal Revision and Textual Variation in Akkadian *Šuila*-Prayers: Two Case Studies in Ritual Adaptation. Pp. 63-108 in *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism*, ed. R. F. Person, Jr., and R. Rezetko. Ancient Israel and Its Literature 25. Atlanta: SBL Press.
- Lewis, C. S.
2014 Modern Theology and Biblical Criticism. Pp. 187-205 in *Christian Reflections*, ed. W. Hooper. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Lichtheim, M.
1971-2 Have the Principles of Ancient Egyptian Metrics Been Discovered? *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt*, 9: 103-110.
2006 *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, Vol. II, 2nd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Marquis, L. M.
2013 The Composition of Numbers 32: A New Proposal. *Vetus Testamentum*, 63: 408-432.
- Martin, W. J.
1955 *Stylistic Criteria and the Analysis of the Pentateuch*. London: The Tyndale Press.
- McEvenue, S. E.
1971 *The Narrative Style of the Priestly Writer*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- Menke, F. G.
1977 *The Encyclopedia of Sports*, 6th ed. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, Inc.
- Milgrom, J.
1991 *Leviticus 1-16*. Anchor Bible 3. N.Y.: Doubleday.
1992 Numbers, Book of. Pp. 1146-1155 in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Vol. 4, ed. D. N. Freedman. N.Y.: Doubleday.

- 2008 The Desecration of YHWH's Name: Its Parameters and Significance. Pp. 69-81 in *Birkat Shalom: Studies in the Bible, Ancient Near Eastern Literature, and Postbiblical Judaism Presented to Shalom M. Paul on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. C. Cohen, et al. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Milic, L. T., ed.
1969 *Stylists on Style*. N.Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Milstein, S. J.
2016 Outsourcing Gilgamesh. Pp. 37-62 in *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism*, ed. R. F. Person, Jr., and R. Rezetko. *Ancient Israel and Its Literature* 25. Atlanta: SBL Press.
- Moore, G. F.
1985 Tatian's Diatessaron and the Analysis of the Pentateuch. Pp. 244-256 in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, ed. J. H. Tigay. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. [Repr. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2005]
- Newman, L. I. and Popper, W.
1917 *Studies in Biblical Parallelism Part I: Parallelism in Amos Part II: Parallelism in Isaiah Chapters 1-10*. [Repr., Miami: Hardpress Publishing, n.d.]
- Nihan, C.
2011 The Laws about Clean and Unclean Animals in Leviticus and Deuteronomy and Their Place in the Formation of the Pentateuch. Pp. 401-432 in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*, ed. T. B. Dozeman, K. Schmid and B. J. Schwartz. FAT 78. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck.
- Notarius, T.
2012 The Archaic System of Verbal Tenses in "Archaic" Biblical Poetry. Pp. 193-207 in *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*, ed. C. Miller-Naudé and Z. Zevit. *Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic* 8. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Noth, M.
1972 *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, trans. B. Anderson. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Person, Jr., R. F.
2016 *From Conversation to Oral Tradition: A Simplest Systematics for Oral Traditions*. Routledge Studies in Rhetoric and Stylistics 10. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Person, Jr., R. F. and Rezetko, R.
2016 Introduction. Pp. 1-35 in *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism*, ed. R. F. Person, Jr., and R. Rezetko. Ancient Israel and Its Literature 25. Atlanta: SBL Press.
- Peter, L. J.
1977 *Peter's Quotations: Ideas for Our Time*. N.Y.: William Morrow and Company, Inc.
- Polzin, R.
1976 *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Pritchard, J. B., ed.
1969 *Ancient Near Eastern Texts: Third Edition with Supplement*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Propp, W. H. C.
1996 The Priestly Source Recovered Intact? *Vetus Testamentum* 46: 458-478.
- Rav-Noy, E. and Weinreich, G.
2010 *Who Really Wrote the Bible?* No Location: Richard Vigilante Books.
- Rehork, J.
1980 Postscript to the Revised Edition. Pp. 387-393 in Werner Keller, *The Bible as History*, 2nd Revised Edition, trans. W. Neil and B. H. Rasmussen. N.Y.: William Morrow and Company, Inc.
- Rendsburg, G. A.
1980 Late Biblical Hebrew and the Date of P. *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 12: 65-80.
2003 Hurvitz Redux: On the Continued Scholarly Inattention to a Simple Principle of Hebrew Philology. Pp. 104-128 in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. I. Young. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 369. London: T&T Clark International.
2008 Alliteration in the Exodus Narrative. Pp. 83-100 in *Birkat Shalom: Studies in the Bible, Ancient Near Eastern Lit-*

- erature, and Postbiblical Judaism Presented to Shalom M. Paul on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. C. Cohen, et al. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- 2016 The Literary Unity of the Exodus Narrative. Pp. 113-132 in *"Did I Not Bring Israel Out of Egypt?" Biblical, Archaeological, and Egyptological Perspectives on the Exodus Narratives*, ed. J. K. Hoffmeier, A. R. Millard and G. A. Rendsburg. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Rendtorff, R.
1990 *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch*, trans. J. J. Scullion. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 89. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Rezetko, R.
2003 Dating Biblical Hebrew: Evidence from Samuel-Kings and Chronicles. Pp. 215-250 in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. I. Young. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 369. London: T&T Clark International.
2016 The (Dis)Connection between Textual and Linguistic Developments in the Book of Jeremiah: Hebrew Bible Textual Criticism Challenges Biblical Hebrew Historical Linguistics. Pp. 239-269 in *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism*, ed. R. F. Person, Jr., and R. Rezetko. Ancient Israel and Its Literature 25. Atlanta: SBL Press.
- Rofé, A.
1985 Joshua 20: Historico-Literary Criticism Illustrated. Pp. 131-147 in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, ed. J. H. Tigay. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. [Repr. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2005]
1987 The Battle of David and Goliath: Folklore, Theology, Eschatology. Pp. 117-151 in *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel*, ed. J. Neusner, B. A. Levine, and E. S. Frerichs. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Sandmel, S.
1978 *The Hebrew Scriptures: An Introduction to Their Literature and Religious Ideas*. N.Y.: Oxford University Press.

- Schwartz, B. J.
1996 The Priestly Account of the Theophany and Lawgiving at Sinai. Pp. 103-134 in *Texts, Temples, and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran*, ed. M. V. Fox, et al. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Schmid, K.
2011 Has European Scholarship Abandoned the Documentary Hypothesis? Some Reminders on Its History and Remarks on Its Current Status. Pp. 17-30 in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*, ed. T. B. Dozeman, K. Schmid and B. J. Schwartz. FAT 78. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck.
- Segert, S.
1983 Parallelism in Ugaritic Poetry. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 103: 295-306.
- Simpson, C. A.
1953 Genesis. Pp. 439-829 in *The Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. I, ed. G. A. Buttrick. N.Y.: Abingdon Press.
1953 The Growth of the Hexateuch. Pp. 185-200 in *The Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. I, ed. G. A. Buttrick. N.Y.: Abingdon Press.
- Ska, J.
2011 The Limits of Interpretation. Pp. 109-122 in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*, ed. T. B. Dozeman, K. Schmid and B. J. Schwartz. FAT 78. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck.
- Sommer, B. D.
2011 Dating Pentateuchal Texts and the Perils of Pseudo-Historicism. Pp. 85-108 in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*, ed. T. B. Dozeman, K. Schmid and B. J. Schwartz. FAT 78. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck.
- Speiser, E. A.
1981 *Genesis*. The Anchor Bible 1. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, Inc.
- Tigay, J. H.
1982 *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. [Repr. Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, Inc., 2002]

Bibliography

- 1985 Introduction. Pp. 1-20 in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, ed. J. H. Tigay. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. [Repr. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2005]
- 1985 Summary and Conclusions. Pp. 239-241 in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, ed. J. H. Tigay. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. [Repr. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2005]
- 1985 The Evolution of the Pentateuchal Narratives in the Light of the Evolution of the *Gilgamesh Epic*. Pp. 21-52 in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, ed. J. H. Tigay. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. [Repr. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2005]
- 1985 The Stylistic Criterion of Source Criticism. Pp. 149-173 in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, ed. J. H. Tigay. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. [Repr. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2005]
- 2012 The Documentary Hypothesis, Empirical Models and Holistic Interpretation. Pp. 116-143 in *Modernity and Interpretations of Ancient Texts: The Collapse and Remaking of Traditions*, ed. Jun Ikeda. IAS Reports 1102. Kyoto: International Institute of Advanced Studies.
- Tov, E.
1985 The Composition of 1 Samuel 16-18 in the Light of the Septuagint Version. Pp. 97-130 in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, ed. J. H. Tigay. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. [Repr. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2005]
- Tsevat, M.
1975 Common Sense and Hypothesis in Old Testament Study. *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 28: 217-230. Leiden: Brill.
- Vang, C.
2011 God's Love According to Hosea and Deuteronomy: A Prophetic Reworking of a Deuteronomic Concept? *Tyndale Bulletin* 62.2: 173-194.
- Vawter, B.
1977 *On Genesis*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, Inc.

- Weaks, J. A.
2016 Limited Efficacy in Reconstructing the Gospel Sources for Matthew and Luke. Pp. 331-354 in *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism*, ed. R. F. Person, Jr., and R. Rezetko. Ancient Israel and Its Literature 25. Atlanta: SBL Press.
- Welch, J. W.
1998 *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis*. Maxwell Institute Publications 22. <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/mi/22>.
- Welty, E.
1984 *One Writer's Beginnings*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Westermann, C.
1994 *Genesis 1-11: A Continental Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Wigram, G. V.
1843 *The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament*. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons. [Repr. as *The New Englishman's Hebrew/Aramaic Concordance to the Old Testament*, No Location: Christian Copyrights, Inc., 1983]
- Wright, G. E.
1953 The Book of Deuteronomy. Pp. 331-536 in *The Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. II, ed. G. A. Buttrick. N.Y.: Abingdon Press.
- Young, I., Rezetko, R. and Ehrensward, M.
2008 *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*, Vol. 1 and 2. London: Equinox Publishing, Ltd. [Repr. London: Routledge, 2016]
- Zevit, Z.
1982 Converging Lines of Evidence Bearing on the Date of P. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 94: 502-509.