

read the lessons, the Litany, or preach the sermon, and many other things of the kind. How many more serious questions must naturally have arisen concerning the ritual of sacrifice, involving, as it did, so much manual work! These things were originally decided, it is probable, by local custom. When religious worship had become centralized at Jerusalem they would probably be settled authoritatively by the body of priests, who are likely to have followed in the main the traditions of the old sanctuary of Jerusalem. (7) But when the line of tradition was broken by the Exile the need would have arisen for more elaborate directions, and we do actually find the prophet Ezekiel framing a sort of manual of ritual, though in some respects ideal and visionary (chs. 40-48). (8) But the troubles and disturbances which followed upon the Restoration must have made it difficult to establish any complete system of worship, and we do not hear of any complete religious organization till the time of Ezra. It would probably then be near the truth to say that P is the result of the religious movement which began with Ezekiel in Babylon, and found its completion with Ezra. Just as the book of the Law found in the house of J^r in Josiah's reign was D, or the nucleus of D, so it is likely that the law-book read by Ezra, Neh 8, was P, or the essential part of P. It is important to observe that the legal ordinances referred to in Neh are to be found in P rather than in D; for example, the custom of dwelling in booths, 8¹³⁻¹⁸.

3. JE. The Jahwistic and Elohistic Sources.—

A. When we have taken away from the Hexateuch all the passages which can with a fair degree of probability be assigned to D or P, we find that the remainder forms a fairly complete and homogeneous whole, giving us, by a succession of narratives more or less connected, an outline of Jewish history from the Creation to the Settlement in Palestine, in fact covering, speaking generally, the same ground as P. This remainder we might have regarded as one literary source, were it not that a difference of authorship is discovered by the use of *Elohim* and *J^r* in Gn-Ex 3 (see above, ii. D), which enables us to distinguish at once a certain number of sections as belonging to J and E respectively. Thus to J belong 2^{1b-4²⁶} 5²⁹ 6¹⁻⁴ 7-8 (ptly.) 9²⁷⁻²⁷ 10⁸⁻¹⁹ 11¹⁻⁹ 12^{1-2a, 6-20} 13^{1-5, 6b-11a, 12b-15} 15 (with some mixture perhaps of E), 16^{1b-2, 4-14} 18. 19¹⁻²⁹ 22²⁰⁻²⁴ (unless the insertion of a reviser) 24. 28¹³⁻¹⁶ 38. 39. To E we may with equal certainty assign 20¹⁻¹⁷ 21⁶⁻²² 22¹⁻¹³ 28^{10-12, 17-22} 31^{1-17a, 19-24} 31²¹⁻³² 35¹⁻⁵ 40-42. 45 (almost entirely) 46¹⁻⁹ 48^{1, 2, 8-22} 50¹⁵⁻²⁶. But in other sections either the name of God seldom occurs, or the names at first sight seem used indifferently, the sections being in the latter case generally compounded, as a close examination shows, of both sources. After Exodus, though we can readily see that both sources still continue, the distinction becomes more difficult, because though E, unlike P, still uses the name *Elohim* sometimes, *J^r* is more generally used; but even here this occasional use of *Elohim* is often helpful in discovering E sections. The mixture of divine names in Gn-Ex 3 sometimes arises from the fact that E purposely uses the name *J^r* and vice versa. Thus E of necessity used the name *J^r* in Ex 3¹ itself, but also in Gn 28²², where the name has a peculiar emphasis, the point being that Jacob promises to worship his country's God even in a strange land; the name is, however, sometimes assigned to a reviser. This is probably the case also with Gn 22¹, unless it be actually a Jahwistic passage inserted in the E story. On the other hand, *Elohim* is sometimes used by J: (1) When God is spoken of by those not in covenant with *J^r*, as by Adam and Eve before the time of

Seth, when men began to call on the name of *J^r* (Gn 4²⁶), and by the serpent (Gn 3^{7, 14} etc.). (2) When emphasis is laid on God's covenant nature, especially in contrast to man (Gn 22^{1, 28} (see below, iii. 3. B)). (3) In the construction of God, when with a following word it is used descriptively of God, as 'God of Abraham' or 'God of Isaac', etc., Gn 24^{7, 27} 28²² etc.

B. The separation of J and E in many passages, and those especially in which the names are used as for any of the reasons given not a sufficient criterion, as in the later books of the Hexateuch, is a matter of considerable difficulty, there being no characters of J or E so marked as to enable us (as we could with D and P) at once to assign the sections in which they occur to their source; but it can in most cases be decided with a fair degree of certainty. Moreover, the more the passages which can be definitely assigned to one source or the other, the easier the work becomes, because we obtain a larger number of criteria by which to recognize either source. Even in spite of the labours of critics there still remains a considerable number of passages in which the division of sources is very uncertain. There is, too, always a certain danger of using as criteria comparatively rare words or phrases, which may by accident happen to occur once or twice in one source or the other. The reasons why the critical results are obtained are very simple. They are chiefly those suggested by Leuncler on the narrative, points of contact, whether by similarity of language or connexion of subject with certain E or J fragments, and the like. Such arguments are often more trustworthy than those derived from vocabulary. We can make the passage by analyzing Gn 32 as an example. The passage is an E passage, and the whole certainly belongs to JE. Vv. 1 and 2 (Heb. 2, 3, and 4) (and the other verses) are obviously the work of an E section (31²¹⁻³²), the name *Elohim* being used throughout and constantly; that the section has no P characteristics. If we turn on examination that vv. 3-12 belong to J (1) there is no apparent continuity between 3 and 4, (2) on the other hand, vv. 3-12 form a narrative continuous in itself without any obvious breaks, and the same is true of vv. 12-17. Vv. 12-17 contain parallels, differing in detail both with the preceding and the following paragraphs, and therefore belong to a different source. This gives a different explanation of the name *Elohim* found in v. 3, and in v. 12. (a) The name is first used as if dividing his property in view of the coming of Esau, but (b) the name is used by each party by itself, vv. 14, 17, instead of being divided into two, v. 7, and (c) with a different sense, in order to propitiate his brother by the gift with an accumulation of peace-offerings, so that that one might escape if Esau attacked the other, as in v. 8; (d) the property is differently described, goats being added, slaves—male and female—omitted, or rather male slaves mentioned as part of the proposed present, but without charge of it, cf. vv. 14-16 with v. 7. Again, v. 12 is a repetition of v. 12, (4) Again, v. 12 and 13-14 have points of contact with other known J and E sections respectively. Thus the possessions of 32⁷ correspond very closely with 31²¹ which belongs to J's account of the manner in which Jacob obtained his wealth by trading. 32⁷ and stands in contrast to E's account which describes it as a miracle revealed by God in a dream, or, at any rate, as so explained by Jacob. The latter passage is marked as E by the constant use of *Elohim*. Again, 32⁷ refers to 31²¹ as evidently J passage. So far all is clear, but vv. 13-14, which has the appearance of a complete and unimixed passage, there is some