

THE YAHWIST REVISITED

Antony F. Campbell, S.J.

The great constructs of biblical scholarship, the pentateuchal sources and the deuteronomistic history, are of immense value, even though they never escape fully from the realm of the hypothetical. They reduce the vast complexity of the pentateuchal and historical traditions to an approach to order which can be related to the history of Israel's life and thought. They open up the possibility of seeing the religious experiences and traditions of Israel's past applied to the interpretation of present situations along the trajectory of her history. And this adds a new dimension to the perception of Israel's narrative literature as theological endeavour.

The shift of interest to the great narratives as literary units and not mere collections of disconnected stories is a relatively recent development.¹ Then just in the last few years doubts have been raised not only about any accepted assumption of an early date for the Yahwist, but also about the methodological possibility of investigating the Yahwist as a theologian.² It is good that we should not be allowed to become too comfortably set in our assumptions. In such a situation it might seem rash to return to the issue of the Yahwist's overarching concern, without a thorough reworking of the methodological issues that have been raised.

However, there may be good reason to do so. If there are literary works at the base of the pentateuchal sources, there must also have been a message which each of these works was shaped to express and communicate.³ It is surely an important part of any reconstruction of a hypothetical literary work, such as the Yahwist, to identify the message it sought to express, the communication to be made which is the reason why the work was produced. It would be unjustifiably short-sighted to assume that the intention was naturally a historical one.⁴

The fundamental communication postulated as the impulse for the work should correlate adequately with the extent of the literary work and provide a satisfactory horizon within which all of its major components can be situated. This is an important part of the validation of a literary hypothesis.⁵

It is in this area that the Yahwist narrative has been badly served. Firstly, the extant text of the Yahwist ends

for all practical purposes with the Balaam pericope (and perhaps Baal-peor).⁶ But no meaning given the narrative adequately explains this. It is taken for granted, as a rule, that the Yahwist conquest account was discarded with the insertion of the narrative into the framework of the Priestly Document.⁷ (Parenthetically, three reasons may be noted which lessen the need for a conquest account in the Yahwist narrative. 1. Since its intention may not be to narrate history, the conquest does not have to be told simply because it happened. 2. Since it was composed when Israel was in secure possession of the land, it may not have seemed so necessary to narrate the fulfilment of these promises. 3. Since it is unlikely that the narrative was an expansion of an old historical credo, it is not bound to the credo's structure, which included the conquest.⁸)

Secondly, Wolff's compelling presentation of the Yahwist's kerygma, concerned with the blessing for all nations, is excellent as far as it goes, but it peters out when it reaches the exodus. At this point the promises vanish from view.⁹ Thus only two, at best three, of the four major complexes of tradition seen as distinct moments in the Yahwist narrative fall within the horizon of Wolff's interpretation. These four complexes are the primeval myths, the patriarchal stories, the exodus, and the wilderness traditions.¹⁰

If the hypothesis of the Yahwist narrative as a theologically significant work is to survive, it must explain the difference in treatment between Genesis and Exodus-Numbers, it must integrate the wandering/murmuring traditions into the horizon of its message, and it must account for the probable extent of the narrative. The possibility of rendering satisfaction in these three areas, at least inchoatively, has to be the justification for revisiting the embattled Yahwist at this time, when renewed intensive methodological soul-searching might seem to be more in order. If a hypothesis is to be subjected to serious scrutiny, it must be scrutinized in its best possible form. It is vain to tilt at windmills.

The question to be asked then is whether there is a significance in the text attributed to the Yahwist which can be alleged with probability to be the message of the compiler. The Yahwist is a compiler, of course, as well as an interpreter. There is no question of his work simply flowing from his pen "*aus einem Guss*". Not only do we presume a process of the transmission of tradition through the oral stages to a probable written stage, with subsequent compilation into the Yahwist's literary work; but there is also the work of subsequent redactors. Together with the work of interpretation, does the task of compilation in itself communicate a message, a theology

of the compiler? L. Alonso-Schökel speaks of a literary work as a macro-syntagma: "the relations between the members constitute or modify or enrich the total meaning. In principle this can happen both in a primary and in a secondary composition."¹¹ To what extent is this the case with the Yahwist?

The data to be taken into account can be rapidly reviewed.

1. It is a fact that the material usually attributed to the Yahwist has a very considerable emphasis on blessing in the section prior to the formation of the nation in Egypt (Exod 1:9, J) and the experience of the exodus. But after the exodus, this emphasis on blessing is absent and there is a very considerable emphasis on Israel's rebellion against Yahweh. Furthermore, it may be considered a probable opinion that this insistence on rebellion in the wilderness comes from the Yahwist himself.¹²

2. It is a fact that a surprisingly large amount of space is given to the story of Balaam; the best part of two chapters is usually attributed to the Yahwist. According to a recent opinion, all four chapters should be assigned to the Yahwist, with the exception of the tale of the talking ass (Num 22:22-35).¹³

3. It is a fact that there is remarkably little material that can be attributed to the Yahwist after the Balaam story. There is the Baal-peor episode (25:1-5) and part of Numbers 32 and perhaps the death of Moses. For Mowinckel, the Yahwist's account of the conquest has to be found in Numbers 32* (Reuben & Gad) and Judges 1* (the other tribes, except Issachar).¹⁴

4. It is a fact that Psalm 78 conceives of the transition to the Davidic monarchy in terms of rejection and election. "He utterly rejected Israel. He forsook his dwelling at Shiloh" (vv 59-60). "He rejected the tent of Joseph, he did not choose the tribe of Ephraim; but he chose the tribe of Judah, Mount Zion which he loves. ... He chose David his servant" (vv 67-70). Whatever the date and the construction one puts on this, the concepts of rejection and election are clear. A strong case can be made for the substantial unity of Ps 78 as a tenth century composition.¹⁵

5. The evidence of the Ark Narrative must also be taken into account. I have argued elsewhere that the Ark Narrative (1 Sam 4:1b-7:2a α ; 2 Sam 6:2-23), composed in tenth century Jerusalem, portrays the transition to monarchy in terms of Yahweh's departure from his people and his return to Davidic Jerusalem, no earlier.¹⁶ The departure of the ark from Shiloh in Samuel 4 is depicted as an end: the ark is gone from its sanctuary, the priest of the sanctuary is dead, and the name of

the tragically born infant characterizes the whole episode - the glory has gone into exile from Israel (1 Sam 4:21-22). This end is to be seen as the deliberate will of Yahweh. This can best be seen from the structure of the narrative in chap.4, and its conjunction with the episode of Yahweh's evident victory over Dagon in the temple at Ashdod. This assertion that an era has come to an end, expressed in the symbolism of the departure of the ark, is not cancelled by its return to Beth-shemesh and Kiriath-jearim. It remains on the fringes of Israel, both geographically and - which is far more important - religiously. The narration of the episode of the seventy dead at Beth-shemesh (1 Sam 6:19-7:1) shows that Yahweh is not yet disposed to bestow blessing in Israel through the ark. In the present biblical text, with or without the hypothesis of an independent Ark Narrative, the new beginning comes with the ark's introduction into David's newly captured Jerusalem, as the symbol of Yahweh's favourable presence to his people. As the narrative shows, both in its structure and by the use made of the episode of Uzzah's death, the coming of the ark to Jerusalem is under Yahweh's sole control. It is not done without his will; it is not achieved until he is ready and willing to bestow blessing once again in Israel.

6. Finally, it should not be necessary to do more than draw attention to the massive change brought about in Israel in the short space from Saul to Solomon. The transition from tribal existence to Davidic empire had profound implications for the social, political, economic, and religious life of Israel.¹⁷

On the evidence of the Ark Narrative and Psalm 78, there were some circles in tenth century Jerusalem which not only saw the Davidic monarchy as a new beginning in Israel's history with Yahweh, but which also related this to Yahweh's disfavour toward or rejection of the old order. The departure of the ark from Shiloh, as narrated, marks the end of the premonarchical period with Yahweh's disfavour. In Psalm 78, Yahweh's rejection of the old order is explicit (vv 59ff.), and it comes at the end of a portrayal of Israel's rebellion beginning very early in the desert wandering (vv 17ff.). A similar interpretation of the same period may be provided by Deuteronomy 32.¹⁸

These circles, then, looked back on part of the past history of their people as having been under the sign of Yahweh's disfavour, of having incurred his rejection. Only after a hiatus (1 Sam 7:2a; Ps 78:60-66) is a new stage in Yahweh's relationship with Israel achieved, a new beginning made in Jerusalem. The major contribution of this paper is to suggest that this same view may be reflected in the structure and intention of the Yahwist narrative.

If we retain the assumption that the Yahwist is also to

be set in tenth century Jerusalem,¹⁹ the question is what did his narrative have to say to the Israel of his time? We may presume that the stories of Israel's tradition - patriarchs, exodus, wandering, conquest, etc. - were well-known. For what particular purpose were they gathered and shaped at this particular point in Israel's history? What concern can account for the alternating emphases in the narrative? The initial stories of Genesis 2-11 are concerned with the introduction and spread of evil; the patriarchal stories are introduced with the theme of blessing and it recurs at key points; after the formation of the people and the exodus, the stories of rebellion in the wilderness return to the theme of evil; finally, with Balaam, blessing is uttered where curse is expected. The possible place of a negative conquest account will be taken up later. But if this accurately reflects the concerns under which the traditional stories have been gathered and interpreted, and if these emphases are not a matter of chance, what message do they communicate?

The early part of the picture has been finely drawn by Wolff; there is no need here to do more than sketch the outline. The Yahwist narrative portrays a humanity increasingly under the curse, in ever greater need of blessing (Genesis 2-11, J). Into this situation is thrown the call of Abraham, with its promise of blessing for all the families of the earth (12: 1-3). This is Israel's destiny, vis-à-vis the nations of the earth. It is symbolically visible in the intercession made by Abraham, the peace established by Isaac, the prosperity effected by Jacob or preserved by Joseph. This expression is achieved by the apt combination of the traditions recounted and the interpretative passages added to them.²⁰

Despite the intimations of fulfilment, the word of blessing to the patriarchs is largely a promise that looks to the future. Hence the constant emphasis on the numerous descendants who will become a great nation.²¹ For the Yahwist, it is in Egypt that Israel becomes a people, "too many and too mighty" for the Egyptians (Exod 1:9). The echo of the promise of blessing is now very faint (Exod 12:32). But with the emergence of the nation, freed from oppression by the experience of Yahweh's great liberating act, the echo of the blessing has died away altogether.

The stories of the wilderness wanderings, practically passed over by Wolff, have a very strong theme to contribute to the picture of Israel - the theme of rebellion. So soon after leaving the scene of the triumph at the sea, the people are portrayed grumbling at Marah (Exod 15:22-25). After the gift of the manna, the people are grumbling again in the episode of Massah-Meribah; the complaint is radical, "Is the Lord among us or not?" (Exod 17:7)

The positive impact of the Sinai theophany and lawgiving (J in chap. 34) is to some degree offset by the apostasy associated with the episode of the golden calf.²² Three days out from Sinai, the people are again in trouble; their lament was offensive and at Taberah Yahweh's anger blazed, destroying one end of the camp (Num 11:1-3). At Kibroth-hattaavah, the people grumble again, yearning for Egypt; the result is an outburst of Yahweh's anger, a very great plague, and many dead (Numbers 11*). At Hazeroth, Aaron and Miriam incur Yahweh's wrath (Numbers 12*). The episode of the spies has the whole community wanting to return to Egypt; with the exception of Caleb, the whole generation comes under condemnation (Numbers 13-14*). The subsequent attempt to take the promised land by storm, without Yahweh, is a dismal failure (Num 14:39-45). Dathan and Abiram criticize Moses' leadership and the exodus from Egypt, and they are swallowed up for it (Numbers 16*). The approach to Edom is a failure (Num 20:19-20, 22a). The success against Arad and the episode of the fiery serpents are too doubtful to be taken into consideration.²³ If the successes against Sihon and Og are to be attributed to E, this completes the wilderness material and brings the narrative to the stories of Balaam.²⁴

Without a doubt, the overwhelming weight of this section is on Israel's failure to respond to Yahweh's salvation. The people are portrayed as murmuring, rejecting the liberation of the exodus, rejecting the leadership of Moses, and ultimately rejecting Yahweh himself. Whether this picture is original to the traditions,²⁵ or whether it was first introduced in the Yahwist's presentation of them,²⁶ it is a remarkably negative portrayal of Israel.

The discussion of the Balaam oracles is too complex to be resumed here. To err on the safe side, only the sayings in chap. 24 will be considered.²⁷ The first saying ends with the formula: "Blessed be every one who blesses you, and cursed be every one who curses you" (Num 24:9b). The echo of Gen 12:3a is unmistakable.²⁸ And the conclusion of the second saying (24:15-19) is clearly open to being understood as a reference to David, the conqueror of Moab and Edom.²⁹

Thus out of a situation fraught with curse, Yahweh's power has brought forth blessing. Despite all the evil of murmuring and rebellion, which surely place Israel under the sign of the curse, the word that Yahweh has given Balaam to speak is one of blessing for Israel. And that blessing harks back to Abraham and the blessing promised him (Gen 12:3a) and looks forward to David.

If the text of the Yahwist narrative ended here, it would have left Israel poised on the brink of the promised land, much as in the later book of Deuteronomy. In both cases, Israel is poised between promise and fulfilment. In both cases, the promise of old is still valid and awaiting the opportunity for fulfilment, despite intervening centuries of failure and infidelity.

The narrative, then, has reached back not only to the roots of Israel but to the beginnings of humanity in order to establish and define Israel's identity and destiny as people of God. She is to be a bringer of blessing to the rest of humanity. The catchword of blessing becomes "the key word for Israel's relation to the peoples of the earth and for their relation to Israel."³⁰ The great nation promised in Gen 12:2 emerges in Exod 1:9, but the desert experience shows that it failed to rise to the challenge of its destiny. Balaam's word shows that destiny as still valid, that blessing as still within reach. The pointer to David clinches what would have been evident anyway to a tenth century Jerusalem audience: this new opening to blessing and the fulfilment of her destiny is given Israel in the new era in her relationship with Yahweh which has begun in the Davidic kingdom in Jerusalem. An old order has been put aside. There is a new order, and so new hope in the promises of old.

On the other hand, if the text of the Yahwist narrative continued, and if it consisted of the episode with the Baal of Peor³¹ and a substantially negative account of the conquest (i.e. Numbers 32* and the so-called "negative conquest" in Judges 1*), then the narrative function of this section would be clear.³² The blessing pronounced by Balaam was not for the next generations - if nothing else, their infidelity saw to that. The inadequacy of the conquest of the land promised to the patriarchs would have been a clear sign that Israel had fallen short of her destiny. As David had achieved these conquests, the conclusion would have been all the more evident that Israel's destiny and the promises she received of old were now being opened to fulfilment by Yahweh, through David and the kingdom he founded in Jerusalem.

In some circles, this foundation of the Davidic kingdom was not seen simply as one more of God's gracious acts towards his people. Rather, what gave a particular and vital importance to the new dispensation was the interpretation of the events associated with the loss of the ark in terms of God's judgement on the preceding period. This articulation of recent history in terms of God's departure from Shiloh and return to Jerusalem, of his rejection of the Israel of Ephraim

and Shiloh and election of the Israel of Judah and Jerusalem permits us to recognize the special significance that would have been attached to the similar transition from curse to blessing in the Balaam story. The desert experience which preceded it was not understood as the story of a difficult period of trial, a warning. Its narration is that recognition of failure which precedes a new beginning, which may be the necessary basis for it. Out of curse can come blessing. The sense of Yahweh's favour, dispensed in Jerusalem, would have been all the more acute, set as it was against the portrayal of preceding disfavour, the result of Israel's rebellious infidelity.

The Ark Narrative gives no history of this infidelity. It simply interprets the events of 1 Samuel 4 as Yahweh's departure from his people, inflicting defeat upon them.³³ Psalm 78 begins its recital of history with what is best understood as a veiled reference to these defeats at Ebenezer-Aphek (Ps 78:9). It then traces the history of infidelity, of Israel's rejection of Yahweh, from the desert to the settlement in the land (vv 17-57).³⁴ The Yahwist narrative also begins the presentation of Israel's infidelity in the desert time, with the murmuring about the lack of water (Exod 15:22-25) - whereas Psalm 78 begins with the demand for food (vv 18-20). The Yahwist follows this infidelity to the desert fringe, and may perhaps trace its consequences in the incomplete conquest.

The Yahwist narrative is more than a cutting rebuke to the hubris of those who lived ostentatiously in Solomon's days and who had to learn that they had not yet obtained Yahweh's blessing.³⁵ Nor is it merely a warning to Israel not to risk the newly won blessing of the Davidic-Solomonic kingdom by infidelity to Yahweh.³⁶ Rather, it would seem that the narrative is intended to interpret the significance of the new era marked by Yahweh's choice of David and his bestowal of blessing in Jerusalem. It is an enunciation of the destiny of the chosen people. After mankind's failure to seize blessing at the outset of human history, the children of Abraham are to be blessed and to be bringers of blessing: this is the meaning of God's elective love. The presentation of their history is part of the great tradition of Israel's confessions of sin or doxologies of justice, a simple statement of the nation's failure which is about as radical as is possible: it goes back to the roots of the national existence. But, from Jerusalem, that period of failure can be perceived as having been brought to a close by Yahweh's action. The narrative intimates that Israel's destiny has not been voided,

that the blessing will be fulfilled, and that the era begun with David in Jerusalem is a new moment, open once again to the fulfilment of Israel's destiny.

A corollary of this understanding is important. The difference of treatment between Genesis and Exodus-Numbers in the text commonly attributed to the Yahwist is one of the major arguments brought by Rendtorff against the unity of the narrative.³⁷ The understanding presented here perceives the Yahwist as dealing with large complexes of tradition and dealing with them quite differently in order to bring out different and contrasting aspects of his message. His task in Genesis is to establish the vision of Israel's destiny and its potential. In Exodus-Numbers, after the nation has been formed and been liberated from Egypt, the task is to portray the failure of Israel to live up to that destiny. The contrast is part of the juxtaposition of traditions out of which the total meaning of the narrative is generated. The meaning suggested here accounts for this difference in treatment, integrates the wandering/murmuring traditions into the narrative, and adequately accounts for the probable extent of the narrative. It provides a hypothesis against which the methodological problems raised by Rendtorff and others may be measured.

If the hypothesis survives the testing, what a remarkably powerful insight into human life the Yahwist narrative provides. It opens with the portrayal of the first human representatives, in the garden, presented with the challenge of life. They are depicted as evading it, seeking to escape the human condition by a short cut to the knowledge of good and evil, taking control of their destiny contrary to the creator's dispensation.³⁸ Mankind has been offered the fullness of life and refused it, and this is the burden of Genesis 2-11 (J).

Then in Abraham a fresh offer is made, that through Israel blessing will be available to all the families of the earth.³⁹ And the promise and a tantalizing taste of its possibilities extends through the patriarchal stories. Yet, wandering in the desert, Israel declines the challenge of life, hankers to return to Egypt; portrayed in murmuring rebellion, she is hardly experiencing blessing, much less able to mediate it to others.

But in the Balaam story, where curse is expected, blessing is spoken. And this is Yahweh's doing. And furthermore it concludes with a pointer to David. So the narrative confronts its hearers in tenth century Jerusalem with a renewed challenge, a fresh opportunity to achieve the destiny that has so far remained unfulfilled. The new beginning that is Yahweh's initiative with the Davidic kingdom in Jerusalem is a

new challenge to fullness of life, a new offer to be the vehicle of blessing to all the families of the earth.

What a trajectory is thus begun! The Deuteronomistic History, in its final form, traces the monarchy's failure to respond to the challenge. But the prophets give expression to yet further hope beyond that failure, a new hope that the full response is to be implanted by God within the human heart, to be brought about by God's new action. And for Christian faith, that new hope finds its fulfilment in Christ's definitive and representative "Yes" to the offer and challenge of fullness of life, a "Yes" that is visible in the cross and accepted by the Father in the resurrection.

FOOTNOTES

1. See for example, O. Eissfeldt, "The Smallest Literary Unit in the Narrative Books of the Old Testament," *Old Testament Essays* (London: Charles Griffin, 1927) 85-93; G. von Rad, "The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch," *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1966; German original, BWANT 26; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer 1938) 1-78; H. W. Wolff, "The Kerygma of the Yahwist," *Interpretation* 20 (1966) 131-58; now reprinted in and quoted from *The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions* (ed. W. Brueggemann & H. W. Wolff; Atlanta: John Knox, 1975) 41-66. Original German, *EvT* 24 (1964) 73-98.
2. See in particular R. Rendtorff, "Der 'Jahwist' als Theologe? Zum Dilemma der Pentateuchkritik," *VTSup* 28 (1974) 158-66 (translated in *JSOT* 3 (1977) along with responses by R. N. Whybray, J. Van Seters, N. E. Wagner, G. E. Coats, H. H. Schmid, and Rendtorff himself); idem, *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch* (BZAW 147; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1977); H. H. Schmid, *Der sogenannte Jahwist* (Zurich: TVZ, 1976); J. Van Seters, "Confessional Reformulation in the Exilic Period," *VT* 22 (1972) 448-59; idem, *Abraham in History and Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University, 1975); N. E. Wagner, "Abraham and David?," *Studies on the Ancient Palestinian World* (ed. J.W. Wevers & D. B. Redford; Toronto: University of Toronto, 1972) 117-40.
3. P. Ricoeur, "Biblical Hermeneutics," *Semeia* 4 (1975) 68-70.
4. Cf. in relation to the Priestly Document, N. Lohfink, "Die Priesterschrift und die Geschichte," *VTSup* 24 (1978) 207-15.

5. E. D. Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven: Yale University, 1967) 221-23, 236-38; P. Ricoeur, *Interpretation Theory* (Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University, 1976) 75-79.
6. Cf. M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1948) 35; Wolff, "Kerygma," 43. When discussing the Yahwist in this paper, I have principally Noth's text in mind.
7. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte*, 35; idem *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963; original, 1943) 210-11. For the possibility of restricted references to the conquest in P, see J. Blenkinsopp, "The Structure of P," *CBQ* 38 (1976) 287-91; Lohfink, "Priesterschrift," 198-99.
8. Against von Rad's influential study, "Form-Critical Problem." See L. Rost, "Das kleine geschichtliche Credo," *Das kleine Credo und andere Studien zum AT* (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1965) 11-25; W. Richter, "Beobachtungen zur theologischen Systembildung in der alttestamentlichen Literatur anhand des 'kleinen geschichtlichen Credo'," *Wahrheit und Verkündigung* (ed. L. Schiffczyk et al.; Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1967) vol. 1, 175-212; N. Lohfink, "Zum 'kleinen geschichtlichen Credo' Dtn 26,5-9," *TP* 46 (1971) 19-39.
9. This is one of the major objections raised by Rendtorff against the unity of the Yahwist's work (cf. *Problem*, 109-12). Wolff's view that the nature of the material forced this on the Yahwist (cf. "Kerygma," 61) is in conflict with the view expressed by Coats and Fritz that the murmuring tradition originated with the Yahwist (cf. G. E. Coats, *Rebellion in the Wilderness* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1968); V. Fritz, *Israel in der Wllste* (Marburger Theologische Studien 7; Marburg: N. G. Elwert, 1970). For criticism of this view, see B. S. Childs, *Exodus* (London: SCM, 1974) 254-64.
10. See G. E. Coats, "A Structural Transition in Exodus," *VT* 22(1972) 129-42, and "An Exposition for the Wilderness Traditions," *VT* 22(1972) 288-95. This imbalance of Wolff's is pointed up sharply by the quite contrary understanding presented by M. L. Henry (*Jahwist and Priesterschrift* [Arbeiten zur Theologie 3; Stuttgart: Calwer, 1960]).
11. L. Alonso-Schökel, "Hermeneutical Problems of a Literary Study of the Bible," *VTSup* 28 (1975) 1-15.
12. See Coats, *Rebellion*, 249-54; Fritz, *Israel*, 117-23.

13. J. Sturdy, *Numbers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1976) 157-58. Cf. also D. Vetter, *Seherspruch und Segensschilderung* (Calwer Theologische Monographien 4; Stuttgart: Calwer, 1974); W. Gross, *Bileam* (SANT 38; Munich: KÖsel, 1974).
14. S. Mowinckel, *Tetrateuch-Pentateuch-Hexateuch* (BZAW 90; Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1964) 9-33.
15. See A. F. Campbell, "Psalm 78: A Contribution to the Theology of Tenth Century Israel," *CBQ* 41 (1979) 51-79.
16. A. F. Campbell, *The Ark Narrative* (SBLDS 16; Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975), and "Yahweh and the Ark: A Case Study in Narrative," *JBL* 98 (1979) 31-43.
17. See, for example, M. Noth, *The History of Israel* (2nd English ed.; London: Adam & Charles Black, 1960) 197-99; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* (2 vols.; Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1962-65) 1. 36-39; J. A. Soggin, "The Davidic-Solomonic Kingdom," *Israelite and Judaean History* (ed. J. H. Hayes and J. M. Miller; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977) 345-63.
18. Campbell, *Ark Narrative*, 227-31.
19. Wolff, "Kerygma," 43-45. It is not possible to engage in a detailed discussion of the issue here.
20. *Ibid.*, 55-60. While the history of the promise traditions is a complex one, as we would expect (cf. Rendtorff, *Problem*, 40-65). it does not appear that Wolff's thesis has been invalidated.
21. Wolff, "Kerygma," 49-51.
22. Probably J; see Childs, *Exodus*, 558-61, and 604-16 for chap. 34.
23. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte*, p. 34, nn. 122-23.
24. Noth, *Das vierte Buch Mose: Numeri* (ATD 7; Göttingen Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966) 142. If the passage is attributed to J (so Sturdy, *Numbers*, 153), the military success prepares for the summons to Balaam. For a quite different view of the passage, see J. Van Seters, "The Conquest of Sihon's Kingdom: A Literary Examination," *JBL* 91 (1972) 182-97.
25. Childs, *Exodus*, 254-64.

26. With Coats, *Rebellion*, and Fritz, *Israel*. Schmid agrees with the attribution to J, but maintains a later date (*Der sogenannte Jahwist*, 61-82).
27. With Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte*, 34-35, 81-82.
28. Wolff, "Kerygma," 51-53.
29. With Noth, *Numeri*, 168; Sturdy, *Numbers*, 178; Vetter *Seherspruch*, p. 47, nn. 493-95. Cf. 2 Sam 8:2, 13-14.
30. Wolff, "Kerygma," 51.
31. On this episode, see G. E. Mendenhall, *The Tenth Generation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1973) 105-21.
32. Cf. von Rad, "Form-critical Problem," 72-73.
33. While the Elides might be seen as a climactic example of sin, the evidence of the text does not favour the inclusion of this material in the Ark Narrative. Cf. Campbell, "Yahweh and the Ark"; against P. D. Miller and J. J. M. Roberts, *The Hand of the Lord* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1977).
34. V 57 echos v 9. Vv 56b and 58 are to be attributed to deuteronomistic revision (Campbell, "Psalm 78," 56-57, 74-75).
35. Wolff, "Kerygma," 63.
36. Fritz, *Israel*, 121-22.
37. Rendtorff, "Der 'Jahwist' als Theologe?," 165-66, and *Problem*, 65-79, 109-12.
38. C. Westermann *Genesis* (BK; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1966-74) 328-37. Note the marvellous eloquence of Irenaeus on this theme (*Adversus Haereses*, IV: 39, 1-2).
39. For a correlation of Genesis 2-3 with Gen 12:1-3, see O. H. Steck, *Die Paradieserzählung* (BibS[N] 60; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1970) 119-29.