

s was strengthened by A. Welch's tracing of D to an earlier and northern origin, by G. von Rad's division of P into two strands, and by many other attempts along the same lines.

At times, the results of literary criticism took on absurd proportions that did much to discredit the science in the eyes of those who were suspicious of its conclusions from the outset. Thus P. Baentsch (1900) divided Leviticus into seven distinct P sources and worked with primary and secondary redactors of secondary documents, etc. A mere listing of his sigla indicated the extreme complexity of his analysis. On the other hand, there were a few who thought that the number of independent documents should be reduced. P. Volz, followed in part by W. Rudolph (1933), denied the independent existence of E and P, at least in Genesis. S. Mowinckel (1930) similarly expressed doubts about E, describing it rather as the product of several centuries of oral tradition. More recently (1963) he dated J, which for him is equivalent to what others consider JE, to the 8th century B.C. but considered historiography to have begun in Israel with the Solomon saga, to which was later added a David story that included events dealing with Saul and Samuel.

These revisions, based principally on literary analysis, have not all been accepted. But they have influenced greatly the conception of the development of the sources within Israel. It is fairly commonly agreed that behind J and E there does stand some common source (e.g., M. Noth's *Grundschrift*) that would account for the many parallels in the two documents. Many, too, are more confident of being able to identify, at least partially, an older stratum (such as Eissfeldt's L) in J that would go back to the 10th or 9th century B.C. and a later stratum that shows the influence of the prophetic movement. In general it would be agreed that historiography began in Juda in the 10th or 9th century B.C. with J or one of its strata, that it continued in both kingdoms with succeeding editions of both J and E, and that the two were conflated in Juda after 721 B.C.

As for D, indication has already been made of the proposal that the development of its theology and of the resulting legal code in Deuteronomy took place over a long period of time, deriving its motivating force from the emphases of the Prophets, especially from Osee in the North and Jeremia in the South. More significant has been the identification of the vocabulary, style, and theology of the book of Deuteronomy with certain editorial passages in the historical books from Josue to 4 Kings. It was concluded that these books form a long history based on material that had been passed on down over the years in both literary and oral form and had been given its definitive shape by the addition of editorial reflections and revisions in the appropriate places. Since these reflections and revisions echo the spirit of the Book of Deuteronomy, the entire history was called by M. Noth (1943) the "Deuteronomistic History" and the fifth book of the Pentateuch was considered its introduction. While this D history was probably not written at any one time, its final form must have been given in the exilic period, since it records the Babylonian Exile and seemingly looks forward to some kind of restoration (4 Kgs 24.27-30). Later in the postexilic period, perhaps around the time of Ezra, the historical books were de-

tached from the introductory Deuteronomy, which was now attached to the first four books to form the Pentateuch. This now isolated corpus, with its emphasis on legal content, thus became the Torah, or Law, for later Judaism.

The development of P is similarly complex. All accept the final formulation of P in the postexilic period but admit also that it contains much older material. This is true especially of the legal sections that formed distinct codes in an earlier period. The Holiness Code (or H=Lv 17-26) was early recognized by A. Klostermann (1877) as forming a distinct unity that would later have been incorporated into the Priestly Code. The date of H has been placed as early as the period of the Judges (E. Robertson) and as late as the end of the kingdom of Juda (H. Cazelles, Von Rad). All would agree that it underwent a long development in accord with the same historical processes that helped to shape the other documents, that the Priestly Code of which it was made a part had similarly been developing over the centuries, and that the final redaction of the entire P did not take place until the postexilic period. (See HOLINESS, LAW OF.)

*Form Criticism.* Out of all this work there has come in recent years a more fruitful attempt to apply the principles of form criticism to the Pentateuchal material. Von Rad (1938), for example, isolated the ancient creeds of Israel (e.g., Dt 26.5-9; Jos 24.2-13) and considered them, or some form of them, to be the most primitive expression of the \*salvation history (*Heilsgeschichte*). The *Sitz im Leben* for the creed would have been a cultic celebration at the ancient shrine of \*Galgal (Gilgal). A separate tradition preserved the account of the Sinai covenant and its resulting covenant code; the covenant festival celebrated at \*Sichem (Shechem) would have been the original *Sitz im Leben* for this tradition. With this as his basis, Von Rad then gradually builds up to the profoundly constitutive work of J and to the gradual development of the Pentateuch along the classical lines.

Analyzing in greater detail the tradition history of the material, Noth (1948), who had already detached the great Deuteronomistic history (1943), attempted to identify and trace the basic themes of the Tetrateuchal history (the first four books of the Pentateuch). He found five of these themes, each of which he attempted to trace to its ultimate origin and then through its later development. While the extreme complexity of the task precluded a final solution to the whole problem, and while many of Noth's reconstructions were influenced by a regard for an underlying historical character less enthusiastic than generally held by scholars, he provided many insights that later scholars gratefully used in their own reconstructions. In both Von Rad's and Noth's studies we can detect a clear appreciation of the constitutive value of the classical documents or traditions, at least to the extent that they are seen to provide a basic theology to the heterogeneous material of which they are composed. This represents a reaction to the fragmentation of documents resulting from an overly critical literary analysis.

Besides the richer insights into the constitutive traditions, form criticism has already provided much deeper understanding of the individual elements of the traditions. Thus, working on a distinction proposed by A. Jirku (1927) and A. Jepsen (1927) between the