

S. H. Hooke in Peakls on the Yahwist's use of E and P

p. 178 First, the Priestly writer, presumably collecting and editing the traditions of Israel after the exile, was using the same kind of ancient material as the Yahwist before him. Secondly, it is a mistake to think of the Yahwist and the Priestly writer as regarding the history of their people from opposed points of view.

It may be remarked in passing that the author or editor whom we are calling the Yahwist, and who has impressed the stamp of his personality and outlook so forcibly upon our book of Gen., need not be the J of the hypothetical document or historical writing composed about the 10th cent. and subsequently combined with the E document to make the main historical source underlying the Pentateuch, or even the Hexateuch, if that hypothetical work ever existed. Our Yahwist would be a prophetic individual looking back over a longer period of Israel's history than one which goes back from the 10th cent., and one whose conception of God as the Judge of all the earth (Gen.18.25) springs rather from the 7th cent. than the 10th. Hence, even if he did not himself prefix to his own account of Creation this Priestly chant [Gen.1.1-2.4a] . . . we can, nevertheless, be sure that there was no fundamental difference of outlook upon the Heilsgeschichte between the Yahwist and the Priestly writer who gave this book its final form.

p. 183 It is generally recognized that much of the material contained in what is classified as P is very ancient, and we have already suggested that the author whose stamp has been impressed upon Gen., and whom we have called the Yahwist, is not to be identified with the editor or compiler of the hypothetical J history which was, on the Documentary theory, combined with the hypothetical Elohist narrative somewhere about the 10th cent. Our Yahwist may well have known and embodied in his work P material which fitted in with his purpose . . . he might well have embodied the P genealogy of Seth in the prelude to the Flood story . . .

p. 193 It should be remarked in passing that critical analysis has assigned ch. 22, with the exception of vv. 15-18 and 20-4 to the Elohist, but from the point of view taken in this commentary it is the Yahwist who has made use of the E material . . .

p. 193 In the P genealogy in 25.12-16 the descendants of Ishmael are arranged in a group of twelve, in order to furnish a parallel to the twelve tribes descended from Jacob. [cf. 46.6-27 also P]

p. 193 We are assuming, . . . that the book of Gen. bears the impress of a single mind, even though various sources have been used in the making of it. We are also suggesting the view that between the period when . . . the J and E narratives were united, and the final editing which . . . the book underwent at the hands of the Priestly school of writers after the Exile, a writer of great literary skill . . . belonging to a prophetic circle, gave the book its penultimate form, and stamped upon it the character of Heilsgeschichte, or salvation history. We have further suggested, that, since it is now generally acknowledged that a great deal of the material classed as P . . . is early and pre-exilic, there is no reason why such material should not have been available to the writer of whom we have spoken, and have been used by him whenever he found it useful for the composition of his design. We have called this writer the Yahwist, with the proviso that he is not to be identified with the J of the JE narrative.