

Dentan, Robert, C., The Knowledge of God in Ancient Israel (The Seabury Press: New York) 1968

p. 145 There is, for example, the often observed fact that both the Elohist and Priestly documents in Genesis avoid the use of crudely anthropomorphic expressions such as we have noted above in the work of the Yahwist. The Elohist prefers to represent God as communicating with men by means of dreams and visions rather than directly, thus removing him at least one step from human life, while the Priestly writer prefers to use special, unusual verbs for the activity of God: thus God "creates" rather than "makes" or "forms," and "establishes" covenants rather than "cuts" them.<sup>19\*</sup> In this way the Priestly writer suggests that God's manner of working is unique and not really comparable to man's work. It is probable that the preference of the Priestly writer for the name "Elohim" rather than "Yahweh" for God is partly motivated by a feeling that the term "Yahweh" should be understood as a mysterious and awe-inspiring communication of the divine essence rather than a mere personal name - a "handle" - for the God of Israel, and therefore should not be used casually and lightly.

\*  
(for Note 19 see 12.6-4<sup>3</sup>)

p. 248 Note 10. Although many scholars now accept the amphictyony theory as almost axiomatic, others, such as H. H. Rowley (Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. E-J. Nashville, 1962; p. 753f.) and G. Fohrer ("Altes Testament - 'Amphiktyonie' und 'Bund'?" TLZ 91(1966), cols. 801-816, 893-904), continue to regard it as doubtful, if not positively implausible. H. Orlinsky has presented a strong case against it in his article "The Tribal System of Israel and Related Groups" in Studies and Essays in Honor of Abraham A. Neuman(Leiden, 1962), pp. 374-387; see also his Ancient Israel (Ithaca, 1954), pp. 58ff.

p. 256 Note 6. The "Kenite hypothesis," first proposed by Ghillany in 1862, is still held by many scholars. The evidence is well summarized in H. Schmökel, "Jahve und die Keniter," JBL 52(1933), pp. 212-229. The theory is criticized, and a counter view presented, by T. J. Meek, Hebrew Origins (New York, 1936; rev. ed., 1950), pp. 93-118.