

Israel's Prophetic Heritage, essays in honor of James Muilenburg. Edited by Bernhard W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson (Harper & Brothers, New York) 1962

Eichrodt, Walther, "In the Beginning" pp. 1-10
(Eichrodt, Prof. of OT and History of Religion, University of Basle, Basel, Switzerland)
p. 6 Von Rad has rightly rejected the attempt to affix a precise date to the Priestly Document of the Hexateuch, a work strongly rooted in the priestly tradition which was preserved and handed down through the centuries.⁹

9 G. von Rad, Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch(1934), p. 189

Porteous, Norman W. "The Prophets and the Problem of Continuity", pp.11-25
(Porteous, Prof. of Hebrew and Semitic Languages, University of Edinburg, Edinburg, Scotland)
p. 17 Today there seems to be a disposition to follow A. C. Welch in his contention that the Code of Deuteronomy was of northern origin so far as its content was concerned¹⁴ and that the covenantal tradition associated with it was in the direct line of descent from the original covenant at Sinai-Horeb.

Wright, G. Ernest, "The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32", pp. 26-67

p. 50 Ex.20.1; 24.3-4,8; 34.27-28

^{10.85} Footnote 53 Frank M. Cross, Jr., and I believe we have demonstrated in an unpublished article that these verses in Ex. 34 do not refer to a supposed "ritual decalogue" (which only with the gravest difficulty can be "found" in the preceding vss. 18-26). Instead, Ex. 34 once contained the Yahwistic document's rendition of the covenant; but only two of the commandments are preserved in the parenetic setting (see vss. 10,14 and 17). The remainder for some unexplained reason has been displaced or omitted, and a ritual calendar inserted (vs. 18-26), another form of which is preserved also in Ex. 23.12-19 (plus Ex. 12.12-13; cf. 34.19-20).

Footnote 54. Discussions about the Ark have always been troubled by the problem of harmonizing two emphases found in the traditions. In one it is the most sacred object of the Tribal League, containing within it the covenant document, the Decalogue. The other (P), while knowing the contents of the chest, emphasizes the lid with the cherubim, which symbolized the throne of God and which was called the kapporet (AV and RSV "mercyseat"). In this case the Ark symbolizes not so much the covenant unity of the tribes in treaty with Yahweh as the holy place where Yahweh may be met for purposes of revelation and atonement (cf. Ex. 25.22). In the past the literary-critical school assumed the idea of the covenant to be late theocratic doctrine, the title "Ark of the Covenant" was also considered a late phenomenon. With our present knowledge, I think a more reasonable case can be made for the assumption that the title is original and that the object was indeed the chest which held the holy "Words." The emphasis on the kapporet may well have been elaborated later, especially in the time of David, when the Mosaic covenant theology had lost its vigor and was virtually displaced in Jerusalem by the theology of the Davidic covenant.