

(171  
121)

Critics admit early elements in P

Hooke, S.H., Peake's, p. 183 It is generally recognized that much of the material contained in P is very ancient . . .

Hooke, S.H. in Peake's, p.193 On Gen. 23. Yet the accuracy with which the account of a business transaction corresponds with contemporary records of such transactions suggests that the story is a piece of genuine early tradition.

B. W. Anderson, 2nd ed., p.71 the P account undoubtedly preserves authentic reminiscences of the ancient desert sanctuary . . . .

Von Rad, Genesis, p. 24 The youngest document (P), for example, contains an abundance of ancient and very ancient material.

The Harvard Theological Review, January, 1967

Notes and Observations

The Usage of װװ and ךך in the Bible and its Implications for the Date of P

by Avi Hurvitz, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel pp. 117-121

p. 120 A linguistic reexamination of the phraseology employed by P might show whether the above-discussed example is representative of the Priestly Source as a whole. If such an analysis proves that P consistently avoids linguistic usages which are peculiar to post-exilic sources, we shall have to reconsider seriously the possibility that even the present form of P ( and not only [some of] its material ) is old.

~~Fohrer, IOT, 181-2 ((( P incorporated both early and late material. Blessing of~~

20 "Its [= P's] language can scarcely be post-exilic" (Cross, op. cit. [The Priestly Tabernacle, The Biblical Archaeologist Reader I (ed. G.E.Wright and D. N. Freedman, 1961,] p. 215) cf. however, H. L. Ginsberg, JBL 59 (1940), x, and JAOS 62 (1942), 230a

Fohrer, IOT, 181-2 (((P incorporated both early and late material, such as, the Blessing of Aaron, names of heads of Israelite tribes, list of families and camp-sites which can hardly have been invented by P, but merely edited by him. )))