

Dr. Lewy's theory may be called a variation on the old supplementary hypothesis. We do not have in the Pentateuch a compilation of four independent documents (JEDP) but rather a basic document (roughly equal to J) which has been annotated by later hands (the rough equivalents of E, D and P). While the figure of Moses is not entirely played down, very little of the Pentateuch stems from him. The creator of the basic Pentateuch document (called N) was Nathan, who wrote presumably for the instruction of his pupil Solomon. Nathan's work was soon revised and annotated by priestly hands (JP) not up to the level of the "enlightened universalist" (p. 158, cf. p. 172, etc.). In the 9th century the document was further annotated by a northern Elohist (E), who was none other than Elisha, and by a southern Elohist (PN), who is identified with Jehoiada, and who contributed the bulk of the narrative portions usually assigned to P. At the same time an Ephraimite collection of laws was compiled, and this forms the basis of Deuteronomy (ED)—again the work of Elisha. After the fall of Samaria this was brought to Jerusalem, where it was further adapted and added to (JD), and became the document of Hezekiah's reform. The basis of Josiah's reform, on the contrary, was the priestly code (PC), the creator of which was Hilkiah (though parts of it show the humane feminine touch of Huldah). It was to this that Jeremiah so strenuously objected (Jer. 7:21-23, 8:8-10). Except for a few additions ca. 520 by

Joshua the high priest, all of the Pentateuch is pre-Exilic.

The reader will sense that on a number of points the author's instincts have carried him in the general direction in which scholarship has been moving of late. For example, that the basis of P is pre-Exilic would be denied by few today. That D rests on an older, north Israelite basis is by way of becoming the common opinion (if one may speak of such a thing). That the so-called Yahwist supplied the basis of the Pentateuch both theologically and as regards its narrative content has been increasingly clearly seen (von Rad, etc.). In returning to a hypothesis of supplements, Lewy follows somewhat—but not exactly—the path chosen by Volz and Rudolph. Nor is he the first to link Deuteronomy to Hezekiah's reform, and P to Josiah's (though most would not agree).

But it is all much too speculative. Dr. Lewy's analysis is often acute, but it lies open to the charge now everywhere levelled against the Wellhausen school: that it treats the Pentateuch too much as a problem of literary composition and ignores the living nature of tradition. Further, the sources are everywhere linked with known historical personages: Nathan, Elisha, Jehoiada, Hilkiah—for none of which is there a shred of historical proof. Too, in isolating the contribution of Nathan, for example, the author seems to proceed on the principle that such utterances as are deemed to be ethically and religiously below the level posited for that great figure are to be assigned to priestly annotators (JP)—all of which