

to do with 7.9? This verse tells of the entrance of the animals into the ark as 'Elohim' had commanded Noah. Hence 7.9 must belong to P. But exactly the same thing is related in 7.15, in a passage that on account of criteria of style and content must be ascribed to . . . P. What then is the value of the criterion of reduplication? Gunkel has seen the difficulty and 'solves' it by having recourse to a Redactor (in 7.9). It is reassuring and sometimes necessary to have a Redactor up one's sleeve. When the criterion of reduplication fails it is also possible to have recourse to other *terms*. Thus it is related no less than four times (7.10, 12 J; 7.11 P; 7.6 P), that the Deluge came upon the earth. Nobody will accept four sources for the coming of this deluge, and hence the critics speak of 'resumption' instead.

The criterion of the name of the Deity likewise does not agree with the criteria of style and content. In 7.8 we read that both clean and unclean animals went into the Ark. This 'pre-Mosaic' distinction between clean and unclean is ascribed to J. Nonetheless the verse is organically connected with v. 9 which as mentioned before ends with the words 'as Elohim had commanded'. Solution: Redactor!

Furthermore, it is maintained that one of the sources, P, is distinguished by its interest in chronology, and a very precise chronology at that, while the chronological statements of the other source are only approximate numbers, and moreover much smaller than P's. However, it has been known for some time that P's chronology in precisely this story of the Deluge contains an inaccuracy. He has the Deluge begin on the seventeenth day of the second month in Noah's six hundredth year. And it is finally over on the twenty-seventh day of the second month in the six hundred and first year. This curious length of time, one year and ten days, may be explained, if one assumes that the dates are based on the lunar year, whereas the object of the chronology is to have the Deluge last a solar year, the latter being exactly ten days longer. The culmination of the Deluge is reached on the seventeenth day of the seventh month in the six hundredth year, but the interval between the seventeenth day of the second month and the seventeenth day of the seventh month is by the same source set down as 150

days (7.24 and 8.3), though if the reckoning were according to the lunar calendar it should only be one hundred and forty-seven days. In this way the one hundred and fifty days become 'a traditional, inexact figure for five months', as Gunkel says.¹

As for (2), however, if one thinks of the present text as more than a mere mechanical joining together of two different sources, i.e., as an artistic whole where old and new materials have been interwoven to form an account of no mean stylistic value and have been bound together by chronology, then it will also be possible to prove that the so-called J chronology (with forty days and seven days a certain number of times) agrees with P's accurate indications of time.

To be sure, the objection may be raised that 7.24 ('the waters prevailed upon the earth a hundred and fifty days') cannot agree with 8.2b ('and the rain was restrained from heaven'), P and J respectively; as the rain is expressly stated to last forty days it cannot very well have stopped after one hundred and fifty days. Those who have some knowledge of the Semitic narrative style will not raise this objection. For 7.24 is the conclusion of a section telling of the destruction of the whole earth. This section is very naturally concluded by an anticipatory remark to the effect that the whole catastrophe lasted in all for one hundred and fifty days. That it really is anticipatory is shown by 8.3 ('And after the end of one hundred and fifty days the waters were abated'). According to my opinion we have a similar anticipatory remark in 8.14 ('And on the twenty-seventh day of the second month the earth was dry'). In 8.15 ff we hear of the exit from the Ark, and of Noah's sacrifice which is answered by God's promise. As we shall see later both sacrifice and promise agree excellently, not with the twenty-seventh day of the second month, but with the previously mentioned date in 8.13, New Year's Day. On that day the waters were dried up from the earth, and Noah removed the covering of the Ark.² But 8.14 stands as the conclusion of the passage about the Deluge. The flood

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 147

² I have already pointed out an example of an introductory note of this kind in the Deuteronomistic literature in Jer. 36.8; cf. above, p. 67 and p. 72