

The Exodus in the Bible:

Traditions of the Event,
and
Judgments Concerning Its Significance.

Submitted in Partial Fulfilment
of the Requirements for
the Degree of Rabbi.

Exodus
Jack M. Rothschild
Hebrew Union College
1936

TO THE MEMORY OF MY FATHER

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Part I: The Traditions of the Exodus according to J, E, and P	
I. The "Choice" of Israel in Egypt	3
II. The Plagues	7
III. The Pursuit	14
IV. The Narratives of the Wilderness Period	17
A. According to J	17
B. According to E	19
C. According to P	23
D. The Significance of the Three Accounts	24
V. The Covenant at Mt. Sinai	29
VI. Summary and Conclusions Regarding J, E, and P	32
Part II: The Significance attached to the Exodus by Other Biblical Writers	
VII. The Significance of the Exodus in Pre-Exilic Times	37
VIII. The Significance of the Exodus in Exilic and Post-Exilic Times	46
A. In the Prophets	46
B. In the Psalms	56
C. In the Laws of P	60
D. In the Historical Books	62
IX. The Significance of the Exodus in the Book of Deuteronomy	65
X. The Role of the Exodus in the Three Pilgrim Festivals	72
Conclusion	77
BIBLIOGRAPHY	81

Introduction.

In the thirteenth century, B. C. E., a group of people left Egypt and journeyed through the wilderness to Canaan. This people was one group of what became eventually/^{became} the Israelite nation. The story of its exodus from Egypt, the incidents that occurred in the wilderness, and the settling of that people in the land of Canaan, has been recorded at great length in the Bible. In addition, other Biblical writers have, from time to time, mentioned that event and made use of it in varying ways.

The purpose of this paper, in the light of the obvious importance which the Exodus assumed, is two-fold. First, it will concern itself with the actual traditions of the event itself, as recorded by the J, E, and P writers approximately four, five, and eight centuries, respectively, after the event took place. It will consider the problem of just why the Exodus was important, and what use was made of that event by each writer in his own generation. In setting about the accomplishment of this task, we have defined the "Exodus" as that period of Israelitish history which began with the choice of Moses as the man to lead Israel out of Egypt, ~~and~~ ending with the advent of that people to the borders of Moab. Second, it will attempt to discover in what light the event was held by other Biblical writers who made mention of it. Here, too, we shall endeavor to discover what purpose the Exodus served in the writings of these men, and to what end they utilized it.

One additional note of explanation is necessary. Although interest in the Exodus did not cease with the closing of the

Canon, the scope of this paper is limited to the Bible alone. To be sure, the Apocrypha, the Mishna, and the Talmud are replete with further references to the event. The entire Haggada developed in connection with it. Nevertheless, we shall confine ourselves to a treatment of the subject by an examination of those references to the Exodus found in that part of the Bible which has come to be known as the Old Testament.

Part I.

The Traditions of the Exodus According to J, E, and P.

Chapter I.

The "Choice" of Israel in Egypt

The story of the Exodus begins, in all three accounts, with the story of God's remembering His people in Egypt, and the decision to free them from their bondage in that land. The selection of Moses as leader and of Aaron as spokesman is also accomplished in these chapters. Chapters 3, 4, and 5¹ contain the J and E accounts, while the P tradition is to be found in 6.2-7.7. The story for all three historians is substantially the same. God appears to Moses from the midst of the burning bush and declares His intention to fulfill His promise to the Patriarchs by saving Israel from Egyptian bondage and by bringing the people to Canaan. Moses mentions his inability to speak clearly, and Aaron is appointed to help him. Certain signs are given Moses by Jahveh that he may impress Pharaoh with the power of the God of Israel. Together, Moses and Aaron confront Pharaoh, requesting the release of the Israelites, and are refused.

The details of the story, however, vary somewhat. According to J, Jahveh tells Moses in Midian to return to Egypt. Moses does so, taking his wife and son with him (4.19,20a). On the way, two events take place; first, the fragmentary account of the circumcision of their son by Zipporah, the wife of Moses-- a story which is not to be found in the E account, and second,² the incident of the burning bush. It is here that Jahveh an-

1. The J account is contained in 4.19,20a,24-26; 3.2-4a, 5,7,8*, 16-20*; 4.1-14a,29*,30B,31a; 5.1a*,3,5-6.1. The E account is contained in 3.1,4b,6,9-15,21f; 4.17f,20b,27-30a*,31b; 5.1,2,4.
 2. Chapters 3 and 4. See note 1 for verses belonging to J.

nounces His remembering "My people that are in Egypt" and declares His intention of freeing them and bringing them to a "land flowing with milk and honey" (3. 7,8*). The method, according to J, shall be that Moses is to request permission from Pharaoh for the Israelites to go three days' journey into the wilderness to sacrifice to Him. That Pharaoh will refuse is a foregone conclusion, and God will, therefore, bring the plagues upon the land of Egypt (3. 19,20). Moses then voices two objections. First, he fears that the people will not believe that Jahveh really appeared to him. To dispel any doubts of this sort, Jahveh shows him three signs to demonstrate the truth of his words to the people (4. 1-9). His second doubt involves his defective speech, and Aaron is chosen (by implication in this account) as his mouthpiece (4. 10-14a). Moses and Aaron appear before Pharaoh and demand the release of the people. Instead, however, their work is made more difficult. As a result, the Israelites murmur against Moses and Aaron, and Jahveh promises to deliver them with a strong hand.

According to the E account, it was while he was tending his father-in-law's flock that God called to Moses out of the bush. The event takes place at Horeb, thus associating this first appearance of the deity with the place at which the covenant is made later (3. 1,4b). This association is not to be found in J. The Deity introduces Himself to Moses as the God of the Patriarchs, and when Moses asks by what name He is called, he is

3. Chapters 5 and 6. See note 1 for verses belonging to J.

answered by the enigmatic words " *וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה* ", after which E, as well as J, calls the Deity by the name Jahveh (3. 13-15). Since "Jahveh" has always been the name by which J called the God of Israel, this story is naturally missing in his account. Neither does E contain the account of a ruse calculated to free the people, as we found in J (3. 19,20). Instead, there is the statement that the people shall not go up empty, and instructions are given whereby the women are to spoil the Egyptians by "borrowing" their precious jewels (3. 21f). Moses, upon his return, meets Aaron in the wilderness, and together they confront the people. The Israelites readily believe Moses' story as recounted by Aaron (4. 27-30a,31b). As in the J account, here too, Pharaoh refuses to let the people go, but there is no mention of the additional work that we found added to the burden of the Israelites in J (5. 1*,2,4).

P's story almost completely parallels those of J and E. P accepts the disclosure of the name Jahveh at this time, agreeing with E in this respect (6. 3). Although his account is briefer than either of the other two, P omits none of the essential details: the promise to bring out the people (6. 6), to give them Canaan (6. 8), the refusal of the people to believe Moses (6. 9), the objection raised by Moses with regard to his speech defect (6. 12), the choice of Aaron as "prophet", that is, spokesman (7. 1f), the refusal by Pharaoh to let the people go (7. 3ff). There are, however, several differences. First, the P writer is most emphatic in his statement that the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob made a promise to them, and that the event which is to

take place; namely the Exodus, is proof that He remembers that promise(6. 4,7). Second, v. 7 is reminiscent of the later references to the Exodus in which the might and power of Jahveh are emphasized by recalling the Exodus story.⁴ Third, when Moses objects to his choice as leader because of his speech defect, it is with regard to Pharaoh's understanding him about which he is concerned (6. 12). In the J account, his concern seems to be with regard to the Children of Israel. And fourth, as a corollary to the preceeding point, Aaron is chosen as spokesman just before Moses addresses Pharaoh, and not in the wilderness as J informs us. It is also interesting to note the place of prominence given to Aaron in the P account. This is to be expected, since the office of the priesthood is traced back to him, and the more important his connection with the Exodus story --which we shall see to be of inestimable value as a source for tradition--the more important will be that office.

4. See below, Psalms, pp.56 ff. . Also Deuteronomy, pp.68. .

Chapter II.

The Plagues

After the preliminary remarks which we have just considered, all three of the strands which scholars have separated proceed immediately to a narration of the marvelous acts of Jahveh which are to result in Pharaoh's letting the people go. Contrary to popular belief--as expressed in the Haggada Service for the Pesach festival, for example--ten plagues were visited upon the Egyptians in none of the three accounts. One, the J, enumerates as many as seven, but each of the remaining two have fewer.

The J document, which was written somewhat earlier than E⁵ and much before P,⁶ lists the plagues in greater detail. According to this account, they number seven, and are, in the order of their mention: the rivers into blood,⁷ frogs,⁸ flies,⁹ murrain,¹⁰ hail,¹¹ locusts,¹² and the slaying of the first-born son.¹³ According to E, the plagues were only five in number: the rivers into blood,¹⁴ hail,¹⁵ locusts,¹⁶ darkness descending upon the land,¹⁷ and one more plague which God promises to bring to pass,¹⁸ but which is never again mentioned by the narrator.

5. Below p. 32.

6. Analysis according to Steuernagel: Einleitung. p. 186f.

7. 7. 17*, 18, 21a, 24f.

8. 7. 26-29; 8. 4-11aA.

9. 8. 16-28

10. 9. 1-7

11. 9. 13-21, 23b, 24, 25b-30, 33f.

12. 10. 1-11, 13b, 14aB-19.

13. 11. 4-8

14. 7. 17b*, 20*, 23.

15. 9. 22, 23a, 25a, 35a.

The Priestly account mentions but five: the rivers' becoming
¹⁹ blood, ²⁰ frogs, ²¹ boils, ²² lice, ²³ and the slaying of the first-
 born son of every Egyptian.

Thus, we find that only one plague brought upon Egypt is common to all three of the narrators; namely, the turning of the rivers into blood. One other, the slaying of the first-born son of every Egyptian is mentioned by both J and P, while the fifth plague suggested in E, but never mentioned explicitly, might conceivably have been this one. This hypothesis is given credence by the fact that in each instance in which the actual occurrence is mentioned--that is, in J and P--it comes as the last plague and the one which finally results in Pharaoh's letting the people go. Each is followed by the exodus of the people from Egypt. The verses in J which continue that narrative state (the words being those of Pharaoh): "Rise up, get you forth from among my people, both ye and the Children of Israel; and go, serve the Lord, as ye have said. Take both your flocks and your herds, as ye have said, and be gone; and bless me also" (12. 31aB,b,32). The P narrative continues in similar vein after this plague: "And the Children of Israel journeyed from Rameses to Succoth, about six hundred thousand men on foot, besides children" (12. 37). Similarly, the continuation of E, after the account of this fifth plague is: "And the Egyptians were urgent

-
- 16. 10. 12,13a,14aA,20.
 - 17. 10. 21-23,27.
 - 18. 11. 1-3
 - 19. 7. 19,20a*,21b,22.
 - 20. 8. 1-3,11*.
 - 21. 8. 12-15.
 - 22. 9. 8-12
 - 23. 12. 1,3-14,17*,28. (in part)

upon the people to send them out of the land in haste, for they said, 'we are all dead men'" (12. 33).

The implication of the remark put into the mouths of the Egyptians would also substantiate the belief that this last plague was the same as the last in each of the other two cases. The fear that all the Egyptians might be destined for death could only be inspired by the fact that some part of them had already met that fate.

Three plagues are repeated by two of the narrators, those of hail and locusts by J and E; and that of the frogs by J and P. The hail is the second plague to be visited upon the Egyptians according to E, but the sixth according to J. The E account is here, as always, more simply stated than that of J. Jahveh speaks to Moses and bids him "stretch forth thy hand toward heaven that there may be hail upon all the land of Egypt..." (9. 22). In J, Moses is instructed to warn Pharaoh of the event before²⁴ he brings it about (9. 13ff). In J, the story requires about²⁵ twenty verses, due to the greater detail in which it is narrated. In E, the whole affair, including the refusal to allow the²⁶ people to depart, requires but one full and three half verses. This same diversity in the two accounts is just as noticeable in the second plague mentioned by both of them; namely, the locusts. Here, again, E's is the more fragmentary account.

It has already been intimated that there is a greater stress

24. The sense of justice indicated by the procedure of J in this instance is to be remarked throughout his account of the plagues, and manifests itself in general in his materials.

25. v. note 11.

26. v. note 15.

upon detail in the J account. It is also to be noted that the descriptions contained therein are usually more extravagantly phrased than those of the E writer. Thus, for example, in the plague of hail, J tells us: "Behold tomorrow about this time I will cause it to rain a very grievous hail, the like of which has not occurred in Egypt from the day of its being founded until the present." (9. 18) E, while stating that the hail shall smite every Egyptian, and all the beasts of the field, omits the colorful description just noted in J. It is also interesting to note that J mentions the fact that there was no hail in the land of Goshen (9. 26) where the Israelites lived.²⁷ E, on the other hand, omits any mention of this additional miracle.

Again, with regard to the plague of locusts, these differences are to be noted. First, that concerning the warning to Pharaoh of what is to come--found only in J; and second, the difference in the language. With regard to this plague, also, J's is the more detailed account. E states quite simply that the locusts will come up upon Egypt and consume every green thing left by the hail (10. 12b, 14aA). J, on the other hand, says: "They shall cover the face of the earth that one cannot see the earth...and they shall fill thy houses, and the houses of all thy servants, and the houses of all the Egyptians" (10. 5f). And again the statement occurs that so great a misfortune has not occurred in all the history of Egypt (10. 6).

27. Here is another indication of the differing traditions which formed the basis of the J and E accounts. Only J knows the tradition that Israel dwelt in Goshen while in Egypt. All of the verses in the Pentateuch containing this information are J's. (Gn. 45.10; 46.24; 47. 4,6,27a; Ex. 8.22;9.26.)

The plague of the frogs gives us an opportunity to compare the methods of J and P. If, however, we ignore the fact that the unnamed fifth plague of E is probably that of the slaying of the first-born, then only J and P enumerate this one also, and it, too, may be utilized for our purpose. Here, too, we find points of difference between the two accounts. J again utilizes the formula of the warning speech to Pharaoh before the plague is brought to pass (7. 27), while P does not. In addition, J's account is more detailed than that of P. With regard to the slaying of the first-born son, P utilizes the tradition as the basis for the historicity of the Pesach festival (12. 3-14), while J ignores this possibility. A much later J writer, however, in 12. 21-23, 27b, does mention the ceremony of slaying the lamb and marking the door-posts of the Israelite homes with its blood. This lamb is even given the name "Passover lamb" (12. 21), but no reference is made to a festival of that name. Nor is the ceremony used by the original J writer as the historical reason for the keeping of such a festival as it is in the Priestly account. Further, it is generally agreed that all these references to the Passover as a historical festival commemorating the Exodus are very late. ²⁸

These five plagues are the only ones of the ten that are mentioned by more than one source. Of the remaining five, two are to be found only in the tradition recorded by J--the plagues of flies and murrain; two in that recorded by P--those of boils

28. Morgenstern: "Two Ancient Israelite Agricultural Festivals". Reprint from J.Q.R. Vol. VIII, No. 1. p. 39, note 4.

and lice; and one in that of E--darkness over all the land.

Of the conclusions which may be drawn from the foregoing analysis of the plague narratives, the first concerns the language used. J is verbose, more vivid in his descriptions, more detailed in his account, and seemingly, more prone to exaggerate. He lists three plagues evidently unknown to the tradition which served as the source for E, while omitting one. He mentions Goshen as the place where all the Israelites who were in Egypt lived, while E evidently is unaware of such a tradition. E's account, on the other hand, is more moderate, his descriptions less apparent overstatements, and his narration simple. There is no reason to assume, therefore, that J and E had at hand the same tradition. Obviously, they both describe the same event; the parallel of their stories has long been obvious. There are sufficient and frequent enough differences, however, to enable us to reach the conclusion that the traditions of the Exodus in the Northern and Southern kingdoms did vary, that J and E were acquainted with two different traditions describing the same event.

With regard to P, there is some evidence that he knew the J tradition. This is borne out by a comparison of the two accounts of the first plague--that of the rivers' turning to blood. Here, his language is almost identical with that of J. The differences that do appear are caused by the fact that in this instance, P actually enlarges upon the J tradition. We must not lose sight of the fact, however, that P is in possession

29. Cf. 7. 17f (J) with 7. 19ff (P).

of a tradition which includes new plagues--those of boils and lice--to the plagues recorded by J and E, which might well indicate that even in the Exile, a differing tradition existed. P's story also differs from the J and E accounts in another detail. For him, the plagues are miracles which the magicians of Pharaoh also attempt to accomplish, sometimes succeeding and sometimes failing. The Hebrew word used by P is *qān* or *qān*. J and E, on the other hand, use *qān*--a "smiting" of the Lord. The concept involved is not quite the same. The J and E writers consider the plagues as a means of punishment by which Jahveh is accomplishing His purpose of freeing the Israelites. P seems to have something different in mind. The plagues are more than the means of setting free Jahveh's people. They are wonders and miracles which attest to the greatness and power of Jahveh. This is an idea which, as we shall see, was given much prominence by the later Exilic and post-Exilic writers when they came to mention the exodus from Egypt.

One more difference between the account of P and those of J and E is to be noted; namely, the status of Aaron in this eventful period of Israel's early history. According to P, Aaron is seemingly equal in importance to Moses. We shall see that this is the only one of the three accounts that includes a ^{lengthy} description of the burial of Aaron.* And here, too, in the narration of each of the plagues, P uses the formula: "And the Lord said unto Moses: 'Say unto Aaron'" (7.19; 8.1, 12; 12.17).

* Below p. 24.

This precise formula does not occur in P's account of the plague of boils, the statement here being: "And the Lord said unto Moses and Aaron." In neither the J nor the E documents do we find a parallel to this position which is accorded Aaron by P. E mentions him not at all in the plague narratives. In J, he is accorded somewhat greater prominence. Here, we find that Pharaoh frequently calls for both Moses and Aaron to ask that the plague of the moment cease. Examples of this procedure are to be found in 8.4 (the plague of frogs) and 8.21 (the plague of flies). Even so, however, it is only Moses who actually entreats Jahveh that the plague may depart (8.8b, 25, et al). The reason for the P writer's interest in Aaron is obvious. Interested in the priesthood, he wants to trace that institution back to the very beginning of Israel's history, thus giving to it a prestige and authority. And since that institution had its inception in Aaron, the greater role that individual played in the Exodus, the greater importance he would have in the eyes of the contemporaries of P. Thus, if he could be demonstrated to have had equal status with Moses in that great deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt, the prestige and authority of the institution of the priesthood would increase accordingly.

Pharaoh's additional

Chapter III.

The Pursuit.

The popular conception of that which happened at the Red Sea is that God saved the Israelites from the Egyptians by separating the waters so that the former might cross on dry land, but causing them to flow back again, thus drowning the pursuing Egyptians. Strangely enough, however, but one of the three recorded traditions tells such a tale, that being P. Of the remaining two, J attributes the failure of the Egyptians to overtake the Israelites to an entirely different cause. And the E account is a fragmentary one. According to it, Moses raises his staff (14. 16aA)--an action which we would expect to be followed by some such act as that contained in J or P. But the description of what actually did follow that act has evidently been lost--or perhaps purposely omitted when J and E were combined. Scholars disagree concerning the placement of the verses containing the story of the pursuit. None of them is able to separate three connected stories. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby assign verse 5 of chapter 14 to J, and verse 7 of that chapter to E.³¹ Steuernagel assigns 14. 5-7 to both J and E.³² Both of them, however, agree in their assigning of the verses following, although the result is not all that might be desired.

31. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby: The Composition of the Hexateuch. p. 516.

32. Steuernagel: Einleitung in das Alte Testament. p.187f.

Using Steuernagel as a basis, there is provided an otherwise lacking introduction to the E narrative, although a fitting conclusion is still wanting. We proceed, then, on that basis.

J's account is the more detailed and the more lucid one. After the introductory remarks, he describes the people as complaining. Here, the exact words of the murmurings are quoted. (14. 11f) In addition, J with his characteristic disapproval of anthropomorphisms, ³³ makes use of the pillar of cloud as that which came between the two camps (14. 19b, 20a). According to 14. 23f Jahveh discomfits (from the root *AND*) the Egyptians by making the wheels of their chariots stick in the soft ground until they are pulled off, and the chariots drive heavily. Thus were the Egyptians frightened and impelled to flee. But the waters returned to their normal state in the morning, flooding back upon the shore, and the Egyptians were caught (14. 27*, 30). According to E, Pharaoh regrets his having allowed the Children of Israel to go (14. 5). He prepares his chariots and pursues after them, just as J recounted. In this narrative, too, the Israelites cry out to Jahveh who tells them that instead of thus bemoaning their fate, let Moses lift up his rod over the sea and divide it (14. 15aB, 16aA). Except for a terse statement that the Angel of the Lord removed from before to behind the Israelites, and stood between them and the hosts of Pharaoh (14. 19a, 20b), E ends his story here, leaving much to the imagination of the reader.

33. Bible 6 class notes.

P tells a far different story. According to his account, the waters were divided and stood as a wall on either side of the Israelites as they crossed on foot upon the dry land (14.21f). The Egyptian horde, pursuing, rode after them. Jahveh, then, commands Moses to stretch forth his rod a second time, thus causing the waters to return. He carries out the divine command, and the Egyptians are drowned to the last man (14. 26,27aA,28).

Our investigation of the verses dealing with the pursuit bring us to a conclusion similar to that arrived at after a perusal of those relating to the plagues. J is once more the most detailed account, even including the actual statement of the Israelites when they complain about the situation in which they find themselves. Again E presents a fragmentary story, offering but the merest suggestion of the miracle contained in either J or P. And again P adds to J, this time in even more striking fashion than when recording the story of the plagues. It would seem, therefore, that P is prone to accept the more vivid and more miraculous tradition recorded by J, even embellishing it, while rejecting the more simple tradition of E. This is but natural. When the P narrative was written, the Exodus had taken place some eight centuries before. It is probable that P had no distinct tradition of the event as did J and E. And since the more colorful account was the more appealing, and the more valuable for his purpose of impressing his readers with the greatness of Jahveh, it is to be expected that he would choose J's document in preference to that of E.

Chapter IV.

The Narratives of the Wilderness Period

After the Children of Israel had crossed the Red Sea, leaving the Egyptians behind, they begin their tortuous journey to the Promised Land. By what route they travelled and what happened to them on the way is the subject of the next narratives of the Exodus. Again, the three strands are noticeable. In considering this material, however, we find no such apparent parallels as were so easily discernible thus far. There are a few stories that are repeated by each--the theophany at Sinai, the sending out of the spies--but for the most part it will be necessary to trace the itinerary, and the incidents attendant upon it separately for each of the three accounts.

A. According to J.

The J document utilizes a "pillar of cloud to lead the people by day and a pillar of fire to give them light at night (13. 21), instead of the "Angel of the Lord" of E (14. 19a). After leaving the Red Sea, the Children of Israel march three days' journey into the wilderness of Shur, arriving at Morah (15. 22f). Moses, at the command of Jahveh casts a tree into the water which was too bitter for the people to drink, rendering it sweet and palatable (15. 25a). The next cry of the people is for food, and the manna is miraculously given by God.³⁴ Again dissatisfaction creeps into the camp over the lack of water,

34. J's account of the giving of the manna is contained in Ex. 16. 4*, 13b-15a, 19, 20, 21b.

and again the people grow rebellious (17. 1bB,2*). Jahveh commands Moses to strike the rock with his rod, and water comes forth (17. 6). The place is called Massah³⁵ and Meribah³⁶. Here, one of the cardinal beliefs of J is revealed--the absolute trust in the ability and favor of Jahveh, and the utter folly of believing otherwise: "And he called the name of the place Massah and Meribah...because they tempted the Lord, saying, 'Is Jahveh among us or not?'" (17. 7).

The next event, according to J, is the theophany at Sinai, at which place Moses' father-in-law visits him (Num. 10. 29-32). The journey begun once again, we find a continuation of the complaints of the people, this time over the manna of which they have tired (Num. 11. 6). Jahveh promises not only meat, but enough meat to last a month and "until it come out of your nostrils" (Num. 11. 20). Here, again, the pen of J makes his point that nothing is too wonderful for the Lord to accomplish. When Moses questions the possibility of such a supply being given, Jahveh answers him tersely: "Is the Lord's hand waxed short?" (Num. 11. 23). From this place, the people journey to Hazeroth, and then to the wilderness of Paran (Num. 12. 16).

From here, spies are sent into the land of Canaan, going into the south of that land until they come to Hebron. They agree that the land flows with milk and honey, but also state that there are giants in the land (Num. 13. 22). Their report is more complete than we shall find that of E to be in that they

35. i. e. "Trying".

36. i. e. "Strife".

describe the nations that inhabit the land, and approximately their place of residence (Num. 13. 29). The people are discouraged at the report, and want to return to Egypt (Num. 14. 3). Jahveh then decrees that the present generation shall die in the wilderness (Num. 14, 32). The conclusion of the J account of the wilderness period is the defeat of the Canaanites who dwelt in the South, and the taking of their cities by the Israelites (Num. 21. 1-3).

B. According to E.

E tells the following story. After the people leave the Red Sea, they are attacked by the Amalekites in Rephidim (Ex. 17.8). A victory is won when Aaron and Hur support Moses' outstretched arms (Ex. 17. 10-13). From Rephidim, they journey to Sinai where the well-known theophany takes place. What happened there, according to J, E, and P shall be discussed in another chapter. While at the Mount, Moses receives a visit from his father-in-law (Ex. 18, 2a, 3-27). Both the J and E documents of the Exodus include, as we have seen, the narrative of the father-in-law of Moses, a Midianite, coming to visit Moses in the wilderness. His name, according to J, is Jethro; E calls him Hobab. There can be no doubt, however, of a similar tradition being in the possession of both writers. The vestige which remains in J serves no purpose. It is mentioned merely as an event which occurred during the wilderness wanderings. For E, on the other hand, it has a definite aim. According to that writer, Hobab shared in the communion meal with Moses, Aaron, and the elders, and showed Moses how to organize the administration of justice.

According to Bewer, "this is one of the most important traditions of E, and especially noteworthy in that it showed that judicial organization in Israel went back ultimately to Jethro, the Mid-³⁷ianite priest, and not to Moses".

From Sinai, with the ark before them, the people travel a three days' journey (Num. 10. 33). At Taberah, the people rebel and Jahveh sends a fire which consumes some of them (Num. 11. 1-3). It is here that Moses feels the burden of leading the people too great for him, and is told to appoint seventy elders to help him rule (Num. 11. 14, 16, 17). The next event of interest, according to E, is the rebellion of Aaron and Miriam against the authority of Moses (Num. 12. 1-15). There is no mention of a journey from Taberah; neither is there any indication that the rebellion took place there. Evidently, the next stop is Kadesh, in the wilderness of Paran (Num. 13. 26*), from which point the spies are sent into Palestine (Num. 17bB). After their return from the valley of Eshcol (Num 13. 23ff), they are all agreed that it is truly a land flowing with milk and honey (Num. 13. 27), but advise Moses not to enter because of the size of the inhabitants, of whom the spies report: "We were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so were we in their sight" (Num. 13. 33). Only Caleb advises that an attempt be made to take immediate possession of the land.

With regard to the continuation of the E account in Num. 14, difficulty is encountered as to the allocation of the verses. According to Steuernagel, it is not possible to determine just what does belong to J and what to E.³⁸ Gray³⁹ offers another opinion.

37. Bewer. Opus cit. p. 77f.

38. Steuernagel. Opus cit. p. 167.

39. Gray. I. C. C. to Numbers. p. 155.

While admitting that 14. 1-12 may well be a part of the original tradition, he insists that parts of vv. 13-27 are undoubtedly late. They demonstrate a marked similarity to Ezekiel,⁴⁰ and to other late passages in the Pentateuch.⁴¹ He is of the opinion, therefore, that the appeal of Moses to Jahveh in which he seeks to deter Him from His purpose by appealing to His regard for His reputation among the nations for strength and for mercy, is much later than the rest of the chapter, being at least Exilic.

The original tradition, then, would be this: After the discouraging news is brought back by the spies, the people express the desire to elect captains and return to Egypt (Num. 14. 4). Jahveh becomes provoked, and declares His intention of punishing the people by permitting no one save Caleb and Joshua of the present generation to reach the Promised Land (Num. 14. 30). The original decree to destroy the people utterly, contained in v. 12, Moses' intercession and the relenting of Jahveh, contained in vv. 13-19, are all later insertions. Moses then reports to the people that their actions have brought upon them a forty years' wandering in the wilderness--until^X all of them shall have died--and the mourning is great (Num. 14. 33,39). By morning, however, the people evidently decide that perchance they can avert the decree if they change their course of action. They acknowledge, therefore, their having sinned, and make ready to fight. The battle is waged despite the warning of Moses, and the Israelites are defeated (Num. 14. 40-45).

40. Ez. 32. 9-14,21; 20 are the verses quoted by Gray.
41. Ex. 32. 12; 34. 6ff are the verses quoted by Gray.

Apparently while still at Kadesh, three more events of importance take place. First, Miriam dies (Num. 20. 1aB,b). Second, another rebellion is begun by the people over the lack of water (Num. 20. 5). Moses strikes the rock with his rod "and water came forth abundantly" (Num. 20. 11a,bA). It is also from this point that messengers are sent to the king of Edom seeking permission to pass through that land (Num. 20. 14,17). The permission is refused, and Israel turns away from Edom (Num. 20.21). At this point in the narrative, an account is inserted by a later E writer (E³)⁴² of an attack on the people by fiery serpents, sent, it would seem, as divine punishment for a continuation of endless complaints (Num. 21. 5ff). The people again repent, and the bites of the serpents are healed by looking upon a fiery serpent made by Moses at Jahveh's command and set up upon a pole in the midst of the camp (Num 21. 8f).

Next, we find the Children of Israel at the brook of Arnon which separates Moab from the land of the Amorites (Num. 21.13b). 21. 16 tells of a stop at Be'er, where water miraculously wells up from the ground. From here messengers are sent to Sihon, the king of the Amorites asking his permission to pass through the land (Num. 21. 23f). Again permission is refused, and a battle is fought at Jahaz in which Israel is victorious, taking possession of the entire country of the Amorites (Num 21.23ff). Now the account hurries to its conclusion, with but brief mention of places on the way to "the valley that is in the field of Moab by the top of Pisgah which looketh down upon the desert (Num. 21.20).

42. Steuernagel. Opus cit. p. 188.

C. According to P.

After leaving Succoth, the Children of Israel encamp at Etham, which is on the edge of the wilderness (Ex. 13. 20f). From here with but brief mention of events which occurred along the way, with the exception of the giving of the manna,⁴³ P brings the people to Sinai (Ex. 19. 1,2a). The P author, however, does utilize the manna story to emphasize, once again, his belief in the importance of the Sabbath in the life of the people (Ex. 16. 23-26,29f). The people remain at Sinai for twenty-three months before journeying to Paran.⁴⁴ From Paran, the spies are sent out, going as far as Rehob in the entrance to Hamath (Num. 13. 21). The interest of P in genealogies manifests itself here in the enumeration of the men sent from each tribe. Only the report brought back by Joshua and Caleb is an optimistic one, and in this account, too, the people rebel (Num. 14. 10). Just as they are about to stone the two, however, the glory of the Lord appeared before all the people. Jahveh speaks, telling the people that they shall be punished by wandering one year in the wilderness for each day that the spies were in the land-- forty years in all (Num. 14. 26-29, 34f). P makes no mention of Jahveh's desire to disinherit His people and destroy them. As we have seen, the concept involved is a late one, dating from the time of Ezekiel at its earliest. Whether it was not yet known to the P writer, we cannot say.

Num. 20 gives the Priestly account of what happened at

43. Ex. 16. 1-3,9-13a,15b-18,21a,22-26,29-32,35.

44. Ex. 19. 1; Num. 10. 11.

Meribah. Because Moses and Aaron doubted that water would flow from the rock, as God had said, they are not to bring the people into the land of Canaan (Num. 20. 10, 11bB, 12). Aaron is the first to die, being buried on Mt. Hor. P is naturally more interested in Aaron than either J or E, hence P's account is more lengthy. After the death of Aaron, P brings the Children of Israel to the borders of Moab in a few, deft strokes.

D. The Significance of the Three Accounts.

The wide variance in the accounts of J, E, and P concerning the march of the Israelites from Egypt to Canaan would seem to bear out the theory of three distinct traditions of the same event. Each of the accounts mentions prominently the rebelliousness of the people and the difficulty which Moses had with them. For the most part, however, the particular incidents vary. And even when they are the same, there may be detected in them a differing emphasis, depending upon the point with which each of the documents is concerned. Now that the wilderness wanderings of the people have been described according to the traditions recorded by each of the documents in just that sequence in which the incidents occurred in the Bible narrative, it will be well to correct any erroneous impression that such a procedure may have given. It is not true that the events actually took place in that order. On the contrary, it is generally conceded by Biblical scholars that the materials contained in Ex. 15-18-- that is, that material which involves the wanderings of the people from the time they left Egypt until they reached Sinai, really

belong after the Sinai materials, and find their rightful place in Numbers. In other words, the Israelites went directly to Sinai from Egypt. The truth of such a contention is borne out by the fact that both J and E indicate that such is the purpose of the request to leave Egypt.⁴⁵ At any rate, what befell the people is not so important as the interpretation made of the incidents by the various writers. Each seeks the sanction of tradition for the religious beliefs which he holds. Therefore, each endeavors to link up these beliefs with the very earliest relationship between the Israelites and Jahveh. Hence, we find in these stories of the wanderings of the Children of Israel much which is of significance in a consideration of the points of view of their authors.

Only one story is contained in all three accounts--that of the sending out of the spies. According to J, the spies proceed into the country as far as Hebron (Num. 13. 22). E omits any specific mention of the parts of Palestine which the spies visited. But P records that they journeyed the whole length of the land until they came to Hamath (Num. 13. 21), which is later a part of the Syrian kingdom.⁴⁶ Here we find an excellent example of P's interest in the land--an interest not evidenced by either J or E. It is understandable, however, since the P document was written during the Exile, when the land was no longer the possession of Israel, while both J and E wrote at a more propitious moment in Israelitish history. Another interest of P is

45. In J, Ex. 3. 19f; in E, Ex. 3. 12.

46. Margolis and Marx. History of the Jewish People. p. 52.

a list of the men who were sent from each tribe. And this, he gives at length (Num. 13; 4-16). All three of the accounts use this story of the fear of the people to enter the land as the cause for their further wanderings in the wilderness. As we have already noted, P does not record the tradition of Moses' intercession with Jahveh to persuade Him that he relent from His purpose of destroying Israel. This account, as we have seen, is also missing in the original J and E documents.

The account of the giving of the manna occurs in both J and P. For J, it is merely another manifestation of the greatness and goodness of Jahveh. P, however, siezes upon the tradition as a means of reminding the people of the importance of the institution of the Sabbath day. Whereas, according to J, the manna would rot if left over till morning--apparently every morning, since no exception is mentioned (Ex. 11. 20)--P states explicitly that it will not spoil if left over on the Sabbath. As a matter of fact, Moses instructs the people to gather enough of the manna on the sixth day to last through the seventh.

The remaining incident wherein comparisons can be made is that of the bringing forth of water from the rock, contained, in P, in Num. 20, and in J, in Ex. 17. The purpose to which the story is put by each writer is interesting. To J, the event bespeaks the great power of Jahveh, and the folly of believing that this powerful and merciful God would forsake His people. To P, it presents the opportunity to explain why Moses and Aaron, particularly the latter, were not to bring the Children of Israel into the Promised Land. They had disobeyed Jahveh--although just how, remains a mystery--and their punishment was

announced. Immediately thereafter, Aaron dies, and P takes pains to describe the hereditary status of the priesthood. His garments are to be stripped off and placed upon Eleasar, his son, who is to succeed him in the office (Num. 20. 22ff).

Other events which occur upon the journey, while involving no parallels among the accounts, do offer an insight into the motives and ideals of the writers. According to E, fiery serpents were sent among the people on their way from Kadesh because of their murmurings against Jahveh, and His servant, Moses. Moses interceded for them, and was instructed to make a brazen serpent which would heal every one who looked at it (Num. 21. 4aB,b-9). This, according to Bewer, is a case of healing by sympathetic magic. The story has greater significance, however, for E. With it, E "tried to counteract the worship of the brazen serpent, an ancient idol which had found its place in the Temple at Jerusalem, by reinterpreting its meaning. It was quite old, he admitted, for it went back to Moses. But he only made it as a symbol. It was not divine, nor did it represent a god. Jahveh used it as a means of healing those that had been bitten by serpents in the wilderness. There was therefore no reason whatever to pay homage to it".⁴⁷ Another important teaching of the E writer is the necessity of absolute obedience to Jahveh and His prophet. Again E uses the story of the wilderness wanderings to drive home this point. Dathan and Abiram and all their families are put to death because they rebel against Moses (Num. 16). When the people attack the Amalekites and the Canaan-

47. Bewer. Opus cit. p. 79.

ites against Moses' wishes, they are horribly defeated (Num. 14. 40-45*). Not only however, does E believe in an absolute obedience to the prophets of Jahveh, he is also a staunch defender of the role of prophecy in the life of the nation. Thus, we find in the E document a number of statements glorifying prophecy. One of these is the divine command to Moses to bring the seventy elders with him to the tabernacle that God may put the spirit which is in Moses also upon them (Num. 11. 16f). Another is Moses' remark when informed that Eldad and Medab were prophesying in the camp: "Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets and that the Lord would put His spirit upon them" (Num. 11. 29).

The motives of J and P have already been suggested. It will suffice to mention here that both of them utilize every opportunity to lend the sanction of tradition to their religious concepts. P invariably introduces the institutions which he upholds wherever possible. J drives home again and again his firm belief that Jahveh is above all a righteous God, one who rewards virtue but is quick to punish wickedness. These stories of the wilderness wanderings present a splendid opportunity to all three writers--and each seizes that opportunity in no uncertain manner.

Chapter V.

The Covenant at Mt. Sinai.

The Biblical material dealing with Israel at the Mount, and the giving of the law is among the most intricate and difficult portions of the combined documents. Scholars have offered numerous suggestions in an attempt to clarify the passages involved. The majority of them are agreed that both J and E contain an original law code of Ten Words,⁴⁸ which parallel each other closely,⁴⁹ while D's is a much later and more advanced group of laws. The Decalogue in Ex. 20. 1-17 which parallels that of Deut. 5. 6-21 is held by Steuernagel to be later than that of Deuteronomy. It was inserted in Exodus by Rp,⁵⁰ and dates from long after the Exile.

It is not our task, however, to make another effort to straighten out these passages. It is sufficient for our purpose to discover whether or not the giving of the law at Sinai served as the beginning of the covenant relationship between Jahveh and the Israelites. There can be little doubt that whatever the basis upon which such a covenant was entered into, such a covenant certainly existed. Both J and E mention it explicitly. Only P neglects it for what--to him--is of greater importance. In P, the giving of the law at Sinai serves to give a traditional basis for the one central sanctuary and its ministering servants

48. The J account is contained in Ex. 34. 10-27; E's in 20. 1-17.

49. Kent. Beginnings of Hebrew History. pp. 185f.

Carpenter and Harford-Battersby. op. cit. p. 210, n. b.

50. Steuernagel. op. cit. p. 259.

the priests and Levites. For did not Moses at the behest of God, command its construction at Sinai (Ex. 35ff)? To return, however, to the covenant relationship entered into at Sinai (Horeb), we find that both J and E consider the code of laws given here as the basis for the solemn institution of a covenant between Jahveh and Israel. In the J account, we read: "Behold, I [Jahveh] make a covenant; before all thy people I will do marvels such as have not been wrought in all the earth, nor in any nation; and all the people among whom thou art shall see the work of the Lord that I am about to do with thee, that it is tremendous" (Ex. 34. 10). This verse, according to Dr. Morgenstern, is a part of an older document than either J or E. According to him, in the original K document, Moses requests Jahveh to take Israel--Moses' people--to Him as His own. 34. 10 "is obviously Jahveh's answer to just such a request of Moses. Israel is not yet Jahveh's people, but ^{וְאֶתְּ} 'thy people', Moses' people, the people whom he had brought up from Egypt, just as in 31. 1a. Now for the first time, Jahveh proposes, presumably in answer to Moses request, to make a covenant with Moses' people, a covenant by which they will now become His people and come under His direct and constant protection, and enter into His worship".⁵¹ In the E account, we find: "And Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people and said, 'Behold, the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you in agreement with all these words'" (ex. 24. 8). This verse,

51. Morgenstern. "The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch." p. 21.

according to Dr. Morgenstern,⁵² is a part of the C document which has been incorporated into the E account. Just as J took possession of the older K covenant and included it in his own account, so has E done likewise with the C materials.⁵³ For both J and E, the fact that they accepted the older tradition of a covenant being formed between Jahveh and Israel at Sinai (Horeb) seems to be sufficient indication that they agreed with that tradition, and also felt that the inception of Israel as Jahveh's people was at the Mount.

Here, then, is the basis for the covenant relationship between Jahveh and Israel according to both of the older documents. E, unlike J (Gn. 12. 1-3), does not carry that relationship back to Abram, but it cannot be doubted that he was deeply impressed by it. For J, there may be some doubt that this was the original covenant. At least, there is a suggestion of a former one with the first patriarch. In the extant materials of E, however, the covenant relationship at Horeb marks the very beginning of such a relationship.⁵⁴ And for both J and E, the covenant at Sinai (Horeb) marked a most important milestone in the history of Israel. Israel now becomes Jahveh's people. He is their God; they are dedicated to Him, and to no other God. How important this covenant relationship became in subsequent Israelitish history shall become more and more evident as the writings of later Biblical writers are considered.

52. Morgenstern. "Book of the Covenant", I. pp. 4ff.

53. What is left of the original K document with regard to the covenant is found in Ex. 34. 14a, 17-23, 25f, with the deletion of certain late glosses. The verses of C are: 20. 23; 22. 28f; 23. 12, 14-19, also with the deletion of late glosses necessary.

54. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby. op. cit. pp. 210ff.

Chapter VI.

Summary and Conclusions Regarding J, E, and P.

The triple-tradition of the Exodus has become an accepted fact. The foregoing resume of the material contained in the Exodus story demonstrates clearly the presence of three separate and distinct narrators: the J or Jahvist, the E or Elohist, and the P or Priestly. Much has been written concerning the place, character, and date of these writings. Scholars are more or less agreed that J wrote in the Southern Kingdom sometime between 850 and 750 B. C. E. Beyer limits the date to ca. 850.⁵⁵ Carpenter and Harford offer the leeway of the century.⁵⁶ Steuernagel places J as earlier than E², and in the ninth century.⁵⁷ E penned his document in the Northern Kingdom sometime during the first half of the eighth century.⁵⁸ Steuernagel places this account at about the time of Jereboam II. ca. 765.⁵⁹ thus agreeing with the general statement of E's date. P is a much later source, arising after the Exile and usually being placed ca. 500 B. C. E.,⁶⁰ or between that date and the time of Ezra's journey to Palestine, which would bring that account down to the middle of the fifth century.⁶¹

55. Beyer. op. cit. p. 60.

56. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby. op. cit. p. 194.

57. Steuernagel. op. cit. p. 225.

58. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby. op. cit. p. 222.

59. Steuernagel. op. cit. p. 223.

60. Beyer. op. cit. p. 259.

61. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby. op. cit. p. 299.

Our problem, then, resolves itself to this: We date the Exodus itself in the thirteenth century, J in the ninth, E in the eighth, and P in the fifth. The history of the Exodus has thus been recorded by writers who penned their documents four, five, and eight centuries after the actual event. The question before us is this: What significance do they attach to it in their own day? What purpose had they in mentioning it?

In general, as we have seen, the tradition of the Exodus from Egypt takes on a parallel form in each of the three accounts. After the "choice" of Israel, and a series of plagues calculated to gain the permission of Pharaoh to allow the people to leave the country, the Children of Israel wander in the wilderness for a number of years. Their complaints and discontent are recorded alike by J, E, and P. Emphasis is placed by each upon the lack of water in the wilderness, and Jahveh's power and kindness as demonstrated by His supplying of this and other needs of the people. The story of the spies, and the result of Israel's dissatisfaction with their report is clearly brought out. And for each, the culmination of the Exodus, the climax of the event, is the covenant entered into between Jahveh and Israel at Sinai (Horeb). This covenant is of the utmost significance. Based upon it is the entire future relationship of the Children of Israel to their God.

Differences between the attitudes of the J and E writers are difficult to distinguish. The two accounts were written too close together in point of time. As a matter of fact, E² which contains the larger part of the E materials, was written

*

contemporaneously with J² according to Steuernagel. Minor differences in their accounts have already been noted. For our present purpose, they shall be considered together as the JE document.

Perhaps the most striking use which JE made of the Exodus story was their basing of the covenant relationship between Jahveh and Israel upon that event. Although P, as well as JE, indicated that Israel was chosen by Jahveh in Egypt, only the latter account emphasized this covenant at Sinai (Horeb). Indeed, the idea of this covenant relationship dating from Sinai went back into even earlier traditions of Israel. We have seen that J incorporated into his material the K materials which Dr. Morgenstern has shown to be the oldest document of the Hexateuch. E likewise accepted the covenant materials of C, and used them as his own. Thus, for both J and E, these earlier writers had expressed the identical religious concept in which they, themselves, believed; namely, the fact that Jahveh's covenant with Israel dated from Sinai (Horeb).

JE also utilizes the story to impress upon the people the importance of prophecy. In J, this is usually accomplished by an emphasis upon ideals which we find crystallized in prophetic writings--thus, for example, the constant reminder that Jahveh is a just and a righteous God, as we noted in J's presentation of the plagues. E, too, emphasizes the importance of prophecy in even more direct language. The divine command to Moses that

* Steuernagel. op. cit. p. 219.

he bring the seventy elders with him to the tabernacle that God might put the spirit which is upon Moses also upon them⁶² is one striking example. Another is to be found in the remark made by Moses upon being informed that Eldad and Medab were⁶³ prophesying in the camp.

- Again JE, and especially E, make use of the Exodus narrative to combat the custom of idol worship prevalent in their day. The story of the golden calf, the anger of Moses at such an act, and his forthright punishment of the people, indicate the attitude toward such a practice (Ex. 32. 17-20). Moreover, by the recording of that incident, E added to his own opposition the support of a similar opposition on the part of Moses at the very beginning of Israel's history. E likewise tried to counteract the worship of the brazen serpent in similar fashion, as we have⁶⁴ seen.

In common with P, the JE account emphasizes the greatness and goodness of Jahveh. All of the writers constantly refer to this point. Every rebellion of the people in the wilderness, followed by a miraculous salvation on the part of Jahveh, bears out the fact that Israel's God is a great and powerful one: the deliverance at the Sea of Reeds, the giving of the manna, the bringing forth of water from the rock are but a few examples of this fact. There is, however, one difference between JE and P which is clearly brought out in the plague materials. For JE, the plagues were punishments brought by Jahveh upon Egypt. For P, they were miracles. In either case, they attest the great-

62. supra. p.28.

63. supra. p.28.

64. supra. p.27.

nees of Jahveh, but the latter is surely a more advanced ethical concept than the former.

In the remaining purposes which P had in recording the Exodus story, we find little in common with JE. P does not make nearly so much of the covenant relationship entered into at Sinai (Horeb). For him, the giving of the law serves to give a traditional basis for the central sanctuary and its ministering servants. This is one of the primary aims of P, and the most important use which he makes of the narrative. For him, the Exodus presents the opportunity to find sanction for the priesthood which he takes great pains to trace back to Aaron. And Aaron plays no insignificant role in the story, according to P. In line with P's interest in the priesthood, are two additional interests which he uses the Exodus story to further. The one is that in the institutions such as the Sabbath which he loses no opportunity to emphasize. We have noted such a purpose in P's account of the giving of the manna, for example.⁶⁵ The other is his interest in the land, as indicated by his story of the spies.⁶⁶ It is also interesting to note that this interest of P in the priesthood, the sanctuary, the ritual, and the institutions supercedes any interest in prophecy such as we found in the JE account.

65. supra. p. 23.

66. supra. p. 25.

Part II.

The Significance Attached to the Exodus by Other Biblical Writers

Chapter VII.

The Significance of the Exodus in Pre-Exilic Times.

Not only did the Exodus assume tremendous significance in the minds of those writers who depicted the actual event, as we have seen in our examination of the traditions of that event, but it became important, as well, to other than those who recorded the history of Israel. And this is true for all periods of Israelitish history subsequent to the Exodus itself, whether pre-Exilic, Exilic, or post-Exilic. With regard to those who wrote before the Exile, we shall find that they were largely concerned with the importance of the covenant relationship, the time from which such a relationship dated, and kindred subjects.

The earliest of the prophets who believed that the covenant between Israel and Jahveh was sealed at the time of the Exodus was Amos. His prophecy can be dated with certainty--having been⁶⁷ delivered between the years 765-750 B. C. E. Since both the J and E writers date from approximately the same period, it is not strange to find in Amos the same interest in the covenant relationship which has been noted with regard to them. While the language of Amos is more poetic, and the covenant is not explicitly stated as "b'rith", the intent of his words is none the less unmistakeable when he says: "Hear this word which the Lord hath spoken against you, O Children of Israel, against the whole family which I brought up out of the land of Egypt,

67. Harper. I. C. C. to Amos and Hosea. p. cii.
Buddenweiser. Class notes.

saying: You, only, have I known of all the families of the earth..." (3. 1f).

Hosea, whose period of prophecy was somewhat later than that of Amos (ca. 745-722 B. C. E. ⁶⁸), is clearer upon the matter. He, too, believed that the covenant relationship between Israel and Jahveh had its inception at the time of the Exodus. In the famous passage in which he beseeches the people to return to Jahveh from whom they have strayed, he states in more direct language than Amos: "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and out of Egypt I called My son" (11. 1). The import of the words is clear. For Hosea, too, the Exodus from Egypt and the beginning of the covenant relationship are synonymous. The fact that he believed, in addition, that the Exodus marked the beginning of Israel's history is a point which will be discussed later in this chapter.

The crystallization of the idea of the covenant between Jahveh and Israel dating from the Exodus is found in Jeremiah, whose period of prophecy extended over a long span of years. We shall find that his post-Exile utterances deal with the New Covenant which is to take the place of the old. ⁶⁹ In his earlier prophecies, however, we find clear-cut references to that earlier covenant which Amos and Hosea also linked with the Exodus period. His first mention of the Exodus as significant for the covenant relationship is to be found in one of Jeremiah's earliest prophecies. Jahveh is represented as saying:

68. Harper. op. cit. pp. cxli, 203.

69. See below, p. 55 f.

"I remember the troth of thy youth,
The love of thy espousals in going after Me
In the wilderness, a land unsown" (2. 2).

70

Driver places this particular prophecy ca. 626-620 B. C. E.

and Smith also characterizes it as one of the prophet's earliest

71

oracles. The true significance of the words for our purpose

is even more apparent in the Hebrew. The nearest English equi-

valent of the Hebrew "hesed" is probably "troth". Smith ac-

curately defines the Hebrew word as "more than an affection; it

72

is loyalty to a relation". And this is precisely the import

of the prophetic words. They refer to a relation between Jahveh

and Israel which has existed since the Exodus period.

At approximately the same period of Jeremiah's life--per-

73

haps immediately after the promulgation of Deuteronomy, ca.

621--the prophet again makes mention of this covenant which was

made "in the days that I brought them out of Egypt" (11. 3-5).

As the period of the Exile approached, the concept became more

clearly defined in the prophet's mind. After the "discovery" of

Deuteronomy, but shortly before the Exile, we find two more

statements by Jeremiah which indicate his attitude toward the

importance of the covenant entered into when Israel was brought

74

out of Egypt. The first of these was written ca. 608-605;

the second in the years immediately preceeding the fall of Jeru-

75

salem. In the first, the prophet objects to the false notion

that Jahveh is concerned with sacrifices. He insists that when

70. Driver. The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah. p. 5.

71. Smith, G. A. Jeremiah. p. 90.

72. Ibid. p. 104.

73. Ibid. p. 144.

74. Driver. op. cit. p. 60.

75. Ibid. p. 209.

Israel was brought out of Egypt, the covenant was established, and was phrased in the words: "Hearken unto My voice and I shall be your God and Ye will be My people..." (7. 21-23).

The second utterance, which Skinner characterizes as "a clear and important reference to the Mosaic Covenant",⁷⁶ is even more forceful. In it, Jahveh says: I made a covenant with your fathers in the day when I brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, out of the House of Bondage" (34. 13-15).

The idea of the Exodus as the historical setting for the covenant relationship between Jahveh and Israel was not confined to the prophets, however. There are similar utterances to be found in the historical books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings. Only two of them, however, would seem to have an early origin. One of these is that contained in Judges 6. 8-10. The people cry out to Jahveh because of Midian. They are reminded that Jahveh brought them out of Egypt, delivered them from the Egyptians, and told them in the wilderness: "I am Jahveh your God". Burney places these verses before the promulgation of Deuteronomy, and states that "they exercised a well-marked influence upon D".⁷⁷ The covenant relationship, then, was recognized as existing from the time of the Exodus by writers preceding the authors of the Book of Deuteronomy. Such a relationship is mentioned by Amos, Hosea, and Jeremiah, in his pre-Deuteronomic utterances, as well as by J and E who recorded the event, and now, by another E writer whose period of activity also pre-

76. Skinner. Prophecy and Religion. p. 323.

77. Burney. Judges. pp. xlv, 186.

ceeded the promulgation of Deuteronomy.

Closely connected with this idea of the covenant relationship dating from the Exodus period is another idea which seems to be almost wholly confined to Hosea. For him, not only did the Exodus mark the inception of Jahveh's covenant with Israel, but the very beginnings of Israel's history as a people date from that period. Hosea makes frequent mention of the period of the Exodus as the "childhood" or "youth" of Israel. It be-⁷⁹ comes increasingly clear that for him that great event marks the beginning of Israel's history. Thus we find the statement in 11. 1: "When Israel was a child then I loved him, and out of Egypt I brought my son". And again: "And she [Israel] shall respond there, as in the days of her youth, as in the days when she came up out of the land of Egypt" (2. 17). Jeremiah and Ezekiel are the only other Biblical writers to share a similar point of view. For them, too, the wilderness is the beginning of the history of Israel. Jeremiah writes, in speaking of the wilderness covenant with Jahveh: "I remember for thee the troth of thy youth" (2. 2). Ezekiel expresses a similar idea in the words: "Because thou hast not remembered the days of thy youth ..." (16. 43.)

It is interesting to note, with regard to both Hosea and

78. In I Samuel 2. 27f we find the story of a "man of God" who speaks to Eli of the covenant relationship with Jahveh which dates from this same early period: "Thus saith Jahveh: Did I not reveal Myself unto the house of thy fathers when they were in Egypt in bondage to Pharaoh's house? And did I not choose him out of all the tribes of Israel to be my priest and to go up unto My altar, to burn incense, and to wear an Ephod before Me?" The principle involved here is identical with that of which we have been dealing, but the covenant extends only to the house of Eli.
79. Hosea 2. 17; 9. 10aA; 11. 1; 12. 10; 13. 4.

Jeremiah, that for them the wilderness religion was the pure religion. They continually urge the people to return to the purity of worship which was theirs during the wilderness wanderings. Obviously, what they wish to convey is the thought that the worship was not yet contaminated by the corrupting influences of the Canaanite Baalim. Yet it is difficult to imagine how they could have overlooked the Pentateuchal tradition of the wilderness period, with its constant reference to the rebellion of the part of the people. Especially contradictory to their viewpoint is the story of the golden calf in Ex. 32. It is possible that Hosea wrote before the Pentateuchal traditions had become clearly defined, and that he was familiar only with a skeleton of the story--the deliverance, the revelation at Sinai, the conquest of Canaan. But Jeremiah wrote contemporaneously with the promulgation of the Deuteronomic material. Although it is true that the passage in Jeremiah 2.2 is recognized as one of his earlier prophecies, nevertheless he must have been, in the words of Skinner, "either ignorant of or indifferent to the literary history which was consolidating⁸⁰ the history of the Mosaic age".

Although Jeremiah and Hosea alone give any indication that Israel's history begins in Egypt, a number of other writers are wont to make use of that period as the means of dating events. Thus, when the concubine was divided into twelve parts, and sent out among the tribes, the writer is moved to remark that such a thing had not happened "since the Children of Israel

80. Skinner. op. cit. p. 65.

came up out of the land of Egypt" (Jud. 19. 30). The traditions of Genesis are evidently forgotten, or considered not a part of the history of Israel as a people. Similar statements are made at the time that the Temple is being built. Jahveh exclaims: "For I have not dwelt in a house since the day that I brought up the Children of Israel out of Egypt" (II Sam. 7. 6). It is also true that there was no Temple in the time of Abraham. For the writer, however, Egypt marked the beginning of the people's history. Further indications of this belief are to be found in I Kings 8. 16 and II Kings 21. 15.

Another purpose to which the Exodus story is put by pre-Exilic writers is to emphasize the ingratitude of the Children of Israel in face of the favor shown them by Jahveh at the time of and subsequent to the deliverance from Egypt. Again, we turn to the works of the prophets first. Amos, Hosea, and Jeremiah all refer to the Exodus narrative to contrast the apostasy of the people with Jahveh's kindness. Amos enumerates all that God has done for Israel in the past, climaxing his appeal with the mention of the deliverance from Egypt, to emphasize the fact that this makes the people's actions even worse, for they have repaid this kindness on the part of Jahveh with ingratitude --corruptness and the maladministration of justice (2. 6ff). In similar vein, Hosea contrasts the lack of loyalty on the part of the people with the fact that a covenant was entered into with Jahveh by the act of His delivering Israel from Egypt (12. 10; 13. 4f). Jeremiah, too, follows the technique of Amos and Hosea. He rebukes the people for forgetting the Lord who delivered them from Egypt and led them through the wilderness, and for

"walking after things of nought" (2. 4ff).

There are a number of similar references to the Exodus in other Biblical books, but it is difficult to determine with any degree of certainty their pre-Exilic authorship. For example, when Israel requests a king to rule over them, Samuel reproaches the people for rejecting Jahveh who brought Israel out of Egypt⁸¹ (I Sam. 10. 18f). Budde holds that these verses belong to E, which would place them at approximately the same time as the prophecy of Amos. Smith, however, believes that v. 18, which contains the reference to Egypt, is an insertion.⁸² Burney agrees with Budde with regard to the age of the verses in question, attributing them to E². He says: "It is characteristic of E² to base admonition and rebuke upon a retrospect of God's mercies as vouchsafed to Israel in their past history. Cf. Josh. 24. 2ff, Jud. 10. 11f., I Sam. 2. 27f, 10. 17ff, 12. 7ff. This method is further developed in Deuteronomy, probably owing to the influence of the school of thought represented by E²".⁸³ Another such reference is contained in Jud. 10. 11. This is adjudged by both Burney⁸⁴ and Moore⁸⁵ to belong to the E source. The former writer holds that the mention of three of the "seven nations" is a later insertion but that Egypt stood in the original text. It would seem, then, that the evidence for considering I. Sam. 10. 18f and Jud. 10. 11f post-Exilic is insufficient. We include, them, therefore, among those pre-Exilic passages which offer a contrast between the lack of loyalty on the part of the present

81. Smith, H. P. I. C. C. to Samuel. p. 72. Quoting Budde.

82. Ibid. pp. 73, xxii, xviii.

83. Burney. op. cit. p. 186.

84. Ibid. pp. 295f.

85. Moore. Judges. p. 278.

generation of Israelites with the kindness which Jahveh demonstrated in bringing their fathers out of Egypt.

We note a growing interest in the Exodus story. The pre-Exilic prophets--Amos, Hosea, Jeremiah--are agreed that the covenant relationship between Jahveh and Israel dates from that event, accepting the emphasis placed upon that fact by the earliest historians, J and E, who, in turn, apparently accepted such a belief from K and C. In the historical books, an E² writer constantly refers to Jahveh's act of the redemption from Egypt. The Exodus further is utilized as a means of dating important events. We shall see this interest intensified greatly when we come to consider the Exilic and post-Exilic materials. Then the psychological need for such an example presented itself. And the Exodus story proved to be an almost perfect event for the purpose to which it was put.

Chapter VIII.

The Significance of the Exodus in Exilic and Post-Exilic Times.

A. In The Prophets.

Just as we have seen with regard to the pre-Exilic writers, so also was the Exodus used in telling fashion by many of the later writers to inspire Israel with optimism and hope. In the face of the political danger and the loss of their homeland, the Exodus served as the source of untold comfort to the people. The great deliverance from the taskmasters of Egypt was constantly recalled as a means of encouraging the people to hope and prepare for another such deliverance. Thus, we read in Micah 6. 4f: "For I brought thee up out of the land of Egypt, and redeemed thee out of the House of Bondage, and I sent before thee Moses, Aaron, and Miriam...that ye may know the righteous acts of the Lord". Or again in 7. 14f: "Tend Thy people with Thy staff, the flock of Thy heritage, that dwell solitarily, as a forest in the midst of the fruitful field; let them feed in Bashan and Gilead, as in the days of old; as in the days of thy coming forth out of the land of Egypt will I show unto him marvelous things". Scholars are agreed that both these passages are post-Exilic,⁸⁶ the former to be placed approximately in the years immediately preceeding Ezra and Nehemiah; the latter after the return to the land, when the people long for the security of former days.⁸⁷ Discouragement has filled the hearts of the people;

86. Smith, J. M. P. and others. I. C. C. to Micah, etc. p. 12ff.

87. Ibid. pp. 16, 152.

they begin to become restless and to murmur at their lot--such is the imprecation of the words of 6. 4f. But Jahveh calls upon them to remember His great deliverance in days gone by--the Exodus from Egypt. Similarly in the verses of chapter 7, the hope is expressed, in words of certainty, that the exiles shall again be made to dwell in Palestine with a measure of security "as in the days of their coming forth out of the land of Egypt".

A similar point of view is expressed by other of the prophets. In the Book of Joel, we find the Exodus serving in a similar capacity of offering hope when the people despair. When the terrible plague of locusts comes upon the land (ch. 2), Joel calls upon the people to repent, and to rely upon the graciousness and saving power of Jahveh. And he chooses to define this power in the striking words heard by Moses at Sinai (Ex. 24. 6ff), thus lending the support of the tradition of the Exodus⁸⁸ to his plea (2. 13).

A fitting climax to our survey of these efforts to buoy up the courage of the people are the words of Deutero-Isaiah contained in 51. 9-11. The setting of the chapter in which the verses are contained requires a word of explanation. The political redemption of the exiles has already been made probable through the advent of Cyrus. The prophet turns his attention to the difficulties in the way of the restoration--not physical difficulties, but rather the moral and spiritual ones arising from Israel's own character. He exhorts the people to courage

88. Jonah (4. 2) also chooses to make use of this same prayer, but in a different way. It seems that he would be disappointed if the people were to repent, and Jahveh would decide not to punish them. He felt that such would be the case for Jahveh is a gracious God, "long suffering..."

and strives to allay their fears by a recitation of Jahveh's
faithfulness and power.⁸⁹ As ever, the greatest example of this
power was made manifest in the redemption of Israel from Egypt.
Any attempt, therefore, to allay the fears of the people and to
urge them to purposeful action must be a reminder of that great
event to be most effective. Hence, we read in the words of this
prophet of the Exile:

90

"Art Thou not it that hewed Rahab in pieces,
That pierced the dragon?
Art Thou not it that dried up the sea,
The waters of the great deep?
That made the depths of the sea a way
For the redeemed to pass over?"

Here is the epitome of this particular use of the Exodus by post-
Exilic writers. Even though Israel is in Exile, even though the
outlook is dark, still there is every indication of hope and
prosperity in the future. For Jahveh long ago demonstrated His
love for Israel; His might was indicated in everlasting example
by the act of bringing His people out of the "iron furnace",
and safely into the Promised Land. By the simple procedure of
recalling that marvelous event were hearts made strong once more!

Of much greater importance in the minds of the Exilic pro-
phets, however, was still another value of the Exodus story.
The Children of Israel had stood in a unique covenant relation-
ship to Jahveh. He had fulfilled His promise of settling them
in Palestine, but in 586 they had been exiled from the land. Was
the covenant, then, dissolved? Were the people to be forgotten
in their exile, and left to disappear among the nations? That

89. Smith, G. A. The Book of Isaiah. II. p. 381

90. Rahab is symbolic of Egypt, and more especially of Pharaoh.
Delitsch. The Prophecies of Isaiah. II. p. 264.

writers after the Exile still held strongly to the belief that the covenant entered into at Sinai was still in effect is apparent. Such an opinion is expressed by the writer of Jud.

2. 1f, whose point of view Burney characterizes as "clearly that of Rp"⁹¹. In this passage the covenant is mentioned as the means of contrasting Jahveh's kindness with the faithlessness of the people--a similar usage of the Exodus as that which was made by E². Further references to the ancient covenant of the wilderness period in material which is Exilic or later are to be noted in Jud. 2. 12. Here, the deliverance from Egypt again bespeaks a covenant relationship in which Jahveh has a right to expect allegiance. The verse is undoubtedly of Deuteronomic origin.⁹²

The memory of this covenant relationship, however, served to greater purpose than merely to support the belief that Israel stood in a unique relationship to Jahveh. That first, great deliverance from Egypt came to be the basis for hope in the future as well. Jeremiah and the Isaiah of the Exile are particularly clear in their prophecies of the New Exodus which is to take place and the new covenant which is to be made, after the pattern of the first. Isaiah, especially, contains a number of references to this New Exodus from Babylon. Two passages of interest for our study are contained in the materials usually assigned to First Isaiah; namely, 11. 11, 15, 16 and 12. 1ff. It is generally agreed, however, that these sections of I-XXXIX are

91. Burney. op. cit. p. 2.

92. Burney. op. cit. p. 55, 57. Moore. op. cit. pp. 63f.

definitely post-Exilic.⁹³ The first of these passages is a clear promise of a second deliverance--this time from Assyria--which will parallel the first--that from Egypt--in wonders, the author concluding with the words: "Like as there was for Israel in the day that he came up out of the land of Egypt". So certain is this new salvation in the mind of the prophet that he even includes a song of exultation to be sung on the journey which is patterned after the Song of Miriam (Ex. 15. 2ff). Gray rightly tells the intent of the author of the second passage mentioned above. He says: "Each song written for the New Exodus is suitably enough reminiscent of the song which, according to the tradition already current in the writer's age, had been sung by Moses and the Children of Israel on the occasion of the First Exodus".⁹⁴

Deutero-Isaiah, who wrote in Babylon between 555 and 538 B. C. E.,⁹⁵ is even more direct in his statements with regard to this new Exodus. According to him, there remains no doubt that there will be another deliverance of Jahveh's people (43. 19-19). Again will Jahveh "make a way in the wilderness" (43. 19bA). As a matter of fact, the second deliverance will be so great that it will even eclipse that first one.⁹⁶ The people are called upon to recall the marvelous acts in that former salvation by Jahveh who "maketh a way in the Sea, and a path in the mighty waters" (43. 16).⁹⁷ And then the prophet tells

93. Gray. I. C. C. to Isaiah. I. p. 223.

94. Ibid. p. 229.

95. Smith, G. A. op. cit. II. p. 20.

96. Battenweiser. Class notes.

97. Isaiah 43. 16f refer to the P tradition of the pursuit.

them:

"Remember not the former things,
Neither consider the things of old.
Behold, I will do a new thing..." (43. 18, 19aA).

The same ideology is expressed once more in 48. 20f. The people are to go forth from Babylon with rejoicing. The details of the journey are even outlined--in words describing the journey from Egypt:

"And they thirsted not
When He led them through the deserts;
He caused the water to flow out of the rock for them;
He cleaved the rock also,
And the waters gushed out" (48. 21).

In Deutero-Isaiah, then, we have an excellent example of this new use to which the memory of the Exodus from Egypt was put. So indelibly was the event stamped upon the memory of the writer that a repetition of it when the need arose became, for him, a certainty. The Children of Israel once more needed the love and strength of Jahveh. He had demonstrated that power once. He would do so again in the similar situation. The method would be the same. The Exodus from Egypt would serve as the model for this new deliverance.

The prophet, Ezekiel, likewise speaks of an Exodus from Babylonia similar to that first one from Egypt. In chapter 20, which deals, in part, with the restoration of Zion, he is obviously impressed by the Exodus narrative. In that place, after a recital of the acts of Jahveh on behalf of Israel in the deliverance of that people from Egypt, and the unfaithfulness of Israel despite His many kindnesses, Ezekiel continues with the striking words: "And I will bring you out from the peoples, and will gather you out of the countries wherein ye are scattered,

with a mighty hand, and with an outstretched arm...and I will bring you into the wilderness of the peoples, and there will I plead with you face to face. Like as I pleaded with your fathers in the wilderness of the land of Egypt, so will I plead with you ...and I will cause you to pass under the rod, and I will bring you into the bond of the covenant; and I will purge out from among you the rebels, and them that transgress against Me; I will bring them out of the land where they sojourn, but they shall not enter into the land of Israel" (20. 34-38). The parallel between this Exodus of the future and the Exodus from Egypt ~~was~~ is obvious: the outstretched arm, the pleading face to face, the rod, the covenant, the rebels not entering the land, are all in the language of the first Exodus. That event undoubtedly had a profound effect upon Ezekiel. Upon it, and the incidents which occurred during Israel's deliverance, he bases his own belief in the repetition of that act, now that a similar situation has presented itself. The covenant relationship will be renewed, he feels; by remembering what Jahveh did for Israel in that other period of its history, the people need not despair even now.

Also noticeable in Ezekiel's prophecies is the belief that the covenant relationship dates from the sojourn of Israel in Egypt (20. 5). He differs from other prophetic writers, however --notably Hosea and Jeremiah--in that, for Ezekiel, Israel was rebellious even in Egypt, and not less then and during the wilderness period than in their subsequent history. At first, according to him, it was Jahveh's intention to punish them in Egypt for their evil doings, but in order that His name should not be profaned among the nations, He brought them out of the

land (20. 6ff). The same idea--that Israel was unfaithful from her youth is vividly portrayed in the parable of the two women, symbolic of Samaria and Jerusalem (ch. 23). Just as Israel played the harlot in Egypt, that is, proved unfaithful to Jahveh, so is she repeating her unfaithfulness with Assyria (23.7ff). Here is a new concept of the Exodus story. Israel was unfaithful even in Egypt and throughout the wilderness wanderings. It is because of this that Jahveh has seen fit to punish them by the Exile to Assyria. Also of interest to our study is the use of the concept already noted as belonging to Ezekiel;⁹⁸ namely, the concept of *in 16nd*.

It is well known that there is a close relationship between Ezekiel and the writers of P. The similarity of their interests is apparent here. Like P, Ezekiel utilizes the Exodus as the means of lending the support of tradition to the statutes and ordinances which must be obeyed. For Ezekiel, then, the Exodus did more than set an example for a similar salvation from the North to take place in the future. In addition, it was during their wilderness wanderings that Israel first went astray and broke the covenant so recently entered into with Jahveh. Further, the unfaithfulness of the people during that early period of their history was the very cause for their present plight. Nevertheless, the Exodus did demonstrate the greatness of Jahveh, and did assume large proportions in the mind of this particular prophet. He, too, carries back the laws and institutions of

98. supra. p. 20 f.

Israel to that period with the intention of lending support to them in that way.

Jeremiah, too, recalls the days of the first Exodus and is certain that a second such event will take place, surpassing the first, and causing the people to forget it completely. The verses to which reference is made occur twice in the Jeremianic prophecies, once in 16. 14f, and again in 23. 7f. Driver holds that they are out of place in the former chapter, and rightfully belong in the latter.⁹⁹ Smith concurs in this opinion, placing the verses in question in chapter 23, and removing them from 16, where they break the connection with verses 16ff.¹⁰⁰ The passage reads: "Therefore, behold, the days come, saith Jahveh, that they shall no more say: 'As the Lord liveth, that brought up the Children of Israel out of the land of Egypt'; but: 'as the Lord liveth, that brought up and that led the seed of the House of Israel out of the north country, and from all the countries whither I had driven them'; and they shall dwell in their own land". It is obvious that the verses were written after the Exile as they clearly indicate a situation in which the Israelites are already scattered. The fact that they are repeated is interesting. If we accept their status as original in 23, it is clear that Jeremiah makes use of the deliverance from Egypt to offer a strong argument for another such deliverance. Their repetition in 16 indicates the agreement of some later Exilic or post-Exilic author with the viewpoint expressed by the prophet. To return to Jeremiah, he, like Deutero-Isaiah

99. Driver, S. R. The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah. p. 96

100. Smith, G. A. Jeremiah. pp. 18, 219.

who instructed the people "to consider not the former things" because Jahveh would accomplish a new salvation which would eclipse the old, likewise insists that so great will be this new deliverance that the people shall speak of it--and not the Exodus from Egypt--in praising Jahveh.

In the utterances of Jeremiah, we find another allusion to Israel's Exodus from Egypt which is even more important; namely, his hope for the New Covenant which is to replace the first covenant--or which is at least a reinterpretation of that first covenant between Jahveh and Israel made at Sinai. There has been some doubt cast upon the authenticity of the New Covenant passage in Jeremiah (31. 31-34) because of the fact that the word "covenant" connotes the legalism of religion, while Jeremiah is interested in the personal, the inward religion.¹⁰¹

Both Skinner and Smith are agreed, however, that such an idea is compatible with the whole of Jeremiah's religious philosophy.¹⁰² It is evident from the discussion of the pre-Exilic utterances of Jeremiah that he did accept the covenant idea,¹⁰³ and it is no less "credible that the conception of Israel's relation to God as founded on a historic covenant occupies a real, though not all-inclusive, place in the theology of Jeremiah."¹⁰⁴

The New Covenant described in 31. 31-34 is similar to the old in two respects. First of all, it, too, will be made with both Israel and Judah--the principle of nationalism is the same. Second, the form of this New Covenant is also the same: I will

101. Skinner. op. cit. p. 325

102. Ibid. pp. 320ff. Smith, G. A. Jeremiah. pp. 374ff.

103. Supra. pp. 38 ff.

104. Skinner. op. cit. p. 327.

be to them a God, and they shall be to Me a people. Jeremiah, however, although basing his New Covenant upon the old and making it concur with the covenant relationship which dates from Sinai, adds a deeper meaning to that relationship. It has been said that the difference lies "not in the content of the covenant, but on the side of reality, of subjectivity".¹⁰⁵ The positive features of the New Covenant are two: Inwardness--"I will put My law in their inmost parts", and Forgiveness--"Their sins I will remember no more". This idea of the New Covenant is of the greatest importance in Jeremiah's prophecies. It demonstrates a vivid memory of that first Exodus; it recognizes the covenant relationship as dating from that event; and it foresees the reenactment of that covenant which had been broken. The essential difference between the two covenants is a striking one. The first covenant had been written upon tablets of stone, according to tradition. Not so this new one. It is to be engraved upon the hearts of the people. In the words of the prophet: "But this is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel after these days, saith Jahveh: I will put My law in their inmost parts, and on their hearts will I write it..." (31. 33).

B. In The Psalms.

An examination of the significance of the Exodus story in the subsequent life of Israel would not be complete if the references to that event contained in the Psalms were to be left out of consideration. Although the dating of the single psalms is open to controversy, the consensus of opinion is that many, if

p. 329
105. Skinner. op. cit., quoting Vatke. Biblische Theologie.
p. 526.

not the majority of them are to be included in the Exilic or post-Exilic period. This is further borne out by the similarity which exists between the mention of the Exodus contained in the Psalter and that contained in certain other late prayers: Dan. 9. 15ff; Neh. 9. 9ff; Is. 63. 9ff; Jer. 32. 18ff; Ex. 15. Dr. Englander notes this fact of the late authorship of most of the Psalms under consideration. He says: "Significant is the fact that most of these references to God's goodness and mercy as exemplified by His deeds during the Exodus period are found in the liturgical or poetical compositions of the post-Exilic period. It seems that the expatriation during the Exile and the troublous times after the Exile prompted retrospection to the former days when God signally manifested His presence by those acts that accompanied and followed the great deliverance from the oppressive hand of Egypt."

The greater part of the pertinent material contained in the Psalms can be divided into two general categories. 1. Psalms of praise --with the wondrous acts of the Exodus serving as proof that Jahveh is deserving of that praise. 2. Psalms of supplication --petitions for the demonstration of mercy to the present generation as was demonstrated in the past and notably during the Exodus. It is more difficult to date the former group than the latter, for many of that group are merely ringing praises of Jahveh without any suggestion of a historical situation which would aid in deciding to what age they belong. This is not true

106. Englander. "The Exodus in the Bible". Studies in Jewish Literature. p. 112.

107. The Psalms containing such references are: 66, 68, 78, 81, 95, 99, 103, 105, 106, 111, 114, 118, 135, 136.

108. The Psalms containing such references are: 74, 77, 80, 86, plus the late prayers contained in Ex., Jer., Dan., Neh., and Is.

*you will
thought a
later of the
psalms are
the basis
of your
data.*

with regard to this latter group. Here expressions depicting the hopelessness of the situation and the pessimistic outlook of the people appear to be definitely in line with similar expression found in the later prophetic utterances, and a date during the Exile or later is indicated for them, as well.

The most striking utterances exemplifying the praise of Jahveh, so richly deserved because of His unfailing love for Israel, as demonstrated during the period of the Exodus, are contained in some of the longer, historical Psalms. 78, for example, contains a lengthy and somewhat exaggerated narration of the wonders of the Exodus. The plagues, the Red Sea, the manna and quails, the bringing forth of water from the rock--all are mentioned in colorful language as exalting the greatness of Jahveh. Again in 105 and 106, the recital of the events of the Exodus serves a similar purpose. Psalm 105 begins with the words: "O give thanks unto the Lord; call upon His name...Sing praises unto Him...Speak ye of all His marvelous works", and continues with a statement of the love which Jahveh bore for Israel as demonstrated by His many kindnesses, chief among them, the miracles of the Exodus (105. 23-45). Psalm 106 carries the picture still further. Jahveh was faithful to Israel, it says, despite the constant backsliding of the people. Even though they murmured against Him, still He continued to watch over them in the wilderness. How much the more, therefore, is He deserving of their praise!

Psalm 77 serves as the best example of that type in which petitions for the former kindnesses of Jahveh are made. The

Psalmist is troubled; nothing can assuage his grief. "Will the Lord cast off forever?" he asks. And he recalls the deeds of Jahveh as the means of reaffirming his faith (77. 11ff). These marvelous acts which the Psalmist would recall are those of the Exodus, summarized by the words: "Thou didst lead Thy people like a flock by the hand of Moses and Aaron" (77. 21).

In similar vein are the late prayers found in Jeremiah, Nehemiah, Daniel, and Isaiah, and also that contained in Ex. 15, which is similar in character. The passage in Jer. 32. 18-22 is admittedly of late origin. Volz holds that it was added at the time that the prophetic works were read in the synagogue.¹⁰⁹ The author of the verses, by inserting them in the prophecy of Jeremiah, demonstrated his own belief in the saving power of Jahveh. For that writer, Jeremiah was certain of a future return to Palestine because of the first return to that land from the bondage of Egypt. So also with the remaining passages, which are also very late, and in precisely the same vein.

It is interesting to note just what details of the Exodus narrative were remembered by the authors of the Psalms. Apparently, the most striking event of that great deliverance was the dividing of the sea and making it dry land. First of all, so deeply did this single incident impress itself, that one writer deemed it important enough to compose a complete Psalm on the subject (Ex. 15). And further, the event is mentioned not only in the historical Psalms which include a recital of almost the complete story of the Exodus (78, 105, 106), but it is singled out for particular emphasis in many of the other Psalms as well.

109. Volz. Der Prophet Jeremia. p. 304.

Thus, we find references to that event in 66. 6; 114. 3; 136. 13ff; 74. 13. The writer of Nehemiah 9 likewise mentions it specifically. Second in importance, apparently, were the plagues, which we find mentioned almost as frequently. Two writers were particularly interested by the slaying of the first-born son, which they mention specifically, although omitting such specific mention of any of the remaining plagues (135. 8; 136. 10). Of the remaining events of the Exodus narrative, few are singled out for specific mention save in the historical Psalms noted above. Psalm 114. 8 mentions the fact that the rock gave forth water. This mention occurs again in 78. 20 and 105. 41. The quails and manna which providentially appear in the wilderness are noted in 78. 27f and 105. 40. The rebelliousness of the people also is remembered by the writers of the Psalms; references to it are found in 95. 8,10 and 106.32. Even those writers, however, who mention the perfidy of Israel in the wilderness overlook--or purposely omit--the story of the golden calf. It is noted only once in all the Psalms (106.19).

C. In The Laws of P.

In the preceding pages, the importance of the Exodus story for Exilic and post-Exilic writers was noted. We have also indicated the manner in which that event was handled by the writers of the P document some eight centuries after the Exodus took place. There, however, we dealt with the actual traditions of the event according to P. It was remarked that P utilized the story of the deliverance almost wholly as a sanction for the laws and institutions which he upheld. In Leviticus, we find many more examples of this procedure, examples which are derived not from

the narrative itself, but which refer back to the Exodus as an important event in the past and use it to intensify the importance of the law or institution described.

The Priestly document was subject to change and redaction almost until the time that the Bible was canonized, and is recognized by all scholars as the latest of Biblical sources.¹¹⁰

It is interesting to note, however, that the later P materials utilize the Exodus story but once as the basis for an injunction.¹¹¹

In every other instance, the verses containing such references are a part of the Holiness Code¹¹² which is admittedly the earliest of all the P materials.¹¹³

It is believed that the Holiness Code is that which Ezra read to the people upon his return to Palestine ca. 458.¹¹⁴ How long before his appearance in Palestine the document was extant is open to conjecture. It does, however, show a marked similarity to parts of Ezekiel, and is to be dated, in all probability, not before 500.¹¹⁵

As we have already pointed out, the author of the Holiness Code utilized the Exodus narrative in much the same manner as J, E, and P. The importance of obedience to the law is constantly emphasized by the refrain: "I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt."¹¹⁶ Thus, the taking of

110. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby. op. cit. ch. 13. Bible 6 class notes.

111. In Lev. 25. 42, which speaks against Hebrew Slaves, the reason is given as: "For they [the poor Jews] are my servants that I brought out of Egypt; they shall not be sold as bondmen". This verse, according to Carpenter and Harford, is P^s.

112. Using the classification of Steuernagel and Carpenter and Harford.

113. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby. op. cit. p. 298. Bible 6 class notes.

114. Bible 6 class notes.

115. Lev. 25. 38; 19. 36; 22. 31-33; 26. 45; 26. 13; 25. 55.

116. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby. op. cit. p. 298.

usury is forbidden, just weights are enforced, Jahveh is the true God--all to be believed and followed in practice because Jahveh was the God who brought Israel out of Egypt. Slightly different use of the Exodus tradition is made in connection with still other matters. The fact that the people of Israel were strangers in the land of Egypt is voiced as sufficient reason for their kind treatment of strangers in their own midst (19. 33 ff). As a reminder that Jahveh made them dwell in booths when He brought them out of Egypt, they are to dwell in them for seven days during the feast of Succoth (23. 42f).

Thus is rounded out the importance of the Exodus story in very age of Israel's history. The pre-prophetic accounts--J and E--of approximately the eighth century reported the event at length. It was spoken of with great frequency during the pre-Exilic period by Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and anonymous authors of the historical books. The Exilic and post-Exilic prophets made use of it; the Psalmists constantly referred to it. P includes a tradition of the event. And now Ph writing at about 500 has been seen also to know it and to emphasize its importance.

D. In The Historical Books.

The growing importance of the Exodus story in the minds of post-Exilic writers is an understandable phenomenon. Its cause may be traced directly to a psychological need on the part of the people. Once again they were outside their beloved land. It is only natural, therefore, that their thoughts should turn

to a former deliverance which they hoped would be repeated. Gradually the event assumed larger and larger importance in the minds of the Israelites. Some indication of the magnitude of the event^t is suggested by a few scattered references, all of post-Exilic origin.¹¹⁷ Their purpose is strikingly clear: So important had the Exodus become in the minds of the people, that they attributed a knowledge of it to the people with whom they came into contact. The first of these references deals with the harlot in whose house the two spies sent out by Joshua were hidden (Josh. 2). Here, the words put into the mouth of the woman are these: "I know that the Lord hath given you the land, and that your terror has fallen upon us, and that all the inhabitants of the land melt away from before you. For we have heard how the Lord dried up the waters of the Red Sea from before you in your going out of Egypt..." (2. 9f). The remaining two references are in similar vein, bespeaking the greatness of the event, but refer to a group rather than an individual. Thus, we find the Gibeonites striving to make peace with Joshua "because we have heard the fame of Him [Jahveh] and all that He did in Egypt (Josh. 9. 9). Likewise, the Philistines are confounded when the ark, symbolic of the Israelitish God is brought into the camp of the Hebrews. They are moved to say: "Woe unto us! who shall deliver us out of the hand of these mighty gods? These are the gods that smote the Egyptians with all manner of plagues, and in the wilderness (I Sam. 4. 8).

In the verses just discussed, we have still another indication of the significance which came to be attached to the

117. Steuernagel. op. cit. pp. 276f, 331.

Exodus story. Not only was it an important event to the Israelites, but even the foreign nations are represented as having known of it, and feared the might of Jahveh because the report of the Exodus had reached their ears. The connection between such references as these, and the purpose to which the Psalms put the Exodus story, the great hopes based upon this first salvation by Exilic and post-Exilic writers, leave little doubt that the memory of the Exodus did become a vital force in the life of the Israelite nation. It offered hope, challenged fear, and became a potent means of revitalization.

Chapter IX.

The Significance of the Exodus in the Book of Deuteronomy.

In Deuteronomy, we find frequent mention of the Exodus narrative. In many instances, the use to which the memory of the Exodus is put closely parallels the end to which the event has been used by other Biblical writers. It is a well known fact that all the material contained in Deuteronomy does not belong to the same period of history, but rather that it was written over a number of centuries. It is also an accepted fact that although the kernel of the book was "discovered" in 621 B. C. E. some of the material which was used as the basis for that nucleus was of still earlier origin. And furthermore, much of the material which now makes up the book was not contained in that original document, but was added during much later periods of Israel's history. Bearing these facts in mind, it will be of interest, in dealing with Deuteronomy, not only to discover the reason for the use of the Exodus material, but also to note in which ages of Israel's history similar motives caused the Exodus to be mentioned, and, further, to attempt to distinguish any new usages of the Exodus narrative, which occur nowhere except in Deuteronomy.

The Exodus is mentioned frequently for the purpose of emphasizing the covenant relationship which existed between Jahveh and Israel from the time that Jahveh brought that people out of Egypt. Thus, in 4. 20, the reason for the people's obedience to the injunction prohibiting their worship of foreign gods is

the reminder of this covenant: "But you hath Jahveh taken and brought forth out of the iron furnace, out of Egypt, to be unto Him a people of inheritance, as ye are this day". Again in 4. 34aA, the same emphasis upon the covenant is evidenced. In 5. 2, we find a direct statement of the covenant that was made at Sinai (Horeb) as motivation for obedience to all the statutes and ordinances which have been set down: "The Lord, our God, made a covenant with us in Horeb"; therefore, the writer implies, we are His people and owe Him the respect of obedience to His laws which He has given us.

In thus emphasizing the covenant, the author--or authors-- of these passages show a marked similarity to certain pre-Exilic expressions which we have noted. Both J and E lay great stress upon this relationship between Jahveh and Israel. ¹¹⁸ The pre-¹¹⁹ Exilic prophets, likewise, make constant reference to it.

Another mention of the covenant occurs in Deuteronomy, however, which is strongly reminiscent of a later attitude. The writer of 7. 7f attributes the Exodus itself to Jahveh's desire to keep His oath, already made with the Patriarchs. He says: "Jahveh did not set His love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any other people--for ye were the fewest of all peoples--but because the Lord loved you, and because He would keep His oath which He swore unto your fathers, hath the Lord brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you from the House of Bondage, from the hand of Pharaoh, king of Egypt". Again in 8. 18, we find a similar motivation, although

118. Supra. p. 34.

119. Especially Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah. Supra. pp. 37 ff.

no mention is made here of Egypt--merely the statement that the covenant had been established with the fathers. In 7. 7f, however, there is a clear similarity to the motivation which we found in P's account of the choice of Israel in Egypt (Ex. 6. 3f). That writer, too, knew and recorded the tradition of a previous covenant with--or at least a previous oath to--the Patriarchs by Jahveh.

We have already noted that Ezekiel was the sole writer with the exception of the narrators of the Exodus itself, who took cognizance of the constant rebellions of the Israelites against Jahveh while they were in the wilderness. In Deuteronomy, however, we find many passages which bear a kinship to that prophet in this regard. Thus, in 6. 16, we find the injunction: "Ye shall not try the Lord your God as ye tried Him at Massah". Chapter 9. 8-21 reminds the people of their making the golden calf. The incidents of Israel's provoking Jahveh at Taberah, Massah, and Kibroth Ha Ta'avah are likewise mentioned (9. 22), as is the perfidy of the spies at Kadesh Barnea (9. 23). The account of the revolt and punishment of Dathan and Abiram is described in 11. 6, while 24. 9 tells of Miriam's being smitten with leprosy because of the sin which she committed. Even more strongly reminiscent of Ezekiel are the two general statements contained in 9. 7 and 24. "...From the day that thou didst go forth out of the land of Egypt, until ye came unto this place, ye have been rebellious against the Lord." And "Ye have been rebellious against the Lord since the day that I knew you". If we compare these statements, as well as the specific incidents

mentioned by Deuteronomy, with Ezekiel's attitude as expressed in 20 and 23. 7f, we shall find that the similarity between them is unmistakable.

Also similar to Ezekiel is the idea contained in 9. 28ff, which tells of Moses' intercession with Jahveh on behalf of the people, and his prayer that they be spared despite all of their rebelliousness "lest the land whence Thou has broughtest us out say: Because Jahveh was not able to bring them into the land which He promised unto them..." The same idea is found in Ezekiel 20. 14,22.

Still another emphasis of Deuteronomy, in which its authors make use of the Exodus narrative to drive home their point of view, regards the portrayal of the greatness and goodness of Jahveh. The J and E narrators of the story, as well as the P writer, utilized the Exodus in this manner. It was in the Psalms, however, that we noted the most frequent and most telling use of the Exodus in this fashion. Still another indication that the passages with which we are concerned here are of late origin is the similarity in language which they bear to P. In both places, the use of the words "signs" (*אֲמוּנָה*) and "wonders" (*מוֹפְתִים*) is noticeable. In 4. 34, we find the the people are to know that Jahveh is the one, true God because He it was who brought them out of Egypt with all the attendant displays of His power. Similar sentiments are expressed in 6. 22; 7. 17-21; 26. 7-9; and 34. 10-12. A more detailed description of the signs and wonders by which Jahveh manifested His power is contained in 8. 15f, where the bringing forth of water from the rock, and the giving of manna is specifically mentioned.

In several scattered passages in Deuteronomy, an idea is expressed that is to be found only once again in the Bible. It appears to be "prophetic" in spirit, and may be classified as a humanitarian impulse which the memory of the status of the Israelites in Egypt is used to further. The same use of Israel's status in Egypt is made in Lev. 19. 34, a part of the Holiness Code, where the injunction is made to "love the stranger" (גֵּר) because Israel had been a stranger in Egypt. This passage exactly parallels that in Deut. 10. 19. In 24. 18, 22, we find a similar purpose attached to the mention of Israel's plight in Egypt. Here, the humanitarian principle of "be fair and honest with the underprivileged" is laid down, followed by the reminder "ye were bondmen in Egypt". And once again in 5. 15, the identical principle manifests itself. The version of the fourth commandment contained in Deuteronomy differs in this regard from that to be found in Exodus. According to the former statement of that commandment, the people are to let their servants rest on the Sabbath because Jahveh brought them out of Egypt. Here, then, is an idea new in the Holiness Code and in Deuteronomy. The Exodus is mentioned to lend force to certain laws of humanitarianism, by reminding the Israelites of their own position as slaves in Egypt. What the writer says, in effect, is this: "You are in a position to understand the situation of the persecuted and oppressed, and to be sympathetic with it, as a result of your own experience in Egypt".

It is interesting to note that there is a similar use made of the Exodus story by P. In Lev. 25. 23, 35ff, 39ff, 55, the fact that the Children of Israel were bondmen in Egypt is likewise

used to promote humanitarian impulses. There is one difference, however. In Leviticus, the humanitarianism extends only to fellow Jews. Verses 35ff, for example, prohibit the taking of interest from a Jew who has become poor. And so with the remaining passages in that book. The sentiment expressed in Deuteronomy is a much loftier one. There is none of the narrow nationalism which is to be found in P. It more nearly approaches the prophetic ideal of justice and righteousness and universalism than ~~it~~ does that later, narrower concept of the priestly school.

Another use of the Exodus, unique in Deuteronomy, is noticeable. In most instances, the verses involved concern themselves with the performance of a duty or obedience to a law. In each case the Exodus serves as the motivation, but the manner in which it motivates the act is different. One of the uses involved here has to do with loyalty to Jahveh because it was He who brought the people out of Egypt. This is most obvious in those verses containing injunctions against worshipping other gods. Thus, 6. 12; 8. 11,14; and 11. 2ff exhort the people not to forget Jahveh who brought them out of Egypt. In other words, it was felt that certain loyalties were due Him because of that act. Similarly, in 13. 6,11, the law prescribing death by stoning for false prophets and others who entice Israel from the worship of Jahveh is followed by "Jahveh who brought thee out of the land of Egypt", again emphasizing a certain loyalty to the Deity by reason of that act.

The second motivation for which the Exodus serves is that of obedience by reason of gratitude for His act. This is the motivation for the bringing of Bikkurim (26. 5-10). The one who

who brings his first-fruits to the priest is to say in effect: "My ancestors went down to Egypt and flourished there. And when they were oppressed, Jahveh brought them out and led them to Canaan, where, once more, we flourished. Therefore, in grateful remembrance, I bring these offerings to demonstrate my gratitude". Another example of this same use of the Exodus is to be found in 5. 20-24.

Still a third motivation is to be found in the injunctions for keeping the Passover. In this case, Jahveh's act of deliverance creates an obligation on the part of the people. Thus, Pesach is to be celebrated in the month of Abib, because in that month Jahveh brought Israel out of Egypt (16. 1). And the people are to eat unleavened bread to remind them of the fact that they left Egypt in haste with their unbaked dough upon their backs. (v.3)

We have found in Deuteronomy, then, many and varied uses of the Exodus story. At least one of them parallels one of the uses made of the Exodus in pre-Exilic times. A number are to be found largely or solely in Exilic or post-Exilic authors. Some are unique in Deuteronomy itself. Among these latter, is one that has not previously been noted. It is that statement in 23. 8b,9 which says: "Thou shalt not abhor an Egyptian because thou was a stranger in his land". If, as has been held,¹²⁰ the statement refers to an Egyptian Jew, the passage is to be classed with those in Lev. 23, mentioned above. If, however, it is to be taken literally, it is certainly an expression of lofty idealism and universalism, and expresses an attitude toward the land of Egypt which is to be found in no other place in the Bible.

120. Glueck. Bible 7 class notes.

Chapter X.

The Role of The Exodus in The Three Pilgrim Festivals.

It is now generally conceded that the festivals of Passover, Tabernacles, and Weeks were originally agricultural festivals. (Passover was pastoral originally, but later became agricultural when it was identified with the Mazzot festival.) The Passover ritual had its inception in the ceremony of the skip-¹²¹ping of the lambs which was imitated by the worshipper. In the course of time, probably when the Israelites settled in Canaan, these rites became identified with the Canaanite festival celebrating the Spring Equinox--the Mazzot festival. Succoth was originally agricultural, being a period of thanksgiving for¹²² the bounties of nature in the year just passed. The earliest origins of the two festivals, however, are related to the¹²³ ancient Adonis and Tammuz cults. The dancing of the maidens in the vineyards mentioned by Jeremiah (31. 4-6, 12) aid in this identification. Similarly in Judges 21. 19-21 it is explicitly stated that the dances held in the vineyards were annual events. Dr. Morgenstern is of the opinion that these dances were celebrated in the earliest ritual in honor of the father-god Baal,¹²⁴ the mother-goddess Astarte, and the divine child, Tammuz. The similarity between the two is clear. Both last seven days.

121. Jewish Encyclopedia. IX. p. 553.

122. Ibid. XI. p. 657.

123. Morgenstern. "The Origin of Massoth and the Massoth Festival". American Journal of Theology. XXI. p. 283.

124. Ibid. p. 283.

Each begins with a period of mourning for the dead god, and becomes increasingly joyous as the week progresses. Only a few traces of actual mourning rites remain, but there is definite evidence of the ceremony of fasting in preparation for the festival. It seems that in ancient times it was the custom for every Jew to fast on the day before the festival.¹²⁵ Dr. Morgenstern holds strongly to a belief in the early origin of the festival. He says: "The entire Mazzot festival...originally preceded the commencement of the harvest. The new crop could not be eaten until after its regular taboo sacrifice of the Omer, or first sheaf, had been properly offered on the day after the close of the Mazzot festival. The eating of the new crop is among primitive agricultural peoples a ceremony of deep religious significance...Before the first mouthful of the new crop may be taken, the old crop must be completely destroyed...They must fast for a definite period...otherwise...the new crop would be unfit for use".¹²⁶ And this similarity is clear and striking between the Tammuz cult and the agricultural festivals of Israel. To quote Dr. Morgenstern once more: "This unquestionably correct explanation of the origin and significance of the rites, both of the fasting and mourning that began these festivals, and of the dances that formed their culmination rounds out, as it were, and completes our chain of argument".¹²⁷

The early origin of both the Succoth and the Pesach-Mazzot festivals is clear. This question now arises: Where and when

125. Ibid. p. 285. Quoting Pesachim 108a.

126. Ibid. pp. 285f.

127. Morgenstern. "Two Ancient Israelite Agricultural Festivals". Reprint from Jewish Quarterly Review. p. 52.

did they become associated with the Exodus story? With regard to Succoth, it was for the first time definitely associated with the tradition that in the wilderness the Israelites dwelt in booths¹²⁸ by the writer of the Holiness Code (Lev. 23. 43). We have seen that it was celebrated in Palestine at an early date,¹²⁹ but still as a purely agricultural feast.¹³⁰ It is mentioned again in Deuteronomy (16. 13-16); here the dwelling in booths is implied by the name of the festival. The significance of the booths in this place, however, may be traced, presumably, to an old custom of living in booths during the fruit harvest.¹³¹ The first indication of the transfer from an agricultural to a historical festival is to be found in the Holiness Code. Later, in post-Exilic times, a similar motivation is noted.¹³² The feast is observed in response to the command that the people dwell in booths to commemorate the Exodus.

A parallel development may be traced in the Mazzot festival. Originally pastoral and then agricultural, it too, came to have historical significance. In the oldest legislation concerning the festival (Ex. 23. 15; 34. 18), there is no mention of its connection with the Exodus.¹³³ Ex. 23. 9b, 15aB, and 34. 18b are undoubtedly later insertions.¹³⁴ Not until the appearance

128. Ibid. p. 39. Jewish Encyclopedia. XI. pp. 657f.

129. Supra. p. 72.

130. Jewish Encyclopedia. XI. p. 657.

131. Ibid.

132. Neh. 8. 14-18. The reference here is not as clear as we might hope. The statement is: "And all the congregation of them that were come back out of the captivity made booths, and dwelt in the booths; for since the days of Joshua the sons of Nun unto that day had not the Children of Israel done so". A similar statement is contained in II. Kings 23. 22. In both places, the reference to Pesach as a historical festival is by implication only.

of Deuteronomy does the association between the two become apparent. To quote: "In Deuteronomy, in the last quarter of the seventh century, we get on undisputed ground. In this first, extended account the strong emphasis on the historical significance of the Passover is especially marked. It commemorates the emancipation from Egypt, the day of the nation's birth".¹³⁵

During the Exile, the Passover became uniformly associated with and commemorative of the deliverance from Egypt. Thus, the references in Exodus, all late, as well as those in other Biblical books, regardless of authorship, almost without exception offer the Exodus as the source of the festival legislation.¹³⁶ Since we find the interpretation of Passover as a historical festival in a chapter of Deuteronomy which is generally conceded to belong to the kernel of that book (16), while a similar re-interpretation of Succoth does not occur until the Holiness Code, we are safe in saying that the reinterpretation of the former festival preceded by almost a century that of the latter one. And it was not until post-Biblical times that the third of the Pilgrim Feasts--Shabuoth--came to be associated with the tradition of the giving of the law at Sinai, and thus, with the Exodus narrative.¹³⁷

133. Morgenstern. Jewish Quarterly Review. Op. cit. p. 39.

134. Ibid. p. 39. note 4.

135. Hastings. Dictionary of the Bible. III. p. 685.

136. Ex. 12. 17 (P); 12. 27 (JE); 13. 3, 14 (JE); 23. 15 (E³); 34. 18 (JE); Deut. 16. 1.

137. Jewish Encyclopedia. IX. p. 594.

We do find in the Bible, however, the beginnings of the Haggada as related to the Passover. In three late passages, 138 instructions are given for relating the reason for the eating of unleavened bread and the commemoration of the Passover ritual to children. After the description of the ritual for the Passover celebration in Ex. 13, we read: "And thou shalt tell thy son in that day saying: It is because of that which the Lord did for me when I came forth out of Egypt...and it shall be when thy son asketh in time to come, saying: What is this? that thou shalt say unto him: By strength of hand Jahveh brought us up out of Egypt..." This teaching to the children marks the climax of the importance of the Exodus tradition.

The place of the Exodus in the three Pilgrim Feasts is obviously and clearly an important one. Although none of them was originally associated with that event, eventually all three came to be. Their reinterpretation from pagan rituals to historical festivals is entirely based upon the deliverance from Egypt. Apparently, no more important event existed upon which to base them. We must also note that in each case, the reinterpretation came after the Exile. This fact is certainly in agreement with our earlier conclusion that the influence of the Exodus period was even more vital in the lives of the people at that time in Israelitish history than ever before.

138. Ex. 13. 8-10, 14-16; Deut. 6. 20-25.

Conclusion.

We have traced the interest of Biblical writers in the Exodus through the canon of the Old Testament. That the event loomed large in their eyes cannot be doubted. Before, during, and after the Exile it was used with telling force to drive home the ideology of those who wrote of it. In all ages, it served to magnify the greatness and the power of Jahveh. J and E, in recording the actual tradition emphasize this point constantly in their accounts, as does P some four centuries later. We also find the same use made of the Exodus by the authors of Deuteronomy. And in the Psalms, too, constant reference is made to it for this purpose.

In the writings of pre-Exilic authors, we find three points emphasized with regard to the Exodus. 1. The covenant between Jahveh and Israel dates from Egypt or Sinai--noted in J and E, and also in Amos, Hosea, and First Isaiah. 2. Israel's history as a people began in Egypt--noted especially in Hosea. 3. The people have proven disloyal to Jahveh, especially to be condemned in face of His kindness to them in bringing them out of Egypt--noted in Amos, Jeremiah, and the E² writer.

The purpose for which the narration of the incidents of the Exodus is included in Exilic and post-Exilic writers is somewhat different. First, the original Exodus offers the hope of a New Exodus, so prominently expressed by Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Deutero-Isaiah. With the people in Exile, the Exodus from Egypt served as a means of buoying up hope for a second such redemption.

Second, a New Covenant is to be made at the same time that this second Exodus is to be accomplished--a covenant after the manner of the first, with certain differences that have been noted. This idea is almost wholly confined to Jeremiah. Third, the memory of the Exodus served as a potent means of reviving the faith and hopes of the people. Jahveh was indeed powerful; He had manifested this power once. He would do so again. The larger number of references of this type are contained in the Psalms. Fourth, the Exodus served as the basis for the observance of the laws and institutions in which the writers were interested. This was largely to be found in P, but the Exodus also served to motivate the observance of certain humanitarian laws as we discovered from our study of Deuteronomy. And fifth, the re-interpretation of the three Pilgrim Feasts as historical rather than agricultural festivals is based upon this important event in Israelitish history.

In addition to these varied uses to which the Exodus was put by Biblical writers, there must be added those purposes which it served that are found solely in the Book of Deuteronomy. Here, the power and kindness of Jahveh, demonstrated by His act of bringing Israel out of Egypt caused that nation to incur a responsibility to Him. As a result of His action, he had a right to expect the loyalty and the gratitude of His people.

One other interesting bit of information was forthcoming as a result of our study. It was found that an unusually large number of the references to the Exodus were written late in the

history of Israel. It seems that the Exodus gradually assumed a greater significance as the years passed. Although there is no lack of material in the pre-Exilic authors--J and E were themselves before that event--it is really during and after the Exile that the Exodus assumes its greatest significance. This is no doubt due to two causes. On the one hand, the legends of the event had probably not yet been crystallized by the time these earlier authors wrote. On the other hand, its greater significance after the Exile is doubtlessly also due to the fact that the Exile caused the thoughts of all to be directed to an analogous situation; namely, that other period of Israel's history during which the people were outside the land. At such a time, the psychological causes were present, and a greater interest in the power of Jahveh as evidenced in a similar situation is to be expected.

There can, then, be little doubt concerning the influence of the Exodus upon Israel. As a final summation, we quote from Dr. Henry Englander's study of the same material. He writes: "In view, then, of the influence of the Exodus as exhibited in Biblical literature alone, the statement made at the beginning of this paper may fairly be reaffirmed; namely, that this period of history exercised a most profound influence in the religious and social development of Israel. Consciously or unconsciously, it helped to mould the thought, life, and legislation of the 'People of the Book'. As a sanction for the new laws and institutions developing from age to age, as a source of hope and encouragement in times of oppression, as a memory invoked to inspire an unfaltering trust in the beneficent workings of a

divine providence, and as a powerful plea to remember and fulfill our social obligations to those less fortunate than ourselves, the Exodus, as a period of history that projected its influence far into the future, stands unique in the annals of Israel".¹³⁹

139. Englander. "The Exodus in the Bible". Studies in Jewish Literature. p. 114.

Bibliography.

Bibliography.

- Bacon, Benjamin W. The Triple Tradition of the Exodus. Hartford, 1894.
- Bewer, Julius A. The Literature of the Old Testament. New York, 1933.
- Blank, Sheldon. Bible 6 Class Notes. Cincinnati, 1933.
- Burney, C. F. The Book of Judges. London, 1918.
- Buttenweiser, Moses. Bible 1 Class Notes. Cincinnati, 1933.
- Carpenter, J. Estlin and George Harford-Battersby. The Composition of the Hexateuch. New York, 1902.
- ^Z
Delitsch, Franz. The Prophecies of Isaiah. Edinburgh.
- ^A
Driver, S. R. The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah. New York and London, 1906.
- Englander, Henry. "The Exodus in the Bible". Studies in Jewish Literature. Issued in Honor of Professor Kaufmann Kohler. Berlin, 1913. pp. 108 ff.
- Glueck, Nelson. Bible 7 Class Notes. Cincinnati, 1936.
- Hastings, James. A Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. III. New York, 1898.
- International Critical Commentary, the:
- Bewer, Julius A., Mitchell, Hinckley G., and J. M. P. Smith. Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, and Jonah. New York, 1912.
- Bewer, Julius A., Smith, J. M. P., and William H. Ward. Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah, and Joel. New York, 1911.
- Driver, S. R. Deuteronomy. New York, 1916.
- Gray, George B. The Book of Isaiah. Vol. I. New York, 1912.
- Gray, George B. Numbers. New York, 1920.
- Harper, William Rainey. Amos and Hosea. New York, 1905.
- Moore, George Foote. Judges. New York, 1910.

International Critical Commentary, the (cont.)

- Smith, Henry Preserved. The Books of Samuel. New York, 1899.
- Jewish Encyclopedia, the. Vols. IX and XI. *arts.?*
- Kent, Charles Foster. Israel's Laws and Legal Precedents. New York, 1907.
- The Beginnings of Hebrew History. New York, 1908.
- Levy, Reuben. Deutero-Isaiah. London, 1925.
- Margolis, Max M. and Alexander Marx. A History of the Jewish People. Philadelphia, 1927.
- Morgenstern, Julian. "The Origin of Massoth and the Massoth Festival." American Journal of Theology. Vol. XXI. Chicago, 1917. pp. 275 ff.
- The Book of the Covenant. Cincinnati.
- The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch. Cincinnati, 1927.
- "Two Ancient Israelite Agricultural Festivals." Reprint. Jewish Quarterly Review. Vol. VIII., No. 1. Philadelphia, 1917. ~~1917~~.
- Skinner, John. Prophecy and Religion. Cambridge, 1922.
- Smith, George Adam. Jeremiah. New York, 1922.
- The Book of Isaiah. II. Vols. London, 1928.
- Smith, James. The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel. London, 1931.
- Smith, William Robertson. The Religion of the Semites. New York, 1927.
- Steuernagel, D. Carl. Einleitung in das alte Testament. Tübingen, 1912.
- Torrey, Charles, C. Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy. New Haven, 1930.
- Volz, D. Paul. Der Prophet Jeremia. Leipzig, 1922.