HEBREW UNION COLLEGE JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

PROPHETIC DOCTRINES IN THE NARRATIVES OF THE HEXATEUCH: THE JACOB CYCLE

In Partial Fulfilment of the
Requirements for the
Degree of Rabbi

Samuel Sandmel
Hebrew Union College
Cincinnati, Ohio
April 1, 1937

Referee: Dr. Morgenstern

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD

I express my gratitude to Dr. Julian Morgenstern whose guiding hand will be seen, I believe, in the following pages. This work was done in close consultation with him, and many of the conclusions reached were crystallized after profitable discussions with him. The analysis of the Jacob Cycle, Chapter Two, was brought to its present more or less definitive form by him.

Thanks are due also to Dr. Sheldon Blank whose essay, "Studies in Post-Exilic Universalism," anticipated a number of conclusions that I had arrived at independently. Conversations with Dr. Blank clarified many of the points at issue in my work and yielded suggestive thoughts that have been incorporated.

I. INTRODUCTION

1.

The interpretations on the part of modern scholars of the cycle of Jacob stories in Genesis have differed to a remarkably great degree.[1] To Steuernagel the cycle represents the historical reminiscences of early Israelite conquest of surrounding territories, especially in the section dealing with Jacob's flight from Esau and his subsequent return: Jacob (Ya'kobel) was a Hebrew tribe which, after being overpowered by the Edomites, sought refuge among the Arameans, absorbed the Aramean clan of Rachel, and returned to resettle in Canaan. Each character, including each woman, represents a nation or/a tribe.

Gunkel,[2] on the other hand, insists that both Jacob and Esau represent not nations, but individuals; that only at the end of the cycle, as in Genesis 31.52, can the heroes be regarded as nationalized protagonists. But almost self-contradictorily, Gunkel terms the stories "ethnographical"; that is, there must of necessity be some

historical basis in fact before a treaty such as that between Jacob and Laban could be consummated. Gunkel sees, too, historical echoes in Jacob's marriage with women from the eastern land: the early Israelites wandered about in the east before entering Palestine and mingled with the people they found there. But over these historical memories has been woven the poetic veil of legend,[3] obscuring the bold outlines of the old occurrences with the threads of folk-tale. The legend tends to gloss over the historical occurrences and makes even prosaic ephemeralities into poetic immortalities. The Jacob cycle is also ethnographical, telling, for example, that the Israelites obtained Palestine as a result of Isaac's blessing. But, in final analysis, the Jacob cycle is the folk-tale of an individual, the tale which emerged from the merging of independent units into an esthetically satisfying narrative, with suspense, humor, dramatic force, and romance.

Skinner,[4] admitting his dependence on Gunkel, goes beyond him to a slight extent. He sees the development of Jacob from unscrupulous roguery to moral dignity. The ethnographic idea is prominent in that there is a reflection of the relations between Israel and Edom and betweeen Israel and Aram. But it is precarious to insist on an identification of these persons with nations: "They

may be real historical individuals or they may be mythical heroes around whose names a rich growth of legend had gathered before they were identified with particular peoples." At any rate, many of the incidents can be understood only as happening to individuals.[5] Also the theory that the patriarchs were tribal deities worshipped at various shrines (as Jacob at Bethel) and later adopted by the Israelites on settling is admissable, but hardly proved; archeology has not substantiated the existence of these characters, neither as eponymous heroes nor as gods.

Jeremias[6] contends that it is impossible to doubt the essential historicity of the patriarchal traditions. The narratives -- all of them -- reflect conditions of premonarchic days, and fit admirably into a premonarchic setting.

Cornill[7] deduces from the Jacob cycle that Jacob (a tribal name) arrived at Palestine with a contingent fresh from Mesopotamia; of this tribe of four groups, the Leah tribe was the biggest and strongest.

One could go on citing the opinions of even more scholars whose detailed studies of the various elements of the Jacob cycle have been of great value in the understanding of the development of the religion of Israel. But it hardly suffices to clarify the meaning of an obscure

word, or to trace the origin of a particular custom, or to elucidate the background of some specific custom, Such antiquarian interest has a definite place in Biblical science. But the scholars seem to have neglected one phase that appears to us to be the most important phase: What was the import of the story to the successive recasters?

Is it likely that the J editor or the E editor or the various compilers and redactors had no further purpose than just to edit or compile? Can a strictly folk-lore or historical interest be attributed to them? Were these redactors no more than literary artists or historians? Was there any deep purpose in the inclusion of such a cycle as the Jacob narratives in the sacred writings?

Few critics have addressed themselves to such a task. Seemingly they have contented themselves with investigating the more extrinsic content. This is more evident when one considers how greatly the interpretations of the scholars differ from each other. Unanimity of opinion is not characteristic of the scholarly interpretations.

This is not to be wondered at, for it is a necessary consequence of the fact that each scholar has come to the task of studying the cycle with definite predispositions or has limited himself to a pet interpretation. At any rate, the scholars have battled each

other fiercely. Steuernagel's views met with the opposition of Gunkel and of Skinner, and these two refute him adequately. But even Gunkel, as we shall point out, is on rather dangerous ground when he stresses and limits to a folk-lore bases.

Certainly we may discount the Fundamentalist view which regards the Jacob cycle as pure history. The "historical reminiscence" does not satisfy. The sum total of what may be historical is the reflection of the relations between Jacob representing Israel, and Esau and Laban, Edom and Syria respectively. However, the allusions are not clear-cut, and one certainly cannot ferret out any definite historical events from the recorded incidents to permit the use of the term historical. We can observe in Samuel and Kings in what forms history (with the Deuteronomic additions removed) was written.

Further, the implication of the term "historical" as used in this phrase is that a later writer was noting down events of some earlier age. We shall show, we believe, that such elements in the Jacob Cycle as are allusions to historical movements are contemporaneous (or nearly so) with the events, and that these historical allusions are superimposed on the existing narrative. Hence, the narrative in toto could hardly be a "historical reminiscence."

The folk-lore interpretation has the element of truth that any old tale will reflect the folk-ways that obtain at the time of the teller of the story, but it does not go far enough.

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the Hexateuch which contains so much religious legislation, which, by the way, was also compiled and edited, is primarily a religious book; that the stories contained in the Hexateuch are stories told to illustrate definite religious teachings; that the final purpose of the collection and redaction of these stories was for religious instruction.

The testing of this hypothesis, together with an attempted solution of certain details, such as date of compilation, etc., will form the purpose of this thesis. This work will be limited to the Jacob cycle; at a later date, the remainder of the narrative portions of the Hexateuch can be studies similarly.

The term "prophetic doctrine" is conceived of as being synonymous with the term "religious teaching." The prophetic element enters not only because the prophets were religious thinkers and teachers, but for the additional reason that it is not unexpected that we shall find that certain of the narratives are illustrations of specific doctrines of specific prophets, and can be equated to a large extent with definite Biblical

passages.

An important point that must be borne in mind is that although the content of the narratives of the Hexateuch deal with the pre-monarchic time and therefore seemingly precede chronologically the literary prophets, actually critical opinion agrees in general that the literary formulations of the Hexateuch are from at least as late as monarchic times. (There is no great general agreement among scholars as to the precise dating of J, E, etc.) Buf if the redactions are from prophetic times, then our task must be to correlate the narratives of the Hexateuch with prophetic teachings, and not to attempt to trace prophetic doctrines from incidents ascribed to the patriarchal age.

In other words, were the Hexateuch to contain, for example, a narrative which could be nothing else than an illustration of the doctrine of vicarious atonement, the conclusion would be that the narrative is an illustration of the "Suffering Servant" poems, not that the author of the Suffering Servant derived his inspiration from such a Hexateuchal story.

It is the intention, moreover, to go even further. Once it is assumed that the Hexateuch was redacted at various times within the period of the literary prophets, we can use the literary prophets as the guide-posts by

which to fit prophetic-inspired narratives of the Hexateuch into the general framework of the development of the Israelite religious thinking. If we can trace such a concept as universalism from its intimations in the writings of Amos to its complete flowering in Second Isaiah, with the steps in between, then we are not on unsafe ground, despite König[8], in assuming that a narrative which is completely universalistic in outlook could have been composed only after Second Isaiah.

If our hypothesis is valid, as we believe it will be proved to be, then the implications for the study of the Hexateuch will be important and far-reaching; the study of the Hexateuchal narratives on the basis of a literary analysis will show that much of the previous assignments by scholars of passages to J, E, P, etc., has been on either arbitrary or flimsy grounds. Specifically, although we anticipate, our results will tent to show that the pre-Priestly redaction of the Hexateuch was not pre-Exilic, but actually post-exilic.

II. ANALYSIS OF THE JACOB CYCLE

Scholars have made detailed analyses of the Hexateuch and have deduced there from that the composite elements or strata are J, E, D, P[9] etc., with secondary authors in each of these schools. By showing the existence of sources that were originally separate and finally unified, they have accounted for the duplications in the narratives and the many contradictions. In general, the process that they accept is the blending in pre-exilic timesof the J and E versions, with a post-exilic Priestly or Deuteronomic redaction and reinterpretation. We notice that in this hypothesis, the existence of separate, independent narratives is supposed; we shall attempt to show, to the contrary, that at least the Jacob cycle is not the result of such blending, but that it is, in the main, an original, unified account, and that it comes not from the pre-exilic period, but from the exilic or early post-exilic period.

The predisposition of scholars in this regard has led them astray; we make no attempt at present to question the general validity of their conclusions with regard to the rest of the Hexateuch, but we are

firmly convinced that the Jacob Cycle (and the Joseph Cycle,too) is a literary unit. Much of the scholarly analysis of the Jacob cycle has been on the basis of the language used; by equating the linguistic character with the language of other parts of the Hexateuch, certain words were assumed to be characteristic either of J or of E, etc., and the analysis of the Jacob Cycle was made, to a large extent, on such a basis. One must point out that this basis is most insecure; that one code utilizes a word a particular number of times does not preclude the possibility of a different code's using it. The linguistic basis,is, in itself, no absolute proof of the stratum to which a particular verse is to be assigned.

The assumption that the present text is the result of the blending of co-existing documents, then, could easily lead one astray. In critical circles there is universal agreement that certain elements to be found in a Biblical text are insertions; explanatory glosses, interpretative glosses, etymologies, etc. These insertions are admitted to be later than the text into which they have been interpolated. Regarding the Jacob Cycle as an integral part of the Hexateuch, scholars have accounted for the difficulties not by the presence of later additions and interpolations, but by the assumption

that the hypothetical independent versions varied from each other in greater or lesser degrees. We shall attempt to shwo that although the author of the Jacob Cycle did utilize some existing material, we have the situation of an original main narrative with interpolations, not primarily of versions blended into one.

Further, we hope to show that Jacob Cycle, while it has a definite external relationship to the rest of Genesis (and the Hexateuch), internally it is an independent narrative, with a unified theme that is very clear and that is well-developed.

Differing so radically from the scholars, we must first make our own analysis of the elements in the Jacob Cycle. It would lead too far afield to discuss each detail in which we differ from the scholars. Instead, we shall attempt to approach our analysis without the predispositions that the scholars had; we shall treat the Jacob Cycle as far as possible as independent of the rest of the Bible(and almost completely abandon the linguistic basis). Our basis for analysis will be the content of the verses; we shall presuppose a definite consistency of viewpoint on the part of the author, and we shall assume that two verses that reflect mutually exclusive views are the work of two different authors.

There are two possible ways in which we might

proceed from here. We might, on the one hand, analyze verse by verse, showing the steps by which we arrive at our completed analysis. Having already made the analysis, however, we believe that this method would lead to a dispensable repetition and to a constant need for returning to verses that will have been passed, and for a progressive reassigning of many verses, because we shall find a building-up of viewpoints. Therefore, since we have the analysis already made, it is simpler and more expeditious to begin by presenting the results of our analysis and then by explaining how the analysis was arrived at. Our presentation, then, will reverse the order or procedure by which the analysis was actually made.

As we have indicated, it is our view that the Jacob Cycle is a unit; the basic narrative, into which interpolations have been made, we shall designate as M, the main narrative. The distinctive features of this narrative is that both Jacob and Esau are regarded as individuals; the story is a tale of discrete personalities, not symbols of nations.

A series of interpolations nationalized the narrative in many places. It made Jacob represent Israel, and Esau, Edom; it presented Israel as triumphant over Edom, and indeed, as destined to hold sway over many other nations by reason of a great increase in population and

extensive expansion. The tone is not over-friendly to Edom. These interpolations we shall call N 1, the first nationalized interpolations.

A second nationalization reflects a slightly different view; the hope of domination over Edom is abandoned in favor of the recognition that Edom will regain a sovereignty of its own and relations of Israel and Edom will be friendlier. These interpolations come from a later hand than the interpolations mentioned in the paragraph above, and will be called N 2.

We shall find that the teraphim incident is secondary and the work of an editor from an altogether different time; the elements of the teraphim incident we shall call T.

In addition, we shall find J 2 etymologies, Priestly, material, and glosses, and some fragments which have defied identification.

Accordingly, we present our analysis.

Chapter 25

19, 20, and 26 B belong to P.

21, 24, 25 (minus admoni and kullo k^{e}adderet se'ar), 26 A, 27 and 28 are M.

22, 23 admoni in 25, and 29 - 34 are N 1.

Kullo k^{e}adderet se'ar in 25, is a gloss.

Chapter 27

The M stratum is 1, 2 (minus the gloss b^{e}no haggadol) , 3 (minus the gloss tely^{e}ka w^{e}qaśteka),4-6, 7 (minus the gloss lifne yahweh), 8A, 9-14, wattiqqah ribqah in 15, 16 (minus the waw in w^{e}et), 17-22. 25, waybarakehu in 27, 30-34 A, 41 (minus 'al habb^{e}rakah aśer ber^{e}ko abiw and the second 'eśaw, which are glosses, 42 (minus the glosses b^{e}nah haggodol and b^{e}nah haqqatan, 43, 44, and 45 (minus the gloss 'ad sub af ahika).

In addition to the glosses indicated above, verse 23 is also a gloss.

To N 1 belong 15 (minus the first two words), 24, 26, 27 (minus wayborakehu) 28, 29A, 34 B - 37.

To N 2 belong 29 B and 38-40.

Verse 46 is P.

Chapter 28

1-9 are P.

19 is J 2.

The M stratum is 10, 11A, wayyahalom in 12, 13 A alpha*, 15 A alpha, 16 A alpha, 17 A B alpha, 18, 20, 21*, 22 A alpha.

N 1 is 13 A beta B, 14, 15 A beta B, and 16 A beta B.

Unidentifiable fragments are 11 B, 12 (minus wayyahalom), 17 B beta, 22 A beta B, and yahweh in 13 and 21.

Chapter 29

P and RP are ben nahor in 5, bat laban ahi immo w^{e}et zon laban ahi immo in 10, 12 A beta, 16,17, bitt^{e}ka haqq^{e}tannah in 18, 24, 28 B, 29, and 31-35.

The rest of the Chapter is M.

Chapter 30

1-25 A are P.

To N 1 belong 27 B, wayyomar in 28, and 30 A.

Explanatory glosses are seh naqod w^{e}taluh w^{e}kol in 32, kol aŝer laban bo in 35, 37 B beta,

b^e^šiqatot hammayim ašer tahona hazzon listot and wayyehamnah in 38, 'aquddim in 39, and wayyiten p^e^ne hazzon el 'aqod in 40.

Chapter 31

To RP belongs the expanded portion of 18: w^e^et kol r^e^kušo ašer rakaš miqneh qinyano ašer rakaš b^e^fadden aram and arzah k^e^na'an.

Unidentifiable glosses are 48 B and 49 A. Other elements that are not identifiable are elohe abraham ufahad yizhaq in 42, 44 A beta B, 45, 50 A beta B, w^e^hinneh hammazzebah in 51, w^e^'edah hammazzebah and w^e^et hammazzebah hazzot in 52, and 53 A beta B.

The Main stratum is 1, 2, 4, 5A, 6, 7A, 8, 9, 11 (minus the inserted malak), wayyomer raiti et kol ašer laban 'oseh lak in 12, 13 B-17, 18 (minus the Priestly expansion), 19A, 20-23, 25B alpha, 26-28, 30A, 31, 36, 38-41A&B, 42 (minus the glosses), 43, 44A alpha, 46A, 48A, 49B, 50A alpha, and 54.

N 1 is to be found in 3, 5B, 7B 10, 12 (minus what has been assigned to M), 13A, 24, 25A, 25B beta, 29, 41 A beta, 42B, 46B, 47, and 51-53 (minus the unidentifiable glosses).

To the Teraphim stratum belong 19B, 30B, 32-35, and 37.

Chapter 32

To P belongs šᵉte sifhotaw wᵉet ahad 'aser in 23.

To J 2 belong 2B, 3, 26A beta B, 31, 32A beta B, and 33.

Verse 24 is a gloss.

The M stratum is 1, 2A, 4A, 5-8A, 14B-22, 23 (minus the Priestly expansion; perhaps one should read not waya'abor, but instead wayya'abirem), 25, 26A alpha, 27-30, and 32 A alpha.

To N 1 belong 4B, 8B-14A.

Chapter 33

To P belong 1 (from 'alleah to the end of the verse), 2, 6, 7, and bᵉbooh mippaddan aram in 18.

17 is J 2.

18 (minus the Priestly phrase) and 19 and 20 belong to the Shechem stratum, which is to be connected with Chapter 34; the consideration of 34 does not fall within the scope of this work.

To M belong 1A B alpha, 3-5, and 8-11.

To N 2 belong 12-16.

Chapter 35

P material is 'od bᵉbooah mippaddan aram in 9, ani el šaddai in 11, 18B, 22-26, 27 A beta B, 28, and 29.

J 2 is to be found in 1A beta B, 6A, 7, 8B, 10 B gamma, 15, and 20 B.

Fragments that may or may not be J 2, but that are secondary are 8A, 16-18A, 19, 20A, and 21.

The Teraphim account is concluded in 2A beta B and 4.

To N 1 belong 9 (minus the P phrase), 10 AB alpha beta, 11 (minus the P phrase) and 12-14.

The Main alternative is 1A alpha, wayyomer ya'aqob of 2, 3(deleting the waw of w^{e}naqumah, 5, 6 (minus the J 2 phrase luzzah aśer b^{e}erez k^{e}na'an hi, and 27 A alpha.

Chapter 49

Chapter 49, which gives no indication of an Egyptian setting, is to be equated not with the Joseph Cycle into which it has been placed, but with the Jacob Cycle. Verses 28-33 are P; 1-27 are a secondary compilation of older material, being compiled either by J2, a nationalizer, or P.

III. THE MAIN NARRATIVE

We are now in a position to discuss the main narrative, its import, its prophetic basis, and its date. The narrative, we find, falls into sections that can almost be equated with scenes or acts from a play. The first scene is the description; the theophany is the second. Next we shift to Haran for the meeting with Rachel, the deception by Laban, Jacob's counter-deception, and the flight. The next scene is at Gilead, the covenant with Laban. Then there ensues the episode of Jacob's wrestling, and after that the meeting with Esau. The last scene is Jacob's return home. We have adopted the division into scenes and acts rather than chapters because of the high dramatic equality of the Cycle, despite the apparent simplicity of style.

The first scene takes us quickly into the situation.[10] Two sons are born to Rebecca, Esau, the elder, and Jacob, the younger. The two are of totally different temperament and interests. Esau is primarily an out-doors man, a person of rugged straightforwardness, and completely lacking in guile. Jacob, on the other hand, spends his time indoors, in contemplation, impliedly not of the highest sort, but of means and ways

of improving his lot without resorting to honest toil. Isaac has grown old; he feels that death is approaching. He wants to bless his favorite son, the out-of-doors man, the hunter. He bids Esau to prepare his favorite delicacies. Rebecca, overhearing, determines to divert the blessing to her own favorite, Jacob. She tells him that she will prepare the delicacies, not of wild animals but of domestic animals. Jacob at first objects to the deception, not because of the immorality or unethical nature of the act, but because he fears that discovery will bring upon him a curse rather than a blessing. Selfish and cautious of character, he is persuaded to carry through the deception by his mother's willingness to have the curse apply to her rather than to him. Guarded thus against all eventualities, Jacob accedes.

Isaac, helpless in the darkness of his blindness, blesses Jacob. Hardly has Jacob left Isaac's presence, when Esau enters. His labor and fatigue in carrying out his father's desires have been for naught; his wily brother has stolen the blessing intended for him. His rage is unbounded; it is exceeded only by his hatred for his brother. He utters threats of vengeance, and these comes to Rebecca's ear. She knows that she will be unable to restrain Esau, so Jacob must pay the consequence of his sin. Jacob must flee from home. Jacob's sinfulness is not be be passed over: sin has a sequel.

Now comes the second scene. Jacob is alone in a field. The solitude, apparently, has made him conscious of the cause of his fleeing and the resultant loneliness: his sinfulness. A vision of Yahwe appears to him, and the full consciousness of his sin comes over him, filling him with terror. He realizes that the path he has been treading is the wrong path; that he must tread the way of righteousness, the way of the deity who has appeared to him. Yet how can he? He has consistently and continuously been a schemer and a sinner. Is it possible for his sins to be forgiven and forgotten?

Jacob does not know the answer, but he is so moved by the consciousness of his guilt that he determines to act as though his sins will be forgiven. He vows (28. 20) that if he can pass through the vicissitudes that appear destined to befall him, Yahwe will be his God; he will know that his well-being will be the result of Yahwe's intercession, and that his past will have been blotted out. Jacob is no longer the sinner; he is now the earnest penitent.

The third scene takes us to Haran. Jacob arrives (29.1ff) and finds that since his incipient repentance, even his physical strength has increased, for the dweller in tents (25.27) is able to roll the huge rock off the well, a feat that ordinarily required the combined strength of many shepherds.

Jacob meets Rachel, and falls in love with her. Simultaneously he is given the means of obtaining her and of earning a livelihood. Laban "takes him in," literally and figuratively. (Perhaps arami is a play on ramah, to deceive; possibly too Laban, "white", is symbolic of deceit.) Thus Jacob's past sinfulness cannot go entirely unpunished. As he treated others, so must he be treated. By a highly dramatic reversal, Jacob is deceived in the dead of the night: Leah is brought into his tent instead of Rachel. The darkness of blindness permitted Jacob to deceive Isaac; the darkness of night permitted Laban to deceive Jacob. Yet this deception is minimized when Jacob later realizes (33.5) that it is an act of divine grace, calculated to increase the number of Jacob's offspring. Even from this evil, good results because of divine grace.

We note, too, the further high dramatic contrast in the rivalry of the sisters, Leah and Rachel, for preeminence in Jacob's affections as a counterpart to the rivalry of the brothers, Jacob and Esau, for Isaac's blessing.

The years pass by. Children are born. Jacob lives quietly, working faithfully and conscientiously (31.38-41). His repentance is almost complete. His former sinfulness is almost wholly a thing of the remote past.

But within him, the old voice begins to speak again. He is becoming old; how will he provide for his wife and children? He approaches his uncle. Laban is loath to have Jacob depart. He does not want to lose so trustworthy a servant, an employe so completely trusting and simple that apparently the servant has not noticed how often his wages have been altered. But Jacob has noticed (31.7), and the remnants of his early characteristics come to dominate him again. Laban has deceived him; he too has known how to deceive. And Jacob justifies himself: he is the agent of the deity, sent to punish sinful Laban. Jacob resorts to tricks of homeopathic magic and benefits beyond his wildest expectations. His deceit makes him a wealthy man.

Again deceit is the cause of Jacob's flight. First it was from fear of Esau; now it is from fear of his cousins, who may attempt violence, and not unjustly; for Jacob has contrived to cheat them out of what they could confidently expect was to be theirs. And somehow they sense this and are openly hostile. Jacob recalls his vow: he must return to his father's house so that he may know that Yahwe has been with him. In his hypocrisy he does not intimate to his wives that it was his deceit that was necessitating their flight. Preparations are made in secret, and Jacob and his company depart.

Laban learns of the secret departure. He starts in pursuit, and overtakes Jacob. Roughly he begins to upbraid him, but he learns to his dismay that Jacob is not the trusting and simple man he had considered him. Jacob retorts forcefully. He defends his actions on the grounds that he feared deception, but he leaves the defensive and assumes the offensive with such aggressiveness that Laban is taken aback. He has come to quarrel with Jacob; instead he meekly sues for a covenant of peace, for assurances that his daughters will receive kind and considerate treatment from Jacob. The covenant is concluded.

Jacob makes his thanksgiving to Yahwe. He had expected trouble from Laban, but he has managed to come through with flying colors. Smugly enough, Jacob considers himself a favored person. He has been (in his own eyes) righteous, and what is more, he has been the means by which the unrighteous Laban has been punished.

Suddenly there dawns on him the realization that his home-coming will entail a meeting with his brother Esau. The danger just passed was small compared with the peril of the future. For Jacob has deprived Esau of everything: the right of primogeniture (by taking the blessing for himself). Esau's whole life has been affected adversely as a result of Jacob's actions.

Jacob has good cause for fright. His flight from home was occasioned by the threats that Esau had uttered. The passing of time could surely bring no other result than to emphasize and elevate in Esau's mind this desire for revenge. One so cruelly treated would not be likely to have forgotten the incidents that relegated him to the position of inferiority that was his.

Further deception, Jacob realized, was futile. His character was well known to his brother. What must be done? His messengers return: Esau is coming with four-hundred men, undoubtedly to make trouble. Jacob can think of only one thing that will save him: His brother must be "bought off." So Jacob despatches a considerable bribe to his brother.

But even so he is not convinced of the efficacy of the bribe. He divides his camp into two parts, so that in case Esau does come to make trouble, at least half of Jacob's company will escape. The act of dividing brings Jacob to the fullness of despair. He suddenly realizes fully how hopeless his situation is. Could he depend on Yahwe after the falseness with which he had treated Laban? Certainly not.

Completely terror stricken, Jacob takes his wife and children across the Jabbok. It is night time.

Under the cover of darkness he is able to separate himself even from them. Let Esau come! Let him attack the camp! Let him carry off even the wives and the children! Jacob is safe---safe, alone and on the far side of the stream.

But terror strikes Jacob anew. He has just completed the climax in his double-dealing: he has set up his nearest and dearest as attractions to lure Esau and to divert Esau's attention from himself. The proud deceiver has become the cringing coward, alone, without any one whose trust he could merit, without the deity who could have no interest in a deceiver. The height of terror, and the lowest depths of moral disintegration.

And yet, from this nadir of spiritual decomposition, Jacob emerges a new man. For the duration of the night he struggles--an inner struggle in which he is both the antagonist and the protagonist. Against his spiritual integrity is pitted the irrefutable knowledge that his past has been filled with actions that have led him to an almost inevitably evil mind. But within him is still a vestige of the impulse that had previously impelled him to forsake his career of deception; the same inclination that had prompted him to recognize the need for moral correction before has grown into a recognition that repentance, only partial or temporary is of no use whatsoever. It is only a complete, drastic

change in his whole spiritual outlook that can enable Jacob to emerge from the exigent struggle victorious. And in the struggle, Jacob does emerge victorious; he is no longer the same person. The deceiver has given way to the champion of God. By his act of complete and unrestricted repentance, a righteous, honorable Israel has supplanted a dishonest, knavish Jacob.

Attention must be called to the similarity of the theophanies of 28.10-22 and 32.25ff. In both, Jacob is alone; both take place at night. From the first theophany Jacob emerged after having undergone only the suffering of fear. From this second contact with the deity, however, Jacob emerges a new man, with a new name, and has suffered actual physical distress. We observe how much deeper has been Jacob's recognition of the error of his ways in this second theophany than in the first.

Accordingly the first theophany did not result in Jacob's complete regeneration; Jacob's repentance was too superficial. But in this second theophany Jacob has been so self-searching and so completely critical of his own conduct, and has struggled with himself so earnestly and so sincerely, that he emerges with the assurance that never again will he fall back into his old ways.

Still afraid of Esau, Jacob nevertheless

does not attempt any longer to reserve an opportunity for himself to escape at the expense of his company. Conscious that it has been his evil actions that have brought his whole company into danger, he puts himself before them (33.3). How different this is from the actions of the wily schemer of the night before who wanted a river between himself and his adversary.

Esau comes with four-hundred men, but in place of a bitter struggle, there is a friendly reconciliation. The bitterness leaves Esau, for his anger is disarmed by the regenerate Jacob's submission.

Jacob has at last realized that that which has come into his possession is the token of diving grace. (33.5) His repentance is complete; there remains only the need for a concrete manifestation of his sorrow over his misdeeds. He has deprived Esau of the blessing that rightfully belonged to him. The gift he has prepared is no longer a bribe. It is now the restitution for the blessing(33.11). Esau accepts the gift, and symbolically affirms his belief in the honesty of Jacob's repentance.

Thankful for having emerged so fortunately from the tribulations, Jacob determines to carry out the vow he has made. He makes his way to Bethel, the scene of his first realization of the error of his ways, and carries out the vow he has made. Then Jacob returns home,to his father (and mother?).

Priestly substitutions have left some lacunae in the conclusion of the main narrative. We can see through the Priestly material, however, that Jacob lived the rest of his life in tranquillity, reaching a respectable age, and able to confer his blessing upon his children.

The above has been a detailed interpretation of the Jacob cycle. Reduced to simple form, the drama asks these questions: Is repentance possible to a man who has been completely wicked? Can a wicked man become a righteous man and live the tranquil life that a righteous man deserves? The answer, unequivocally, is yes. And how does a man repent? By a long struggle with his baser self; by searching and profound insight into his ways; by the realization that his ways have been wrong; by an unshakable determination never to stray from the right road again; and by making restitution for the wrong that he has done.

We are now in a position to date the main stratum of the Jacob cycle. The dependence on Ezekiel's doctrine of individual responsibility is clear. This doctrine is to be found in Ezekiel 18; 33.1-20; 3.16-21: and 14.12-21.

This doctrine was in keeping with Ezekiel's message of hope to the exile. The kernel of the message is to be found in Jeremiah 31.28-31, in a passage which is, however, not universally accepted as original. But the

But the proverb recorded in the book of Jeremiah was the point of departure for Ezekiel.

This doctrine was applied by Ezekiel to all the possibilities within one man's lifetime (18.4 ff.). Morality, he taught, was not static. Even in an environment of unmitigated unrighteousness, an individual not caught in the current of his surroundings can stand out as a righteous man. Conscious of his short-comings, the individual has repentance open to him, and God waits eagerly for his regeneration.[12]

For our purposes, Ezekiel 33.14 and 15 and 16.21-24 are especially significant. They state in simple prose exactly the same thing as the highly dramatic cycle of Jacob's stories.

We have, then, a terminus a quo; the narrative must come after Ezekiel's pronouncement of the doctrine of individual responsibility, and moral regeneration. At the earliest, the main stratum, in its unified form, is exilic.

A further evidence of the date of the terminus a quo, we observe the dependence of Ezekiel's doctrine of individualism on Jeremiah's doctrine that the exile was part of Yahwe's plan for Israel's moral regeneration.[13] Jeremiah was concerned with the nation; Ezekiel, with individ-

uals. The main narrative, dealing with a sinner who is forced into exile because of his sins; who, in the exile, undergoes moral regeneration; and who, having become purified as a result of this suffering, returns home --- the main narrative is strikingly an illustration of Jeremiah's doctrine of the new covenant (Jer. 31.30ff.). The only difference is that our narrative follows Ezekiel in dealing with the problem of the individual, and not Jeremiah who dealt with the problem of the nation. But Ezekiel's application of the principle of moral regeneration is dependent on Jeremiah, and our narrative is thus, by only one remove, dependent on Jeremiah. The doctrine of the new covenant comes from the latter period of Jeremiah's life, from the period in which Ezekiel, a younger contemporary, began his prophetic activity.

Our main narrative must come at a time later than Jeremiah's doctrine of the new covenant, from the time when this doctrine could have been blended with Ezekiel's doctrine of individual responsibility. Certainly, it could not have come before Jeremiah's doctrine of the new covenant.

We shall discover the terminus ad quem after we investigate the nationalistic interpolations. Manifestly, the cycle had to be complete before the interpolations could be made. When we establish the date of the interpolations, we shall have the terminus ad quem.

IV. NATIONALIZING ELEMENTS: THE FIRST NATIONALIST STRATUM

The nationalist strata are clearly additions and interpolations, but made by so artistic a hand that in most incidents they not only fit into the narrative without any roughness, but they even add to the dramatic intensity.[13]

In Chapter 25, we have called 22 and 23 N 1. We observe that 23 makes the babies not children, but nations, and points to a future strife between the two nations,[14] with the smaller nation triumphant over the larger. This nationalization in itself would be sufficient to prove the secondary nature, but we have an even stronger proof. Twenty-two speaks of the children in the womb and 23 makes of them twins; 24, however, expresses surprise that twins are born, rather than one child. Certainly, 24 cannot be from the same hand as 22 and 23. We note, moreover, how perfect the connection between 21 and 24 is: these two verses stood together before the interpolation was made. This interpolation not only nationalizes the two children, but it predicts that the younger, Jacob, will become dominant over the older, Esau.

In 25, admoni is N 1; it equates Esau with Edom, and further, it does not provide a motivation for the name Jacob. the name Esau as does 26/ Kullo k^{e}adderet se'ar is a much later gloss, explaining the seemingly unrelated admoni.

Twenty-nine-34 motivates 27.36, which reinterprets the name Ya'aqob; it again equates Esau with Edom, and explains how the domination of Edom by Israel was predicted from early times. Twenty-nine-34 interrupts between 25.28 and its natural sequel, 27.1.

Chapter 26 falls out of discussion; it has been misplaced, and belongs with the Isaac narratives.

Chapter 27 gives two methods by which Isaac was deceived. The main stratum utilized the delicacies which were to be prepared; the nationalist version utilizes the clothes of Esau, with their scent of the field. This scent is the basis for the blessing in 28, so that 15 A beta B must be interpreted with 24, 26, 27 (minus wayyeborakehu), 28, and 29A. The main stratum spoke of a blessing without quoting it; the nationalist blessing again predicts prosperity for Jacob (that is, for Israel the nation) and provides for Israel's dominance over related nations. The nationalist interpolations are still in harmony with each other.

Thirty-five-37 is part of N 1 because it is dependent on earlier nationalist interpolations (as 36 clearly is). The b^{e}rakah and the b^{e}korah amounted to the same thing; there is no reason for both of these to have been given. However, the interpolator has added them artistically, and they blend into the story rather well; Jacob's acquisition of the b^{e}korah was legal, but rather unethical; the b^{e}rakah incident develops Jacob into a complete sinner.

Thirty-eight-40 are likewise a nationalistic interpolation, making Esau equivalent to a nation. Thirty-seven has implied that there is no blessing whatsoever for Esau; we are rather surprised, then, to find a blessing recorded. Thirty-eight-forty can hardly come from the same hand. Further, the inner content shows a difference in viewpoint; 24, 26ff. have provided for the ascendancy of Israel at the expense of, among others, Edom. Thirty-eight-40 insists that there will be a period of tribute to Israel,[15] but eventually Edom will be free. Such a sentiment must be later than 24, 26ff.; therefore, we have called it N 2.

Left out of the discussion has been 29B; it could go with 24, 26ff., but in the light of the other N 1 interpolations, it strikes us that in N 1 there would be no admission of the possibility that other nations would curse. We have put 29B in N 2, although there is no

change if we were to call it N 1.

Twenty-eight 10-12 is difficult of analysis, especially because of the presence of the inidentifiable material that interrupts the flow of the narrative. However, 13, 14, and 15A beta B clearly are interpolations; there is no reason for the fear expressed in 16 after the promises contained in 13-15. Also, the verses are nationalized, and again predict wide-spread domination by Israel of the surrounding nations and territories.

The confusion found in this section, 28.10-22, prevents a definitive solution of all the problems involved; for our purposes it suffices that we can recognize the presence of the nationalized verses and that these verses are interpolated.

In Chapter 30, 27B-28A and 30A are secondary; they give a concrete example of "blessers being blessed"; and they provide, as does 28.14, for great expansion. The verses do lack a clear nationalistic interpretation (although one might infer such an interpretation from wayyifroz in 30), but the similarity to the other N 1 interpolations with respect to the "blessing" enables us to class it as N 1.

Chapter 31, like 28.10-22, is difficult of analysis. The secondary character of verse 3 is obvious;

it interrupts between 2 and 4 which have a natural connection, and even more, it reinterprets Jacob's reason for leaving. 5B and 7B likewise reinterpret the verses in which they stand, injecting a divine overseeing such as is completely consistent with the overseeing in the other nationalized passages. 10, 12A beta, 13A, 24, 25AB beta, 29, 41A beta, 42B, 46B-47, and 51-53 (as indicated in the table of analysis) continue the motif of divine intervention in Jacob's behalf. The allusion in the nationalized account of the covenant between Jacob and Laban is not clear; as far as in known, there is no historical event to which this can refer in the same way that the Edomite references can be explained. However, we recognize the nationalized character of the rewritten account, and note the continuation of the divine overseeing.

In 32, the nationalized character of 4B is obvious. 8B-14A is a unit, closely knit together. Its core is a reminder to Yahwe of his promise; 13 demonstrates that the passage must be interpreted nationalistically. The passage is the work of a literary master in that it seems at first glance to fit in with the main stratum. We observe, however, that 8B is a reinterpretation of 17 ff. Why we say reinterpretation will become clear when the import of 8B-14A is discussed.

In Chapter 33.12-16, the account is less artistically nationalized; we deal here not with individuals symbolic of nations, but almost with nations themselves. We observe that there is a spirit of friendship between the two, and that neither is subject to the other. These verses, accordingly, belong not to N 1 but to N 2. We note too how they are superimposed on the account that deals only with individuals.

The foregoing has been for the purpose of establishing the secondary character of the nationalistic allusions. This we believe we have done. Now we must discuss more fully the import of the nationalizing verses, their prophetic bases, and their dates.

The first stratum, we have said, refers to a future domination by Israel of the nations in the immediate civinity. This is the import of the one nation's being subject to a brother nation. This triumphant nation will become very numerous, like the sand of the sea, and will spread out in all directions. Its prosperity will make it the envy of all other nations, and it will be a blessing to wish that a nation may become like Israel. Further, these proclaim the broterhood of Edom and Israel. We observe also the inclusion of the doctrine of the "merits of the patriarchs." All these elements combine to enable us to

crystallize our view as to when these verses were written. The doctrine of the merits of the patriarchs,[17] which has no literary prophetic bias, developed in the century after the fall of Jerusalem in 586. The import of this doctrine was that Yahwe would not cast off Israel entirely because of the special merit of the ancestors. The doctrine expresses itself in the frequent mention of the patriarchs together, especially in appeals to the deity: "God of our fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." (Jacob, of course, would limit himself to Abraham and Isaac.) It occurs frequently in the Hexateuch: Gen. 24.12, 27.42; 26.24; 28.13; 32.10; 46.3. Exodus 3.6, 15, 16; 4.5; Deuteronomy 1.11, 21; 4.1; 6.3; 12.1; 26.7; 27.3; 29.24; and Joshua 18.3. It is likewise found in Judges 2.12; II Samuel 12.7; 23.1; I Kings 18.36; II Kings 21.22; Psalms 20.2; 76.7; 84.9; Ezra 10.11; I Chronicles 28.9; 29.10, 20; II Chronicles 13, 5, 16; 19.4; 21.10; 28.6, 9; 30.6, 7, 22; 34.32, 33 and 36.15.

The formula was retained in the later literature (and even in the modern Jewish liturgy), but without the special import it had in exilic and early post-exilic times.

The promises of great expansion in territory and increase of population, are from the period shortly after the restoration.[18] The prophet Zechariah delivered such

a promise, presumably on the day on which the foundation of the temple was laid (Zech. 8.9). The remnant of Israel, that is, the small community of Judah located in Jerusalem and its environs would not always be small. Under God's leadership (Zech. 8.12) the nation would become populous and would expand and be unlimitedly prosperous. In place of being a curse, it would be a blessing in the eys of the rest of the world, and God would be its redeemer. (Zech. 8.13). The prophecy in Zechariah 8.9-12 coincides in practically all details with the promises of expansion and the divine guidance found in the Jacob cycle. These promises and statements of divine guidance are dependent upon this passage in Zechariah, and are to be dated after 520.

Such sentiments are to be found too in Isaiah 45.14; 49.22; and 54.1ff; these passages may be post-exilic rather than exilic (the hitherto accepted view), and may come from this same period.

Such too is the import of the paper legislation of Deut. 20, in the first stratum. Israel, under Yahwe's active leadership, will conquer all the world. With Yahwe as the lactive leader, it will be unnecessary to maintain a huge army under strictest military control, for history and conquest will be assured to Israel.[19]

However, we have seen that the prophetic interpolations come from the period beginning, at the earliest,

with 520. Accordingly, we have the terminus ad quem for the main narrative, and we can fix its date as coming after Jeremiah's doctrine of the new covenant and Ezekial's enunciation of the doctrine of individual responsibility and before the year 520. The fact that Ezekial lived in the exile and that the narrative was complete so early in the post-exilic period seems to urge that the composition of the Jacob Cycle was exilic.

But to return to the prophetic interpolations, we have seen that they are at earliest, early post-exilic. What is the terminus ad quem for the first stratum? The answer is to be found in the fact that the prophetic elements speak of the domination by Israel(rather, by Judah(of Edom, and that the date of these insertions was at earliest 520. It is hardly likely that such a sentiment that Judah would triumph over its enemies could have persisted in the same positive way(confer Deuteronomy 20.10-14) after the disasters of the year 485. From 485,and for a considerable period, we have the relationship between Judah and Edom expressed in terms of deepest hatred(Psalm 137.7-9; Ezekial 35; Amos 1.11, 12, which is post-exilic; Isaiah 34; 63.1-6; and Obadiah). The idea of brotherhood of the nations has persisted, but one feels less the spirit of Judah's divinely-guided triumph over Edom, and more, sheer hatred. Accordingly, we may set the terminus ad quem of the first nationalist stratum at 485.

As to the fiction[21] that Edom and Israel were brother nations, Biblical literature has several instances in which this sentiment is expressed: Numbers 20.14, Deut. 23.18, Amos 1.11, Mal. 1.2 and Obadiah 10. The idea seems to have arisen as a sort of a fiction, according to Dr. Blank, in the century from 586 to 485. Apparently the universalism preached by the Isaiah of the exile with its attendant concept of Israel's mission imbued Israel with a kind of proselyting universalism, one phase of which was the hope for wide-spread expansion. Under the urge of this proselyting impulse, coupled with the friendly relations since at least 586 (the older view of the schools to the contrary)[22] and the common fate suffered by both Israel and Edom under the Babylonians and the Persians, the fiction of brotherhood could have arisen very easily. At any rate, our evidence has shown that the fiction was in force at the beginning of the period of the restoration.

The first nationalist stratum, then, is from the period from 520 to 485, probably from the latter half of this period.

From such a period, the "two camps" of 32.11 becomes[23] clear. It refers to the two Jewish settlements, the one in Jerusalem, and the one in Babylon. This accounts for calling the river the Jordan in the nationalist interpolation (32.11) and calling it the Jabbok in the main stratum

(32.23). 32.12 seems to come from just before 485, when the danger of the attack that did materialize was evident to the Judeans.

V. THE SECOND NATIONALIST STRATUM

The fiction that Israel and Edom were brother nations persisted even after the disasters of the year 485. Indeed, he hatred expressed by some of the passages cited above seems to have given way, after a long time, to a new feeling of friendship, as exemplified by Deuteronomy 23.8. This passage in Deuteronomy is secondary; it is probably from the period of reaction away from the extremism of the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (confer also the friendliness to foreigners expressed in the book of Ruth, which is also a reaction away from this particularism). Indeed we know of the later assimilation by the Idumeans by the Judeans; Deuteronomy 23.8 is probably a reflection of the amelioration of the relationship, and probably comes from the fourth century (the exact date cannot be given, because the whole latter post-exilic period is so dark).

Further, we know that the Edomites, who were located east of the 'arabah in pre-exilic times, eventually moved into the southern part of Palestine into what became Idumea.[24] It is contended, in fact (by Dr. Glueck, in lectures in History Seven), that the word se'ir is altogether a post-exilic word and refers only to the region occupied by the Edomites, or Idumeans, west of the 'arabah. The lo-

cation of Edom is important to this extent: If it is true, as Seligsohn[25] says, that Edom was a "rocky and calcareous country," then Genesis 27.39 could hardly apply to Edom. However, it might apply better to the region west of the 'arabah and south of Judah. The land alluded to in 27.39, then, would be exactly the same land as in 27.28. The reference to the fertility[26] of the land in 27.39 must therefore came from a time when the Edomites, or Idumeans, occupied the land in conjunction with the Judeans. This would presuppose free mixture of the people, and would accord to the view of Deuteronomy 23.8. Thus, from the nature of the land described, and from the fact that the second nationalist stratum deals with friednly relations between Judah and Edom, we are led to date the second nationalist stratum in the fourth century.

Such too is the picture in 33.14B-16. We have called attention to Dr. Glueck's contention that se'ir is the region west of the 'arabah. Here too the picture is of the two nations at peace with each other, under the friednliest of relations, and having intimate and amicable intercourse with each other. 33.14B-16 fits well into the fourth century.

Beer-Sheba has been represented in 28.10 (and in chapter 26) as the dwelling place of Isaac from which

Jacob has gone forth. Impliedly that is where he is to return (according to 28.21A). Beer-Sheba was, by this time, in the heart of what had become Edomite territory. Accordingly, the background of 33.12-16 now becomes clear, and one sees that Jacob is not over-reaching Esau again, but is assuring him that within a reasonable time he will come to Se'ir.

(Also, the fact that Beer-Sheba lay in Edomite territory may account for the incorporation by RP of the material which makes Jacob settle at Shechem and which denies that he came to Edom. The Shechem material, especially chapter 34, although it gives some incidents in the life of Jacob, is not an integral part of our unified, prophetic account, and hence has not entered into detailed consideration.)

The second nationalist stratum, then, comes from the fourth century.

VI. THE TERAPHIM INCIDENT

The teraphim incident in Chapter 31 has generally been interpreted in one of two ways. First, the possession of these teraphim was necessary to give full title to the animals in Jacob's possession. These animals had been born under the sway of the teraphim, and belonged to their worshiper. Hence it was necessary for them to be stolen to validate Jacob's claim to the flocks. However, 31.31 and 32 seems to preclude such an interpretation by those who regard the chapter a result of JE blending, because it is only the teraphim that Jacob invites Laban to take with him. There is no intimation that the flocks will be returned.

The second interpretation is independent of the validity of the first; whether the possession of the teraphim conferred title or not, the function of the incident is to reveal another instance of deception, parallel to Jacob's deception of Isaac and Laban's deception of Jacob. This third deception would be Rachel's deception of Laban, and we would thus have a nice chain of deceptions, revealing the workings of retributive justice: he who deceived was eventually deceived.

This second interpretation does add dramatic flavor to the drama from a literary standpoint, and especially if one conceives of Chapter 33's being acted on a stage. By successive steps the tents of those we know are innocent are searched. A certain tensity of feeling develops when Laban enters Rachel's tent. The suspense gives way in excellent dramaturgic technic, to hilarious laughter at the droll way in which Laban is completely fooled. The scene has a high comic flavor, and was the work of a literary man of ability.

We believe, however, that the incident has a deeper meaning, and that it is in a way a Tendenz-Schrift.[27] The teraphim incident is secondary and superimposed. Verse 19A illogically makes the theft of the teraphim precede in importance (by its emphatic position, being stated first) the details of Jacob's flight. In 22 and 23, Laban does not know of the teraphim; 30B appears to be no more than an afterhought. It is exceedingly laconic if we are to assume that the purpose of Laban's pursuit was primarily to recover the teraphim. After verse 37, there is no mention of the teraphim. Verse 37A beta may not refer to them, and possibly the allusion in 37A beta is explained by the rest of 37; Laban is hunting for vessels that Jacob may have stolen (presumably precious vessels) and Jacob

resents the implication. However, it is only with respect to the teraphim that Laban in this speech accuses Jacob of theft, so that 37 most probably is part of the teraphim incident. There is little reason to doubt the secondary character of the whole incident.

The conclusion of the teraphim incident is to be found in the secondary verses 35.2 and 4. Here we find what disposition was made of the teraphim, and the whole import of the incident becomes self-evident. It is a bit of satire directed at false gods. The teraphim, we note, are capable of being stolen; certainly, then, they are of very limited power. Once stolen, they are sought for, but they lack the power of revealing themselves to the seekers. Susceptible of the most contemptuous treatment, they are placed in the rather equivocal position of resting under a woman's pediment. But there is still a greater indignity: the woman is menstruous, in the state of her greatest defilement, and the defilement presumably passes over to the teraphim (confer the transmission of menstrual defilement in Leviticus 15.19-23). Thus far, the teraphim are treated with extreme contempt. In 35.2 and 4, they disappear completely from our notice by reason of being buried under the oak near Shechem.

Verses 35.2 and 4 use the expression elohe nekar. Teraphim fall into this category by virtue of having belonged to Laban, a foreigner. The term elohe nekar appears in Jeremiah 5.19, which is, however, secondary. Deuteronomy 32.12 (exilic?) used the expression el nekar. Elohe nekar occurs in I Samuel 7.3, in a very similar context. The passage is certainly Deuteronomic, and accordingly post-exilic. Deuteronomy 31.16 uses the expression; this passage is post-exilic, containing the idea that Yahwe will depart from the land (31.17) as a result of anger, if elohe nekar are worshipped. II Chronicles 33.15, the last occurrence of the expression, is likewise late. All this points to a hypothesis that the term elohe nekar was late. The word nekar is also apparently late. P uses it three times (Genesis 17.12, 27 and Exodus 12.43). It occurs in Leviticus 22.25 and may be RP rather than H. Judges 10.16 is to be understood as explained by 10.6; this Deuteronomic interpretation is post-exilic. Other late occurrences of nekar are Nehemiah 9.2 and 13.30, and II Chronicles 14.2 and 33.15. It is to be observed that nekar is not equivalent in import to ger or tošab; because these terms frequently reflect a friendly relationship, whereas nekar reflects an unfriendly relation. Nor is nekar a general term and ger tošab specific terms. The difference seems to be in place of residence. A ger or a tošab dwells in Palestine, but a nekar usually is from outside Palestine, although the latest occurrences of the

term (in Nehemiah and Chronicles) do not preclude a Palestinian residence. Nekar, however, and nakri, too, is a term denoting the sharp differentiation between Israel and other nations; nekar a high degree of separation, well-attested by the usage in Nehemiah 9.2 and 13.30, and appears to be a term to characterize those who were excluded from the Judean community as a result of the extreme particularism.[28] (Confer Nehemiah 13.27 and Ezra 10.2, 10, 14, 17, and 18.)

Teraphim figure in the narrative of Micah in Judges 17 and 18. This narrative is set in the pre-monarchic times, but was written, of course, much later, probably as a bit of propaganda to cast contempt on the sanctuary at Dan. This treatment suggests the hand of Deuteronomic editors, and is strikingly similar in spirit to our narrative, in the matter of the transportation of the idols. The present form of Judges 17 and 18 is, we believe, post-exilic.

The passge in I Samuel 15.23 reveals that the use of teraphim was regarded as a non-Yahwistic practice. I Samuel 10 likewise illustrates the weakness of the teraphim; they are powerless to save David, and become subjected to the indignity of being the "dummy" in David's bed so that David can escape. The Deuteronomic passage,

II Kings 23.24, reveals clearly the post-exilic attitude to the teraphim.

Hosea's attitude toward teraphim seems to have been one of at least toleration (Hosea 3.4), seemingly regarding teraphim as associated with the legitimate cult practice. Ezekiel, on the other hand, associates teraphim with the Babylonian monarch, as a part of the consultation of an oracle (Ezekiel 21.26).

Deutero-Zechariah flatly rejects the teraphim as sources of false oracles (Zechariah 10.2). These three passages constitute all the prophetic mentions of teraphim, and although three occurrences is a scanty number, we can perhaps reconstruct the attitude towards teraphim from them. At first they were a regular part of Israelite cult practice (or household divinities); in exilic times, the term designated the oracles of non-Israelites: in late post-exilic times, after the conception had developed, based on Deutero-Isaiah's teaching, that Yahwe was the one true God, teraphim were scorned as impotent, false divinities.

It is the disposition that was made of the teraphim in our narrative, however, that gives away completely the purpose behind the inclusion of the incident

in the Jacob Cycle: the burial under the oak at Shechem. It is beyond doubt, we believe, that Chapter 34, some anti-Samaritan propaganda, occupies its present position not merely as a result of random editing but it was placed where it is by the attraction to the similar Tendenz of the teraphim incident. The import of the incident seems clearly an attempt to cast contempt on the Samaritan temple: these worthless teraphim were stolen from Laban, subjected to the most humiliating treatment, and then buried in the Samaritan stroghold. The use of the definite article in haelah leads to the conclusion that the oak tree was well-known; it suggests further that this oak may have been the scene of the orgiastic practices such as would call forth the bitter scorn of the Judean community (confer wetahat kol elah 'abutah in Ezekiel 6.13; the presence of the word to'aboth in Ezekiel 6.11 leads to the conclusion that this passage in Ezekiel is post-exilic).

This same tree figures in the account in Joshua 24. In this chapter, the people reject the elohe nekar (verse 23) and the witness of this act of rejection and the covenant made with Yahwe is a stone set up under the oak tree (haelah, instead of haelah) in the sanctuary of Yahwe. Joshua 24, according to Morgenstern, is a "composite and confused narrative resulting from far-reaching

29

re-editing of the original narrative." The chapter is mainly the work of Deuteronomic editors who sought to suppress the account of the covenant with Joshua in favor of their own tradition of the covenant with Moses.

What could have been the purpose of the Deuteronomic editors, however, in retaining the tradition of a covenant with Joshua at Shechem? It is surprising for them to admit the existence of a sanctuary in addition to the one at Jerusalem. It is further surprising that they should permit the chapter to imply that the covenant at Shechem was actually consummated. We should expect the Deuteronomic editors to be most unfriendly to the claims of Schechem, in the same way that the late Deuteronomic editors of II Kings 17 made insertions of far-reaching import in that account to imply that their contemporaries in the north were not the descendants of those who knew how to worship Yahwe. The thought suggests itself that the motive behind Chapter 24 is to cast further aspersion on the Shechemites, or Samaritans. Verse 20 gives the clue: if those assembled at Shechem leave Yahwe and worship elohe nekar, then Yahwe will/return in do evil to them and make an end of them. According to the late editors of II Kings 17, this is exactly what happened; the native Israelites were all deported and a completely strange people brought in who did not know how to worship Yahwe.

The stone under the oak at Shechem was to be the witness (verse 27) against the people if they ever were false to God. This stone, then, was to be the testimony to the falseness of the people.

Our narrative does not mention the stone; it speaks only of the oak at ('im) Shechem. Yet we seem to glean the information that not only did the people break the covenant and not only were they made an end of, but the very site that had been before the scene of the solemnization of the covenant with Yahwe, later came to be the repository of false, foreign gods.

Curiously enough, the Midrash (Genesis Rabbah, LXXXI) records a story about Rabbi Ishmael ben Jose, a tanna who lived near the end of the second century A.D., that interprets Genesis 35.4 in almost exactly this way. This story tells that Ishmael was on his way to Jerusalem to pray. He passed the Samaritan hill, and one of the Samaritans saw him, and asked where he was going. Ishmael replied that he was going to Jerusalem. The Samaritan thereupon rejoined that it would be better for Ishmael to pray on the blessed hill of Samaria rather than at the cursed (ie. ruined) place in Jerusalem. Ishmael replied: I shall tell you to what you are comparable -- to a dog greedy for carrion. Since you know that idols are hidden underneath, as is written, "And Jacob hid them, etc.," therefore you are eagerly desirous of them.

We suggest that this is an instance of history repeating itself, that the attitude of the author of the teraphim incident was exactly the same as the attitude of of Ishmael, and we believe that Ishmael's interpretation is exactly proper for the teraphim incident: anti-Samaritanism.

The composition of the teraphim incident comes from approximately the same time as the secondary portions of Chapter 34, and is to be dated about the year 432 B.C.

VII. THE SOURCES OF THE JACOB CYCLE

We have indicated that the Jacob Cycle was composed during the period after Ezekiel's pronouncement of the doctrine of individual responsibility and the early period of the so-called Second Temple.

Now we turn to the question of the sources that the author could have drawn on. We shall attempt to discover what was original with him and what older material he recasted or merely appropriated in completing the dramatic narrative.

Biblical data is not abundant. Gunkel cites parallels to the incident recorded in this folk-lore of many peoples, but these, of course, are not sources.

The Jacob legend did have a pre-exilic existance at least in certain details. Hosea 12 alludes to this legend and, significantly enough, cites incidents that are divergent from those in the narrative as found in Genesis. 12.4, for example, locates Jacob's coming to supremacy over his brother in the womb. Our versions (Genesis 25.21 and 24) defer the struggle until the bless-

ing of Isaac (Genesis 27.27A beta); the nationalist stratum (Gen.25.22) does indicate some activity in the womb, but certainly no supplanting. In the nationalist stratum the supplanting does not take place until the incident of thelentils and the interpolated blessing(25.29-34 and 27.15,26, and 27 A alpha B). We do have an incident of supplanting in the womb in the Tamar story in Genesis 38.27-30. The parallel is quite remarkable. 38.37 is closely similar to 25.24, the B parts of both verses being identical. Verse 38.30 occasions a little surprise in that there is no motivation for the name Zarah such as there is for Perez. Gunkel finds a West Aramaic root z^{e}hori meaning crimson. However, in addition to the fact that a metathesis is required to link zarah with z^{e}hori, the etymology is not typical; either the motivation should contain the root zarah or the name bestowed should be based on the motivating word šani.

We note too the association of šani, the scarlet thread, with the son who was supplanted in the womb, and the term admoni with an etymological association with adom ,red, with the son supplanted after birth. Seemingly, there is more than a mere coincidental relationship between these similar accounts, although there is an observable discrepancy between details.

We wonder, however, whether or not it is possible that 38.27-30 is an addition to the Tamar story for the purpose of retaining this interesting incident. The incident might have been somewhat similar in the Jacob legend, but on being adapted for the narrative as we now have it and as rewritten by the first nationalist stratum, it was appended to the Tamar story to which it is rather an anti-climax. However, we are in the realm of speculation, and we can do no more than point out that the incident alluded to in Hosea 12.4 does not occur in the Jacob Cycle, but doesoccur in the Tamar story.

Hosea 12.4 differs further in that Jacob's antagonist is elohim,not ish, as in Gen. 32.25. That 32.25 was edited we can be certain from 32.29; w^{e}'im anaśim in 32.29 appears to be an interpolation to mitigate the harshness of the elohim (also, it spoils an otherwise perfect three beat measure), and possibly the verse originally read et elohim śśinaHosea 4.instead of 'im elohim; it is quite understandable that there would be a theological objection to et elohim, A similar procedure seems to have taken place in Hosea 12; 5 makes Jacob's antagonist not elohim, but malak, thereby modifying 4B.

This procedure would lead one to suppose that Hosea 12.5A is later than 12.4B. 12.5A is certainly post-exilic, as shown by the use of malak; there is no

indication, though, of the date of 12.4. 12.4 sounds early and is borne out by the Gen.38, but the commentators are not agreed as to the originality of it or its complete congruency in its present setting.

We have similar difficulty in dating 5A beta, which is an allusion to something that does not appear plainly in our narrative (Gen.32.27), which has no weeping, and which has very little that could be described by the word hithanen. Again we have a different version.

5B occasions further difficulty. It seems to locate the struggle not on the banks of the Jabbok, but at Bethel; Bethel, our narrative tells, was the scene of the first theophany to Jacob. 5A alpha is certainly post-exilic, but A beta B may be pre-exilic. At any rate, we notice the divergences, but it is impossible (at least until a minute, detailed analysis of Hosea 12 and reconstruction of the text is made) to determine whether this material is earlier than our narrative or later; for the present we must be content to point out the divergences.

Hosea 12.15 makes Jacob flee to s^{e}de aram; our narrative uses the place-name haran (Gen.28.10), although P speaks of padan aram (Gen. 28.2). Again we are unable to date the verse in Hosea; some commentators insist on a late date, but to others it is early. We notice that this verse knows of the interchange between the names ya'aqob and yisrael, suggesting that either this verse is

based on our narrative or that the story existed at least in this detail even before the composition of our present Main narrative. However, even if this verse is late, it is possible that the whole incident at the Jabbok involving the changing of the name had a pre-exilic literary or oral form.

What śamar means in Hosea 12.13, we confess we do not know. Possibly a word has dropped out, probably et hazzon ; or possibly another word stood here and śamar is a copyist's error occasioned by the occurence of niśmar in verse 14. Or, 13 B beta might also refer to Moses, and to the content of verse 14.

To summarize the results of this comparison of Hosea 12 with our narrative, we have found different versions of the supplanting, different versions of the birth incidents, and differences in the location of the nocturnal struggle. If our conclusion that the main narrative as found in Genesis came into its present form sometime in the sixth century, it is natural to assume that once the narrative became crystallized that the narrative would be alluded to in its present form; the existence of divergent narratives, then argues for the existence of traditions about Jacob that antedate our main narrative; in other words, there was a pre-exilic narrative about Jacob that was known to the author of our

prophetic narrative.

This is borne out by Jeremiah 9.3B, the originality of which is, so far as I know, not questioned. The allusion here is clearly to the incidents of the Jacob Cycle, and since we have showed that the prophetic narrative is later than Jeremiah, then there must have been a pre-exilic version.

Our own feeling is that most of the prophetic version as we have it in Genesis was written de novo, although it was based upon earlier traditions. Two sections however, may have been largely drawn from old sources without having been completely rewritten:28.10-22 and 32.24-30.

28.10-22, our analysis has show, has suffered the interpolation of the first nationalist and also contains some unidentifiable material. When this is removed, we seem to feel a vagueness and incompleteness about the section in direct contrast to the definiteness and completeness of the other parts of the narrative. The narrative breaks off abruptly, and there is no direct link with the continuation in 29. The thought suggests itself that possibly the name of the deity in verses 12 and 21 was originally something ether than Yahwe; what it could have been, we have no way of knowing. The angels of 12 point to a late date for this verse; indeed, the

whole ladder motif is most likely secondary, because it plays no part in the subsequent story. This section was considerably embroidered by later hands. The angel motif may have arisen as a result of the interpolation of the prophetic promises in 13-15, which are similar to the passage in 22.17,18, that are spoken by an angel. However, in 28, we have angels; in 22, only one angel, the malak yahwe. 28.22B occasions difficulty because of the sudden shift in person; in 22A, haeben is feminine, and the verb as the text now stands is masculine.

That Bethel was an old sanctuary, there can be little doubt. Amos delivered his address there(Amos 7.13), and I Kings 12.29 records that Jerobeam set up a golden calf there. Seemingly the sanctuary was old already by this time. The original probably told how it came about that a sanctuary was located there. The prophetic author apparently took over the incident without rewriting it. On the other hand, possibly the later reworking of the passage has resulted in the present lack of complete cohesion with the rest of the narrative.

32.25-33 likewise impresses one as being early. 26A beta B, 31, 32 A beta B and 33 we have called J2. The remainder is rather cryptic, and we have already called attention to the fact that 25 originally read an elohim that was suppressed in favor of ish. Doubtlessly

there was even further suppression, and we seem to have no more than a mere reminiscence of what was originally probably a longer and more detailed account. However, we observe that our prophetic author did not bother to , or could not, rewrite the whole section; he had to retain elohim in 29 to explain the name israel. We are led, then, to the conclusion that he merely adapted sufficient from the older version to carry on his story. The incident herein is hardly an original composition of our prophetic author.

Gunkel's[30] identification of the spirit with the demon of the Jabbok, on the basis of the similarity to wayyeabeq in 25, is accpted by Morgenstern[31], who cites two similar legends that are cogent support of Gunkel's suggestion. This points to a great antiquity of the original narrative.

Possibly too 31.44-53 is also based on some earlier account. We have indicated that this section contains an interpolation and some unidentifiable fragments; possibly these fragments are from a redactorial hand that attempted to harmonize the two accounts. At any rate, we cannot state definitely that the basic account is old, but it is not unlikely that this is so.

Except for the two sections 28.10-22 and 32. 25-33, and possibly 31.44-53, the remainder of the cycle

impresses us as having been written de novo; none of the incidents recorded is of such a striking uniqueness as to require the insistence upon great originality on the part of the author, but even if older sources were drawn on, our account is so well unified and so coherent that it is beyond doubt that it is not simply a random arrangement of separate instances, but is is a planned and well-executed complete narrative. Although we have similar motives in other Biblical narratives, for example, Moses' flight to Midian and his meeting of Zipporah and her sisters at the well(Exodus 2.15) parallels Jacob's flight and meeting of Rachel at the well, we see that the Jacob Cycle holds together so closely that such motives are integral in the narrative and not simply motives dragged in to pad the story. Thus, despite the presence of what may be older sections, the main narrative is the work of a single author of no mean literary ability.

The possibility that the Shechem material is based upon an old, pre-exilic tradition or even a literary version of the Jacob story should have been discussed here.

VIII. SUMMARY

Although we intend now to summarize briefly the material that this thesis has presented, we must confess that not all that could be said about the Jacob Cycle has been said. The record of the births of the children, for example, could be gone into in much greater detail. Also, here and there certain details have, of necessity, been investigated only casually. However, we have limited ourselves specifically to prophetic doctrines in this work, and we have succeeded, we believe, in showing how prophetic writers utilized the elements of the legends about Jacob to illustrate certain prophetic doctrines.

In pre-exilic times, the Jacob legend apparently told of the incident of the birth, in the form of a conflict of Jacob and Esau in the womb; it told of Jacob's dream at Bethel and the subsequent sanctification of Bethel; it told of the incident at Gal Ed and of Jacob's wrestling at the Jabbok. The allustion to Reuben's shameful deed in Genesis 49.4 is an indication that this incident was known of old. The nucleus of chapter 34 is certainly pre-exilic.

In exilic times, a prophetic editor, basing himself on Jeremiah's teaching that the exile was for the

moral regeneration of Israel and on Ezekiel's doctrine of individual responsibility, adapted some of these incidents in a unified composition toillustrate that repentance is open to an individual and to show that such repentance comes about when the individual recognizes his sinfulness, and after deep insight into himself and intense self-searching, and, after resolving with unshakable determination never to stray from the right road again, makes restitution for the wrong he has done. This narrative we have called the Main narrative. The author adapted the story of early conflict, but did not utilize the motif of the brothers struggling in the womb; the struggle is deferred until it is time for Isaac's blessing. The incident at Bethel was incorporated, but suffered additions from a later hand.

Jacob then arrived at Haran; our author tells then of his marriages, the wiles by which he acquires wealth, and his subsequent flight. Then is incorporated the incident at Gal 'Ed, and then the incident of the wrestling is introduced. Finally, it told of the reconciliation with Esau, and then of Jacob's return home, fulfilling his vow made at Bethel.

This was the procedure of the prophetic author of the main narrative, who wrote his work sometime during the exilic period after Ezekiel's doctrine of individualism has been taught.

The incidents of Chapter 34 and Reuben's misdeed play no part in the prophetic narrative.

The first nationalist author, writing in the period from 520 to 485, and most probably in the latter part of this period, inserted verses that attempted to make Jacob and Esau symbols for Israel and Edom; under the influence of the hopes for universal domination by Israel of the whole world, these insertions reflect a future domination not only of the brother nation Edom, but of all the nations; the insertions further reflect the view that the hopes for expansion are based on promises of the deity.

The first nationalist author utilized the old story of the pre-natal struggle, but gave it a national interpretation, and did not retain it in its original form. It made the supplanting wait until long after the birth for the sake of equating Esau with Edom again. It reinterpreted the manner of Jacob's acquisition of the blessing by introducing the motif of the odor of the fields with which Esau's clothes were redolent, in order to introduce the blessing by which Jacob was to prosper. The main narrative had not cited the blessing.

The first nationalist author seized upon the theophany at Bethel as an opportunity to incorporate the divine promises for Israel's future expansion.

At Haran, this author makes Laban's prosperity a result of the favor in which Jacob was held by the deity, who was fulfilling his promise of expansion. The motive for Jacob's flight from Haran is reinterpreted to make it seem part of the divine plan for Israel's future greatness; Yahwe prevents Laban from executing Laban's plans for harming Jacob. With Esau about to come upon Jacob, the first nationalist author makes Jacob remind Yahwe of His promises; he nationalizes the account by letting Jacob allude to the two Jewish communities, in Babylon and in Palestine. Israel and Edom are again called brother nations.

Returning to Palestine, the first nationalist stratum rewrites the change of Jacob's name to Israel, and at Bethel repeats the promises for great fruitfulness and expansion.

At the time of the difficulties with the Samaritans, about the year 432, an anti-Samaritan interpolated the incident of the teraphim, to cast contempt on the Samaritans. In his flight from Laban, Rachel is represented as having stolen the teraphim, which, after undergoing indignities, are buried at Shechem.

In the fourth century, after there was a reaction away from the particularism of Ezra and Nehemiah, a second nationalist author made some interpolations that

reflected the more amicable relations of his day. He represented Esau as receiving a blessing at the hands of Isaac, although the blessing, of course, was not equal to the blessing that Jacob had received. After the peaceful reconciliation of Jacob and Esau, the second nationalist editor represented Israel as willing to have friendly relations with the Edomites. By the fourth century, the Edomites were dwelling west of the 'arabah, south of Judea.

The Priestly redactor, in addition to supplying genealogical material and other rather minute details, also reinterpreted some of the incidents. Jacob leaves, not for Haran, but for Padan Aram as a result of his mother's bidding him not to take a wife from among the Canaanite women as Esau had done. P says nothing of Jacob's deceiving Isaac and supplanting of Esau.

The Priestly editor incorporated the material about the birth of the sons, utilizing older material. He apparently attempted to suppress the material about Reuben's lying with Bilhah; he listed the sons of Jacob, and told of Isaac's death. Then P gives the genealogy of the Edomites and the list of Edomite kings Jacob's blessing of the sons, material that is much older, was incorporated, and then P told of the death of Jacob.

NOTES

1. Cited in Gunkel, Genesis übersetzt und erklärt, 3rd. ed., p. 283.

2. Gunkel, op. cit., p. 323.

3. Gunkel, The Legends of Genesis, p. 20.

4. Skinner, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis (I.C.C.), p. 356.

5. op. cit., XXIV.

6. op. cit., XVI.

7. op. cit., XX.

8. Cited in Spiegel, Ezekiel or Pseudo-Ezekiel, p. 309. However, König warned against "rash" assumption of relationships.

9. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, The Composition of the Hexateuch, ch. XVI, p. 327-346.

10. This interpretation of the Jacob Cycle is taken with almost no divergence from Morgenstern, A Jewish Interpretation of the Book of Genesis, p. 200-213. Accordingly, it is not annotated in detail.

11. Morgenstern, A Jewish Interpretation, etc., p. 218-219.

12. Unquestionably Ezekiel's doctrine of individual responsibility and individual repentance grew out of earlier prophetic teachings. Repentance was taught both by Hosea (14.2 ff.) and by Jeremiah (3.12, 36.3), but until Ezekiel's time, under the covenant, repentance was not for the individual, but for the nation as a whole. The genesis of individual culpability and repentance seems to have been in Isaiah a doctrine of the "sacred remnant" (Isa. 10.21 and confer Morgenstern, Moses with the Shining Face, 22 ff.).

13. Morgenstern, Book of the Covenant III, p. 4-6.

14. For example, the scene laid in the womb (25.22-23) fits remarkable well as a prologue fore-shadowing the future strife between the brothers. Confer Morgenstern, A Jewish Interpretation of the Book of Genesis, p. 205.

15. Morgenstern, Book of the Covenant III, p. 4-6.

16. Confer Blank, Studies in Post Exilic Universalism, p. 16-32.

17. Jubilees 26.32 and many modern commentators interpret the mem of mišmanne and umittal in v. 39 as privative, arriving at a translation such as this: "Away from the fat of the earth shall you dwelling be, away from the dew of the heavens on hight" (The Bible: An American Translation, p. 45). This interpretation has much to commend it, in that a closer relationship is established between 39 and 40A, for under this interpretation 40A continues in the same vein as 39, rather than modifying it, as our interpretation requires. Further, if 39 and 40A are not a "blessing," then our surprise at 37's implication that there is to be no blessing is unwarranted: 37, then, could imply that Isaac has actually only one blessing and that has been taken, and the words addressed in 39 and 40 to Esau are not a blessing.

39-40A would possibly be a reflection of great unfriendly relations between Judah and Edom; historically the allusion would be to the relations after the vents of 485, except that 40A beta implies the subjugation of Edom to Judah. 40B, of course, reflects Edomite independence. Many commentators, including Blank, take 40B as a prose addition to the poetry of 39 and 40A. However, the word ורדתי is so obscure (that is, assuming our text is in good shape) that we cannot be sure that 40B contradicts the preceding, and we are on even less secure ground in trying to distinguish between poetry and prose in such a short passage. But if 40B is a prose addition altering the import of the previoous verse and a half, then we are at a loss to know what the allusion could be, because after 485 and for quite some time (perhaps until the time of Judas Maccabeus (Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews, XII,8) there was no occasion for Edom to throw off a Judean yoke. That the passage is secondary to the main stratum is beyond question, and we cannot assume that the allusion is to something earlier than the sixth century.

Of course, it would be possible to equate 39 and 40A with the hopes of expansion of the period 520-485 and that this refers to exactly the same thing as verse 29; that 40B is an addition from after 485, as Blank suggests.

The case rests on the interpretation of the two occurrences of the prefix mem. Certainly the translation "away from" is not impossible. However, the very ambiguity seems to suggest that the author did

not intend a clearly-defined "curse" on Edom, because there is no reason readily apparent for the author not to have been plainly out-spoken. Further, 39 is so dependent on 28 that it is unlikely that the mem would serve an opposite function in 28 from what it serves in 39. In 28, we have a blessing; similarly, we believe that 30 also is intended as a blessing. A further indication of this we can glean from the Greek which seems to have read צדק ו'ד ם at the end of Esau's speech in 38. If the Greek reading is correct, it would be surprising for Isaac to be reported as remaining silent, and then to find him speaking, as in 39. Also, the dew of heaven falls as freely on Edom as on Palestine.

Our feeling, then, is that 39 is to be interpreted as a blessing, not as a curse.

All this does not change the fundamental theses of our argument, even if it is necessary, on lengthier deliberation, to abandon the views that 38-40 represent a second and later nationalist editor. Certainly 33.14B-16 represent such a later editor, and the most that is necessary is that we modify our analysis, making 38-40A as part of N 1 and 40B as from the period after 485.

Accordingly, we have merely raised the problem; the definitive solution, we believe, is not at hand.

18. Morgenstern, Moses with the Shining Face, p. 20.

19. Blank, Studies in Post-Exilic Universalism, p. 7-11.

20. Ibid.

21. op. cit., p. 16-25.

22. op. cit., p. 14-15, especially the allusion to Dr. Morgenstern paper, "What Happened to Jerusalem about 485 B.C.?" and the citation from Stanley Cook.

23. This suggestion was made by Dr. Blank in the course of a conversation.

24. Descriptions of the geography from Edom do not seem to tally. Skinner (Genesis, p. 373) cites from Strabo that Edom was the most barren and worst country near Judea. However, he cites modern travellers, Robinson, Palmer, and Buhl, who find it extremely fertile. Buhl thinks the barrenness of 27.39 (regarding the mem as privative) refers to the plateau west of the 'arabah;

if this is correct, then we have an additional basis for calling the insertion late because it was in late times that Edom moved, or was pushed by the Nabateans, into the region west of the 'arabah. Confer Glueck, The Boundaries of Edom, p. 13.

25. J. E., article, "Edom," vol. V, p. 40-41.

26. However, when we realize that the legislation in Deuteronomy 20 was paper legislation, and that our first nationalist stratum is in the same spirit, we need not necessarily look for historical confirmation of the allusions in the stratum. But if the spirit of the two blessings is identical, then it is hardly likely that two regions varying so greatly in fertility would be alluded to.

27. Gunkel (Genesis, 347) agrees with Meyer, whom he cites, that the account of the flight in E is composite; that E_1 was the older, telling of the stealing of the teraphim; that E_2 was later, telling of the "stealing of Laban's heart." We cannot agree with these gentlemen as to the dating of the passages, but we recognize with them the compositeness of the account.

28. Morgenstern, Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel, p. 59, note 91.

29. Book of the Covenant, p. 66, 67, footnote.

30. Genesis, p. 361.

31. Morgenstern, A Jewish Interpretation of the Book of Genesis, p. 200-201.