THE ROLE OF TRADITION IN THE STUDY OF RELIGION: THE CASE OF ANCIENT ISRAEL

J.J. Smolicz and R.B. Crotty

The concept of tradition, whether it is secular or religious, tends to be a vague entity. When the religious tradition of ancient Israel is considered the two main facets proper to all tradition — continuity and actuality — come to the fore. Tradition is, in the first place, linked to the past, and within pre-Christian Judaism there was the insistence that the basic written tradition, conserved in the Torah, had been actually written and handed on by Moses. His authority therefore stood behind the story. In the second place, however, literary analysis and concomitant tradition-history analysis (*Traditionsgeschichte*) have demonstrated the successive developments of the written text, illustrating its actuality for new generations. Since the last century in particular, there has been a confrontation in the field of Biblical scholarship between the proponents of 'Mosaic authorship' and scholars holding to some variant of the 'Documentary hypothesis', which has advanced from simple literary dissection to an analysis of the life-situation of the traditions.[1] It is the aim of this article to show, in the case of ancient Israel, that a fuller appreciation of the role of tradition would lessen the lines dividing the two positions.

The Concept of Tradition

In order to give some direction to the meaning of tradition in the history of ancient Israel we will make use of the theoretical categories devised by Jerzy Szacki[2] for the study of this concept: Within a broad concept of tradition, Szacki has focussed, first of all, on its functional meaning, namely the act of transmitting certain values from one group or generation to another. Szacki calls this *social transmission.* In this context, a value is that which is consciously sought; it therefore contains a specifically human element. In the particular case of tradition, valuation related to antiquity must be included. Other values may accompany antiquity but the latter is essential.

Szacki identifies a second meaning for 'tradition' by describing the actual content of what has been transmitted. This can be called *cultural heritage,* or simply the culture that has been acquired from a group's past. A third meaning approaches 'tradition' from a subjective point of view and describes the attitude of any given generation to its past. This attitude may amount to either approval or disapproval of its heritage. The current generation either identifies with its predecessors, the 'ancients' from whom the heritage has derived, or dissociates itself from

them. Within the ambit of this third meaning, the present generation can select a certain aspect of the heritage and evaluate it, reform it or adjust it to present needs. Sometimes the aspect of the heritage so selected could even be invented without negating the process. It is only to this last meaning, which is concerned with *evaluated* heritage, that Szacki gives the scientific title of *tradition.* Tradition is, therefore, in the strict sense, only that portion of the heritage which has been handed on and which is subject to active evaluation, exciting feelings of approval or disapproval in the present generation.[3]

In a pre-literate society only that tradition which is being presently valued, can be retained. The rest of the heritage is irreparably lost and forgotten. In literate societies and societies manifesting social differentiation, such as was the case in ancient Israel, there is a more complex pattern. Since records of the past heritage are preserved in literate societies, retrospection becomes possible. Reversion to the original heritage is possible and there may thereby be more than one single heritage available for evaluation. Further, within a socially differentiated society, individuals can belong to discrete sub-societies and these can presently value different heritages or variant forms of the one heritage.[4] In this sense the past can have different meanings for different sections and sub-groups of society.

What is actually handed on in these cases, the heritage, has been well described by Ossowski as 'certain patterns of muscular, emotional and mental responses which shape the dispositions of the group members'.[5] This definition excludes any external objects, which are thereby deemed to be simply correlates of the heritage. Each generation then selects some part of this heritage and evaluates, reforms and adjusts it according to its circumstances. It can therefore happen that some original heritage has been repeatedly evaluated and adjusted to new needs, bringing about considerable change in its content. Eventually it may hardly resemble its original format, perhaps the only link being the firm belief that the past has been preserved, in its unchanged form.

If the process of tradition, as analysed by Szacki, is deemed acceptable, then it follows that any cultural system can only be adequately investigated by considering the intentions, the experiences and the activities of its participants over a historical period. Human consciousness must be taken into account in deciding what is being presently evaluated, provoking an active display of the sentiments of acceptance or rejection. Such analysis is not as subjective as might first appear. According to Znaniecki, human values are facts, as real as things, and can be accepted as such. But values can only be validly seen in the form in which they function in the consciousness of those who produce and

maintain them.[6] Unless such values are highlighted in their human dimension, the process of tradition will remain illogical, a haphazard series of changes throughout the history of a group.

In order to see at more depth the working of tradition within a cultural system we must distinguish between personal and group cultural systems. The group cultural system is the collection of cultural and social values maintained by a particular group. This can be distinguished from the personal cultural system, which individual members construct for themselves by selecting those cultural items supplied by the group system which meet their own particular situation in life. The personal cultural system may, therefore, be regarded as a mediator between the culture of the group and the private world of the individual.[7] The personal cultural system can take different forms. It can be culturally homogeneous, deriving from one group cultural system, or it can be heterogeneous, deriving from more than one. In the latter case, we can visualize the process of cultural interaction occurring in two possible ways: coalescence of values drawn from two cultural systems, varying in importance perhaps, to form a new, hybrid type of personal system, or the formation of a personal dual system of cultural values in which the two components co-exist within the individual and are activated by him in different cultural and social contexts.

Such drawing upon a variety of cultural stocks can be explained by the special role of the ideological system. The ideological system refers to the group's standards of value and norms of conduct. Some part of that system, because of its connection with the social system, may represent the group's core values. Whenever a group feels that there is a direct link between their identity as a group and what they regard as the most crucial and distinguishing element of their group culture, the element concerned becomes an ideological core value for the group.[8] Core values and the social system are connected by the collective group identity, therefore, effectively differentiating between members and non-members and indicating that the collectivity in question has some kind of definite identity.

One of the principal functions of these core values is to act for each generation as the evaluating agent for the presently esteemed heritage, as well as structuring both the individual's and the group's social systems. Core values can therefore be regarded as the very heartland of tradition; if they cease to be used for evaluating they no longer form part of their living tradition and pass into the realm of heritage (which may however be reactivated at some future date).

As each individual activates group values in a somewhat different way, the range of tolerated deviation may be quite considerable.

However, individuals are expected to operate within the basic context of the ideological system of their group, suppressing any notable deviation from group norms. Otherwise, they are regarded as activating what the group perceives as external, hence deviant, values. When a sufficient number of such deviant individuals are involved and they become influential, however, a newly organized group system can emerge, despite the fact that this system may be in conflict with previously established group norms. Assessed by the new group values, the heritage will inevitably then undergo either minor or major modification.

No matter what modification takes place there will still be some continuity, at least in the firm assertion of antiquity. The reason for such constant affirmation of continuity is to be found in the human need for order.[9] The group acts to retain its cultural identity with the same tenacity shown by individuals in maintaining physical life. In order to survive, both individuals and groups must adapt to the present environment and, for the group, this requires at times adaptation of the received heritage, which is then evaluated as tradition. However, continuity with the past is then necessary unless the identity of the group is to be lost and a fundamental lack of order introduced.

Religious Tradition

Religious heritage enjoys longevity, by this argument, because of the human need for order within a group. The order within a particular religion consists in the firm maintenance of relationship between the human community and some manifestation of Ultimacy.[10] Relationship with Ultimacy, indeed, constitutes the basic religious experience, but for this relationship to be established Ultimacy must be symbolized, rendering it specific and tangible, and capable of being experienced. A particular religious community would then be differentiated on the basis of such symbolization of Ultimacy and its normative description of the mode in which contact with Ultimacy can be achieved.

Symbolization of Ultimacy, and the effective mode of contacting it, constitute the basic 'event' for the group. This event is contained and transmitted in the principal myth or myths of the religious community, while the mechanism of contact is handed on through knowledge of its basic ritual. Myth and ritual would therefore constitute, in the main, the cultural heritage of a religious community. Using Szacki's categories, religious social transmission would begin with rites of initiation and be continued through repeated recitation of the myth and performance of ritual.

The original achievement of order, by contact with Ultimacy, is always ascribed by a religious community to its 'ancients', those close to

the original 'event'. That experience must be re-lived and re-presented if the present religious community is to be similarly ordered and shaped according to the model of the 'ancients'. Thus the religious heritage, received from the 'ancients' by social transmission, is evaluated and thereby received into the present group as their current tradition. There is always a firm emphasis on the tradition's antiquity, its identity with the symbolization and mode of contact known to the original group.

In those cultures where the cosmos is viewed in a total sense, with clear distinction between self and the cosmos, the symbolization of Ultimacy takes the form of a High God.[11] Inevitably, however, over any sustained historical period, various positive characteristics of the High God are emphasised and they tend to splinter off into hypostatizations which form new gods. Fertility and warrior prowess are the principal characteristics so heightened within the religious community. The High God then becomes more and more a *deus otiosus,* with the god of fertility or war maintaining active contact with the human community. This experiential contact is primarily reserved to certain sacred individuals within the community — shamans, priests, kings, prophets.[12]

A religious construct or model appears from anthropological observation of religious communities which have a High God. The principal elements are the High God, however symbolized, and the human community. It is essential for the maintenance of order that these two elements be somehow in contact. From the side of the High God there is partial bridging by hypostatizations while, from the side of the human community, there is further bridging by sacral persons and institutions. The essential act of contact is actually made by the hypostatizations and the sacral persons. This religious model could be called 'mediatorial'. The principal myth of such a mediatorial community would give a basis to its official symbolization of the High God, the accepted forms of hypostatization and would validate the sacral persons or institutions able to make contact. The community's ritual would encapsulate the official means of making contact.[13]

The cultural heritage of such a group, with a mediatorial model, would be patterns of response shaping the disposition of group members so that they would take up a particular posture before their High God. The particular patterns of response would be symbolised in myth and socially transmitted by means of its recitation and by the performance of ritual. But there would also be evaluation of the heritage by successive generations, adapting and modifying the heritage to present needs and the present situation. A priori, notable change in the myth would take place when the ideological system of the group, which evaluates the heritage, had itself undergone drastic change. This would be due to

values, coming from outside the system, being accepted by 'deviants' into their personal cultural systems and then becoming sufficient in number and sufficiently influential to activate a new system against the previously prevailing group system.

The Case of Ancient Israel

When we apply the foregoing theory to the particular case of ancient Israel, it is first of all clear that we are dealing with a mediatorial community. Its fundamental pattern of response, handed on as its religious heritage, is contained in a basic myth which recounted that the community of Israel, under the sacred leader Moses, came into contact with the High God, YHWH, who manifested himself in various sacral forms. This contact brought the 'ancients' victory, freedom and the possession of land. The literary precipitation of this myth is found in the book of Exodus, particularly chs. 19-20, 24, 32-34.[14] Since Israel was, at least from the time of the monarchy, a literate society, it should be possible to reveal the successive evaluations of the heritage. In fact, modern literary analysis and *Traditionsgeschichte* have done just that, although the full import of their own conclusions have not always been made clear.

We will follow the analysis of a typical breakdown of the material in these chapters and integrate the findings into the theoretical framework on tradition. Exodus 19[15] is made up of various strata of literary material, each with its own proper Sitz im Leben. Vv. 1-2a can be distinguished as belonging to P, since it shows a typical Priestly interest in stopping-places of the Exodus and a hint of cultic datation. The double statement concerning the pitching of Israel's tents in v. 2 would then indicate that this stratum had ended. Vv. 2b-8 was originally E material that has been considerably revised by Deuteronomic editors. It describes a simple act of contact between Moses, the mediator, and Elohim on Sinai. Side by side with this account is a separate description of a theophany in v. 9, very abbreviated and possibly from a J source.

The principal description of a theophany occurs in 10aα.11.14a.16aα. 18. 20-21. Deriving from J, it describes an act of contact between Moses in the midst of smoke, fire, earthquake which are manifestations of the presence of YHWH. This J account has, interspersed through it, some Priestly additions (in 10aβ b. 12. 13a. 14b. 15b) which elaborate on the J theophany, describing the ritual mechanism whereby a 'holy people' can be created through contact with YHWH. Vv. 22-24 are a still later expansion, also deriving from P circles.

The corresponding E description of a theophany is found side by side in vv. 16aβb. 17. 19, taken together with 20:18-21. It uses other hierophanic terminology to describe the moment of contact between the

mediator, Moses, and YHWH while describing the religious fear of the people at that moment.

Exodus 24 contains two interwoven accounts of Moses' ascent of Sinai, clearly interrelated. In the first account, Moses, together with Aaron, Nadab, Abihu and seventy elders are called to ascend the mountain. A theological correction, from a later hand in vv. 1b-2, makes it clear that actually only Moses went near the mountain. This account, from J, concludes in vv. 9-11 with a vision of the God of Israel on the mountain. The corresponding E account, in vv. 3-8, is not completely homogeneous. In one strand, sacrificial acts are performed by young men, presumably cultic officials, at the foot of Sinai. A second strand describes a separate blood-sprinkling ceremony. The two strands have been combined into a single cultic activity, not corresponding to any known Israelite ritual.

So far the religious heritage has described the basic act of contact and the elements of fear, awe and reverence that should characterise any Israelite's posture before YHWH. Exodus 32[16] further elaborates on that posture by telling of the apostasy of the 'ancients' in their worship of the Golden Calf. Vv. 1-6 detail the sin of Israel at the foot of the mountain. There is an account of the intercession of Moses in vv. 7-14, which would seem to have come from E, reworked perhaps in Deuteronomic circles. However, the later block of material in vv. 15-20 gives the reaction of Moses to the sin without presupposing that he knows of it, as he does in vv. 7-14. Moses institutes an ordeal to isolate the guilty parties. Vv. 21-24 would seem to be a later accretion, although still in the E line of thought, and a conclusion is given in vv. 30-34, with Moses offering himself to YHWH in place of the erring people. Hence we are dealing with an E account of apostasy in vv. 1-6. 15-20. 21-24. 30-34 which has a variant inserted in vv. 7-14 (influenced by D terminology). Vv. 25-29 would have come from Levitical circles of P, while v. 35 is a stray fragment from some unknown, post-Exilic hand.

The same E material is continued through ch. 33. It deals with the perplexing problem of the guidance of the people through the desert to the promised land. Behind this problem of the 'ancients' stands the perennial need within Israel to ascertain that YHWH, who had been localised at Sinai, was in fact present in the cult in Canaan. The answer was given in additions to the basic myth, dealing with a transfer of YHWH from Sinai to a new setting in Canaan. However, there is evidence of various answers given to the question at various points of time. In vv. 1-4 an 'Angel' is to lead the people. The Angel was originally YHWH in travelling form. Later it was seen as a substitute for YHWH, a deprivation of his presence.

The rest of the material shows further discrepancies. Vv. 12-14 explain that the guidance will be direct — YHWH's 'face' will guide them. Similarly, in vv. 15-17 YHWH accedes to a request for direct guidance and the chapter concludes with refined theological reasoning concerning the subtle question of whether an Israelite can see YHWH and live. There is clear enough evidence here of successive evaluations of the heritage.

Finally, chapter 34 introduces new J material, possibly variants of the theophany in chs. 19 and 24 but rewritten to appear as a renewal of the covenant-relationship with YHWH. It introduces a body of law similar to the Elohist code. The final unit, in vv. 29-35, is clearly P material describing the absolute uniqueness of Moses, the mediator.

This analysis of the religious heritage of Israel, from both a literary and tradition-history point of view can be revealing when placed in the context of the earlier theory. The earliest form of the heritage, to which we have access, was the J account of the theophany and the making of the covenant on Sinai. Moses was presented as the mediator whose role it was to complete the covenant with YHWH and, when the covenant was broken, to remake it. Between this Moses-figure and the kings of the Jerusalem line there are undoubted similarities. Analysing kingship in the south we find that there was a tension caused by the dynastic perpetuation of the office in David's family and the sacralization of kingship. Again and again the texts assert in justification that the role of the king is to be the servant (*'ebed*) of YHWH and to assure the covenant with people. The king is a Moses-like figure (Moses being the *'ebed* par excellence) when the J model is appreciated. We become aware, then, of the office of kingship developing in the southern kingdom from the earlier position of military commander (*nagid*) and being justified by evaluation of the heritage so that Moses appears as a king. Kingship, accepted as a value in limited circles, had become a core value for a group cultural system. This had required a new assessment of the heritage and a drastic change in that heritage.

The E stratum in Exodus, on the other hand, gave voice to the typical prophetic protest against false forms of cult. The northern cult at Dan and Bethel had included bull-worship, and this was seen in prophetic circles as a repudiation of the covenant with YHWH. As the prophetic community, with their own cultural group system and core values, assessed the situation in the North they also evaluated the heritage and 'Moses' in E became a prophet in this form of the myth. He had to contend with an erring people and with a distant YHWH, who did not manifest himself directly.

The institution of Israelite prophecy, in its typical form, depended upon a theophany in which the prophet was instructed in what he had to say to the people. The Elijah tradition even made an explicit parallel between the Sinai experience of the first Moses and the later experiences of an Israelite prophet. Thus in the north, in E circles, this understanding of 'Moses' circulated, in contradistinction to the 'Moses' in the south. As would be expected, the D presentation of Moses (especially in the book of Deuteronomy) followed much the same lines. Behind E, therefore, there stood another socially discrete community, with its group cultural system and core values, assessing the received heritage in a distinctive fashion.

In the period after the Exile the importance of the priesthood was greatly accentuated. Zadokites took control of all specifically priestly functions in the Temple and, by a genealogical fiction, they derived their origins from Aaron, the brother of Moses.[17] Once more a significant group cultural system was being formed. By re-evaluation of the heritage, Moses was seen as the founder of the worshipping structure of Israel and the Exodus narrative culminated in the establishment of the Tent of Meeting, in which YHWH was present for contact with Moses and Aaron. The Tent of Meeting was simply a forerunner of the Temple. In fact, 'Moses' became a priest in this new form of the heritage according to the pattern of the post-Exilic priesthood. The final depiction of Moses, in ch. 34 of Exodus, is the epitome of P's ideal.

King, prophet and priest all found their validation and vindication in the myth of Moses as contained in the book of Exodus. As successively the material was evaluated anew, according to the theory we have put forward, there was a conglomeration of heritage content. However, there was a constancy in the affirmation by all groups that Moses had been the supreme mediator with YHWH and that their assessment of his role was the most ancient.

Conclusion

It is an appreciation of 'tradition' in Szacki's third sense, which throws light on the intricate process of analysing Israel's sacred writings. The heritage of ancient Israel was the mediatorial attitude underlying the Moses-myth. The mediatorial model designated the required posture of the people before YHWH. Various elements in that heritage could be, and were, stressed. Values came from outside the community. There was the need for an established monarchy in the face of enemy infiltration. There was the austere cultic reform, seen by prophetic circles in the north as vital to the religious vigour of the people as against the fertility trends favoured by the establishment. There was the need for security

and power in the circles of Zadokite priests. These values, accepted first by individuals into their personal cultural systems, eventually became so influential that they entered the group cultural system and assumed the role of core values. Such change in core values then brought about a re-evaluation of the heritage. A monarchy with attendant priesthood and subservient laity, a freelancing prophetic community holding a loose aegis over some of the populace, a theocracy under the leadership of a priestly clan each in turn formulated its own evaluation of the past and thereby propounded its own version of heritage thus establishing its own special tradition, which they claimed to be 'original' and derived from the most 'ancient' sources. The present book of Exodus is the repository of such successive evaluations.

Returning to the dichotomy mentioned in the beginning, a full theory of tradition would remove some of the misunderstanding of the past. The literary critics and the *Traditionsgeschichte* school have unearthed the process of actuality in tradition. The fundamentalists, who insist upon the Mosaic authority behind the Torah, have continued to uphold the equally vital element of continuity. Both facets must be maintained if the full meaning of tradition and myth, in any religious society, is to be appreciated.

University of Adelaide,
and Salisbury College of Advanced Education

Notes

1. Standard treatment of the so-called 'Documentary Hypothesis' can be found in R.H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament,* (2nd ed., London, 1949); C.R. North, 'Pentateuchal Criticism' in H.H. Rowley (ed), *The Old Testament and Modern Study,* (London, 1951), pp. 48-83; H. Hahn, *The Old Testament in Modern Research,* (London, 1956); O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction,* (Oxford, 1965); A. Weiser, *Introduction to the Old Testament,* (London, 1961). See further on n.14.
2. J. Szacki, 'Three Concepts of Tradition', *The Polish Sociological Bulletin,* 2 (1969), pp. 17-31.
3. J.J. Smolicz, 'The Concept of Tradition: A Humanistic Interpretation', *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology,* vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 75-83.
4. Even the modes of social transmission can cause variation. There can be a literate national heritage, transmitted by specifically literate institutions and a pre-literate folk heritage, transmitted by more primitive existential contact. On this distinction of 'great' and 'little' traditions see R. Redfield, *Peasant Society and Culture,* (Chicago, 1961).

5. S. Ossowski, cited in Smolicz, *art. cit.* Describing the social heritage as a set of patterns in this way highlights the group aspect.
6. See F. Znaniecki, *The Method of Sociology* new ed. (New York, 1968). In his terminology, the 'humanistic coefficient' needs to be taken into consideration.
7. For a longer discussion of personal cultural systems see J.J. Smolicz, *Culture and Education in a Plural Society,* Curriculum Development Centre, Canberra, 1979.
8. J.J. Smolicz and M.J. Secombe, "Cultural Interaction in a Plural Society", *Ethnic Studies,* vol. 1, no. 1, 1977, pp. 1-16.
9. E. Shils, 'Tradition', *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* 13 (1971), pp. 122-169.
10. See in particular W. King, *Introduction to Religion,* (New York, 1968), ch. 7.
11. K.A. Hidding, 'The High God and the King as Symbols of Totality' in *The Sacral Kingship,* (viii International Congress for the History of Religious) (Leiden, 1959), pp. 54-62; R. Crotty, *Yahweh, the God of Israel* (S.C.A.E. Occasional Paper, 1976).
12. R. Pettazzoni, 'The Supreme Being: Phenomenological Structure and Historical Development', in M. Eliade and J.M. Kitagawa (eds.) *The History of Religion, Essays in Methodology,* (Chicago, 1959), pp. 50-61; G. Van der Leeuw, 'Die Struktur der Verstellung des sogennanten höchsten Wesens', *Archiv für Religionswissenchaft,* XXIX (1913), pp. 79-107; M. Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion,* (London and New York, 1958) pp. 109-111; id., *Myths, Dreams and Mysteries,* (London and Glasgow, 1968) pp. 136-138.
13. R. Crotty, *The Influence of the Phenomenon of Mediatorship on the Earliest Historical Structures and Institutions of Ancient Israel,* (unpubl. M.A. Thesis, Melbourne University, 1974). The other possibility is an 'immediate' model where the community view of the cosmos tends towards the impersonal and monistic. In such a case the mediatorial model does not apply and instead a more simple, unilinear process could be described. However, in Near Eastern religion, we are dealing principally with the mediatorial model.
14. There is a voluminous bibliography on the sources of the Pentateuch. For our purposes we will follow the line developed by moderate scholars such as A. Weiser, *Introduction to the Old Testament,* (London, 1961). Thus the Yahwist strand of the Pentateuch will be designated by the siglum J, and will denote the earliest complete description of the myth of ancient Israel, deriving from the period of David and Solomon and redacted by an editor who was clearly closely associated with the royal house of Judah and party to it. The Elohist account is designated by the siglum E. Its home is, by general agreement, the northern Kingdom of Israel. It shows a clear relationship to the prophetic circles and their way of thinking and is later than J. Both J and E shared the common basis of the ancient myth of Israel which probably circulated in oral form. After the fall of Samaria in 721

the Elohist account was assimilated into the southern kingdom and became part of the J strand. No doubt alterations and abridgement took place so that we no longer possess an original E source. Deuteronomy, designated as a source by D, had its origins in the period of the confederation of tribes when it served as a liturgical text for the festival of the renewal of the covenant. It was presented in the form of a series of sermons delivered by Moses on the eve of entering the land of promise. These would have been preserved in the north in prophetic circles and also came to the southern kingdom after the fall of Samaria. The group who retained this original form of Deuteronomy used it as a reform programme but received little encouragement until the time of Josiah (640-609) when the Urdeuteronomium was accepted as the basis of reform. Then began a period in Israelite history when the school of Deuteronomy dominated the thinking and interpretation of the ancient myth. Various additions that had derived from the time of Moses were redacted in the spirit of D's theology; at the same time some of the other material in the fused corpus of JE was revised. The final major influence on the growing Pentateuch was the Priestly writing or P. This writing admitted and assimilated earlier material. It had its own independent narrative going back, in parts, to early priestly learnings, handed down orally. It became the foundation of the post-exilic religious community.

15. The following general works on the book of Exodus, as a literary work, and on Moses were consulted: E. Auerbach, *Moses,* (Amsterdam, 1953); G. Anzou, *De la Servitude au Service: Étude du livre de l'Exode,* (Paris, 1961); A. Bentzen, *King and Messiah,* (London, 1955); M. Buber, *Moses,* (New York, 1958); U. Cassuto, *A Commentary on the book of Exodus,* (Jerusalem, 1967); H. Cazelles, *Moise, l'homme de l'Alliance,* (Paris, 1955); A. Clamer, *L'Exode,* (Paris, 1956); F.M. Cross, 'The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth' in R.W. Funk (ed.), *God and Christ: Existence and Province,* (New York, 1966); G. Fohrer, 'Überlieferung and Geschichte des Exodus', *BZAW,* 91 (Berlin, 1964); E. Galbiati, *La struttura letteraria dell'Esodo,* (Rome, 1956); H. Gressman, *Mose und seine Zeit* (Göttingen, 1913); J.P. Hyatt, 'Were there an Ancient Historical Credo in Israel and an Independent Sinai Tradition?' in H.T. Frank and W.L. Reed (eds.), *Translating and Understanding the Old Testament,* (Nashville, 1970), pp. 152-170; id., *Exodus,* (London, 1971); W.L. Moran, 'Moses und der Bundesschluss am Sinai', *Stimmen der Zeit,* 170 (1961/62), pp. 120-133; M. Noth, *Exodus,* (London, 1962); H.H. Rowley, 'Moses and Monotheism', *ZAW,* NF 28 (1957), pp. 1-21; R. Smend, *Das Mosebild von Heinrich Ewald bis Martin Noth* (Tübingen, 1959); H.M. Teeple, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet,* (Philadelphia, 1957); P. Volz, *Mose und sein Werk* (Tübingen, 1932); G. Widengren, 'What do we know about Moses?' in J.H. Durham and J.R. Porter (eds.), *Proclamation and Presence,* (London, 1970) pp. 21-47; F.W. Winnett, *The Mosaic Tradition,* (Toronto-London, 1949); E. Zenger, *Die Sinaitheophanie. Untersuchungen zum jahwistischen und elohistischen Geschichtswerk,* (Würzburg, 1971).

16. There are notable inconsistencies in Exodus 32. In two different ways Moses learnt of the apostasy (vv. 7-8/vv. 17-19); there are two accounts of Moses' intercession (vv. 11-13/vv. 30-33); different consequences of the apostasy are put forward (vv. 14, 20, 34 and 35). Who made the calf? In vv. 1-6 the people ask Aaron and he complies; in vv. 8 and 20 the people make 'gods' themselves; in v. 35 it is Aaron and the people and in v. 24 it is self-produced. Material on the formation of vv. 1-6 can be found in Beyerlin, *op.cit.*, pp. 126-129; S. Lehming, 'Versuch zu Exodus 32', *VT,* 10 (1960), pp. 16-50; M. Buber, *Moses,* p. 175. The difficulties met in the actual calf-making are covered in M. Noth, 'Zur Anfertigung des goldenen Kalbes', *VT,* 9, (1959), pp. 419-427; J. Petuchowski, 'Nochmals "Zur Anfertigung des goldenen Kalbes" ', *VT,* 10 (1960), p. 74; S.E. Loewenstamm, 'The Making and Destruction of the Golden Calf', *Biblica,* 48 (1967), pp. 481-490; id, 'The Hebrew Root *haras* in the Light of the Ugaritic Text', *JJS,* 10 (1959), pp. 63-65; L.G. Perdue, 'The Making and Destruction of the Golden Calf — A reply', *Biblica,* 54 (1973), pp. 237-246.
17. See J. Cody, *A History of Israelite Priesthood,* (Rome, 1968).