

Similar methods could divide almost any book into diverse documents. In the Koran, which is recognized to be substantially what was given by Mohammed--the sermons of Mohammed given at different times and gathered together after his death-- a great deal of accident as to the way they were gathered, nevertheless to have come substantially as it is from the mouth of Mohammed.

You have different names used for God just the same way as in the Bible. You could divide the Koran this way but it is not believed that it is right to do so. It is recognized that it comes from him.

3. The method applied here cannot stop with a few main documents. Logically each of them proves in turn by the application of the same methods to require subdivision into a number of smaller documents. We note that there is the D document which is the main part of the Book of Deuteronomy. All ~~xxx~~ materials consist of exhortation elsewhere in the Pentateuch is assumed to be a product of the D School.

Then there is the JE material, the narrative material and this is assumed to be two different writers J and E and most make J1, J2 at least, some (tape broke at this point)

Pfeiffer takes J1 and J2 and makes one of them into a separate S document in his Introduction to the OT, the latest elaborate work on the subject.

We noticed that in the story of the flood you have repetition in the early parts. Alright give one of them to J and the other one to P. That leaves you three repetitions. Some think there are 5 (?) of others in P. Naturally if this method is valid you have to go further and make further divisions by it. So there is no limit to it. It's the old fragmentary attitude really again in another form. Of course it has been extended on not only in the Pentateuch, it's been carried on into Joshua. It's assumed Joshua is a part of the Hexateuch. Some carry it on into Judges and into Samuel and speak of it as an Oxateuch rather than a Hexateuch.

The same method was carried on into the prophets and applied to most of the prophets. However, the book of Ezekiel was held for many years to be a unit. Reason for this was that it was held that in Ezekiel you have a certain viewpoint on the arrangement of the temple and the sacrifices which it was held comes in between J and P, and therefore that Ezekiel marks a transition stage between J and P and shows the process of the development and the unity of Ezekiel was a more or less central feature in the holding of the development theory.

However, by 1910 the development theory was considered as so well established and the idea of the division of the Pentateuch so well established that it no longer was felt necessary to maintain the