

from which the Pentateuch was formed, usually dividing J into two parts.

Thus, Otto Eissfeldt, <sup>1</sup> in ~~his~~ <sup>Hexateuch Synopses (1922)</sup> ~~work~~ <sup>of 1922</sup>, identified a lay document (L) <sup>in J</sup>, which he claimed had a nomadic outlook hostile to the Canaanite way of life. ~~Smend and~~

~~Eichrodt have isolated a similar document which they called~~

~~document (K).~~ <sup>2</sup> <sup>11</sup> In 1927, Julius Morgenstern wrote ~~The Oldest Document~~ <sup>"(Hebrew Union College Annual IX (1927), 1-138)</sup> of the Hexateuch, in which he claimed to recognize a Kenite document (K), which ~~was~~ similar to Eissfeldt's L, and was <sup>thought to have been</sup> used

in the reforms of King Asa about 900 B.C.

<sup>no 91</sup> Robert H. Pfeiffer, <sup>3</sup> in his ~~Introduction to the Old Testament~~, published <sup>in 1941</sup>, split J quite differently,

calling <sup>ed</sup> the material in Genesis 1-11 (previously assigned to J) by the name S, standing for Mt. Seir in Edom, <sup>much of which corresponds to passages in Eissfeldt's L.</sup> He claimed this document ~~was~~ the earliest of all those in the Pentateuch, but that it was added to the others last.

<sup>no 91</sup> Georg Fohrer, <sup>4</sup> whose ~~Contributions to the History of the Pentateuch~~ <sup>was translated into English in 1968</sup>, divided Wellhausen's J into N and J, the latter document reflecting the attitudes of the farmer and the former those of the nomad.

<sup>no 91</sup> Thus, some of <sup>today's</sup> the leading writers in the field of Old Testament studies have felt the division of sources generally accepted is false. They are each convinced that their newly discovered document is very different from J in style.

Certainly, ~~this must raise a question concerning the objectivity of stylistic determinations.~~