

Aage Bentzen, Introduction to the O. T., Vol. II (Preface, 1949)

page 16 Most critics consider the sources composite and split them up into separate documents. . . . the history of the older documentary theory from ca. 1800 is repeating itself: The New Documentary Theory is tending towards self-dissolution.

S. H. Hooke, Peake's Commentary on the Bible, p. 169 . 1962.

- p. 169 ". . . the Documentary hypothesis exhibited in the course of time what may be called a tendency to nuclear fission. Critical analysis of the sources tended to multiply revisers and revisions, and symbols threatening to extend J, E, and P to the nth degree, together with the rainbow hues of the Polychrome Bible, bred an increasingly sceptical attitude toward the Documentary theory and a hostility towards the application of the techniques of 'higher criticism' to the Scriptures.
- p. 170 While most of the recent German work seems to take the general position of source criticism for granted, its trend seems to be away from further minute dissection of the documents, and towards a study of small units and special phenomena in the documents,

Anderson, G.W., A Critical Intro. to the O.T., 1959

- p. 51,52 Carried to extremes, this kind of criticism would amount to a revival of the fragment hypothesis. It is sometimes argued that the artificial results obtained by some scholars reveal the fundamental unreality of the methods of literary criticism, and that therefore the hypothesis of four main sources is insecure and ought to be discarded. But, although the methods may be the same, the amount of evidence for these more minute analyses is less than that for the existence of J, E, D, and P, and the supposed remains of the subordinate strata are usually fragmentary. Accordingly, the improbability of the more extreme analytical refinements does not affect the general probability of the main theory. We may readily admit the presence of varied material from different periods in all the sources; but precise definition of its extent and development remains conjectural.
- p. 55 We cannot return to the hair-splitting analyses which were fashionable about half a century ago, but must be content sometimes to leave the lines of demarcation between the sources vaguely defined.

See 5.4-4 P. Baentsch(1900) divided Lev. into 7 distinct sources, etc.

See 17.8-12 Albright - "impossible to carry out close analysis . . . So popular in lst 19th Cent. . ."