

ligations flowing from it (e.g., Gn 35.2). Similarly its morality is stricter than that of J's (cf. Gn 20 with J's 26.6-11). Prophetic influence has probably colored E's description of Moses as charged with a prophetic office (Ex 3), and has determined its anachronistic identification of Abraham as a prophet (Gn 20.7). Finally, it avoids the bolder anthropomorphisms of J and presents God as speaking to man in dreams, from clouds or in the midst of fire, or through the medium of an angel. While the early critics debated the relative date of E and J, they all agreed in placing the composition of E in the northern kingdom, and the majority concurred on the time as the middle of the 8th century B.C. E was conflated with J, to J's advantage, in Judah some time after the fall of the northern kingdom. Following are the principal passages attributed to E: Gn 20.1-18; 21.22-22.24; 40.1-23; Ex 17-18; 20 (mixed with P); 21-24. See also the many passages conflated with J.

Deuteronomist (D). Early in the 19th century De Wette had already pointed out the special character of the book of Deuteronomy and argued that it had been composed as the basis of a reform program during the reign of Josiah (see DEUTERONOMIC REFORM). Riehm (1854) confirmed its special character. All critics accepted their principal conclusions. Within the Pentateuch D is confined, for the most part, to the book of Deuteronomy, whence its name, and is easily distinguished by its marked literary style. In vocabulary it makes frequent use of expressions such as "choose," "the good land," "with all your heart and with all your soul," "make his name to dwell," "a mighty hand and outstretched arm," etc. These and its manner of presenting its material in the form of Mosaic addresses that are strongly hortatory and moving readily characterize it as a separate document. Its theology, too, is marked, stressing the law as a loving response to the God who chose Israel out of love and who made His name to dwell in the one Temple of Jerusalem where pure worship can alone be offered. While the critics did not endorse De Wette's thesis that Deuteronomy was composed and then put in the Temple to be "found," they did agree that it was a document of the 7th century B.C. that bore some relation to Josiah's reform. As will be seen, later scholars recognized D in other books of the OT. As already stated, within the Pentateuch D is confined to the book of Deuteronomy except for a few brief passages in Exodus (Ex 12.24-27; 13.3-6; 15.26).

Priestly Document (P). The identification of P was relatively easy once E had been separated from it and recognized as a separate document. P's vocabulary tends to the abstract. Stereotyped expressions abound. The style is pedantic and redundant. P makes much use of genealogies, gives minute descriptions especially of ritual matters, and delights in chronological precision. Its presentation of history is liturgical in character, which accounts for the systematic and precise way in which the events are said to occur. As might be expected, God is presented in P less anthropomorphically than in any of the other documents. God "appears," although it is not always indicated how, and speaks to man. The conversation is usually one-sided; man's attitude is one of respectful listening (Gn 17). P is responsible for most of the legal collections in their canonical form, and this interest is reflected in the whole composition. The critics agreed on a postexilic date for the document and that it was the work of priests at-

tempting to restore liturgical worship in Jerusalem. Following are the principal passages attributed to P: Gn 1.1-2.4a; 5; 17; 23; 27.46-28.9; Ex 6; 16; 25-31; 35-40; the whole of Leviticus; Nm 1.1-10.28; 13.1-17a; 17-19; 25-31; 33-36. See also the passages conflated with J and E. Toward the end of the 7th century B.C., D had been joined to the conflated JE. The addition of P at some time in the 5th century B.C. would have completed the work, and the Pentateuch would have existed in its canonical form.

Reactions to the Documentary Hypothesis. In the succeeding years the Wellhausen hypothesis was subjected to many attacks that resulted in extensive revisions. While the outer shell of the theory, represented by the fourfold siglum of JEDP, has held up well and still claims the majority of supporters, the inner construction has been radically changed. The change was brought about by work in three major directions. The first and second of these were a more intense application of the principles of literary criticism and of a form-critical analysis. It is not always easy to distinguish the two, since the latter was a natural development of the former. Scholarly research led to the recognition that much of the material of the "documents" that had been the object of the classical literary criticism had developed from originally independent units. The attempt to recognize these units and trace their development through their varying "life situations" (*Sitze im Leben*) until they reached the final stage represented in the canonical books was an approach initiated principally by H. Gunkel (1910) in his commentary on Genesis. The approach was called form criticism (see FORM CRITICISM, BIBLICAL). Thus, single stories or legal units were examined to see what could have given rise to them in early history. They would then be studied in relation to the complex cycle of stories or code of laws of which they became a part. Since the form critics agree that the fixing of these cycles or codes had already taken place to some extent within the period of oral tradition, this would throw considerable light on the role of the authors of the classical "documents" or "sources." These, whether individuals or schools, would not have been authors in the modern sense of the word. Rather would they be editors of already developed material, but with no little freedom to rearrange, conflate, revise, and, in general, cause the material to reflect their theology. It is clear that such an approach demands a much more extensive knowledge of history, in particular of the social, political, and religious institutions, and of situations that would have occasioned the origin or influenced the shaping of the unit in question. Such a knowledge was not possible in the 19th century and only in the 20th century was it becoming such that the form-critical approach could be used with some degree of confidence.

Literary Criticism. As indicated, there was first a more intense literary analysis that showed that the four documents were much more complex than generally suspected. Thus J was seen to reveal several strata in some of its stories. In the face of this, several scholars have posited a fifth source, called L (*Laienschrift* or Lay Document) by O. Eissfeldt, K (Kenite Document) by J. Morgenstern and S (South, or Seir Document) by R. Pfeiffer. These proposals, though differing in detail from one another, indicated that the documents in the Pentateuch had developed over a long period of time.