

6.2.1

Critical Scholars Differ

Julius A. Bewer, The Literature of the O. T., 3rd edition

p. xii "It is true that there are differences of opinion on the part of critical scholars about the date and composition of quite a few documents, but the main lines of the development are sufficiently clear to warrant our weaving the single literary results together in a story, which in itself will be a means of judging their plausibility and validity."

6.2

p.85 As in the case of the Yahwist it is doubtful whether the Elohist's  
p.86 strand continued beyond Numbers. Scholars are currently & much divided in this matter . . . . Much that was formerly assigned to the Elohist can perhaps be attributed to the Deuteronomist.

2

p.126 Scholars incline increasingly to the belief that it was here (the northern kingdom), rather than in Judah, that the original nucleus of the Deuteronomic program was evolved in anticipation of a possible restoration. One must then suppose that a copy of this northern draft came into the hands of the Jerusalem priesthood, and lay unheeded for a while in the temple archives (that is, if 2 Ki. 22:8 can be trusted).

Footnote: Northern origin of the Code was first advocated by A. C. Welch (1924), but coupled with an attempt to date it very early.

1/2

p. 231 "Perhaps the most uncertain thing about the Deuteronomistic historical work is its beginning, since that is involved with the problem of Deuteronomy. Not all scholars who accept the Dtr thesis agree that the work opened with the introductory address of Moses when he gave the people the Deuteronomic law (Deut. 1-3). However, a more suitable beginning is hard to find, and so we shall begin there."

9.2

p.291 Footnote. That P was originally a purely narrative work, as some scholars have held, seems unlikely . . . There is much repetition and inconsistency in P, and this led G. von Rad to seek two strands in the work. The view has not found wide-spread acceptance. . . .

Norman Gottwald, A Light to the Nations

6.1

p. 183 Some critics trace the JE sources of the Pent. through the historical books and into Kings. Others are very skeptical about the presence of "constants" that would give controlled evidence of the continuation of sources. . . . . But many scholars agree that an early, more trustworthy source and a later, more legendary one are present in Samuel.

p. 184 Others contend for the necessity of a three-source analysis, with two strands in the early source.

6.1

p.248 . . . . so skimpy is the E narrative at times that some critics have questioned whether an independent source E ever existed; rather they regard it as a series of disconnected supplements to the J document. This notion has found no wide support; all the critical Introductions to the Old Testament in recent years continue to adhere to E as a distinct source with a history of its own and a definite tendency, in spite of its curtailment by editors.

R. H. Pfeiffer, Intro. to the O.T.

p.141 Broadly speaking, the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis is adopted as fundamentally sound in the following analysis of the Pentateuch. In some points, however the views presented here differ from all others . . . . .