6.2.80

Pfeiffer states: "Ex.1.6,8-10 is all that can be certainly assigned to J in ch. 1" (p.144).

However, Driver(1913), C&H, H-B, McNeil, Brightman, Bewer, Stalker, Harrelson and G. W. Anderson also include verses 11 and 12 in J, in Ex. 1.

* * * * * *

Pfeiffer (p.161) finds it difficult to decide whether Gen. 36.9-30 is S1 or S2. Most of the other critics give this section to P.

* * * * * *

Pfeiffer (p.170) says that in Ex. 16-18, "J and E cannot be separated". Eissfeldt very clearly separates J from E in chapters 17 and 18, and Driver (1913) gives all but $2\frac{1}{2}$ verses in ch. 17 and 18 to E.

* * * * *

Pfeiffer (.p. 175) says "The story of Ex. 4.1-4 . . . . cannot be J, as many critics suppose; if it is not E, it must be E2."
All the other critics,except Eissfeldt who assigns them to L, give these verses to J.

* * * *

J. A. Bewer (The Literature of the O.T., p.66. New York, 1922) finds no J material whatsoever between Exodus 18.11 and Num. 10.29 according to Pfeiffer'S footnote on p. 146 of his Intro. to the O.T.
Pfeiffer sees traces of the J story in Ex. 19.2b, 18,20a, 21 "if these dis- connected remnants are really J" (Pfeiffer, p. 145-6) Also in 34.1â,2,4,28 (omitting a few words).
In addition to these verses which Pfeiffer gives to J, Eissfeldt also gives 19.3b,9,11,13a,15-16,19a,20b,22,25 to J. He also gives 20.18b,20b to J which no one else does.

XI-75   New Catholic Encyclopedia, 1967, p. 99 "There is no universal agreement on all the attributions, and at times the conflation with other sources is such as to preclude a precise analysis." Said of the Yahwist (J) document.

G. Fohrer(Intro. to the OT)p. 109 Good summary of divergent theories held by critical scholars respecting chronological order and date of J, E, D, and P.

G. Fohrer,IOT, p. 155/4 It is likewise incorrect to assume that the preserved form of E is more fragmentary than that of J (Noth, Weiser), if this assumption is meant as a wholesale judgment.