

As to ability to divide sources

B.W. Anderson (163) - in many places the two sources (JE) are fused indistinguishably together

(226) - . . . is often difficult to reconstruct the E narrative as a continuous account

(166) - . . . in some instances J and E materials are blended together so closely that they cannot be disentangled . . . but J is the basic literary source to which the other narratives have been subordinated.

Weiser (80) - . . . It is hard to resist the impression that the method of literary criticism for identifying the sources down to the individual wording has reached its limit and has sometimes exceeded it.

. . . the aim of literary criticism to carry out the analysis of the sources as far as the individual wording can hardly be reached in view of the state of form of their transmission. The fact must be faced that much of the material had behind it a very long history full of vicissitudes before it was fixed in writing, and that the sources, too, after their amalgamation themselves experienced as traditions a further active history which we are not yet in a position to survey; for we do not know for how long the oral tradition continued beside the written one and what influence it had on the latter; we should, therefore, do well to be cautious with regard to an analysis which is too mechanical, formally logical and based merely on literary criticism. We can no longer grasp the strands of the Pentateuch as though they were entities fixed in detail . . . Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to give up altogether with Pederson and Engnell the methods and results of literary criticism; for the criteria it has worked out retain their appropriate validity for the oral tradition also.

Eissfeldt (241, 241) After referring to Dornseiff, Eissfeldt says, "Little as such works as these have been able to shake the normally accepted Pentateuchal criticism, they nevertheless, quite apart from important individual points, have their significance as a warning against too great reliance upon the results of Pentateuchal criticism itself. . . ."

Harrelson (9) Some scholars also doubt that the Yahwist put his version of Israel's history into written form; some, indeed, doubt the existence of a Yahwist.

(33) After discussing the Scandinavian scholars approach to the study of the Pentateuch and their merciless attack