

Harrelson (33, cont'd)

on the "bookish" approach to the Pentateuch of Wellhausen and his followers, Harrelson continues, "Most scholars have found it difficult to accept this radical interpretation of the presumed way in which the Pentateuch took shape. The insistence that the literature was first written down during the Babylonian Exile is clearly an hypothesis which can not be proved or even made very probable, in our judgment.

(67) The view of Pfeiffer that the story of Tamar (Gen. 38) is designed to discredit the forefather of Israel and that it came into the Genesis narratives long after the old traditions took shape is "hardly correct". Judah is not portrayed as being particularly evil (p. 68). Harrelson puts Gen. 30 in J, not in S as does Pfeiffer.

C. R. North in "Pentateuchal Criticism"

Voltz rejects Pfeiffer's Pentateuchal synopsis.
 Voltz reacted against the excessive analysis of Bissfeldt.

B. W. Anderson (164)

" . . . although scholars differ somewhat on the material in Genesis that should be assigned to J "

H. H. Rowley in "From Moses to Qumran"

p.90 Disagreement among scholars as to whom to assign Ex. 19.5

p.116/4 A generation ago it was common amongst scholars to set the prophets and the priests ~~over~~ against one another in the sharpest way

117/1 Not all scholars took this extreme view

See File XI - 7

JB 142/9

. . . the more precise relationship of Deuteronomy to the reformation of Josiah is still one of the foremost problems of Old Testament research. The law book found in the temple was hardly identical with the code in 12-26 as we have it. But theories as to an original Deuteronomy or of separate editions later combined have failed to convince.

NG 252/3-6

Priority of J over E questioned by the critics (Noth, Pfeiffer)

Allis, 276

Driver assigned Gen. 30.22a to E (Intro, p.16; Commentary on Gen., p. 276), but he admitted it might be P (Intro., p.12; Commentary, p. v)