

3. Statements from any critical books that assume that a document is preserved in its entirety

Driver, LOT, 128-9 (Concerning P). His representations of God are less anthropomorphic than those of J(p. 120f), or even of E. No angels or dreams are mentioned by him. . . . But anthropopathic expressions of God he avoids scrupulously; even anthropomorphic expressions are rare On such subjects as the justice of the Divine government of the world, the origin of sin and evil, the insufficiency of all human righteousness . . . he does not pause to reflect; . . . His work contains no Messianic outlooks into the future: . . .

Pfeiffer, 148 Neither J nor E makes the slightest allusion to the divided kingdom.

U2 186/4 It seems a little strange that in the J version of the Joseph story there are no explicit references to the promises made to Abraham - the thread by which the Yahwist bound the patriarchal stories together.

GWA, 47 Anthropomorphisms are, on the whole, avoided (But note, e.g. that God is said to rest on the 7th day ...Gen.2.3)

Eissfeldt, 202/2 In the first place, it is characteristic that E's decalogue, the ethical one which is so familiar to us (Exod. 20.1-17), says nothing about agricultural festivals and apparently deliberately ignores them

Eissfeldt, 203/3 This it is E and E alone which describes Abraham as a prophet (Gen. 20.7), . . .

Von Rad, Genesis p.365 We must suppose that the document E did not know of the episode of Joseph's temptation at all (ch. 39).

Meek, Theophile James, Hebrew Origins (New York: Harper & Row) First pub. 1936, rev. ed, 1950, First Harper Torchbook edition, 1960.

p. 136-7 Aaron never once appears in the J document, and in E he plays a minor role, acting merely as a sort of adjunct to Moses (cf., Ex.5.1,4), and ~~he~~ he is clearly a supernumerary who was later introduced into the narrative as Israelite and Judean sagas became fused with the union of the two peoples.

Footnote 53 So practically all scholars since J. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Israel (Eng. trans., 1885), pp. 139 f.