

Such a man as Professor Theophile J. Meek of the University of Toronto states in the Preface to the Second Edition of Hebrew Origins (New York: Harper and Row) 1950, that he has "always felt that the hypothesis, as usually understood, is too artificial" and he indicates some great questions he has about certain vital features of the theory, such as his belief that it is "impossible, except in a few instances, to separate E from J."

Meek, T. J., Hebrews Origins (New York: Harper and Row), 1960, pp.xi-xii

Frederick V. Winnett, "Re-examining the Foundations" JBL, Vol LXXXIV, March 1965 pp/18-19 If the theory which I have propounded regarding the literary history of the Book of Genesis be correct, it is obvious that current views regarding the Pentateuch will have to be radically revised. In the first place, we must recognize that Genesis was of later origin than the early parts of the Books of Exodus and Numbers. This undermines the argument that the promises of the land in Genesis presuppose that the J and E narratives must have carried the story of the Hebrews as far as the conquest and settlement in Canaan. Secondly, we must give up the idea of two primary, parallel strands, J and E, running through Genesis. And thirdly, if the JE theory does not hold good for Genesis, it is time to take another look at the literary structure of the Books of Exodus and Numbers. . . . Volz and Mowinckel<sup>28</sup> have also expressed the view that the concept of J and E as two parallel narratives cannot be maintained. The whole pentateuchal problem stands in need of fresh investigation.

<sup>28</sup> For the latest expression of Mowinckel's views, see his Tetrateuch-Pentateuch-Hexateuch (Berlin, 1964), pp. 1-8. It will be noted that he believes that the traditions received their present basic form at the hands of a younger J, a Jahwista variatus, "JV," although he is inclined to regard JV as a "school" rather than as an individual.