

2

SOURCE CRITICISM

PAULINE A. VIVIANO

The historical-critical approach to interpretation has had a profound effect on the search for meaning in the biblical text. The new and often radical views of this century concerning the history of the biblical period and the formation of the Bible have been the direct result of the application of historical criticism to the Bible. This approach is not limited to one way of analyzing the text but employs many methods that try to answer such questions as, Who wrote it? When and where was it written? Why was it written and to whom? Each method has its own distinct concerns. But just as these questions are interrelated, so the concerns of the different methods overlap. The often complex answers given to these questions lead in turn to other questions dealing with multiple authorship, the variety of forms, numerous and conflicting purposes, and so on. One of the methods at the foundation of this process of questioning the text is source criticism.

Definition of Source Criticism

The historical approach presupposes that a literary work carries the imprint of the historical age in which it was produced and that the interpretation of a work is best served by situating it within its historical context and determining the intent of its author. A major difficulty in the application of the historical-critical method to the biblical text, however, is that neither authorship nor date, both essential for the method, can be ascertained readily. Indeed, complicating the issue is the fact that many books of the Bible give evidence of an extremely complex history of development, making questions of authorship and date virtually impossible to answer. Source criticism analyzes the biblical text in order to determine what sources were used in its formation. Once sources are isolated, the source critic considers issues of authorship, date, style, setting, and intent of each source. The primary focus of source criticism is the determination of

written sources. Although the determination of oral sources can theoretically be included in source criticism, it has become the provenance of form criticism and tradition criticism and will not be considered here.

When source criticism emerged in the eighteenth century it was called “literary criticism,” and well into the twentieth century the terms have been and continue to be used interchangeably.¹ Nevertheless, it is common today to draw a distinction between “source criticism” and “literary criticism.” While both pay close attention to the literary features of a text, noting stylistic characteristics, vocabulary usage, repetitions, contradictions or inconsistencies, and other literary traits, their respective goals are different. Source criticism tries to discover the sources behind the text by examining its literary features. More recent literary criticism grounds meaning in the literary or surface structure of a text; it focuses on the text as it is, not on the text as it came to be. To avoid ambiguity, we will use the designation “source criticism” for the method known to eighteenth- and nineteenth-century scholars as “literary criticism.”

The search for sources begins with a close examination of the biblical text itself. It is clear that in certain instances sources were used in the compilation of various parts of the Bible,—for these sources are explicitly mentioned, such as the Book of the Wars of Yahweh (Num. 21:14) and the Book of Jashar (Josh. 10:13; 2 Sam. 1:18).² Apart from the titles of these sources, nothing about them is known directly. But it is possible to draw conclusions about their nature by studying the quotations taken from them or the material in which those quotations are embedded. For example, the Book of the Wars of Yahweh may have been just that, a collection of stories of holy war, and the Book of Jashar may have been a collection of poems, for the Old Testament quotes two poems from it (Josh. 10:12b–13a; 2 Sam. 1:19–27). The “chronicles” used in 1–2 Kings and 1–2 Chronicles (see n. 2) most likely were court records containing details of the reigns of the kings of Israel and Judah.³

Although the study of explicitly mentioned sources is of some interest to source critics, their primary concern is to detect and study sources that are not directly mentioned in the Bible. It is assumed that the biblical authors did not make up the stories they tell but that these stories were already in circulation in their communities in oral or written form. While we should not underestimate the creative genius of these ancient authors, source critics assume that they incorporated, rewrote, and reinterpreted traditional material—whether they explicitly say so or not—to produce their versions of Israel’s past. Source critics also maintain that these versions were then taken up by later authors or redactors who also incorporated, rewrote, and reinterpreted Israel’s past for their own audiences, and that this process continued until the text received its present form.

Source critics seek to retrace this process by isolating each redactional layer, thus revealing the sources that have come together to form the text as we now have it. In order to do this, source critics rely upon certain criteria that, when applied to the final form of the text, enable them to separate out its sources. Based on the assumption that authors exercise a certain consistency in the way they write, in the terminology they use, and in their perspective, source critics view marked differences in any of these areas as an indication that sources have been incorporated into a text. Likewise, it is assumed that single authors do not include contradictory material in their work and that such contradictions reveal multiple hands at work in the production of a text. Intrusions into a text—breaks in the sequence of events or interruptions in the progression of thought—are seen as evidence that works by various authors have been combined by later redactors. Multiple versions of the same basic story, as well as repetitions within a story, are taken as further proof that more than one author's work lies behind the present form of a text. These, then, are the criteria used by source critics to determine the presence of written sources behind the text: variations in style, vocabulary, and perspective; contradictions and inconsistencies in a passage or between passages; abrupt interruptions that break the continuity of a passage; and various kinds of duplications or repetitions.

Historical Background

As indicated above, source criticism is part of the historical-critical approach to biblical interpretation that emerged in the eighteenth century. The approach was already being used by classicists to deal with problems in interpretation of the Homeric epics. It was “borrowed” by biblical scholars who wanted to delve beneath the surface of the text to uncover information regarding authorship, date, provenance, and intent.

The area that received most attention in the application of source criticism to the Bible was the formation of the Pentateuch. Early source critics searched for the sources used by Moses in writing the Pentateuch, but eventually that search called Mosaic authorship itself into question. Challenges to Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch had been raised prior to the eighteenth century,⁴ but these challenges remained isolated until critics were able to offer a viable alternative to Mosaic authorship. That alternative was found in the Newer Documentary Hypothesis, articulated and defended most ably by Julius Wellhausen. Wellhausen's work was the culmination of a process whose origin can be traced to the work of Jean Astruc,⁵ a French physician. In his *Conjectures on the Reminiscences Which Moses Appears to Have Used in Composing the Book of Genesis*,⁶ Astruc sought to determine the sources used by Moses. Astruc himself did not deny Mosaic authorship,

but his search for sources led inevitably in that direction. By dividing the text on the basis of the names of God found in the book of Genesis, Astruc posited two sources for this book, each using a different name for the deity. Source A used *Elohim*, translated “God” in English; Source B used *Yahweh*,⁷ the personal name of Israel’s God, often translated “LORD” in contemporary Bibles. Astruc’s work was carried forward by J. G. Eichhorn in his *Introduction to the Old Testament*.⁸ Eichhorn carefully analyzed the style and content of Astruc’s two sources and set up additional criteria for the determination of sources, including repetitions or duplications, distinctive stylistic features, and characteristic terminology. Once the idea of more than one source or document in the Pentateuch was accepted, it remained to subsequent scholarship to determine the number and extent of the sources, their dates, and their interrelationship. In the process, the Newer Documentary Hypothesis emerged, but not before two alternate theories about the formation of the Pentateuch were developed: the Fragmentary Hypothesis and the Supplementary Hypothesis.

While the Documentary Hypothesis draws its strongest evidence from Genesis and the beginning of Exodus, the Fragmentary Hypothesis is based on evidence provided by the various law codes in the Pentateuch. A. Geddes,⁹ credited with the origin of the Fragmentary Hypothesis, argued that fragments of varying lengths, rather than sources or documents, lay behind these law codes. He further argued that these fragments were put side by side without much consideration given to connecting links. The Pentateuch itself, like the law codes, was formed over a long period of time by the same process of combining fragments of varying lengths. According to J. S. Vater,¹⁰ who accepted Geddes’s position, the process of formation began with a collection of laws, now found in the book of Deuteronomy, dating from the time of David and Solomon but rediscovered during the reign of Josiah (621 B.C.E.).

Although the Fragmentary Hypothesis offered another way to account for the diversity in the Pentateuch, it did not account satisfactorily for the structural consistency of the Pentateuch, especially in terms of its chronology. While the Pentateuch has many diverse elements, it seems too unified to have been formed by the piecing together of fragments. The attempt to account for the extensive unity of the Pentateuch grew into the Supplementary Hypothesis, whose origin is attributed to H. Ewald.¹¹ Ewald maintained that the core of the Pentateuch was an “Elohistic” work that a compiler supplemented by drawing material from other sources. This Elohistic work was one connected strand, thus accounting for the Pentateuch’s unity of theme and structure; the fragments, worked into this core, account for the diversity of style, vocabulary, and perspective.

Neither the Fragmentary Hypothesis nor the Supplementary Hypothesis found much support among scholars. Instead, the Documentary Hypothesis was revised and came virtually to control the field of source criticism in its formulation as the Newer Documentary Hypothesis. This process began with H. Hupfeld's *The Sources of Genesis and the Nature of Their Combination*.¹² Before Hupfeld, it was assumed that the Elohist narrative, called the Foundation Document, was the oldest and most comprehensive of the Pentateuchal sources. Hupfeld showed that the Foundation Document was actually composed of two sources, both of which used the name *Elohim* for God. Thus the Elohist work was divided in two, an early and a late Elohist. The third source was the Yahwistic source (J, based on the German spelling of Yahweh), which used the name *Yahweh* for God. In the later development of the Newer Documentary Hypothesis, Hupfeld's early Elohist sources would be identified as the Priestly source (P).

The claim that the Deuteronomistic Code (Deuteronomy 12–26) is not a compilation of the sources found in Genesis–Numbers (J, E, P) was advanced by W. M. L. de Wette.¹³ De Wette maintained that this code was the law book discovered in the Temple during King Josiah's reform (2 Kings 22–23). De Wette dated the Deuteronomistic Code shortly before 621 B.C.E., the date when it was discovered in the Temple and thus provided a fixed date around which to group the other sources. The dating of sources had been a major problem for source critics because the texts themselves give little evidence upon which to make a determination with respect to dates. Once the date of Deuteronomy was established, however, progress was made in dating the other sources. In *The Historical Books of the Old Testament*¹⁴ H. Graf convincingly argued a suggestion made by his teacher, Eduard Reuss,—that P was the latest of the sources. Graf maintained that the ceremonial and ritual laws found in the Pentateuch could not reflect Israel's early period but emerged only after the exile, after the prophets. In the books of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 1–2 Samuel, and 1–2 Kings, the ritual laws of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers are not presupposed and so must be later than Deuteronomy–2 Kings.

W. Vatke showed in his *The Religion of the Old Testament*¹⁵ that ritualization is found at the end of a long process of religious development, not at its beginning. He maintained that J, E, 1–2 Samuel, and 1–2 Kings reflect the primitive period in Israel's development, which was replaced by one of ethical consciousness, emerging with the prophets and found in Deuteronomy. The latest stage of Israel's religious development was characterized by a more ceremonial religion that emphasized external rituals and is found in priestly law.¹⁶ Vatke's position was based on Hegelian historical and philosophical assumptions, not on literary-critical grounds. Nevertheless, the conclusions

drawn by Graf and Vatke revolutionized future scholarship and its understanding of the development of Israelite religion. By understanding Mosaic law as the latest development in the history of Israelite religion, they forced subsequent scholars to abandon a simplistic understanding of Israel's religious development. Now the history of Israel could be approached rationally and comprehensibly.¹⁷

It remained for Wellhausen to combine source analysis with the arguments of his predecessors. Wellhausen's *History of Israel*¹⁸ is noted not so much for its originality as for the way in which he organized and built upon the work that had preceded him. In fact, the dominance of Wellhausen's view in all subsequent discussion of Pentateuchal sources is a testimony to his ability to synthesize and articulate the work of his predecessors. He showed the importance of the history of Israel's religious development as described by Graf and Vatke for dating the individual sources of the Pentateuch. Wellhausen also strengthened the foundation for the view that Mosaic legislation was postexilic. He made common property the view that there was a progressive development in Israel's religion from a spontaneous natural observance of religion to the reforms of the prophets, which were subsequently superseded by the ceremonial and ritual laws of the priests. Thus it was the prophets, according to Wellhausen, who established a truly ethical faith in Israel. Wellhausen's work became a standard in biblical criticism, not simply for the next generation but for generations to come.

The Newer Documentary Hypothesis as promulgated by Wellhausen maintains that four sources or documents were edited together to form the Pentateuch. The oldest of these is the Yahwistic source (J). It is linked to the period of intellectual growth and national consciousness under David and Solomon (ca. 950 B.C.E.). Its author, the Yahwist, used the name Yahweh for God from the beginning of its narrative (Gen. 2:4b). He tells vivid stories in a folkloric style and reflects a southern provenance (i.e., from the kingdom of Judah). The Yahwist provides the basic story line for Genesis and Exodus, beginning with creation in Gen. 2:4b; J material is also found in Numbers.

The work of the Elohist (E), a more or less fragmentary source, originated in the Northern Kingdom during the height of its power (ca. 850 B.C.E.). It is not found in the primeval history (Genesis 1–11) but begins with the Abraham story in Genesis 15.

The Deuteronomistic source (D), generally believed to be confined to Deuteronomy 12–26, is a law code with a sermon style characterized by stereotyped phrases. It is marked throughout by a sustained exhortation to obedience to the law. D is presumed to be of northern provenance and is dated prior to its discovery in the Temple during Josiah's reform (621 B.C.E.). The Deuteronomistic source is thought either to have been written prior to

the fall of the Northern Kingdom and brought south by refugees fleeing at the time of the fall (721 B.C.E.) or to have been written by northern refugees after they fled south and deposited in the Temple, where it was forgotten until Josiah's reform.

The latest of the sources is the Priestly work (P). This source provides the chronological framework of the Pentateuch and, as the name suggests, was primarily concerned with priestly matters: ritual laws, the origin of shrines and rituals, and genealogies. P has a formal, rigid, repetitive style. It is said to have emerged from priestly circles in Jerusalem during the period of the exile (ca. 550 B.C.E.). It begins in Gen. 1:1 and is juxtaposed to J and E, or intertwined with J and E throughout Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers. Leviticus is regarded as the work of P exclusively.

In Wellhausen's view, these four documents—J, E, D, and P—were combined to form the Pentateuch as we now have it. First, the Yahwistic source was supplemented by the Elohist, most likely after the fall of the Northern Kingdom. To this the Deuteronomic Code was added some time after 621 B.C.E. After the exile, the Priestly work was joined to the other sources. Since the final redaction bears the stamp of the Priestly author and carries the chronology of this source, it is supposed that the Priestly author himself or someone from the same priestly circles was the final redactor.

The generations following Wellhausen saw the emergence of a scholarly consensus regarding the Newer Documentary Hypothesis. Once this consensus was reached, source criticism in the Pentateuch turned to the task of examining the four documents and defining them more precisely. The only major change in the hypothesis was to view the documents as having undergone a long process of growth and therefore as being less unified than was once assumed. Attempts to trace the sources beyond the Pentateuch into Joshua–Kings have met with little success.¹⁹ Successors of Wellhausen claimed to have discovered other sources beyond J, E, P, and D, but none of these additional sources has gained wide acceptance.

Despite refinements, the general contours of Wellhausen's view have remained dominant. Nearly every historical-critical scholar of the twentieth century, either explicitly or implicitly, has affirmed the Newer Documentary Hypothesis. Every critical introduction to the Old Testament written in this century has given prominence to the Newer Documentary Hypothesis, which has been considered an assured answer to the complex question of the formation of the Pentateuch and a firm basis for reconstructing the history of religious development in ancient Israel.

As early as 1924, it was suggested that source criticism had gone as far as it could and that it had no further problems to solve.²⁰ G. von Rad, a little over a decade later, agreed: "So far as the analysis of source documents is concerned, there are signs that the road has come to a dead end."²¹ Other

questions began to call for the attention of biblical scholars, and other methods, notably form criticism and tradition-historical criticism, were developing to address these new questions. Source criticism, it was felt, had done its job and had given such assured results that no change in the understanding of the formation of the Pentateuch was envisioned. The following statement by E. Kraeling is typical of the confidence concerning the achievements of source criticism.

Universally it is conceded that Old Testament scholarship has given us a new, realistic and dependable picture of the way in which the literary materials of the Old Testament arose and of what they mean historically. While the future may bring many corrections, nothing that could be adduced along critical lines could change the situation very much in principle.²²

The extent to which the Newer Documentary Hypothesis continues to dominate the field even today is evident in the spate of books and articles on the individual sources themselves.²³ This level of acceptance makes it hard for its critics to be taken seriously. Nevertheless, dissatisfaction with the Newer Documentary Hypothesis has persisted and in the last few decades has been growing in intensity. Criticism is directed not only against the Newer Documentary Hypothesis but also against source criticism itself, as we will see in the final section of this chapter.

Illustration of the Method

For purposes of illustration we will apply the source-critical method to Genesis 1–11.²⁴ This section of Genesis has the advantage of being manageable in size and a part of the Pentateuch about which there is some consensus regarding the presence and nature of its sources. We will begin with an application of the criteria used by source critics to discover sources behind a text: differences in style, vocabulary, and perspective; contradictions and inconsistencies; interruptions or abrupt changes; and duplications or repetitions.

Style

The most obvious stylistic characteristic of the opening chapter of Genesis is its repetition, which is a result of the framework surrounding each of the eight acts of creation: “And God said. . . . Let there be. . . . And it was so. . . . And God saw that it was good. . . . And there was evening and there was morning, X day.” While not all elements of the framework are found each time, enough are present to characterize the style as formal and repetitive. This repetition gives a solemn, hymnic tone to the entire

account. The repetitive style abruptly changes in Gen. 2:4b, which begins the first of several stories containing the usual elements of a narrative: characters and plot. In contrast to Gen. 1:1–2:4a, we find in Gen. 2:4b–4:26 a deity actively involved in shaping, breathing, and planting. There is interaction between creator and creature in a vividly told story filled with suspense and drama. Creation unfolds, not as the result of a series of commands but as an action taken by the deity with a kind of experimental flair. It is unclear what will happen once the man and the woman, the animals and the garden, have been created. Will God's will prevail, or will humans transgress the one command they were given? A new and unusual character, the serpent, is introduced, and the tension builds as the story moves from temptation to sin to punishment and on into Genesis 4. These narratives in Genesis 2–4 have all the elements of good storytelling: plot, characterization, action, dialogue, and suspense. The stories use an evocative vocabulary with poetic words such as "mists" and "deep sleep." They employ word plays: 'ādām (humanity)/'ādāmāh (ground), 'iššāh (woman)/'îš (man), 'ārūmmîm (naked)/'ārûm (cunning), qānāh (gotten)/Cain. Such clever word plays hold the interest of the hearer or reader. Even in the genealogy of 4:17–26, where one would expect to find repetition, there are short narrative-like sections (4:17b, 19–24). In the genealogy of Genesis 5, a style that is repetitious as a result of a recurring framework, as in Gen. 1:1–2:4a, resumes. This repetitive framework is as follows: "When X had lived Y years he became the father of Z. X lived YY years and had other sons and daughters." Both Gen. 4:17–26 and Genesis 5 are genealogies, but their respective styles are very different. In Genesis 6–9 and 11:1–9 we find the same kind of vividly told stories that characterize Gen. 2:4b–4:26. There are characters and action as well as word plays: šēm (name)/šām (there), bālal (confuse)/Babel. In Genesis 10 and 11:10–32, repetition again comes to the fore, as in Genesis 1 and 5. Thus Genesis 1:1–2:4a; 5; 10; and 11:10–32 are consistent in style but different from the style of Genesis 2:4b–4:26; 6–9; and 11:1–9. Genesis 6–9, though similar in style to Genesis 2:4b–4:26 and 11:1–9, presents a special case, as will be clear when we examine its vocabulary, duplications, and inconsistencies.

Vocabulary

In comparing vocabulary, we will focus on different terms that have the same referent. For example, it is clear that *Elohim* and *Yahweh* are different terms for the deity. The same applies to terms such as "image and likeness"/"living being," "male and female"/"man and woman," and "create"/"form." The terminological distinctions in these early chapters of Genesis are illustrated in Table 2.1.

TABLE 2.1

Genesis 1:1–2:4a	Genesis 2:4b–25	Genesis 5
Elohim	Yahweh or Yahweh Elohim	Elohim
These are the generations of		These are the generations of
Image and likeness	Living being	Likeness of God
Male and female	Male and Woman	Male and female
Create	Form	Create

It is important to note that the vocabulary patterns in the chart occur elsewhere in Genesis 1–11. The name *Elohim*, used in Genesis 1 and 5, is found again in Genesis 6–9. The phrase “these are the generations of” (2:4a) is found again in Gen. 6:9; 10:1, 27; and 11:10, 27, and a similar phrase, “according to their generations,” occurs in 10:32. The following phrases also recur: “the deep” (1:2/7:11), “male and female” (1:27/6:19), “in his image” (1:26–27/9:6), “be fruitful and multiply” (1:28/9:1, 7). In addition to Gen. 2:4b–25, the name *Yahweh* is found again in Genesis 3–4; 6–9; and 11:1–9, but not in the other chapters of Genesis 1–11. Furthermore, in Gen. 7:2 “man and woman” (NRSV: “the male and its mate”) is the same as in Gen. 2:23–24, and the notion of the “ground” being cursed because of humanity repeats the motif of 3:17.

The fact that both *Elohim* and *Yahweh* are found in Genesis 6–9 is significant and calls for a closer examination of this section. In Gen. 6:5 *Yahweh* observes the “wickedness” of “humanity,” in contrast to 6:12 where *Elohim* sees that the “earth” is filled with “violence,” “corrupted” by “all flesh.” In Gen. 6:7 *Yahweh* decides to “blot out humanity” from the “ground,” whereas in 6:13 *Elohim* will make an “end” of “all flesh” and also of the “earth.” In Gen. 7:12 we find “rain” rather than “the great deep” of 7:11. “*Yahweh* said in his heart” (Gen. 8:21) stands in contrast to “*Elohim* blessed Noah” (Gen. 9:1). The promise that *Yahweh* will “never again curse the ground” (Gen. 8:21) is paralleled by “I will establish my covenant” (Gen. 9:9, 11). Table 2.2 illustrates these differences.

Just as there are different styles in Gen. 1:1–2:4a; 5; 10; and 11:10–32, on the one hand, and Gen. 2:4b–4:26 and 11:1–9 on the other, so also 1:1–2:4a; 5; 10; and 11:10–32 have a distinctive and recurring vocabulary, different from that of 2:4b–4:26 and 11:1–9. There are different sets of vocabulary through Genesis 6–9, indicating a blend in these chapters of the

TABLE 2.2

Genesis 6:5, 7; 7:12; 8:21	Genesis 6:13, 22; 7:11; 9:1, 8, 11
Yahweh	Elohim
Wickedness	Violence, corruption
Blot out	Make an end
Humanity	All flesh
Ground	Earth
Rain	Great deep
Said in his heart	Blessed Noah
Never again curse the ground	Will establish my covenant

vocabulary from 1:1–2:4a; 5; 10; and 11:10–32 with that from 2:4b–4:26 and 11:1–9.

Perspective

In addition to stylistic and vocabulary differences, there are differences in perspective throughout Genesis 1–11. In Gen. 1:1–2:4a, God is presented as a majestic, transcendent being. The world is created by the mere power of God's word. In 2:4b–25, a different picture of the deity emerges. God is depicted in anthropomorphic terms. Here God is involved in creation, "getting his hands dirty," so to speak, as the deity forms clay like a potter and breathes life into that clay. This God is not distant but is as close as humanity's next breath. Far from the organized God of Genesis 1, this God seems to decide what to create in the very process of creating, and sometimes gets it wrong, as when the animals are formed as partners for the man before God discovers that they are not at all suitable. In Genesis 4, the deity interacts in a humanlike fashion with Cain. God is also described in human terms in Gen. 6:5–8: Yahweh is grieved by humanity's evil; Yahweh is sorry that humanity was ever created. Yahweh even shuts the door of the ark! But the transcendent, majestic figure of God resurfaces in the decree issued in 6:13–14 and the commands God gives Noah (6:3–22). The more human picture of God appears again in 8:20, where Yahweh smells the sacrifice; the more majestic God issues further decrees and establishes a covenant (Gen. 9:1–17). With Gen. 11:1–9 we return to the anthropomorphic presentation of the deity found in 2:4b–25. God is alarmed at the potential of humanity and has to "come down" to earth to find out what

humanity is doing. We are forced to conclude that there are two very different images of God in Genesis 1–11: a majestic, transcendent God in 1:1–2:4a and a down-to-earth, humanlike God in 2:4b–4:26; 6–9; and 11:1–9. The God of 1:1–2:4a emerges again in Gen. 6:13–22 and 9:1–17.

Humanity is also viewed in very different ways in Genesis 1–11. In Genesis 1 humanity is created in the very image of God, suggesting an exalted view of what it is to be human and setting humans apart from animals. In Gen. 2:7 humanity is made from the dust of the ground and will be dependent upon the ground for food. Humans live because God breathes in them, and so humanity is dependent upon God for life. This dependent creature is much frailer and more vulnerable than humanity in Genesis 1. Humans and animals are both “living beings” (Gen. 2:7, 19); the only distinction given to humans is God’s interest in them. Apart from the characterization of humanity as intent on evil, little can be said about how humanity is presented in the flood story. But in Gen. 9:6 it is affirmed that humanity is created in the image of God, and God gives the same command to humanity (9:1) as in Gen. 1:28: “Be fruitful and multiply.” Thus in addition to two distinct styles and sets of vocabulary, Gen. 1:1–2:4a and parts of Genesis 6–9 differ in theological perspective from Gen. 2:4b–4:26, other parts of Genesis 6–9, and 11:1–9.

Contradictions/Inconsistencies

Careful analysis of Genesis 1–11 reveals several contradictions and inconsistencies between Genesis 1 and 2 and within Genesis 6–9. In Gen. 1:1–2:4a, animals are created before humans (1:24–25 and 1:26–27), but in Gen. 2:7 the human is created before the animals (2:19). In Gen. 1:2, water (the deep) is present and must be restrained by the creation of the firmament and the earth. But in Gen. 2:4b–5, the earth is a desert, and water must be brought to it in order to facilitate creation. In Gen. 6:19–20 and 7:15–16, one pair of every kind of animal is brought into the ark, yet 7:2 says that seven pairs of clean and one pair of unclean animals are to be brought into the ark. The flood is caused by rain in Gen. 7:4, 12, and 8:2b, but 7:11 and 8:2a speak of the fountains of the deep that burst forth, causing a reversion to the primeval chaos (the deep) of Genesis 1. In Gen. 7:4, 12, the rains lasts forty days, and it takes twenty-one days for the waters to recede (7:10; 8:8–12). But according to 7:24 and 8:2a, 3b, the flooding of the earth takes 150 days, and by the time the waters recede (8:13), a year and ten days have passed. In Gen. 8:5, the mountains have appeared, but in 8:9 the earth is still covered by water. The contradictions and inconsistencies between Genesis 1 and 2 and in Genesis 6–9, taken in conjunction with the differences in style, vocabulary, and perspective we have already

noted, indicate separate stories of creation that have been juxtaposed and perhaps two separate flood stories that have been merged.

Interruptions

The first abrupt change that confronts the reader of Genesis 1–11 is that Gen. 2:4b begins again what has supposedly been concluded in 2:4a; in 2:4b God begins again to create. The story line of Gen. 2:4b–25 continues into chapters 3 and 4. Even the genealogy of Gen. 4:17–26, which introduces a shift in literary form from narrative to genealogy, is not as abrupt as the shift to the genealogy of Genesis 5 and 10. The genealogy of Genesis 4 is worked into the narrative, but in Genesis 5 it begins with a formal introduction that echoes Gen. 2:4a. The story of the flood is interrupted to give genealogical information (Gen. 6:9–10) and begins again in 6:11. The genealogy of chapter 10 is interrupted by the narrative of Gen. 11:1–9 and resumes in 11:10. These interruptions occur at the very points where changes in style, vocabulary, and perspective begin.

Repetitions/Duplications

Lastly, we draw evidence from the repetitions and duplications found in Genesis 1–11. Most repetitions are found in the Genesis flood story. God observes the malice of humanity in 6:5 and 6:12 and resolves to destroy humanity in 6:7 and 6:13. The flood is announced twice: 6:13, 17, and 7:4. Noah is ordered to enter the ark twice: 6:18–20 and 7:1–3. Noah obeys God's commands in both 6:22 and 7:5 and enters the ark twice: 7:7 and 7:13. Twice, the waters increase and raise the ark (7:17 and 7:18ff). All living creatures die in 7:21 and again in 7:22. The waters recede in 8:1 and again in 8:3b. God promises never again to destroy the earth by flood in both 8:21–22 and 9:8–17. Apart from these duplications, one notes that we have two accounts of creation (Gen. 1:1–2:4a; Gen. 2:4b–26), and the genealogy of Gen. 4:17–32 is repeated in a different order and with some variations in spelling in the genealogy of Genesis 5.²⁵ These repetitions and duplications support the view that two different stories of the flood have been merged, and, together with our other evidence, they indicate that Gen. 1:1–2:4a; 5; 10; and 11:10–32 can be attributed to one source and Gen. 2:4b–2:26 and 11:1–9 to another. In Genesis 6–9 both sources have been merged.

Conclusions

On the strength of the differences in style, vocabulary, and perspective in Genesis 1–11, together with the abrupt shifts, contradictions, and

repetitions/duplications in the same material, we may suggest that Genesis 1–11 is composed of two separate sources. Furthermore, each source can be identified on the basis of what we have discovered. Genesis 1:1–2:4a; 5; 10; and 11:10–32, taken apart from 2:4b–4:26 and 11:1–9, has a consistency of style, vocabulary, and perspective. When the two strands are separated from each other, duplications and contradictions are eliminated. Genesis 1:1–2:4a; 5; 10; and 11:10–32 have been attributed to the Priestly author, and Gen. 2:4b–4:26 and 11:1–9 to the Yahwist. It is more difficult to separate the stories intertwined in Genesis 6–9, but this can be accomplished by the same application of criteria. A consistency of style, vocabulary, and perspective, without contradictions or repetitions, is found in Gen. 6:1–8; 7:1–5, 7–8, 10, 12, 16b–17, 22–23; and 8:2b–3a, 6–12, 13b, 20–22 (J), on the one hand, and in Gen. 6:9–22; 7:6, 9, 11, 13–16a, 18–21, 24; 8:1–2a, 3b–5, 13a, 14–19; and 9:1–17 (P), on the other. Some slight variations may be found in the assignment of verses to J or P by different scholars, but there is agreement on those verses wherein the main contours of the story are found. Beyond Genesis 11 the same criteria can be applied. Although it is impossible to assign every verse or part of a verse with absolute certainty, J and P appear to continue throughout the Pentateuch, with E being introduced in Genesis 15 and D in Deuteronomy 12–26.

Critique of the Method

Now that we have seen the method in operation, it remains to consider the weaknesses of source criticism and its most prominent theory, the Newer Documentary Hypothesis. While the focus of our attention will be on that hypothesis, the issues raised below apply to any area of biblical study where source criticism has played a dominant role.

From the time when source criticism emerged as a critical method, there were questions about its validity. The Fragmentary and Supplementary Hypotheses, as we have seen, offered alternative ways to account for the evidence cited by proponents of the Documentary Hypothesis. Other scholars have continued to argue for the unity of the Pentateuch by explaining the stylistic peculiarities that led source critics to posit multiple sources as the result of oriental modes of thought²⁶ or by providing theological or stylistic justification for incongruities in the text.²⁷ But by and large these scholars have not been taken seriously, as scholars have generally regarded the evidence for multiple sources as compelling. If anything, the evidence suggests an even more complex process of formation than conceived of by the Newer Documentary Hypothesis. Although an overall unity may underlie the Pentateuch, its component parts are too disparate to assume the activity of a single author.

A more serious challenge was presented beginning early in this century by scholars who accepted the Newer Documentary Hypothesis but used other methods of inquiry. H. Gunkel,²⁸ a pioneer in form criticism, began to focus on smaller narrative units and their origin in oral tradition, separating them from their literary context. He sought to move behind the written text and emphasized the importance of the oral prehistory for the formation of the Pentateuch. Gunkel saw J and E less as authors than as inheritors of an oral tradition that was already formed. A. Alt²⁹ used a similar approach to demonstrate that even the oldest law was preceded by oral tradition. The effect of the approach taken by Gunkel and Alt was to cut loose both narrative and law from the chronological scheme of Wellhausen, thus giving a broader picture of Israel's religious development than source criticism had allowed. G. von Rad³⁰ moved beyond what he saw as the impasse created by source criticism when he used form criticism to understand the Hexateuch as a genre. By focusing on larger complexes of tradition and the process of their transmission, rather than on "documents," von Rad led attention away from individual sources. His work, coupled with that of M. Noth,³¹ prepared the way for a tradition-historical approach that stands in tension with source criticism. R. Rendtorff,³² a successor to von Rad and Noth, has now moved completely away from the Newer Documentary Hypothesis, providing an alternate description of the formation of the Pentateuch based on tradition-historical criticism. He maintains that individual traditions underwent a long process of development wherein smaller units grew into larger ones. These were combined into single continuous accounts, which in turn were combined into larger and larger continuous accounts, until the Pentateuch as we have it was formed. This process would have taken centuries, so that the formation of the Pentateuch as such is dated late. Thus Rendtorff explains the formation of the Pentateuch not on the basis of the Newer Documentary Hypothesis but in opposition to it. E. Blum adopts the approach taken by Rendtorff, his teacher, and has applied it in a detailed study of the patriarchal narratives³³ and more recently of the Pentateuch as a whole.³⁴ In Blum's reconstruction of the process of the formation of the Pentateuch, a D redactor has an expanded role in Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers, with the Pentateuch resulting from an integration of D and P. Future discussion of the formation of the Pentateuch has to take into account the methodological shift represented in the work of Rendtorff and Blum and the challenge that work poses to the Newer Documentary Hypothesis.

Scandinavian scholars since the middle of this century have also tended to emphasize the oral background of the text, objecting that the "book mentality" at the basis of the Newer Documentary Hypothesis—the notion that ancient authors "cut and pasted" from various documents—is more appropriate to modern culture than to that of the ancient world, which was

primarily oral. In the background of the text, they hold, was an oral tradition that continued into the period of the exile and beyond. I. Engnell³⁵ maintained that there never were parallel continuous documents such as J and E. Variations in style, vocabulary, and perspective arose from the oral basis of the text, not from the splicing of documents. According to Engnell, contradictions and repetitions are to be expected given the cultural background of the Old Testament and the long period of time during which the text was in formation and passed on orally. During major crises, when there was a breakdown of normal communication, the need to commit traditions to writing arose. Then the tradition's oral form was replaced by a fixed written form.

In view of the ever-increasing knowledge of ancient Near Eastern culture, we are cautioned by these scholars against the application of modern literary categories to ancient literature. Nevertheless, the assumption that oral tradition dominated to the exclusion of written material is equally untenable. The many ancient texts uncovered as a result of archaeological excavation testify to a rich literary heritage dating back, not just centuries, but millennia before the biblical text. Biblical scholars need to be aware not only of the oral and written traditions of the ancient Near Eastern world but also of the interplay between oral and written forms in the development of a work like the Pentateuch.

The Newer Documentary Hypothesis has been significantly undermined by scholars who accept source criticism but dissent from the details of the hypothesis. For example, the fact that in most instances E cannot be extricated from J,³⁶ and that even when separated it does not yield a continuous narrative, has led some to challenge the existence of E as a continuous source.³⁷ In spite of recent attempts to save E,³⁸ it remains a fragmentary source and a problem for Pentateuchal analysis. Other scholars, however, have tried to divide J, E, D, or P even further on the basis of the same criteria that led to their initial identification. These critics see J, E, D, and P not as unified documents but as products of a "school" that generated more than one document and that shaped and reshaped these documents by further additions.³⁹ Still others have been led by further analysis of the Pentateuch to posit the existence of other sources: a Lay source (L), centered on matters of concern to laity as opposed to priests;⁴⁰ a Nomadic source (N), which contains a negative evaluation of civilized life;⁴¹ a Kenite source (K), which deals with the life of Moses;⁴² and a Southern or Seir source (S),⁴³ limited to Genesis. Finally, Noth⁴⁴ posited a "foundational source" or *Grundlage* (G), from which both J and E independently drew their content. In this way, Noth accounted for the similarity of J and E, finding the major themes of the Pentateuch already present in G.

The arguments for these various subdivisions and additional sources have not gained acceptance by many scholars beyond the recognition that the

identification and formation of source documents are far more complicated than was once assumed. The multiplication of sources and the fragmentation of the original four sources into other documents have undermined the Newer Documentary Hypothesis itself. The more "sources" one finds, the more tenuous the evidence for the existence of continuous documents becomes, and the less likely it is that four unified documents ever existed. Even for those able to avoid skepticism and confusion in the face of the ever-increasing number of sources, the only logical recourse seems to be to move away from the Newer Documentary Hypothesis toward a position closer to the Fragmentary Hypothesis.

Another serious threat to the Newer Documentary Hypothesis is posed by problems of dating. Wellhausen based his dating of sources on the Hegelian view that progress in history occurs in an evolutionary manner from thesis to antithesis to synthesis. This Hegelian outlook contributed to the acceptance and popularity of the Newer Documentary Hypothesis, but critics were quick to show that it was unsatisfactory.⁴⁵ In fact, the generations of scholars following Wellhausen have abandoned the evolutionary scheme underlining the Newer Documentary Hypothesis as inappropriate to their philosophical frame of reference. Moreover, the scientific study of religious development in this century has produced no evidence to support Wellhausen's view that religions evolved from a primitive, spontaneous, personal stage to a rigid, formalistic, and ritualistic stage. The process of religious development is far more complex and uneven than Wellhausen imagined. Without his evolutionary assumptions, his dating of sources can no longer be accepted, and contrary views cannot be ignored. Several scholars over the past century have disagreed with Wellhausen's dates, especially for D and P.⁴⁶

While the early date assigned to J has remained relatively unchallenged until recent years, J. Van Seters⁴⁷ has now dated J to the exile because of the similarity of its vocabulary to that of the Deuteronomistic History and Deutero-Isaiah. Likewise, H. H. Schmid⁴⁸ has critiqued the Solomonic date of J, maintaining that parts of the J narrative reveal the influence of later forms and theological development and so must be pushed to the exilic period. According to Schmid, the kind of reflection found in J only occurs when national history is at an end and can be reflected upon. Though Schmid accepts the existence of the sources, J, E, D, and P, his late dating makes the provenance, date, and form of these sources very different from what they are held to be by most source critics. The trend toward later dating is continued in the work of Blum, who argues for an exilic or post-exilic date for both P and D. Though he acknowledges the use of earlier written sources, he does not admit the existence of continuous "documents" passed down for centuries as in the Newer Documentary Hypothesis.⁴⁹

While source criticism has always had its detractors, the past few decades have witnessed an escalation in the level of dissatisfaction with the method in general and in particular with its best-known representative, the Newer Documentary Hypothesis. The most sustained and vehement attack on the Hypothesis is found in R. N. Whybray's *The Making of the Pentateuch: A Methodological Study*.⁵⁰ Whybray draws together the arguments of his predecessors, highlighting the inadequacies of the Newer Documentary Hypothesis, its presuppositions, and the criteria upon which it is based. But he goes further in calling for an abandonment of the Documentary Hypothesis, and for its replacement with the view that a single ancient historian wrote about the origins of the world and the people of Israel, possibly as a preface to the Deuteronomistic History. According to Whybray, this historian used sources, but they were of recent origin and were reworked with substantial creative additions of the historian's own, according to the canons of historiography of his day. No attempt was made to eliminate inconsistencies, contradictions, and unevenness. Although most source critics are reluctant to discard the Newer Documentary Hypothesis as readily as Whybray, future source-critical analysis of the Pentateuch must take his work into account, while reevaluating its presuppositions in light of the ever-increasing knowledge of ancient literature and its formation.

The Pentateuch is a large and complex work, and the evidence it supplies is vast and conflicting. So it is not surprising that there are alternate explanations of its formation, none of which is completely satisfactory. Many more complex questions are involved in the determination of sources than was once thought. While it cannot be denied that the biblical authors used sources, serious questions have been raised about the possibility of recovering them. The criteria source critics use are inadequate for identifying sources. For instance, stylistic variation does not always indicate different sources, and variations in vocabulary could be necessitated by a change of topic. Inconsistencies and contradictions may simply result from the presuppositions of ancient authors who do not share our notion of "contradiction."

Source criticism and the Newer Documentary Hypothesis should not be discarded. Rather, both need to be reevaluated and reconceived. We are rightly admonished to exercise caution⁵¹ in our reevaluation of the Newer Documentary Hypothesis, but a wholesale acceptance of the hypothesis that ignores its weaknesses is not advisable either. Certainly we can no longer use the hypothesis as a basis for reconstruction of the history of the religious development of Israel, nor even as a basis for Old Testament theology. Still, it has made a lasting contribution to our understanding of the Bible, moving scholarship away from a naive approach to the biblical text and opening up new possibilities of meaning. It has disabused us of "the notion that the Bible is through and through literal history."⁵² For

these reasons alone, if for no others, source criticism and the Newer Documentary Hypothesis merit our appreciation.

Notes

1. See, for example, Norman Habel, *Literary Criticism of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), which is on source criticism.

2. The narrator of 1–2 Kings refers to the Book of the Acts of Solomon (1 Kings 11:41), the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel (1 Kings 14:19; 15:31; 16:5, 14, 20, 27; 22:39; 2 Kings 1:18; 10:34; 13:8, 12; 14:15, 28; 15:11, 15, 21, 26, 31), and the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah (1 Kings 14:29; 15:7, 23; 22:45; 2 Kings 8:23; 12:19; 14:18; 15:6, 36; 16:19; 20:20; 21:25; 23:28; 24:5). First and Second Chronicles likewise makes reference to the Book of the Kings of Israel (1 Chron. 9:1; 2 Chron. 20:34), the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah (2 Chron. 27:7; 35:27; 36:8), the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel (2 Chron. 16:11; 25:26; 28:26; 32:32), the Commentary on the Book of the Kings (2 Chron. 24:27), and a book called Chronicles (Neh. 12:23).

3. The verbal similarity between 1–2 Chronicles, 1–2 Samuel, and 1–2 Kings suggests that the author of 1–2 Chronicles used 1–2 Samuel and 1–2 Kings as a source in addition to other “chronicles.”

4. Already in the twelfth century, Abraham Ibn Ezra, a Jewish commentator, in discussing Gen. 12:6, had problems with the phrase, “When the Canaanites were in the land,” noting that it must come from a time after Moses when the Canaanites were no longer in the land. Carlstadt, in *De canonicis scripturis libellis* (Wittenberg: Ioannes Viridi Montanus, 1520), pointed out that the Pentateuch contains Moses’ death and burial (Deuteronomy 34) and that it is unlikely that he wrote of these events. Both T. Hobbes, *Leviathan* (London: Andrew Crooke, 1651) and B. Spinoza, *Tractatus theologico-politicus* (Hamburg: Henricus Künraht, 1670) raised questions about Mosaic authorship in the seventeenth century. Richard Simon, a French priest, likewise questioned Mosaic authorship in *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* (Amsterdam: D. Elzevier, 1678) and was immediately censured by the Church.

5. H. B. Witter in *Jura Israelitarum in Palaestinam* (Hildesiae: L. Schröderi, 1711) had come to similar conclusions based on the divine name, but his work remained unknown until discovered by A. Lods in *Jean Astruc et la critique biblique au XVIIIe siècle* (Strasbourg: Librairie Istra, 1924); and “Un précurseur allemand de Jean Astruc: Henning Bernhard Witter,” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 43 (1925): 134–35.

6. J. Astruc, *Conjectures sur les mémoires originaux dont il paroît que Moyse s’est servi, pour composer le livre de la Genèse* (Brussels: Fricx, 1753).

7. Astruc used the term *Jehovah*, an archaic form of the name *Yahweh*. *Jehovah* resulted from reading the vowels of *’adonay* (“Lord”) with the consonants of *Yahweh*. It was used often in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries but has since been replaced by *Yahweh*.

8. J. G. Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Leipzig: Weidmanns, 1780–1783).

9. A. Geddes, *The Holy Bible*, vol. 1 (London: J. Davis, 1792); *Critical Remarks on the Hebrew Scriptures*, vol. 1 (London, 1800).

10. J. S. Vater, *Commentar über den Pentateuch* (Halle: Waisenhaus, 1802–1805).

11. This is found in Ewald's review of J. J. Stähelin's *Critical Investigation of Genesis* (*Kritische Untersuchungen über die Genesis* [Basel: J. G. Neukirch, 1830]), in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 4 (1831): 595–606.
12. H. Hupfeld, *Die Quellen der Genesis und die Art ihrer Zusammensetzung* (Berlin: Wiegandt und Grieben, 1853).
13. M. L. de Wette, *Dissertatio critico-exegetica, qua Deuteronomium a prioribus Pentateuchi libris diversum, alius suiisdam recentioris auctoris opus esse monstratur* (1805).
14. H. Graf, *Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Leipzig: T. O. Weigel, 1866).
15. W. Vatke, *Die Religion des Alten Testaments* (Berlin: G. Bethge, 1835).
16. B. Duhm (*Die Theologie der Propheten als Grundlage für die innere Entwicklungsgeschichte der israelitischen Religion* [Bonn: A. Marcus, 1875]) supported this view, demonstrating that the prophets do not presuppose P or D; rather, D depends on the prophetic movement, and P follows D.
17. The first to attempt a description of Israel's religious development that conformed to the chronology of Graf and Vatke was A. Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel* (*De Godsdienst van Israël* [Haarlem: A. C. Kruseman, 1869–1870]).
18. J. Wellhausen, *Geschichte Israels* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1878). With the publication of the second edition (1883) the title became *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*; in English it is known as *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (Edinburgh: A. & C. Black, 1885).
19. Attempts were made by K. Budde (*Die Bücher Richter und Samuel, ihre Quellen und ihr Aufbau* [Giessen: J. Ricker, 1890]) to carry the search for the four sources of the Pentateuch into the books of Judges and Samuel. See also R. Smend, "JE in den geschichtlichen Büchern des Alten Testaments," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 39 (1921): 181–217; I. Benzinger, *Jahvist und Elohist in den Königsbüchern* (Berlin: W. Kohlhammer, 1921); O. Eissfeldt, *Die Quellen des Richterbuches* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich, 1925) and *Die Komposition der Samuelisbücher* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich, 1931).
20. Cf. H. Gressmann, "Die Aufgaben der alttestamentlichen Forschung," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 42 (1924): 8.
21. G. von Rad, "The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch," *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (Edinburgh and London: Oliver & Boyd, 1966), 1.
22. *The Old Testament since the Reformation* (New York: Schocken, 1969), 7.
23. On J see P. F. Elli, *The Yahwist: The Bible's First Theologian* (Notre Dame: Fides, 1968); H. Bloom, *The Book of J* (New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1990). On E and P, see A. W. Jenks, *The Elohist and North Israelite Traditions*, Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 22 (Missoula, Mont: Scholars Press, 1977); R. B. Coote, *In Defense of Revolution: The Elohist History* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1991); J. G. Vink, "The Priestly Code," *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 15 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969), to mention but a few. R. E. Friedman's *Who Wrote the Bible?* (New York: Harper & Row, 1987) is remarkable in the utter confidence with which the author expounds on the documentary hypothesis and, indeed, on the authorship of nearly every other book in the Old Testament.
24. For a fuller treatment of Genesis see Habel, *Literary Criticism of the Old Testament*.
25. The similarities between the genealogies can be seen in the following list. The number indicates the order in which the names appear; the first name in each unit is from Gen. 4:17–26, the second is from Genesis 5: 1. Adam/1. Adam; 8. Seth/2. Seth; 9. Enosh/3. Enosh; 2. Cain/4. Kenan; 5. Methuselah/5. Mahalalel; 4. Irad/6. Jared; 3. Enoch/7. Enoch; 6. Methuselah/8. Methuselah; 7. Lamech/9. Lamech; 10. Noah/10. Noah.

26. B. Jacob, *Das erste Buch der Tora: Genesis übersetzt und erklärt* (Berlin: Schocken, 1934).

27. U. Cassuto, *La Questione della Genesi* (Florence: F. le Monnier, 1934); *The Documentary Hypothesis and the Composition of the Pentateuch*, trans. Israel Abrahams (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1961). Other scholars who have argued for the literary unity of the Pentateuch include Y. Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel*, trans. M. Greenberg (London: Allen & Unwin, 1960); W. Möller, *Die Einheit und Echtheit der fünf Bücher Mosis* (Solzufen, 1931); J. Dahse, "Naht ein Umschwung?" *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* 23 (1912): 748–56. More recently, the unity of the Pentateuch has been defended on other grounds; cf. Y. Radday and H. Shore, *Genesis: An Authorship Study in Computer-Assisted Statistical Linguistics* (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1985). But see also an evaluation of statistical data that leads to the opposite conclusion, by S. Portnoy and D. L. Petersen, "Statistical Differences among Documentary Sources: Comments on 'Genesis: An Authorship Study,'" *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 50 (1991): 3–14.

28. H. Gunkel, *Genesis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901). The introduction of this book was published in English as *The Legends of Genesis*, trans. W. H. Carruth (Chicago: Open Court, 1901).

29. A. Alt, "The Origins of Israelite Law," *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, trans. R. A. Wilson (New York: Doubleday, 1968), 101–71.

30. Von Rad, "Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch."

31. M. Noth, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, trans. B. W. Anderson (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972).

32. R. Rendtorff, *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch*, trans. J. J. Scullion, JSOT Supplements Series 89 (Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 1990).

33. E. Blum, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte*, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 57 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1984).

34. E. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 189 (Berlin and New York: W. de Gruyter, 1990).

35. I. Engnell, *Gamla Testamentet: En traditionshistorisk inledning* (Stockholm, 1945).

36. This was noted by J. Pedersen in *Israel: Its Life and Culture* (London: Oxford, 1926).

37. For S. Mowinckel ("Der Ursprung der Bil'amsage," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 48 [1930]: 230–71), E is reduced to a series of corrective additions to J. P. Volz (*Der Elohist als Erzähler: Ein Irrweg der Pentateuch-kritik?* Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 63 [Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1933]) and later W. Rudolph (*Der "Elohist" von Exodus bis Joshua*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 68 [Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1938]) adopted a kind of "supplementary hypothesis" in which E ceases to exist as a continuous document and, at best, designates a series of additions to a single document that took place over a long period of time. More recently, J. Van Seters (*Abraham in History and Tradition* [New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1975]) has expressed doubt about the existence of E, preferring to speak about stages in the development of J, which he dates to the exile.

38. Cf. A. W. Jenks, *The Elohist and North Israelite Traditions* and R. B. Coote, *In Defense of Revolution: The Elohist History* (both cited in n. 23).

39. For example, R. Smend (*Die Erzählung des Hexateuch auf ihre Quellen untersucht* [Berlin: G. Reimer, 1912]) posited two separate strata of writing from the J "school," J¹ and J², and von Rad (*Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch* [Stuttgart and Berlin: W.

Kohlhammer, 1934]) argued that the structure and theology of P shows it to be the combination of two sources, P^A and P^B, the latter being more complex and more priestly in perspective than the former.

40. O. Eissfeldt, *Hexateuch-Synopse* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich, 1922). Eissfeldt actually divided J into two sources, calling the earlier one L and the later one J.

41. G. Fohrer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, trans. David E. Green (Nashville: Abingdon, 1968). Fohrer's N was akin to Eissfeldt's L. Despite its "nomadic" nature, N's theology was as highly developed as J's in Fohrer's view.

42. J. Morgenstern, "The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 4 (1927): 1–138. Morgenstern dated his K source to the reign of King Asa, believing it was produced to support Asa's religious reform.

43. R. H. Pfeiffer, "A Non-Israelite Source of the Book of Genesis," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 48 (1930): 66–73; *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941). Pfeiffer dated S to the time of Solomon but believed that it had originated in Edom.

44. Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions*.

45. For example, B. P. Eerdmans (*Alttestamentliche Studien*, 4 vols. [Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1908–1912]), rejecting the evolutionary model adopted by Wellhausen, sought to show that Israel's religion was not primitive in its early stage. Eerdmans was not alone in attacking Wellhausen's Hegelianism; see also J. Pedersen, "Die Auffassung vom Alten Testament," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 49 (1931): 161–81.

46. A. Welch (*The Code of Deuteronomy: A New Theory of Its Origin* [London: J. Clarke, 1924] and "On the Present Position of Old Testament Criticism," *Expositor* 25 [1923]: 364–65) recognized archaic elements in D and argued that most of the P legislation was preexilic. E. Sellin (*Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 5th ed. [Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1929]) maintained that the narrative portions of P were as old as J and E. Y. Kaufmann ("Probleme der israelitisch-jüdischen Religionsgeschichte," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 48 [1930]: 23–32; 51 [1933]: 35–47) held that P was entirely preexilic. G. Hölscher ("Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 40 [1922]: 161–255) went in the opposite direction, abandoning a preexilic date for D.

47. J. Van Seters, *Abraham in History and Tradition* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1975). See also his *Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox, 1992).

48. H. H. Schmid, *Der sogenannte Jahwist* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1976).

49. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*.

50. R. N. Whybray, *The Making of the Pentateuch: A Methodological Study*, JSOT Supplement Series 53 (Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 1987).

51. E. W. Nicholson, "The Pentateuch in Recent Research: A Time for Caution," in *Congress Volume Leuven 1989*, ed. J. A. Emerton, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 43 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991).

52. D. McCarthy, "Twenty-five Years of Pentateuch Study," in *The Biblical Heritage*, ed. J. J. Collins and J. D. Crossan (Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1986), 39.

For Further Reading

History, Description, and Application of Source Criticism

- Barton, John. *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984.
- Clements, Ronald E. *One Hundred Years of Old Testament Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976.
- Eissfeldt, Otto. *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. Trans. P. R. Ackroyd. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.
- Habel, Norman. *Literary Criticism of the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.
- Hahn, Herbert F. *The Old Testament in Modern Research*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966.
- Noth, Martin. *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*. Trans. B. W. Anderson. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Petersen, David L. "The Formation of the Pentateuch." In *Old Testament Interpretation: Past, Present, and Future: Essays in Honor of Gene M. Tucker*, ed. J. L. Mays, D. L. Petersen, K. H. Richards. Nashville: Abingdon, 1995.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*. New York: Meridian, 1957.

Critique of Source Criticism

- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "The Documentary Hypothesis in Trouble," *Bible Review* (winter 1985).
- Nicholson, E. W. "The Pentateuch in Recent Research: A Time for Caution." In *Congress Volume Leuven 1989*, ed. J. A. Emerton. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 43. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch*. Trans. J. J. Scullion. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 89. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 1990.
- Van Seters, John. *Abraham in History and Tradition*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1975.
- Whybray, R. N. *The Making of the Pentateuch: A Methodological Study*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 53. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 1987.

AN INTRODUCTION
TO EACH
TO BIBLICAL CRITICISMS
ITS OWN
AND THEIR
MEANING
APPLICATION

Revised and Expanded

STEVEN L. MCKENZIE AND
STEPHEN R. HAYNES, EDITORS

Westminster John Knox Press
LOUISVILLE
LONDON • LEIDEN

© 1999 Westminster John Knox Press

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher. For information, address Westminster John Knox Press, 100 Witherspoon Street, Louisville, Kentucky 40202-1396.

Scripture quotations from the New Revised Standard Version of the Bible are copyright 1946, 1952, and 1971 by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. and are used by permission. All rights reserved.

Grateful acknowledgment is made to the following for permission to quote from copyrighted material:

Kristine Batey, from her poem "Lot's Wife," which appeared in *Alive Now!* January/February 1988. Used by permission.

Zephyr Press, from "Lot's Wife," *The Complete Poems of Anna Akhmatova*, translated by Judith Henschemeyer, edited by Roberta Reeder. Copyright © 1990, 1992, 1997 by Judith Henschemeyer. Reprinted by permission of Zephyr Press.

Book design by Rohani Design, Edmonds, Washington
Cover design by Kevin Darst

Published by Westminster John Knox Press
Louisville, Kentucky

This book is printed on acid-free paper that meets the American National Standards Institute Z39.48 standard. ∞

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

03 04 05 06 07 08 — 10 9 8 7 6 5

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

To each its own meaning : an introduction to biblical criticisms and their applications / Steven L. McKenzie and Stephen R. Haynes, editors. — Rev. and expanded.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 0-664-25784-4 (alk. paper)

I. Bible—Hermeneutics. I. McKenzie, Steven L., 1953–

II. Haynes, Stephen R.

BS476.T6 1999

99-28620