

3. The method applied here cannot stop with a few main documents. Logically each of them proves and confirms by application of the same method to require sub-division into a bunch of smaller documents. There is the D document which is substantially Deut. and all the material the exists of exhortation is assumed to be product of the D school. Then there is the JE material, the narrative--two different writers, J¹ and J² etc. and Phiffer takes J¹ and J² and makes them S documents--note the latest elaborate work on this. We noticed in the record of the flood and the repetition--one belongs to J and the other to P--that leaves you three repetitions and five of others, and if this method is valid you have to make further divisions by it. Of course it has been extended on not only to the Pent. It is assumed that Joshua is a part of the Hext. and some carry it on into Judges and even into the books of Samuel and the same method is applied to most of the prophets--however the book of Ezekiel was held for many years to be a unit. The reason was that they thought that what was written there was between J and P. However by 1910 the developmental theory was so well established that they no longer maintained the unity of Ezekiel. In 1907 _____ made the statement that scarcely any doubt had been cast by the extremist of critics as to the unity and authenticity of the book. But in 1914 _____ Phiffer says the traditional view is maintained but in 1924 about 6/7 of the book was regarded as editorially supplements. The same thing was done with Isaiah, and today the critics would not give over a 1/6 of Isaiah to the actual authorship and you have about 40 different writers having written the book, theoretically. It is ~~not~~ altogether conceivable that a book might have been written in exactly the same way that critics say the Pent. was written, but before anyone can say with any certainty that such a thing has occurred, it is necessary to have much greater proof that we have of any book in the O.T. To say that you can divide the Pent. up on the basis of style, you could just as well divide up any other book in exactly the same way. That is to say that you need a different type of proof than that which is alleged by them.

4. The Assumption of Redactors puts an end to any Criteria whatever. Here again we have differences in ideas. Is it the work of composite men--it was attempted to take various sections out to prove the clear evidence. Today it is accepted and has been by all sorts of scholars. Today--the question is -what is in J, E, P? Today, there is no hesitation