

~~That~~ is alarming to say the least.
case, the contributors sincerely believe that the documentary hypothesis is ^{so} woefully deficient in a number of crucial areas, that the only logical step is to totally reject it. Since this borders upon "heresy" in ^{OT} certain circles, the ^{author} contributors request ^{that} an emotional reaction be suspended in favor of a careful sifting of the facts.

Although ^{this book} ~~these essays~~ can undoubtedly be classified "negative," there is a very real implication of a "positive" nature which pervades ^{it} them. It is implied throughout that the best working hypothesis is unified ^{of it} authorship, specifically in reference to the Pentateuch. A full-blown argument is certainly not given for this suggestion, but ^{it's} ~~it only fair to mention it, so that the reader can study the message more effectively.~~ ^{However,} in opting for this ruling conception, the ^{author} contributors intend to show a ^{reasonable} healthy respect for tradition, ^{Furthermore, he} ~~They~~ believe the trend in general literary studies is a powerful motivating factor in the direction of unified authorship, while a careful ^{study} of the particular literary phenomena of the Pentateuch points to a single creative writer. ^{And,} since Moses is claimed by the writings themselves to have written or spoken large parts of the Pentateuch, he ^{would seem to be a} ~~is the most~~ ^{very} likely candidate ^{for} ~~to be~~ the author ^{ship} of the Pentateuch. But even this very "plausible" hypothesis must be handled cautiously; when the account of Moses' death is given in Deuteronomy 34.5-8, it would appear that more than strict Mosaic authorship ~~of the Pentateuch~~ is required to explain all the phenomena of ~~Pentateuch~~. In ^{even if the reader may heartedly disagree with this working hypothesis,} any case, ^{case,} it is thought here that ^{many of the supposed incongruities} of the Pentateuch can often be given a more adequate explanation ^{than} ~~from~~