

the conflicting results and the wild ups and downs of the documentary theories in the century before its final formulation attest to the faulty methodology of distinguishing documents by stylistic criteria.

Even though the chameleon features of the documentary <sup>hypothesis</sup> theories had finally assumed a fixed form in the JEDP <sup>hypothesis</sup> ~~theory~~, this did not prevent refining, which sometimes became tantamount to gross tampering; The ~~Multidocumentary Theory~~ <sup>hypothesis</sup> was always the point of departure, but adjustments came dangerously close to actually destroying the theory.

no 9/

An important illustration of this is the division of J into two documents. Previously, scholars had spoken of J as a unit, but recently several scholars have split the document. Otto Eissfeldt refers to a lay document (L) <sup>running parallel to E & P</sup> taken from J in ~~The Old Testament, An Introduction~~ <sup>New York and London: (in German)</sup> (Harper and Row, 1965). Robert H. Pfeiffer <sup>2</sup> ~~in his Introduction to the Old Testament~~ <sup>New York:</sup> (Harper & Brothers, 1941) does not find J in the first 12 chapters of Genesis, but rather the document S which has an Edomite origin near Seir. Pfeiffer's S corresponds approximately to Eissfeldt's

ft-notes on opp. p.

~~E.~~ One of the latest books presenting the ~~Multidocumentary~~ <sup>hypothesis</sup> Theory in detail, Georg Fohrer's ~~Introduction to the Old Testament~~ <sup>3</sup> ~~(trans. D. Green, in the English in 1968)~~ <sup>Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1968</sup> (translated from German) discusses a nomadic document (N) which has been taken from the original J document. Although some would magnanimously call the splitting of J "a minor adjustment," the ~~Multidocumentary Theory~~ <sup>hypothesis</sup> has come close to adding another document besides the traditional four.