

Anderson, G. W., A Critical Intro. to the O.T.

p. 30 Later scholarship . . . has been concerned with more precise delimitation and analysis of the sources and with the attempt to discover the process by which they came into existence, were transmitted, and, finally, were combined to give us the Pentateuch as we now have it. In spite of considerable diversity of view on such points, comparatively few scholars would deny the existence of these ~~found~~^{four} main blocks of material.

p. 42 Most scholars are content to hold that D is the code of the Deuteronomic reform, and that it came into its present form some time during the century preceding its discovery in the temple.

Anderson, B. W., Understanding the O.T., 1966

p. 61 " . . . scholars distinguish two types of covenants: . . . "

p. 77 " . . . it is proper to regard all the material found in Deut. through I-II Kings as a comprehensive Deuteronomic History which begins with the Mosaic period and interprets the events of Israel's history to the time of the fall of the nation.⁷

Footnote 7 - This view has been advanced by Martin Noth . . . and is now widely accepted.

p. 86 Scholars who accept this picture of the conquest have virtually scrapped the account given in Joshua¹⁻¹² as having little historical reliability. Modern archaeology, which has revolutionized our understanding of the Bible in many ways, has made it necessary for us to look more carefully at the story of the conquest presented in the book of Joshua.

Von Rad, Genesis, p. 43 re the Creation story

The form of this theological preface in the Priestly document is characteristically distinct from that of the Yahwist. - Wherever the separation of the two strands by literary criticism is recognized at all there is absolute unanimity of opinion.

p. 10 This is the unanimous opinion of all critics who accept the documentary analysis of the Hexateuch, and it is abundantly proved . . .