

Pfeiffer traces S as distinct from J through the Book of Genesis (but not through the Pentateuch). He says that "Supplemented with S2 (a Jewish midrash to it), S was incorporated into the Pentateuch after the insertion of P, not long before the final edition of the 'Law of Moses' was issued about 400 B.C." ( p. 167). Again, Pfeiffer asserts "that the source which he calls S, with its editorial accretions (S2), was inserted into the Pentateuch after P . . . . , or between 430(the approximate date of RP) and about 400, when the Pentateuch reached its final form and was canonized." (p. 288)

\* \* \* \* \*

R. H. Pfeiffer, A Non-Isra. S. of the Book of Gen., ZAW 48 (1930), 66-73  
 In "A Non-Israelitic Source of the Book of Genesis" (printed as read at the 17th International Congress of Orientalists, Oxford, 30. August 1928) in Sonderabdruck aus der Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des nachbiblischen Judentums. Johannes Hempel. Verlag von Alfred Topelmann in Gleben. the following has been taken (pp.69-73)

Contrasts between J and S

The style of J is imaginative, poetical; in S it is adequate, matter-of-fact . . . The emotional overtones of J are lacking in S . . . J is refined, sophisticated S is primitive, barbarous.

J never speaks of the death of the patriarchs. In S on the contrary the mood is desperately pessimistic. . . J is truly a "paradise Regained"; S is literally a "Paradise Lost".

There is no allusion to worship in S (except in the story of Cain and Abel), no trace of communion between man and God, exactly as in J, where a similar conception of the deity is set forth. . . Sacrifices appear in later additions to S (4.3-5; 8.20), and in E, but not at all in J: in J the patriarchs build altars but curiously do not sacrifice thereon. . .

S knows nothing of these local spirits, but used sources that were unmistakably polytheistic; I am inclined to believe that the unskillful substitution of Yahweh for a pantheon is due to an Israelite redactor rather than to the original collector of the stories of S.

. . . it seems plausible to conclude that S was an autonomous literary work. Its place of origin cannot have been Northern Israel, for the northern tribes are not even named. . . Mount Seir is the geographical center of the region covered by the stories of S as well as the focus of the narrative, which culminates in the annals of Edom, the only portion of S (and of Genesis) which preserves for us actual history.

J and E and even D betray no knowledge of S, but Ezekiel is unquestionably familiar with S . . . and Second Isaiah seems to have read it

over-