

p. 749 In our references to the Hexateuch in previous chapters we have, in accordance with general usage, regarded the principles of analysis and the existence of the hypothetical texts, J, E, D and P as established, though we have seldom had occasion to notice passages in which a minute analysis of the text is of essential importance. But we feel bound to say here that we cannot view without considerable misgiving such analysis as the following.<sup>1</sup> In Gen. 37.1,1a are derived from P, 2b-11, 19,20,22-24, 28a,28c-30,36 from E, 12-18,21,25-27,28b,31-35 from J. Again, in Josh. 4.1-3,8,20 are derived from one source of JE, 4-7,9-11a,13 from another source of the same, 13,15-17,19 from P, 11b,12,14,21-24 from a Deuteronomic source. More or less similar analyses are given for many other chapters. The principle upon which the existing text in such cases is believed to be constructed is that of the scrap-book, just as in annals and chronicles. But is it really probable that such a process was applied to narratives, and at what seems to have been an early phase in the history of written literature?

*Difficulties of "Scrap-book" Theory*

<sup>1</sup> The examples are taken from Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, pp. 17, 105.

p. 750 The evidence upon which the analyses are based consists partly in the use of certain terms, especially J-h-v-h and Elohim, and partly in linguistic and stylistic characteristics of various kinds, of which none but experts can judge, as well as in inconsistencies in the narratives. Are these features not capable of any other explanation? In other early literatures which are preserved in late texts inconsistent modernisation is a frequent phenomenon. Sometimes also there seems to be reason for suspecting that a scribe knew from memory a text different from that which he was copying.<sup>1</sup> And there may be other possibilities. But we can do no more than express a feeling of doubt. We are quite ready to believe that extracts from (say) E were copied into a text of J; but the 'scrap-book' theory seems to us to present much greater difficulties.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Vol. 1, p. 511.