

11.

About 20 years ago I examined a number of standard detailed books about the Pentateuch, written by leading supporters of the Wellhausen theory. When a chart was made with various colors to indicate their views of the alleged J, E and P documents it showed more differences than agreements among them. In his commentary on the book of Genesis in the Anchor Bible ~~X~~.E.A. Speiser pointed out that all previous critics had agreed in assigning Gen. 29:24 and 29 to P, as they were "the type of statistical detail that is customary with P," but declared on the basis of the Nuzi tablets that "it is precisely these two verses that are most likely to constitute direct transcripts from some old and authentic document."~~X~~⁹

Today the alleged consensus can no longer be claimed. Every critic has his own theory of sources, though most try to preserve the Wellhausenist terminology.

P. 10 We shall look at other aspects of this matter later on, when we look at Literary Source Criticism (p.22) as we go through the paper in order. Now we shall begin to respond to its successive parts, as far as time and space permit.

The introduction makes the following statement about "grammatico-historical exegesis": "The divisions between those within the church employing this method of exegesis bears mute testimony to the fact that the method has problems" (p.4).

Personally I incline strongly to the opinion that most of the divisions among Christians are not the result of problems in using the grammatico-historical method, but rather of failure to use it. All too often we go to the Bible to find proof texts to support views that we already hold instead of carefully examining the Bible to see what each