

## Chapter 8 Style

### 3. Precise statements by Pfeiffer and Eissfeldt as to the difference between S or L and J, with precise page references.

Eissfeldt 169/8-9  
193/3-10  
194/1-3

Eissfeldt 195/3 It appears that the L strand in the primeval history pictured men as nomads, whereas J and P clearly think of them as husbandmen. . . . It thus envisages only nomads and knows no other men. To this fits also the fact that the narrative of the building of the tower, which also belongs to L . . . pictures mankind . . . as a wandering group of nomads. It is quite clear that in Israel, which became an agricultural people from being a nomadic people, an outline of their history which places nomads at the beginning must be older than one which pictures the first men as husbandmen.

Eissfeldt 195/8 Furthermore, it is an indication of the age and nature of L that, unlike J, it is aware of a disharmony at Sinai. J pictures Israel as departing from Sinai in the liveliest hopes and with its joy unclouded . . . and Yahweh as accompanying them . . . But L knows of a disharmony with which Israel's sojourn at Sinai came to an end, and this had the result that Israel's departure from Sinai appears rather as a dismissal from the presence of Yahweh than as a joyous march into the land of promise.

Eissfeldt, 196/2 From the point of view of form too L is the most primitive of the four narrative works. Whereas in J, E and P we have strictly constructed narrative works, in which not only the individual narratives but also the narrative complexes are linked together, in L the individual narratives follow one another with relatively little connection, and the thread which holds them together is often merely the chronological sequence of the events.

Eissfeldt, 197/3 In yet another direction there is a striking difference between L on the one hand and J and E on the other . . . In the L narratives the elements of national and tribal history are much clearer and purer than in J and E, where frequently a more fictional element prevails and often conceals the background of national and tribal history to such an extent that it can hardly now be recognised, and the impression is given that we are dealing not with people and tribes but with individuals.

Eissfeldt, 198/8 . . . L regards Sinai and not the land of Canaan as the real dwelling of Yahweh, and hence also as the real home of Israel . . .

Eissfeldt, 199/5 It has already become clear in the characterisation of L just undertaken, where reference has been made of its differences from the strands J and E, that they are later than L. Indeed, we have seen that both in content and in form J and E represent a more advanced stage.

Pfeiffer, 148-9 If the S document was Edomitic in origin, as there is reason to believe, its author reciprocated J's unfriendly attitude toward Edom by his unflattering portraits of the eponym heroes of four tribes of Israel (Judah, Gen. 38; Simeon and Levi, Gen. 34; and Reuben, Gen. 35.21f.), although he disclosed no trace of J's intense nationalism.