

Hookfelt shows that this section, though it uses the name Elohim for God, actually is much more similar to , in its style and viewpoint to the other documents, the Jehovah document, than it is to the main part of the Elohim document. Thus, this which had been thought to be an integral part, perhaps a third, a large portion, of the main original unified document, (15 1/2) other document than like the original one. Now there were two main documents hereafter, P which was what was left of the original and...

t.2. (1/4)

...it would be strange indeed if people, upon seeing this great change, thought to wonder as to the basis of the whole source division. Here the section which was considered to be quite solidly a part of one of the two main sources, and now ~~this~~ this large section is switched over to be a separate source but so much like the other sections that it was quite generally admitted that even though the difference between t and j might be quite clear, the difference between e and j is at many places almost impossible to set down with any definiteness. This would seem to raise great question as to the (1) criteria. As a matter of fact, the widespread idea that the division is an easy division made on the basis of the divine names is not so. The divine name Jehovah is used by all the documents most of the time after the early part of the book of Exodus. It is only in the book of Genesis and the very early part of the book of Exodus that the names are of much help in attempting to separate documents. In addition to that there are places in each of the documents, as divided, where the other name is used. After these matters have been pointed out, finally it was even said that the division on the ~~basis~~ basis of divine names was only one of many criterion and not an outstanding one at all. Yet it is the one from which the start was made. Of course, it was ~~said~~ that the basis, it could be made as a matter of differences