III The Alleged criteria is not carried through consistently

If you could take all the sections that use Elohim and put them together and all the sections that use Jehovah and put them together, you could say that in the sections that use Jehovah a maidservant is always spoken of as ALMAH whereas in the sections that use Elohim the writer always speaks of a maidservant as _____ , not ALMAH. *that would be a strong argument* Furthermore, in the sections that uses Elohim, he always says male and female (animals or human beings) were created by God, *or entered into the ark* but in the section that uses Jehovah, the writer always uses the expression "male and his wife."   If these and similar usages could be carried through consistently it would be a most remarkable thing. It would be a strong argument for the theory. But when you take a word that the critics say is consistent with one document and trace it through, you have little difficulty showing that the criteria are not applied consistently.

Brightman (Sources of the Hexateuch, p.82) in a footnote on Ex.4.29-31 asserts that "Almost all critics agree that Aaron was probably unknown to the oldest J tradition. Aaron in a J context is superfluous, and R; . . . "
(rather than "man and his wife")
"Male and female"/is said to be a typical ~~mark of~~ *phrase* P₁ and in Gen. 1.27 and 5.2 "male and female" are found in these sections given to P. However, in 7.3 and 9 when this phrase is found in a J section, we are told that the Redactor did this in order to bring the passage into harmony with P. So the alleged criteria is not consistently carried through.   Every time the critics say that a redactor has ~~inserted a word here~~ done something they weaken the evidence for their argument. When you have a Redactor who can make changes whenever he chooses, you do not have much evidence left that the alleged document really has a distinct style.

Actually the beginning of this whole matter of style in the critical argument began with the enumerative style - ~~was day comes~~ first day, second day, third day - in Genesis 1 together with the fact that the *name Elohim*