$V$ As regards $J$ and $E$ there is much disagreement among critical scholars.
A. Carpenter \& Harford give over 65 verses to $J$ which Harrelson gives to $\mathbb{E}$ and Harrelson gives over 98 verses to $J$ which Carpenter and Harford give to $E$. Driver gives over 52 verses to $J$ which Carpenter and Carford give to $\mathbb{E}$ and Driver gives to $\mathbb{E}$ over 50 verses which Carpenter and Harford give to J. Likewise Driver giver close to 55 verses to $E$ which Speiser gives to $J$ and Speiser gives 10 verses to E which Driver gave to J. Von Rad gives nearly 35 verses to $J$ which Carpenter and Harford/give to $E$ and Von Rad gives about 29 verses to $E$ which Carpenter and Fprford give to $J$.
B. Pfeiffer differs from Drifer in that he takes $J$ and divides it up between $S$ and $J$ and he puts the frirst of $G$ nesis in what he calls $S$ and instead of considered $S$ the earliest document he makes it the latest of all.

There is considerable disagreement over the style of $J$ and $E$. For some fifty years from 1825-75 the overwhelming mass of critics were convinced that there was a great foundational writing, the Elohist, and that $J$ was a supplement. Eventually Hupfeld proved that the bupe of the $P$ document in Genesis was actually much like $J$ in style and that the only way you can tell the difference is that P had the name "God" instolad of "Jehovah". Even in P there are two or three passages where they have to say that Jehovah was put in by a redactor. So here is the style of the Elohist and here is the style of the Mehovist and $2 / 3$ to $3 / 4$ of the materiay formerly given to the Elohist was put into a separate document whose otyle was so muph like that of $J$ that you could scardely tell the difference in which the style was uniform and that $J$ was a supplement with a distinct style of its own. Then Hupfeld said that the one into First and Second Elohist Elohist document was to be divided up and the resulting. The First Elohist became $P$ and the Second Eloh/st which was called $E$ was said to be no near $J$ that often it is very difficult to tel? the two apart. Thus on stylistic grounds the differences between $J$ and $\mathbb{E}$ are very difficult to separate out.

