III The Alleged criteria is not carried thr ugh consistently
If one could take all the sections that use Blohim and put them together and all the sections that use Jehovah and put them together, he could say that in the sections which use Jehovah a maidservant is always spoken of as almah whereas in the sections thet use Elohim the writer always speake of a maidservant as . not elmah. Furthermore, in the sections which use Elohim, the writer alwgys says "male and female" (of animals or of human beings) who were created by God or who entered into the ark. But in the section that uses Jehovah, the writer always uses the expression "man and his wife" when describing his creation by God or his entering into the ark. Now if these and similar usazes could be carried through consistently it would be a most remarkable thing. It would be a strong argament 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.

For instance, Professerralders in his book A Short Introduction to the Pentateuch notes that Chapter 33 of Genesis is ordinarily ascribed to $J$, except for the last two or two and a half verses which are ascribed to $E$. The chapter is ascribed mainly to $J$ because in verses 1,2 and $6 J^{\prime} \mathrm{g}$ word for "iemale slave" is used rather than $\hat{F}^{1} \mathrm{~g}$ word for female slave. To be sure the name Jehovah does not occur at all and the name Blohim occurs in verses 5,10 , and 11 but still the critics give the passage to $J$. One reason they do this is because it uses J's word for "feftale slave". The Divine name, therefore, untifinaliy must have been

