

So, they called it E document. E often stands for Ephraim, because this was the people in the North. The tribe of Ephraim in that area gathered the E story. So, the E document at about 750 B.C. - just about the same general line as the J document, except from a different viewpoint. J is anthropomorphic, and E is anthropathic. That is to say anthropomorphic shows God acting as a man. Anthropathic shows God nearly feeling as a man. God grieved, God was pleased, God repented. The term that is used to express human emotional aspect of God rather than to refer to human action in the E document. Now, you can hear they say that J document and E document follow through the same course of events, and you can see these differences between them right through. Actually it is not nearly so simple. The alleged J document starts with Genesis 2, and the alleged E document starts with Genesis 20. The E document is much more than the so called J document. There are many points which E document does not touch upon at all. And in many cases, in order to get the two documents together, they give half of it to J and give half of it to E, where they would say, and something like "he came into the room, and he spoke to the people whom he came to see." They would divide something like this: "he came into the room" belongs to J document, and "and the people whom he came to see" might be from the other document. They are together in one sense: One is from E and one is from J. That way we get a complete historical development. But the story from E is very fragmentary, ... and it starts and the best you can do with it is to start long after ... and J does not start until near the end of it. And in addition to that if you get a book by one scholar which shows you what J has and what E has, and you find that this one is dogmatic on certain areas, in that you will note that in many points what one will give to E the other will give to J. It is very difficult to make distinction between