very difficult to tell, and J uses the Lord and E uses God and they are so very hard to tell. / K of course also uses God , but-the- as you see this original part of God and Lord is not much used as a ei- criterian for division any more. Well, it is that way for most of the arguments of the theory. Most of them go a certain distance but they don't go far enough to really prove anything. It is sort of like them man I knew who fe had a creek he-wah he wanted to jump across and he made it across in two jumps, well that doesn't keep him from getting wet. You can have a dozen arguments, no one of which proves a thing and you put the whoe dex dozen together and it doesn't prove it. Each of these arguments shows a certain number of interesting things that make you wonder what is thre real meaning. And God wants us to study into the scripture and find what He has revealed and what He really means by these things but instead of Ahis we take this theory and this looks a little bit that way and this looks a little that way but no one of them goes far enough to reapp really prove k what is set out to prove. Now, the arguments for this theory divide naturally into two passages. There are the arguments for the dividing up tax into arguments. Now, you see tethe position that we are in. Here is the Pentateuch. There has be never been any document-which found in ancient times , it would be the J document, of the E, or the C, or the D. If we had these documents, if they actually existed somewhere you could compare them, and say the here is evidence want that this is early, here is evidence that this is later, but you don't have them. You divide them up on the basis of arguments and then you are arrange them on-the that basis, and so you are argumi arguing in a circle to quite an extent. Now the critics differ as to what is J and what is E very very much , but they arg - ardently agree on x what is f^+