

In relation to the second argument, from continuous narrative, it must be asked if they have a complete document in each of them. It was already admitted that E does not start until Genesis 20. It is not complete, but they say it is complete from there on. That is, they may start at different times and end at different times. Why would you have to have the whole thing covered to have a complete document? For the area covered you could have two entirely different documents, and not have them cover the same ground. It seems very strange that they do completely cover things like that. So the second argument is not as important as the fourth: are there two distinct styles, or three or four, which would clearly have to have written by different authors?

Regarding the third argument (from parallel passages), which can be a significant argument for a distinct document, if you have the same thing told twice and told in such a way that the author did not realize it is the same thing, and they contradict each other, it would suggest that it could have come from two different sources. But, it would not prove two extensive long documents. It is a great argument for breaking up the argument from parallel passages, but unless you have a long series of parallels, it would in itself not prove it. But if you could say, here are three or four styles which are so different that there is no question that different people wrote them, then you would have a very strong argument.

If you could say that there are three or four styles in the text which are so different that there is no doubt that different people wrote them, then you would have a tremendous argument. If proven, it would be far more important than the previous three.

2) *There is no solid basis for establishing a style of distinct writers since no separate document by the alleged writer has been preserved.*

This is a very important point. Regarding the suggestion, made by some, that a comparison between Chaucerian and Modern English is analogous to the language of the Old Testament, it must be asserted that any such statement is ridiculous. Nobody can simply look at a section of Genesis or Exodus and say that they are as different as the English of Chaucer and the English of today. The language in the text