

- three birds, sacrifice - Gods, hungry, gather like flies.
- Man made a god by Powerful God as he never dies.

Friedrich Dalesh - modernist - said this account far superior to Bible because of compassion for dying man.

Notice! Babylonian story corresponds to flood story as it stands and not to one or the other of the documents! Very important!

-
- D.- Argument from differences in style - J & P differ like Chaucer and modern English.
- 1.- Division of P & JE - a point of style to separate, but now joined. (Now: division on basis of subject matter only.)
 - What does style mean in the face of this? - Baloney.
 - Syntax, morphology, dialect - all OK.
 - Ray Standard Baker - "Treatise on Social Science"
 - changed name to
 - get off book on travel
 - stories of easy going
 - style - David Grayson - "Travels about the Country"
 - A lawyer has two different styles - contracts and letters.
 - 2.- Words used by one author. -- Tall and short people division. No documents preserved written exclusively by these writers.
 - a.- Authors do have shifting vocabularies.
 - b.- If you divide up on basis of listing and not listing then there will be a division.
 - c.- We have no separate J book or P book! Therefore no basis for judgement.
 - 3.- Alleged criteria not carried through consistently. (Redactor changed names. (- To keep within the theory.
 - 4.- The theory doesn't maintain individual writers but schools of writers (as held by most critics.) Pfeifer of Harvard holds this line as well as most critics.
 - 5.- Distinction of various styles in a document is extremely difficult and certainty is almost impossible. Try it on Roosevelt's speeches. The Higher Critical System first applied to classical writers - 1800. Then tried on modern writers-- Goettig's "Faust" picked apart. Prologue into parts written in old age and parts written in youth. Later found original document proving all early. System discredited but nonetheless extended to the Bible. Wellhausen's uniting it with the theory of evolution really established it. No longer applied to any other ancient documents. Attempts to fill in gaps in old documents of a line or so are only 1/5 successful. How much more intelligence is needed to partition Old Testament?
- E.- Conclusions regarding arguments for Partition
- 1.- No solid basis upon which to make partition. No historical evidence of separate writers or schools of writer.
 - 2.- Similar methods could divide any book. (Pent. and O.T. has special repetition).
 - 3.- Method applied here cannot stop with a few main documents. Logically each of them proves in turn by the application of same methods to require subdivision into a number of smaller documents. Ezekiel once (1910) held even by rankest critics as a unit. (1924) 6/7 regarded as editorial supplement-Pfeiffer This shows the process goes on and on indefinitely.