

Another problem is the assignment of passages to J and E. There is a great deal of difference of opinion about which passages should be assigned to J and which to E.

G.W. Anderson states: ^{London:} (in A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament (Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., 1959)) "The difference in style between E and J is a subtle one, and easier to sense than to describe or define." ^{(p.36).} Thus, many scholars have

St. note

preferred to speak of the complex JE. ~~The obvious question is:~~ ~~Will the JEDP Theory~~ ^{hypothesis may possibly} lose a document ~~eventually~~ in the merger of J and E, ^{if this trend continues.}

An obvious shortcoming of the argument from style is the readiness with which "fudge factors" are used to support it. In some instances, stylistic features of one document will abruptly interrupt the progress of another document with a different style. How can this be accounted for, while retaining the ^{hypothesis} ~~theory~~ of different documents? The ~~compiler~~ or redactor is the most obvious answer; he has attempted to blend the documents at various points. The lengths to which this explanation is carried is clear from an example in the Flood account. The mention of "forty days" in Genesis 7:17 is given to J, but the phrase in which it appears belongs to P. Of course, the redactor is responsible for the insertion, it is said. But this explanation can be used to remove any and all problems.

~~And it has been.~~ Although it is difficult to remove all the problems from any theory, ^{economy can often be a literary} ~~Ocean's razor needs to be rigorously~~ ^{virtue, i.e.,} ~~applied wherever possible~~ the simplest theory is ^{often} the most desirable (^{the important} assuming it accounts for enough facts).