

7 7. It is often declared that the theory can be demonstrated by showing differences of style between the documents. Yet these alleged differences mostly settle down to the fact that certain parts of the Pentateuch are statistical or enumerative, while other parts have more of a running narrative style. There is no reason why the same writer^r should not use both styles, depending on the nature of the particular subject matter. Thus we have an enumerative style in Genesis 1, where the formation of the material universe is set forth in definite stages. For the subject matter of Genesis 2, which describes in more detail the creation of man and the formation of a proper habitat for his life, the narrative style is more fitting. There is no reason why the same writer should not use both styles. Similar instances of the use of ~~two~~ styles at least as different as these ~~two~~ could be found in the works of almost any extensive writer of recent days.

8. The names given to two of these documents are generally based upon the allegation that the so-called J document uses the name JHWH (LORD in the King James Version) for the deity, while the so-called E document is said to use the name Elohim (God in the KJV). ~~It is also alleged that the so-called P document uses the name~~ Yet, actually, in the first four books of the Bible each of these alleged sources uses both divine names, and in both sources the name JHWH is far more common than the name Elohim. It is also alleged that the so-called P document uses the name Elohim; yet in the first four books of the Bible the P source uses the name JHWH far more frequently than it uses the name Elohim.

9. The claim of constant duplication of material in the various alleged sources is grossly exaggerated.

10. Most of the alleged contradictions between the so-called sources disappear on careful examination.