

The question naturally arises how can the critics follow the divine names when it suits their purpose and then throw them out when it does not? Such procedure makes a question on the whole matter.

Another good illustration of the actual incompleteness and serious mutilation of the text by critical methods which are designed to show allegedly continuous narratives is O. T. Allis' discussion of the narrative (Gen. 29.15-30.24) which tells of Jacob's marriages and of the birth of all of his sons, except Benjamin (The Five Books of Moses, pp.25-26)

Chapter 37 begins the story of Joseph as a boy and tells of his life with his brothers and finally how he was sold into Egypt. However, many critics have so divided the chapter that all mention of Joseph is removed from the P document (only verses 1-2a being given to P) and the rest of the chapter is divided up between J and E. The next verse that these critics assign to the P document is found in 41.46, "And Joseph was thirty years old when he stood before Pharaoh king of Egypt. So Joseph went out from the presence of Pharaoh, and went throughout all the land of Egypt." What sort of a continuous document it is that after saying "These are the generations of Jacob" (37.2a) that Joseph is not even mentioned until we read that he was 30 years old when he stood before Pharaoh. How he got down to Egypt and how he ever came to stand before Pharaoh is not even mentioned by P. Certainly this is very far from being a complete document. The next continuation of P (given by all critics except Skinner who finds P in 42.5-6a)) is when we come to 46.6, "And they took their cattle, and their goods, while they had gotten in the land of Canaan, and came into Egypt, Jacob, and all his seed with him: "

It should perhaps be noted that in Harrelson's analysis of Genesis 37 in the Appendix (p.489) he gives verses 1 - 2a to P, ^{but} and verse 2b beginning "Joseph, being seventeen years old, was feeding the flock with his brethren; and the lad with with the sons of Bilah, and with the sons of Zilpah, his father's wives: and Joseph brought unto his father their evil report." Harrelson gives to E. However, in his discussion given earlier in his book (p. 37) Harrelson appears to give all of verse 2 to P which would include the reference to Joseph being a lad of seventeen but Harrelson admits "P's continuation of the story is not preserved". This incompleteness of P must be kept in mind when one reads another statement by Harrelson (p.39) that "P must itself be considered a narrative of Israel's early history, from the creation to the death of Moses." It is hard to understand how anything this incomplete could be considered a narrative, much less a complete narrative.

If, as some have maintained, each of these stories is absolutely complete originally and certain parts of one were selected and certain parts of another were selected and these then supplement one another this amounts to dropping the whole argument from continuous narrative, which was one of the four original arguments for the documentary hypothesis. Kuhl says that the unknown writer or redactor who combined P with J and E "did not accept the material in its entirety are he found it and simply string the sources together: His task was to supplement, at his own discretion" Although this redactor attempted to incorporate as much as possible from the older sources, Kuhl contends that this did not hinder him "from selecting from the other sources or abbreviating them where necessary." (The Old Testament Its Origins and Composition, p. 78) But if the redactor "abbreviated" his sources he did not preserve a continuous document.