6. E. Wright states Wee do not know $E$ as a complete source but mainly as a supplementation of $J$, and Frank li. Cross, Jr. has argued persuasively that $P$ $c_{i n}$ no longer be proved to be cuything more than an editing and supplementing of JE ("Exodus" in the Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible

This is the critics dilemme. If the redactor takes care to avoid anything that might degrade the Fathers in the eyes of the reader and he never says anything critical of $A b r=h m, J a c o b$, ur ITo ah then the redactor must have picked what he wanted and left out a lot that he did not want included.

On the other hand it is contended that the compiler wen surdulously impartial and aid not tamper with or seek to harmonize divergent traititions.

Either the compiler and redactor has been busy smoothing over discrepancies (Skinner, Genesis, f. 417n) or "he had no intention of rewriting all the fraIjtions to make them fit into a smoothly consistent theological system. In fact he permitted theological archaisms to stand."(B. W. Anderson, 1966 ed., p. 167)

According to Driver's Analysis out of the 2534 verses in Genesis he gives about 720 to $J$, about 730 to $P$ and $E$ together (the original Elohist). Of the 730 he assigned to $P$ sink $E$, nearly 200 are in the first 19 chapters and practically ali cf those are given to P. Subtract 200 from 730 and got get 530. In Gen. 20-50 there are about 530 verses given to $E$ and $P$ together, with onn-third to $P$. So in the last 30 chapters of Genesis on ?y 775 verses are given to $P$ which originally was the foundation writing and sunnosed to be that upon which the supplements of other documents were added, this $P$ hes been cist down to be the smallest of the three documents. Most of P's material is in a few chapters, and the rest is in tiny fragments scattered throughout the book.

That which is tola in one document often assumes what is told in another.










