

23.

depending on the subject matter. In the analogy of the trip around the world, the first chapter could easily be "formal and straightforward," briefly listing places visited and expenses at each; the second could be developed "by means of a dramatic plot" as it described interesting experiences while motoring across America. It would be at least as easy to find linguistic differences as in Gen.1 and 2, perhaps easier, since an occasional word in a foreign tongue might occur in the first part.

| p.20
The fourth criterion is called "diverse theologies." This can hardly mean that the theological views of the two chapters contradict each other, for it is said on page 25: "We should stoutly deny that the sources contradict one another." If it means only that one chapter stresses the transcendence of God and the other His immanence; it is my feeling that either of these thoughts about God is incomplete without the other, though I do not feel distressed when emphasis is put on one of them without the other being immediately mentioned. We can hardly expect every chapter of the Bible to cover every aspect of theology. I see no reason on this account to say that these two chapters must originally have been separate accounts of creation.

On pages 25-27 enough errors and weaknesses of literary source criticism are mentioned to seem in my opinion to prove the whole procedure unworthy of confidence. Since the method has been abandoned in general literary studies and does not work out consistently in biblical studies, and since no copies of manuscripts P and J have ever