divide up Genesis into three original documents, which have been interwoven by one or more editors.

3) *The alleged criteria are not carried through consistently.* The average person who has done some study in a liberal school, but has not gone into the theories extensively, as few do any more, might not think it through critically at all. A few years ago a student in a liberal school might have been expected to spend a great deal of time studying the evidences for P and J. Today it is generally taken for granted, and the students come out with absolutely no question as to the "facts," but actually not knowing much about the details. They think that Genesis can be clearly divided into three long, parallel documents which are distinct, and they assume that these distinct documents display very different styles. This alleged difference of style would be a very strong point for the whole argument, if it could be proven. If we could separate all the sections that use Elohim for God from all that use Jehovah, and then would find that the sections that use Elohim always speak of a maidservant as *shiphah*, while those in the other section always speak of a maidservant as *ammah* — if we found that the Elohim section always speaks of "male and female," while the Jehovah section always says "the man and his wife" — if we could carry such features through consistently, it would be a very strong argument for their theory. I am sure that many graduates of liberal schools are convinced such distinctions can be carried through the entire Pentateuch. If you were to spend some time with a person who has done work in this area, but who was beginning to have doubts about it, and you let him select two or three stylistic features said to be typical of each document, one of the things they said are consistent, and look at all the occurrences of these particular features in the Pentateuch, I do not believe you would have much difficulty in showing him that those criteria are not consistently applied.

The critics say that there are three or more distinct documents with recognizably different styles, but when asked for evidence they do not try to prove there are different styles; they assume this and simply ask which verses belong in which document. Thus they say that a use of the word *shiphah* for maidservant instead of the more common *ammah*, is typical of J, and so the passage where it occurs must be part