

and that in the same vs., both concluding sentences have no continuing
 pen. Vss. 11-22 belong entirely to J, cf. יְהוָה in v.14 with Gen.28.16
 and אֱלֹהֵי in v.16 with Gen.30.38; vss. 1-10 in entirety to E (אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה).
Whether the name Raguel comes from J, I doubt (1. The father of Hobab
in Num.10.29 is hardly the priest of Midian with his seven daughters in
Ex.2.16ff). Perhaps, J didn't name originally any names; Jethro only
appears to be Jehovist, cf. ch.18.

70'

In ch.3, the parallel passage, in which the name of Yahweh is
 revealed as opposed to Q in 6.2ff, viz. vss.10-15, does not belong to
 J, but only to E, without a doubt. Actually, אֱלֹהֵי appears everywhere
 in the mouth of the narrator- vss.11,12,13,14,15, while this criterion
 from here on steps in more recent periods, quite probably because of
 the fault of the redactor, than the intention of the Elohist himself,
 who appears to have used the general name usually afterwards as well
 as previously (2. יְהוָה in vs. 14 is no longer appropriate at the
 end, since Yahweh himself with justice אֱלֹהֵי in the first person, but
 otherwise he is אֱלֹהֵי in the third person, therefore, אֱלֹהֵי. As to the
 question, what his name is, God answers, "I am- since I am. Thus shall
 you say to Israel; He is has sent me to you." Thus, after Ibn Ezra.).
 In 3.1-9, scattered traces of E are also found, as in vs. 4, the sentence
 following the athnah with the characteristic call in the vocative (before
 the actual conversation) and the with the answer אֱלֹהֵי, cf. besides, Elohim
 after the previous Yahweh. Vs. 6 is connected to vs.9 (אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה).
 In addition, J chiefly lies at the base (cf. vs.8), just as again in
 3.16-4.17, although the motive also comes from E, e.g. 3.21f (11.1-3),
 4.17. One must however observe: in such speeches of Yahweh the Jehovist
 takes more liberties and composes rather independently with the use of
 his own pattern. Certainly 3.16-18 (cf. vs.18 אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה with

!?!
!?!