

Genesis 21:1,2

Genesis 30.22 P, E, J

E knows that Bilhal had two sons (30:6,8) and that Leah had a fifth and sixth son(vs. 17-20a) but says nothing about the birth of the first four. E also knows that Rachel had a son, but does not know his name(vs.20c-22,except last clause which is J). Vs. 23 is generally given to E. J records the birth of four sons of Leah (29.32-35), of the two unnamed sons of Bilah(30.3b-5 (though some make 4a belong to P),7), of the two sons of Zilpah(30.9-13), and apparently the birth of a fifth son of Leah who is said to make six(30.14-16,20b), also the birth of Joseph to Rachel(?) in 30:22c, 24. In short, P records the birth of no sons, E of 14 sons, J of 10 sons. Yet the fact that Jacob had 12 sons including Benjamin(Gen. 35.16-20 which is considered E by most scholars) is referred to again and again in the O.T. and no one knows this better than P in Gen. 35.22b-26), who records the birth of none of them. It is perfectly plain that what each of the three documents needs to complete it and make it intelligible is exactly what has been cut away and given to the other two. And the defenders of the analysis must either hold that each source originally contained all of this information or that the idea Jacob had 12 sons was the result of the attempt to combine traditions which were more of less conflicting and contradictory.

-- Allis, Five Books of Moses, p. 26

Deuteronomy 25.5-10

Three different words are used to describe the unwillingness of the husband to fulfill his obligation: viz. "refuse",v.7

"like(not),v.7.8

"will (not), v.7

Three different expressions are used to indicate the intent of the law: viz. "that his name be not blotted out of Israel" v.6

"to raise up unto his brother a name in Israel" v.7

"build up his brother's house" v.9

Driver, Carpenter and Harford, Addis, Harrelson give the passage to D. But the variations in phrasing and the emphatic repetition are essentially the same as are made the basis of source analysis in such "test passages" as the Flood Narrative. If such a passage as this is not composite, there is no reason why many similar passages should be partitioned by the critics, and no reason for the hairsplitting analysis they so often indulge in.

-- Allis, Five Books of Moses, 68

Gen. 20:18 E

Gen. 21:1,2 1a J, 1b P, 2a J, 2b-5 P

That 21.1b contains "Jehovah" occasions considerable embarrassment, since a P passage prior to Ex. 6:3 should read "Elohim" (The LXX reads Kurios in all three instances )

-- Archer, A Survey of O.T. Introduction, 116

Gen. 33.12-17 J

18 a P

18b-20 E