

Von Rad, Gerhard, The Problem of the Hexateuch and other essays. Trans. 1966

p. 75 Direct quotation, cont'd.:

The Elohist therefore takes a less sharply differentiated theological line, and presents far fewer theological problems than does the Yahwist. He is more nationalistic, and for this reason his presentation, although later in date from a literary point of view, has always been considered more archaic. It is thus no accident that there is no primaeval history in E; the Elohist has preserved the ancient Settlement tradition more faithfully than the theologically bolder J writer, not only in the constituent materials but also with regard to the traditional forms embodied in the main structure of his work.

We agree with Mowinckel that E cannot have begun at Gen. XV.1, and that there must have been some sort of account of Abraham's antecedents by way of introduction. We must, in fact, suppose that the Elohist source was abridged when it was combined with J, J having already given an account of Abraham's migration and of what first befell him in Canaan.

p. 76 We believe, and Noth does not appear to contest this, that the work of the Elohist can be discerned right through from Genesis to Deuteronomy