

G.5.9  
(7.4)

Frederick V. Winnett, "Re-examining the Foundations" JBL, Vol LXXXIV, March 1965

(( E was a reviser who neutralized by addition. His modification of the J narrative was by supplementation, not by alteration. pp. 6-7))

Winnett says the JE hypothesis reduces "this masterpiece of literary art" ( Genesis 27) to a shambles, to mere literary rubble. (p.8) He says Gen. 31 provides another instance where the JE hypothesis is misleading.

Argument from Divine Names

. . . it must be admitted that the occurrence of Elohim in a non-P passage does not automatically stamp it as being from E. A writer who normally employed YHWH might be led by the nature of his story, or of a particular episode in his story, to use Elohim instead. Thus the occurrence of Elohim in the story of Jacob's dream at Bethel in ch. 28 is not necessarily a proof that the story is from E. The choice of divine name is clearly dictated by the fact that the author is trying to explain the origin of the place name Beth-el. (pp. 8-9)

p. 10 An examination of the E material in the Jacob story thus reveals that it is neither sufficiently extensive nor of such a character as to warrant the theory that a complex E version of the story once existed.

p. 12 I have already tried to demonstrate that the theory of two parallel documents, J and E, running throughout the Abraham and Jacob stories is without foundation. Sandmel has justly castigated the effort of scholars to divide the stories in the Pentateuch into J and E strands as inspired by "parallelomania."<sup>19</sup> If one approaches the Abraham and Jacob stories unencumbered by the JE hypothesis, he soon discovers that what he is faced with is a basic document which has received supplementation. ((Winnett believes in the possibility of separating these oral additions from the basic narrative))

<sup>19</sup> JBL, 80 (1961), pp. 105-22.