

the standard textbook in most theological seminaries in the English-speaking world. (It is a very excellently written work. His scholarship is greatly superior to that of Pfeiffer.) But Driver's book is now sufficiently old, that it is no longer the standard one. Yet, on this particular matter there is very, very little change. A few changes that Pfeiffer proposed have not been adopted by other scholars. You will find that at least four-fifths of what Pfeiffer says about the Pentateuch will be the same as what Driver says, and that where Pfeiffer differs from Driver, other scholars today probably differ from Pfeiffer.

Driver begins his discussion of the Hexateuch by showing a difference of style between Genesis 1:1-2:4 and what follows. He tries to show that this style is utterly different from the rest of chapters 2, 3, and 4. As we have noticed, chapter 1 is like a table, a list, or an enumeration, while chapters 2, 3, and 4 are more like personal narrative. There is a noticeable difference in style, but that does not necessarily mean that it is a type of style that requires a different author. After Driver discusses this difference in style he goes on to say that you find this same style used in later portions all through the Pentateuch and that you find the word Elohim commonly used in these sections as far as Exodus 6:3, and that after that they always use Jehovah. He calls this group of passages "the P Document," and says that it has a style that is very different from that of the other portions. Then he says that the parts of Genesis which remain after the separation of P have next to be considered, and declares that these also are not homogeneous in structure, but that, especially from chapter 20 on they exhibit marks of composition. He says they are composed of parts which do not differ from one another in diction and style as widely as does either from P and which have been so welded together that often the lines of demarcation cannot be fixed with certainty. Yet, he claims, their difference can be plainly discerned, and he bases much of this claim on differences in the use of the term God and Jehovah. In fact he even says, "Other phraseological criteria are slight." He says that when you take the P material out, the phraseological criteria to distinguish different documents in the rest of it are slight, aside from the criterion of a difference in divine names.

So you see that this argument still has great importance even though