

several times the critics assign it to J because it applies this phrase to a female slave. Thus they say that Jehovah has been changed to Elohim “by the redactor”! These are only two illustrations of the many that could be given of the way that the critics are inconsistent!

Every time the critics say a redactor has changed things, they weaken their argument! And the places they say that a redactor has changed things are very numerous! For example, Brightman’s book on the sources of the Pentateuch says the name Aaron is typical of the P document, and does not belong in the J document at all. Yet Aaron is used thirteen times in the J document, according to Brightman. So in each case he cuts it out and he says it was inserted by a redactor! Even if it worked out the argument from words would not by itself be a conclusive argument, but it is important to note that it does not do so. As it is presented it sounds strong, but when we examine the details, we find many places where they have to say that the redactor changed the words. When they do that they really destroy the basis of that type of argument!

4) *The number of individual styles.* The theory does not generally maintain individual writers, but schools of writers. We have not said much about this, but if you look at the many critical books that were written forty years ago, you will find that practically all of them speak of J1, J2, J3, J4, P1, P2, P3, P4, and so on. Today there are some who say that J was a writer of the time of David who was a very brilliant stylist. Most would say that P represents a priestly school. I do not think anyone holds that P is an individual, they say instead that a “priestly school” gathered material, wrote it up, and put it together. How can there be one distinctive style if there are many writers involved? There might conceivably be a tendency in such a school to favor certain words and types of expressions. This possibility does not destroy the argument, but it significantly weakens it.

5) *Scholars disagree about J and E.* Regarding J and E there is much disagreement among critical scholars. Driver’s statement above is perhaps as accepted as any, but most will disagree as to the divisions of J and E. Pfeiffer, who wrote *An Introduction to the Old Testament* which has largely replaced Driver in liberal schools, divides J into S