was used throughout the section. On the other had Gen. 2.4 - 4.26 had a beautiful narrative style and had none of the enumerative and repetitious style of the first chapter. So criticism began with two documents : J and P. Following that any word found in the first chapter was a distinctive word of P. Any word found in chapter two - four was a distinctive word of J. When one takes every word in these two chapters and checks it through in the documents into which the critics have divided the Pentateuch he finds that the bulk of the words are naturally used in both the J and P documents, for after all the use of a different word is not a very good evidence for a different writer, because anybody can use a different word.

The argument from words to prove distinct style has to be used with very great caution if it is going to really be valid. But even using the critics argument the point is that they do not carry it through consistently because in almost every case where they make the statement there will be some other thing in a J passage where they will have a footnote saying that the redactor has inserted P's word about that same word.

Driver in his LOT, p. 14 in discussing the account of the Flood says "the main narrative is that of P, which has been enlarged by the addition of elements derived from J: here, however, these elements form a tolerably complete narrative, though there are omissions . . . " ~~Then Driver has a footnote which says~~ Driver charts Gen. 7.1-5, 7-10"(in the main)" as belonging to J. However, he has a footnote which reads: "For v.7-9 include two or three expressions ("Two and two," "male and female," "God") . . . borrowed by the redactor from P." So in these three verses which Driver gives to J he says that there occur three expressions which he regards as distinctive P phrases. In a passage mainly from J we learn that the Redactor has put in three phrases which really are P phrases. Why would the redactor do that? If he is going to take three verses and change three different expressions in them to fit with P why did he not change the whole thing throughout so that the documents could not be distinguished.