

again in Genesis 26, but this time it is said about Isaac. In these three cases there is a similar event. You have Abraham telling the wife to represent herself as his sister. You have the king taking her. You have God punishing the king for doing this. You have the king criticizing Abraham for having led him into sin because Abraham did not tell the truth about the situation, and then you have the Lord removing the disability which had been done to the king and to his family as a result of Abraham's prayers. These three stories are told in Genesis 12:10-20, Genesis 20:1-17, and Genesis 26:6-11. Driver lays great stress on the first of these accounts in his argument that there are distinct documents. He says that the same story is told twice, that in one case God is used throughout and in the other He is called "the LORD." Actually, however, the first of them has "LORD" used only once. LORD is not used more than once in the story. But in the other case, though you have the name God used ordinarily, you also have LORD used once or twice, so there is not a consistent difference between the two on the basis of the names God and LORD. In addition, in what is said to be the E story, Abimelek is the king and it happened in Gerar; in the J story in Genesis 12, the king is Pharaoh, and it happened in Egypt.

There is undoubtedly a great similarity between the two stories. If these similarities were such as to give absolute proof that the thing could not have happened twice, but that it must be the same story told in different ways, that would be very strong evidence for distinct documents. It is interesting, though, that in Genesis 26 you again have the same course of events and there you find the name Jehovah used in the story so you have two parallels in J. Thus there are three parallels instead of two, and if one of them had the name Jehovah and two of them had the name God, it could be cited as strong evidence for three documents! – the J story, the E story and the P story. But unfortunately for the critics, instead of two of them having Elohim, two of them have Jehovah, and only one uses Elohim. That being the case, it is necessary, unless one will abandon the theory, to say that there are two parallel passages in the J document and one in E, instead of one in E and one in P and one in J.

Of course you know that, according to the critics, the first J story