

names are arranged in this way give us a clue to division into two main sources which Moses used? But what I am interested in at present is being sure that you know what the claim is. The early church fathers noticed the variation between God and Jehovah in Genesis, and they said that God is the name for God in the general sense, as the great omnipotent Creator, the One that deals with the universe. They said that when you get into chapter two and you start talking about God's specific relation to man it is quite natural to use the name Jehovah. The translation LORD does not really give this idea, perhaps because Lord is the one you obey. Actually Jehovah means the One Who has the personal relation with you, the One Who redeems you, the One Who helps you. It is the covenant name for God in relation to Israel. Personally I liked the usage of Jehovah in the American Revised Version, and am sorry that it did not win acceptance and will doubtless disappear from use. I like it because it does not convey that it is simply His mastership that is stressed here. He is the LORD, but that is not the fundamental meaning of this word. Our Authorized Version put it LORD in capitals. The American Revised Version translated this Hebrew word as Jehovah. They said, when it deals with man, it used the intimate personal name, Jehovah, and then when it speaks of flood waters overflowing the universe, it naturally used God, the name showing Him as the great powerful One. Then when He speaks of His relation with Noah, helping and blessing Noah, it naturally reverts to the name Jehovah. There are many cases where there is no particular reason to use one or the other and then it is quite natural to keep on using the name you have been using. Often it does not matter which you use, you are simply referring to God without a stress on one aspect or the other.

We will look into this in much more detail later. Here I am just pointing out that the early fathers faced this problem and they said, "Here is the answer." It is sometimes emphasizing one aspect or the other of God's Being.

The critics of the development that became so strong insist that it shows that one document called God by this name and another document called God by that name and you can separate them out using this factor as an important key.