

It is important to examine the four arguments for partition. We shall now examine the first of them.

*A. The Argument from Divine Names*

Astruc's clue was the fact that he noticed the difference in Divine names and suggested that it points to a division of documents. Eichhorn also made a great deal of it. It came first chronologically. By this I mean two things. The first is that the chronological development of the criticism was to so great an extent based upon this that it is hard to imagine that the criticism could have developed without it. It had a vital part in the start of the partition and most people think of this criterion first. It is true that a real scholar who holds to the Wellhausen theory today would probably say that this is merely one of many instances of style and is no more important than any one of the other instances, but the fact is that as the theory developed its literature was filled with discussion of this particular criterion. It has been used more than any other to convince people that it is right. I gave a paper on this subject a year ago before the Oriental Club of Philadelphia. In the audience there were professors from the University of Pennsylvania and from various other universities, including practically every theological seminary within forty miles. In the discussion that followed more attention was given to this than to any other. Those who were strongest in insisting that my denial of the critical theory was wrong put their whole emphasis on the fact that the name "God" is used from Genesis 1:1 to 2:4 and then the title "LORD" for the next three chapters, and that some sections use one divine name and some the other.

There you have a problem. How are you going to answer it if you do not say that you have sources?

These men included two professors who had been Orthodox Jews at one time. Probably they had given up their faith as a result of the Higher Criticism. To their minds this was the important thing. They were educated, considered as real scholars, but not men who had specialized in the field of the Higher Criticism.