

The critical use of Ex.6.3 interprets the verse in one way, and then builds a great structure upon that interpretation. But that interpretation of the verse is by no means certain. In fact several other interpretations are equally possible. In reading any other book one would interpret an obscure sentence in such a way that it would not be a glaring contradiction of what had gone before. The verse may be taken as a question "Was I not known by my name Jehovah". Another interpretation is to consider the ~~Behh~~ as a Beth of nature. The preceding men had known Jehovah as the great powerful One, the omnipotent creator, but they had ~~not~~ known Him fully as a redeemer. The great superstructure which the critics build upon their interpretation of this verse rests on a foundation of sand.

When the division is made by the use of the divine names, it breaks down. In the E document the term Jehovah is found, and in the J document the term Elohim is found, etc. No sufficient criterion for making such a division is provided by the use of the divine names.

Moreover there is no reason why one writer might not have used all the names of God just as they are used in the Pentateuch. Why should a man have to use the same name for God in every case? Every such use found in the Pentateuch can be paralleled in the Koran, and that is known to be a unit. In one Babylonian creation story seventeen different words are used for "create". Moses had doubtless good and sufficient reasons for using the divine names in the way he did. They give us no warrant for dividing his work up into different documents.

2. It is alleged that each of the documents can be made to form a continuous narrative, independent of the rest. But attempts