Henry But Dr. M. even if you say that you cannot carry through consistently, Isn't it strange that this should be the case with Genesis one and two? Doesn't the fact that it the two chapters are as strikingly parallel and yet as strikingly different as by same to my the xnoon a term the says, doesn't tat that go atomy xatomy xx long way toward establishing the theory? Dr. not ready to xxx that it would do so. However, it is not necessary. We can examine these chapters and find that actually the situation within them is very different from what your roommate thinks. First, let us look at the difference of ... Your roommate says that Benesis 1:1-2:4a always uses the name Elohim, and that is correct. He also/said that the end of the 4 YHNH 2:46 always uses the name JEHOVAH. 2xA Now, that is not quite accurate. In chapters 2 2 and 3 so many times we find the work which the King James Version represented as the Lord God or might be put as faptial through YHWH,) as the critics would say Yahweh Elohim, Yhink xfx This occurs in chapters 2 and 3 and XahorekxEiskinxxxAnghardly ever again in the which is use (Bible/ and thouse Thus you have a term plohim wases/so many times the Richerx in chapter one, /Also used in this combination, all though 2 and three. Henry C. I pointed that out to my roommate and he said The man that the redactor -- who combined the two documents -- put the word Elohim after, put the word God after Yahweh in the chapters two and In order to show that the one who was speaking about here was three. Q1. M. the same one that called Elohim in chapter one. That is a reasonable explanation of why a redactor might have made such a combination, but wouldn't it be/equally reasonable toxmax explanation of why the original writer might have done it if one writer wrote all four chapters. Henry C. I never ton thought of that. That certainly a writer sounds reasonable, However, why should the writers have used the name