

enough, the redactor who combined them was unaware of the theory of the E document and of the P document that the name YHWH had not been used before the time of the call of Moses, and therefore he simply kept whatever name he found in each of the three documents. In fact he must have been a very obtuse individual indeed, because, according to the theory, he included in his combined manuscript the statements in Exodus 6:3 which, they claim, sharply contradicts every use of YHWH prior to that time, and declares that the name had never been known until then.

I hope that the above statements will make clear the utter unreasonableness of the critical theory regarding the use of divine names in Genesis and early Exodus, and the illogical nature of the deductions. The deductions drawn in the early years of the last century were far less illogical; their idea of documents having become established, Wellhausen and his associates simply reversed the order of documents while keeping the same theory as before, not realizing that this made the whole idea rather absurd.

ORIGIN OF THE NAME YHWH

It is claimed by the supporters of the multi-documentary theory that the difference in the use of divine names between J, E, and P reflects a different idea as to the time when the name first came into use, and that this shows itself in a sharp contradiction between certain specific statements. Thus it is claimed that the J document considers the use of the name as beginning in Genesis 4:26, while the E document represents it as first given in Exodus 3:14, and the P document Exodus 6:3.

Genesis 4:26 reads as follows: "And to Seth, to him also there was born a son; and he called his name Enos: then began men to call upon the name of the LORD."