

the developmental and documentary hypotheses and consider them in some detail.

a. The arguments for partition: (sources)

(1) The Divine Names

This, as well as the other arguments advanced in literary analysis, is virtually unchanged in its idea over the last many decades. Implementation of the idea may vacillate a bit from instructor to instructor.

(a) Statement

The different use of the Divine Names is thought to indicate differing sources of material. (It would be clearer to say: the use of different Divine Names is thought to indicate differing sources of material...not sure why I didn't think of that at first. Although the legends compounded into the present Pentateuch to bind the nation together are well-fused, we can take the individual names for God and by extracting the passages that use that (those) names, we can isolate much of the original material. There may be a few places where the system will not work well for us but a few exceptions will merely test the rule. Conceptually it is not thought likely that a single entity of people could use a plurality of designations for deity. When you separate the designations you will have the different types of people.

(b) Implications

While the foregoing is a bit general it is sympathetically what the critical ideas affirm. The following implications are held and must be noted as follows:

--the names need not be mutually exclusive for the same deity might be involved but identified in unique fashion. This would be occasional.

--the two names may occur in one account for the same god when two sources are used. The people reading the finished product would neither be alarmed nor perplexed by this.. they being far removed from the time when the