

/2/ It greatly increases the work of the redactor

We might call him a gloss-maker but whatever, every place where a name is out of place is his responsibility. The redactors are not only heroes for their compositing skill but for their leaving us enough clumsy clues to indicate their presence.

/3/ And, ironically, the whole thing assumes the infallibility of the Masoretic text. The authority given to the placement of names is more rigid than the conservative view of inspiration.

/4/ And finally, the treatment gives the Pentateuch a very contradictory touch. Note that while the Pentateuch tracks Israel through the early stages of national pride and development, it is amazing that the Jehovah document would spend much time telling about Jehovah before the flood when the P document would deny that Jehovah was known before the flood. Ultimately along this line, P, the most recent document--and the most highly developed--becomes the least trustworthy.

/5/ Conclusion: Divine Names

To us it seems rather plain and unadorned to say this:

The names of God do not require different authors. Utility, circumstance, and individual choice offer a more realistic explanation of the use of different names. The number of variants needed to explain and rationalize the name usage tends to make the whole hypothesis unworkable and when we see this we think the Divine names argument would fall if studied simply on its own merit. It is the strongest of all, incidentally, but not very impressive when subjected to analysis and belief. When the other points are joined to it the array is somewhat more formidable but the final word is about the same: It is far simpler to believe what the Bible says about itself