

Lord, but I think we need some Christian leaders who can come with an open mind to look at a thing and to see what the facts are and to learn to point out that the facts point in the one direction rather than the other. You can not do that unless you know clearly what it is and can look at it with an unprejudiced eye. In this course I am very much interested that you know the difficulties of the critical theory, but I am still more interested that you know what the theory actually is. And so this second argument, the continuous narrative argument, is a very strong argument if it works out.

If you find “Lord” in small letters we are not now interested, but if you have in the Revised Version in capitals “LORD” that represents Jehovah. It is the Hebrew word representing a proper name, the name of God. Note the alternation of these two names. Do not pay attention (except in parenthesis for the sake of completeness in your list) to cases where it is “God of something or other.” See the alternation of names. Between Gen. 1:1 and 2:3 you never have Jehovah. Then you begin to see Jehovah God. Here God is not a title. It is just saying that Jehovah is God, the same God as mentioned in Chapter one.

After a couple of chapters it stops saying Jehovah God, you are used to it then and you understand that He is God, and thereafter he called Him simply Jehovah on through. Hardly ever again do you see Jehovah and God together. Go through and look at the alternation.

You can go through the book of Genesis in your list and see if you have two complete stories. If each gives a complete story, it is a mighty strong argument for saying we actually are able to separate out the sources that Moses used, but if it is not a complete story, then this argument does not work out. It is a thing which is worth investigating. Do we have a complete story in each of these alleged documents?

c. *The Argument from Parallel Passages.* The third argument is even more important than the second argument. It might be possible to have two sources. One man could describe the world war and tell what happened and another man could describe it and they would follow substantially the same order but each would tell it in his own