

pretation here should be “I appeared unto Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob by the name of God Almighty, and by the name Jehovah was I not known to them?” Since he is the only man I know of who has advanced that theory, I do not think it is necessary to feel that it is correct. It might be correct, but in the view of most conservative interpreters, the translation is accurate, taking the word know in a stronger meaning of “realizing the characteristics to the full, having an intimate relationship with one rather than simply an acquaintance with a name.” At any rate, whatever the true interpretation (and this one seems entirely satisfactory to me), it is the one that the writings of Dr. Green and Dr. Allis both contain and each of them gives supporting evidence of it. Whether it is the correct interpretation of it or not, certainly no contradiction was felt to be here in ancient times.

6) *All admit that there is a difference between the names.* It is admitted by all that the names are sometimes used with a special reason. From the critical viewpoint, J always uses Jehovah, E and P always Elohim, but from the very beginning of the J document in Genesis you have the name Elohim used twice. What is the explanation? There are two possible explanations. Some will say, “In that case, the writer did not think it proper to put the sacred, covenant name, Jehovah, into the mouth of Satan so he uses the general name, Elohim, recognizing the difference.” Others will say the original writing must have had Jehovah, but that the redactor who put them together did not think it fitting that Satan should use the name Jehovah and so changed it to Elohim. In either case it is recognized that there is a difference in meaning between them. There are cases where one name occurred in the document supposed to have the other where that statement will be made. Actually you cannot separate them consistently simply on the basis of the names without mutilating the documents beyond recognition at many points. To avoid that in some places, middle sections are taken out, but in other sections they say the redactor changed it – but why did he change it unless there is a difference in meaning? In other cases they say that the original writer used the other name for a special reason. Thus it is recognized that there is a difference in meaning between the two. Driver admits that there is a difference and that sometimes they are used with a difference, but he says that in the great bulk of cases this does not apply.