

tells what Abraham did in Egypt, then the E story tells what Abraham did in Gerar and then the P story tells what Isaac did in Gerar. As the account stands, however, it represents them as three distinct but similar events, which really occurred. Therefore it is a matter of judgment as to whether it is possible that all three events could have taken place, rather than an absolute certainty that three such events could not possibly have taken place, and therefore it only happened once and there are three different accounts of it. But, if so, it would not fit in with the critical theory, because, as we have seen, two of them would have to be in the J document and one in the E, instead of having one in each of the three documents! It could fit very nicely if two of them had the name Elohim and only one had the name Jehovah, but they cannot say that because only one of them uses Elohim in it, and the other two have Jehovah. So it does not fit together. And incidentally, in the one that they assign to the E document one verse contains the name Jehovah. We have already looked at that verse, “for the LORD had closed every womb in the house of Abimelek because of Sarah Abraham’s wife.” And here Addis has a footnote. He says, “For Hebrew Elohim. This verse is an addition by the editor who united the Elohist and Jehovistic documents.” One says LORD instead of Elohim, which proves that the redactor misunderstands the Elohist document which he used, because he forgets that Abimelek had been instructed and leaves the impression that the barrenness was merely in the women.

One of the three stories uses the name Jehovah but only uses it once. The second one uses the name God several times and uses the name Jehovah once. And the third one uses the name Jehovah. So it does not fit together with the argument from divine names. That is a fine example of the type of alleged parallel where you have two contradictory stories which they say are the same event described differently, but we see that it does not really fit with the first argument – the argument from divine names. It does not fit well with it at all.

You would be interested in noticing an interesting footnote in Addis’ book on the *Documents of the Hexateuch* in connection with the story of the birth of Isaac. In his section on “The Priesthood in History and Law,” he claims there is a contradiction between two accounts of the