

explanation of why varying names are applicable in one case but not another. For instance, Jacob and Israel are names for the same person, but these have never been used to distinguish documents. The "king of Egypt" is also called "Pharaoh" and "Pharaoh king of Egypt" in the Pentateuch; what prevents one from using this variation of titles as a stylistic criterion of different documents?

But one of the most serious problems which the argument of varying names for God has to overcome is its virtual destruction by the ~~Multi~~^{hypothesis}documentary Theory itself! In the history of documentary theories, E and P were at one time part of the same document, which was characterized by the consistent use of ^{Elohim} "God." ~~However, Hupfeld~~ ^{However, Hupfeld} ~~was responsible for the "Copernican revolution of Higher Criticism" in 1853 by splitting this document into E¹ and E².~~ *Split this document into E¹ and E².* E¹ (which later became known as P) retained its distinctive style from J, but E² (later just E) was now claimed to be very similar in style to J although each document used different names for God. The variation of the names for God loses all its bite when E becomes closer stylistically to J than to P (even though this document uses the same divine name as E!).

Since the ~~Multi~~^{hypothesis}documentary Theory gives a very unsatisfactory explanation for the varying names for God, is there another answer? Ironically, S.R. Driver, a proponent of the ~~Multi~~^{hypothesis}documentary Theory, suggests a better case. (In An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament ^{Cleveland and New York:} (The World Publishing Company, 1956),) He states, "It is true that Elohim and Jahweh represent the Divine Nature under different aspects, viz. as the God of nature and the God of revelation

ft. -
note