

(p. 13, footnote).

respectively. " However, he continues with this qualification, "but it is only in a comparatively small number of instances that this distinction can be applied without great artificiality to

ft.-note

explain the variation between the two names in the Pentateuch (ibid. p. 13, footnote).

Although Driver explains the vast majority of the instances where there is a variation in the divine names by multiple documents, the suggestion that Elohim and Yahweh have better justice to the outstanding example of varying names for God at the beginning of

Genesis than the explanation of multiple documents. Thus, in Genesis 1.1-2.4a, "Elohim" is used as the God of nature whereas "Yahweh" is used

in what follows to express the personal revelatory God as He dealt with Adam and Eve. The suggestion of different connotations for "Elohim" and "Yahweh" provides a reasonable hypothesis in the most striking

example of varying names for God in the Pentateuch. The reader is urged to try this explanation in other instances where variation of the divine names occurs.

Although it may not hold in every case, other hypotheses should be tried (such as the avoidance of monotony in style by varying the divine names) before necessarily appealing to multiple documents.

The Multidocumentary Theory. The Multidocumentary Theory is eaten through with inconsistencies in its explanation of the varying names for God and should be rejected.

So many that it should be employed only as a last resort.

2. II. Can JEEDP be Distinguished by Other Stylistic Criteria?

The varying names for God is only one among hundreds of stylistic criteria which are used to distinguish the documents in the ~~Multi~~ documentary ~~theory~~ hypothesis.

In the following discussion, these criteria will not be taken up separately, but several outstanding difficulties of