

those sections that the name "LORD" and put these here and those there, and then read these right through and have a complete story. And then in addition to that, if you would find that wherever this one said "male and female," that one always said "the man and his wife," and that certain expressions were very common in one and never used in the other, and that a different style was always used in one of them, then a definite difference as to the use of divine names would be one part of style. If this worked out clearly it might be sufficient to demonstrate that we could divide the book of Genesis up into two original documents which were put together to form a book. But when you begin to do this, you find soon that there are places where it does not work out. Consequently they say, "Well, the man who combined them — the redactor — altered it here." Once you begin to say the man who combined them altered them, you are greatly weakening the evidence. The question is, How complete is the evidence? How satisfactory is the evidence? I can say without hesitation that the evidence from style is very, very unsatisfactory. If the theory had stopped at that point, I would ask you to take the book of Genesis and to divide the whole book. Many of you have already indicated in your notebooks the alternation to divine names through the whole book. If the theory had stopped at this point, I would ask you to get a little copy of Genesis which you could get for a few cents from the American Bible Society and paste all the sections that had "God" together and all the sections that had "LORD" together and then compare them and note the phraseology used here and see whether it is used there. Note the type of language here and see whether it is used there and if you could find an absolutely consistent difference, between those two and each of them making sense as it goes through even if they were not complete, I would say that you had good proof. But if you began to do that, you would soon find the real proof was very limited.

Nevertheless, the documentary theory does not stop at that point. (That particular view is held by nobody today, and consequently there is no need of our taking the time to fully investigate that idea.) It is vital, though, that we understand the next feature of the argument. It was not said by Eichhorn that the style of the two is absolutely different all the way through so that on the basis of style you can make a