

names of God being the decisive point. The occurrence of the names in Genesis is the factor that sets the earlier and later assignments. In this regard Eichhorn was paying considerable respect to the stated chronology of Genesis.

With the Divine Names as indicators of different source material, Eichhorn further sought some line of internal evidence to support this thesis. He found, as it were, four lines of evidence to show a concurrence for the documentary sources. These four are widely recognized today and while supplemented by some modern critics, are virtually unchanged in idea over the years. They are:

(a) the use of Divine Names.

(b) the evidence of continuous narration.

The thought is that when the passages are separated on the basis of name, there is a continued and relatively complete account in each.

(c) parallel passages...the repetition of ideas in the existing document suggests the combining of two accounts.

(d) style...each source will be seen as having a distinct system of expression that characterizes itself in distinction with the other sources.

We will discuss these later when we analyze the critical notations.

(3) Illgen (1786-1844)

We do not attempt to mention all the men who put energy into these theses but Illgen, as a very inventive thinker, editor, publisher, etc., made a contribution that was indirectly helpful. He proposed a fragmentary hypothesis in which the Pentateuch was a combination of many small fragments. He saw at least 17 separate sections in Genesis and assigned them to three authors: E-1, E-2, and J. He was still following the chronological ideology of Eichhorn and gave--without intent--the obvious proposition that the more fragments suggested the less obvious the style or deducible guidelines for identification.

Working in similar style was Geddes, a Scots Catholic, who carried the work to the entire