

fairly simple one. We could spend the rest of the year looking at the evidences for Eichhorn's theory to see whether it is true or false, but the development did not stop there. Nobody today believes Eichhorn's theory. It was the beginning of the movement which developed into the views held today. If you do not know something of its background you do not really understand the theory as it is held today. Many of its defenders really understand it very little, because they do not know its background. If you are going to deal with it properly you must know its background, so it is very important to know what Eichhorn believed and how his theory developed, but it is not important to spend a lot of time examining the arguments for and against Eichhorn's theory. It is valuable to see how the later theories developed out of this one and what effect they have on the argument. Do the new forms of the theory make these arguments stronger or weaker? This is a very important question.

Eichhorn may not have known about Astruc's idea, but, after all, it was a rather obvious idea. The real question is, Does it work out? The alternation of divine names had been noted over and over again in Christian history. We have seen what, at that time, was the usual explanation of it. Astruc suggested a different one: anyone has a right to suggest a different explanation for anything. The only thing is, you have no right to insist on one unless you have real evidence for it. We must go to the facts and to the evidence. There are too many people in the world who follow a view simply because their parents followed it, or their teachers have followed it, or they have been told that it would be sinful for them to question it or to consider any other views. One of our great needs is that we examine evidence and see what the facts are and then follow the facts wherever they lead.

Here is a fact: *the alternation of divine names*. Where does it lead? Does it fit in with the interpretations that the fathers had given, or does it prove a diversity of writers? Certainly divine name alternation alone would never prove a diversity of authors.

But Eichhorn suggests three other arguments. And I would like to say this, if you could take the Pentateuch, or the book of Genesis, and you could take out of it those sections that have the name "God" and