

with the addition of about ten smaller fragments inserted here and there.

There was, of course, nothing new in the idea that sources might have been used by the writer of Genesis. Whenever a man writes a book about matters which he has not personally observed, it is reasonable to assume that he has used sources. The new element in Astruc's approach was the idea that these sources had been incorporated almost without change and that it was possible to disentangle them and to determine just what parts of the book came from each source. The clue that Astruc suggested was the use of the divine names. It had long, of course, been realized that in Genesis 1:1-2:4 God is designated by the word Elohim, the general term for God. In the next two chapters, this term is always combined with the specific personal name for God, which is represented as Jehovah in the American Revised Version, and this name is frequently used alone thereafter. (I will not here enter into the problem of pronunciation of this name since we have no definite proof regarding it. Many feel that it was pronounced Jahwe. A few years ago, it was widely held that the original pronunciation was Jahu. The Authorized Version renders it as LORD with large capital letters, while the Revised Version translates it throughout by the hybrid form of Jehovah. In lack of any certainty of its proper pronunciation, I will call it Jehovah for the present.

It had of course been long recognized that there was this difference between chapter one and chapter two of Genesis. It was interpreted as meaning that the author in chapter one was dealing with God in His relation to the universe, and hence used the generic term, while in chapter two He was speaking specifically of God's relation to mankind and hence used the more personal intimate name. Astruc suggested