

that this was not the reason, but that there were different sources which used the different names, and that these had been combined exactly as they stood.

Little attention was paid to Astruc's book for a quarter of a century. Then Professor J. G. Eichhorn of the University of Göttingen advanced a similar view, but did not confine it to Genesis. On the basis of the difference between the first two chapters of Genesis, he claimed to be able to separate two distinct original documents running clear through the Pentateuch, one characterized in Genesis and early Exodus by the use of the word Elohim, and the other by the name of Jehovah. Other scholars using a similar method began finding evidence of more and more documents until in the hands of Geddes, Vater, and Hartmann the resulting theories came to be known as the Fragmentary Hypothesis. Reaction against this extreme soon set in, and the regnant theory for about forty years was a modification of Eichhorn's position, known as the Supplementary Hypothesis, which held that there was one foundation document characterized by the name Elohim, and a series of later additions, characterized by the name Jehovah. Similar methods began to divide each of these into other documents from which it was supposed to have been made up. De Wette suggested that the Book of Deuteronomy was actually a pious fraud, perpetrated on ^{King} Josiah by the Jerusalem priests, in order to compel centralization of worship in Jerusalem.

In 1853, Hupfeld suggested that the foundation document which used the name Elohim was itself composite, and that much of its contents after Genesis 20 was a distinct document which was actually more like the Jehovah (or J) document than like the rest of the Elohim document.