

section was written and then the book of Deuteronomy. Hupfeld said all of these had been most cleverly combined. He said the First Elohist and the Second Elohist had been very cleverly joined together and in some places little changes had been made to make them fit together. Then the Jehovist was put in and very cleverly combined with the others. Then Deuteronomy was combined with the others. He said there had been a whole series of redactors, rather than (as Eichhorn would have said) one man who took a section of this and a section of that and a section of the other and put them together. He said that in some cases the redactor had just put them together as they stood, even though they contradicted each other. In other cases, where there were apparent contradictions, he said that the redactor had changed the wording. Most scholars did not follow Hupfeld in this idea, but there were some who did. All agreed that the E section was first. It was the ground or foundation writing, the beginning. Most said there were supplements added afterward. Hupfeld said the E section is first and then comes the Second Elohist. Some who followed Hupfeld said, "No, the Jehovist comes after the First Elohist and before the Second Elohist." So you see, there was a question: Is the order First Elohist, Second Elohist, J, D, or is it First Elohist, J, Second Elohist, D? The second order is the one that was accepted by most. Actually, Hupfeld's view was not adopted by a great many scholars and probably would have been forgotten, if it were not for the next step — the vital step, the one which continued to be followed.

Really, this whole business of dividing books into documents and thinking you can separate out the original documents is highly questionable. At about A.D. 1800 it was done to all ancient literature and much fairly modern literature, but it was beginning to go out of fashion and by 1900 it was used hardly at all aside from the Bible. It is very interesting to pick up the *Cambridge Ancient History* which was published sometime between 1900 and 1920. In its introduction a statement like this is made, that the old idea which so many people held in the last century, that Homer's poems — the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* — were made up of a series of different documents united together is now being pretty largely given up, and it is usually held that there must have been one great mind that composed these and that the