

considered as composed of two original writings, the beautiful simplicity of the theory was largely destroyed, and the probability of being able to show the existence of a complete document that had formed the basis for the Pentateuch was greatly diminished. Hupfeld said that in the E document, even with the removal of the second E document as well as the J document, there was a complete story, and that this was also true of the second E document, from Genesis 20 on, though it did not go back to the creation. He made much of this claim, but it is easy to see that this would be much harder to prove after the removal of his second E document.

Of course the parallel passage argument would fit with Hupfeld's idea. That argument would not be weakened by his idea, but the argument from style would be. If you have this long E document, running all the way through Genesis, from Genesis 1 on, and including half or more of the material in our book of Genesis, it provides enough material to determine exactly what type of style that document uses. But when you divide it into two parts you have far less material and it is much more difficult to determine a definite type of style. Then Hupfeld said, what we have thought of as one document is really two different documents, and the style of one of them is actually more like that of the former second document than like that of the other part of this one. This would seem to cast doubt upon the whole claim to determine the existence of different documents here by alleged differences of style. Hupfeld said that his second Elohist was so much like the style of the Jehovist that they could scarcely be distinguished, except for the difference in divine names. What does that do to the previous argument that the whole J document had a style that could easily be distinguished from the style of the E document? Hupfeld actually weakened the evidence for any belief that the Pentateuch can be divided into original documents. He tried to strengthen some of its weak points and in so doing he greatly weakened the whole structure, and I think it would have completely disappeared, as so many other theories have, if it had not been for its union with the idea of development — an idea that had had no part in the previous discussions.

Up to this point it had been discussed only as a *literary* problem.