

clearly early.” But the other scholar would say, “I do not follow your reasoning there. Those points you mention I do not consider dependable at all; they are just later imaginings. But look at these other points. I am sure that these come from an early time and have been handed down correctly.” Thus, each of them was sure there was early material in the chapter, but one thought it was a certain section and the other thought it was a different section. Each was trying to reconstruct the Wellhausen theory to fit the archaeological evidence, while keeping to its main structure, and each of them was reconstructing it in a different way. Consequently, during the last thirty years, the consensus has been greatly disrupted by the attempts of first-class scholars to fit in the archaeological material at various places. The great masses of so-called scholars, who are not really first-hand scholars, but those who simply take over the material taught them by others, keep on teaching the Wellhausen theory as established fact.

We have seen that the arguments for the Higher Criticism do not work out consistently. None of them is adequate to prove the hypothesis that you have here a number of documents that fit together, as the Graf-Wellhausen Theory claims. Not one of them is adequate to prove it, nor do all of them together prove it. The whole approach of partition, which was so commonly applied to all ancient documents a century ago, is now given up except for this one book where it is still applied by the critics. They apply it to many portions of the Old Testament and also to the New Testament.

Actually, the reason it has remained in the study of the Pentateuch is the fact that the Graf-Wellhausen Theory combined it with the idea of development. They claim that they can show through these documents how the biblical ideas came into existence: that there was one God and that Israel was His people, and that God had certain great ethical principles which He demanded. They claim that the evolution is visible before us through these documents, as we see the development from one document to the other. This was said to be especially true of the law, but it was claimed that it could also be seen in the historical documents and in the narrative portion. Thus they claim that this offers an explanation on natural grounds for the existence of the Bible