

and of the religion of Israel. But we have seen that the matter of partition is not proven, and we have seen varying weaknesses in the whole method. Of course, this does not disprove that there might have been such a method used. It would have been entirely conceivable that someone should have taken different documents and combined them together, though it is a bit strange that these different documents should exist and we should have no record of them. There is no evidence of their existence, but it is not inconceivable. There might have been such documents and they might have been combined. So even if there is not sufficient evidence to prove partition, that does not prove there was no partition.

You would be very foolish to believe something simply because you cannot prove the contrary, especially since you cannot divide any other ancient document and be sure of your division, unless you have evidence elsewhere regarding it. There is no instance that I know of where anything can be proven which parallels the critical theory of the union of these documents, and certainly not to the whole theory.

Yet, if you would divide it along these literary grounds and then could really see the development along historical and evolutionary lines, that would naturally constitute a strong argument for the reality of partition, so this is doubtless one of the principal motivating forces in leading people to accept the theory. More than that, it is one of the motivating forces which kept the theory intact for so many years. Previous to that, new theories would come up with all sorts of variety as to the order of the documents, their arrangements, and the particular section they belong in. But once you have this development, you have something which is very appealing to the mind that is seeking a natural explanation of things. So it is important that we look at the arguments for development.

The critics claim that the documents, as arranged, show a development and that this development corresponds to the historical facts. Carpenter divides this into the development within the documents as regards to religious *ideas* and the development as regards religious *institutions*. We will look first at the development regarding religious