

- 5.- Modified Documentary Hypothesis - Hupfeld - 1853 - Two main documents with one of them split in two.
    - Very important for the way it fits into the developmental hypothesis.
  - 6.- Developmental Hypothesis - 1865 - Graf--first strong step.
    - Originally: E -
    - J - Combined by supplementation
    - D -
- Hupfeld: E<sub>1</sub>  
E<sub>2</sub>  
J  
D
- (- Graf - complex laws (E<sub>1</sub> of Gen and 1/2 Ex) are, late (i.e., 1/2 of E<sub>1</sub>)
- (- Kuenen - 1869 - All of E<sub>1</sub> is late - New Order:
- |                |    |              |
|----------------|----|--------------|
| E <sub>2</sub> | -  | E)           |
| J              | J) | Present      |
| D              | D) | Terminology. |
| E <sub>1</sub> | -  | P)           |
- (- Wellhausen - 1878 "History of Israel" - Sold the Graf system. "Hupfeld, Graf, Kuenen, Wellhausen Theory" - New Order:  
J E D P

D. - Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis --

- P = priestly document, creation, tabular -- everybody agrees.  
 D = Deuteronomic and other exhortations.  
 E = Elohist - other than P - developed in Ephraim.  
 J = Jaweh
- P - One wonders whether a person doesn't have a tabular style from time to time.  
 D - Why can't a person exhort once in a while - most of Deuteronomy has this style - much of Jeremiah.  
 J) - Narrative, prophetic - very similar, critics differ over division  
 E) except where Jaweh and Elohim names actually used.  
 (Pfeiffer (Howard) - J E D P S
- 2.- Spread of Theory - 1878 - Wellhausen first.
    - W. Robertson Smith, brilliant young Scotchman - 1881 lectured and sold Wellhausen theory to many. Others tried him and dismissed his professorship.
    - Geo. Adam Smith took his place and continued the Wellhausen theory. Germany has to a certain extent rejected it and continued evangelical.
    - Reasons for acceptance--
      - a.- Eliminated supernatural authorship
      - b.- Reason for partition logical
      - c.- Concomitant with Evolution
  - 3.- Development of the laws.--from simple to complex.
 

Three examples (of outstanding arguments)

    - a.- Priesthood--not in J and E documents in Gen. (separate institution.)
      - in Ex.- some references (by redactor, of course)
      - in Deut.- a Levitical Priesthood - gives impression that any Levite may be Priest. So what? Why should details be brought out?
      - P document - infinite detail on priesthood. (In Gen. no need of a national priesthood.)

(over)