

CONCLUSION

~~CHAPTER ONE,~~

<sup>^</sup> ~~"A History of 'Higher Criticism'" has shown~~ the conflicting results and absurd lengths to which literary critics had gone, <sup>prior to the twentieth century,</sup> in splitting up writings into hypothetical documents, often composed by unknown writers, <sup>has been demonstrated.</sup> There was finally a reaction against such an arbitrary methodology in general literary studies. However, <sup>Biblical</sup> studies have shown very few signs of retreating

<sup>As shown in (CHAPTER TWO,</sup> ~~Wellhausen's Theory of Development~~ <sup>chapter two,</sup> ~~the developmental history~~ of Israel's religion and religious institutions from primitive beginnings to an advanced level ~~during~~ and after the exile is now seen to be simplistic and highly subjective. However, <sup>since</sup> Wellhausen's ~~theory of development~~ <sup>development hypothesis</sup> largely paved the way for the acceptance of the ~~Multidocumentary Theory~~, <sup>hypothesis</sup> it would seem <sup>justified</sup> to suspect the ~~Multidocumentary Theory~~ <sup>hypothesis</sup> when <sup>its developmental</sup> ~~the evolutionary~~ history is torn away. However, some would claim that the ~~Multidocumentary Theory~~ stands or falls apart from Wellhausen's particular theory of Hebrew religious development, since the ~~Multidocumentary Theory~~ was elaborated in the century preceding Wellhausen. Recognizing the apparent force of this argument, ~~the next two essays, "Do Stylistic Differences Prove the JEDP Theory?" and "Do Duplications Prove the JEDP Theory?"~~ <sup>The next two chapters</sup> show the internal literary weaknesses of the ~~Multidocumentary Theory~~ <sup>hypothesis</sup>. <sup>A fair appraisal of the facts in these essays here</sup>