

the Graf-Kuenen theory received (acquired) its definitive form. Nine ~~years~~ ^{form} later Julius ~~Well~~hausen presented the theory in almost exactly the/~~for~~ in which Kuenen and Graf had worked it out, but did so in a beautiful ~~g~~ German style with a compelling presentation that fit exactly into the general atmosphere of liberal scholarship of the day, and began to sweep the other theories into the discard. Thus the theory, while based to some extent upon the philosophical and historical ideas of such men as Rauss (sp?) and Vatke (sp?), so ~~a~~ far as the literary ~~theor~~ theory is concerned, represents actually the working out of three men, Hupfeld, Graf and Kuenen, with a minor amount of alteration, but a great contribution in his cogent presentation by Julius ~~Well~~ Wellhausen. So it represents the ideas of a few men worked out over a comparatively small (short?) period, and cannot be said to be the result of intensive research on the part of a great ~~num~~ number of men over a period of 200 years two hundred years.

Actually these are the bases upon which the theory is generally presented today. Usually, even in rather scholarly books, there is a rather brief and superficial presentation ~~f~~ of certain arguments ~~which do sum~~ which summarize some of the bases that were originally presented by its supporters. Pressed into active debate or discussion of it, those who hold it would doubtless go back to these same bases, for there is really no other on which to found it. Consequently we shall look These bases can be quite well summarized as four main arguments. First, that a clue to the division can be found from the two particular names for God in different sections use of/various names for God of the Pentateuch; second, that when the four documents are divided out each of them is said to be a continuous and practically complete narrative; three, that the documents parallel one another, and with substantially the same story told in a different way, and with greatly contradictory and conflicting detail in the various

documents; and fourthly, that the style of the documents so differs as to necessitate the idea that they were originally distinct ~~documents~~ documents. We shall examine these four arguments ~~in~~ in full, starting in our next chapter with the argument from divine names.

*Conform
first
second secondly etc*

[Faint, illegible text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page]

2. The Result of Sixty Years of Intensive Study by Scholars

Recently a professor of English in the University of ~~of~~ who had been assigned to teach a course in the Bible, and was presenting as fact the ideas of the once independent existence of the documents J, E, D and P, asserted that the reason he did so was because that it was the result of the last fifty fifteen years of intensive study by scholars.

I don't know how often this particular statement is made. I doubt that many who write books on the subject would say such a thing because actually it is quite contrary to the fact. The fact is that the theory as presented today in most books that teach it is almost identical with the theory ~~that is taught=be~~ presented by Wellhausen in 1878. There is a small amount of difference about the dates of the documents, and a certain amount of shifting as to what ~~has~~ belongs in each document, but otherwise their view is just about identical with that which was presented then.

(sev. 'presented's')

Furthermore, it can be safely said that no solid evidence has come to light in the last fifty years, or, in fact, within the present century, that makes any (offers?) (provides?) new support of any substantial nature for the theory. Most of the new evidences that have come to light actually point against the theory rather than in its favor. The theory does not represent intensive work of scholars in the last sixty years, but has simply been passed on almost identically as presented nearly ninety years ago by M Julius Wellhausen.

3. That the Theory is the Result of the Intensive Research of Scholars during the Last 200 Years

This statement which is found in a number of recent books comes nearer to the fact than the other, but it also is very far from the actual situation. The fact is that during the period when divisive theories and intensive source study led literary scholarship in general up a blind alley, many such approaches were made to the Old Testament. Most of these started on the basis laid out by ~~Axx~~ Astruc

A third argument found in recent books is the claim that the theory represents the consensus of opinion of all trained scholars. Actually this is now the most commonly used argument. It would be quite safe to say that most people who have accepted the documentary theory today have done so on the basis that "it is what all scholars believe," or that it "is so obvious that all scholars accept it," rather than because of any carefully detailed analysis or examination of evidence.

Yet this ^{argument} is really far from solid. As a matter of fact, the agreement was never absolute. There have been many differences of detail. In case after case a verse which one scholar declares to be "very obviously the peculiar style" of a particular document is attributed by other equally scholarly books to a different document. In examining the precise division into documents given in many recent books dealing with the critical theory, we have not been able to find any two books of scholarly type that have exactly agreed as to which verses they would attribute to each document, even though in general following very closely the lines laid down by Wellhausen ninety years ago.

It is not true to say that all critical scholars have accepted this theory. Most of the older scholars, many of whom were highly esteemed, including such men as Dillman, Baudissin, and others, never accepted it. Such a man as Professor Theophile ^{J. Meek} of the University of Toronto states in the introduction to his book that he always had great question about certain vital features of the theory. Today a large group of Scandinavian critics completely rejects the theory.

Essfeldt 4-5 p. 166

*C. A. Nord in OTMS, pp. 44-83
Harrison, p. 33*

*S. H. Hurler, "The Pentateuch"
Bible Com p. 170
E. Nielsen, "Oral Tradition" (1954)*

As a result of archaeological developments of recent years many of today's scholars, even while holding to the theory in general, suggest very important reservations or revisions.

In this connection it is interesting to note that of the books that have

One of the types of parallels which is very frequently present in the critical discussions of the ~~Book of Genesis~~ books of the Pentateuch is the type where successive verses or parts of verses or groups of verses are separated out and put into two distinct columns, and then it is alleged that there were two parallel stories of the same event but contradicting one another. This type of alleged parallel appears first in the story of the flood which we shall discuss at length.

Among the various parallels of this type one of the most interesting is the story of Jacob's departure from his father's house. It is claimed that here there are two distinct stories, each of which gives a different reason for his going.

Actually the situation requires the material in both alleged sources to make a full account of the event.

The story ~~x~~ tells how Rebecca succeeded in persuading Jacob to make a visit to ^{Mesopotamia} Aram---Naharaim, where her relatives lived. One of the alleged parallels ~~xxx~~ tells how she persuaded Jacob to go; the other tells how she persuaded his father, Isaac, to let him go.

In a patriarchal society, such as that described in Genesis, both of these ~~xx~~ steps were necessary. A young man could not simply pick up and leave home without his father's consent, nor, on the other hand would it be easy to persuade a wilful young man like Joseph to go on ~~at~~ a long journey if he were not convinced of a ~~satisfactory~~ satisfactory reason for doing so.

Rebecca herself had two reasons for wanting to send ~~Jak~~ Jacob to Mesopotamia. It is not at all strange that one person would have two motives for an action. Very frequently individuals have a number of reasons before they reach the point of performing an action. Rebecca doubtless was very sorry to see her favorite son going away from home. Yet to her there were two very ~~strong reasons~~ strong reasons for wishing him to do so at this time.

The first of these reasons was of course her fear for her son's life. She knew that Jacob, with her help, had done a very mean thing to Esau in pretending to be Esau and thus leading Isaac to give him the blessing that Isaac desired to give to Esau. This was a mean (contemptible?) and underhanded scheme. It is true that it was God's will that it (the blessing) should go to Jacob. This has already been revealed before the birth of the children. Yet Rebecca wanted to take things into her own hands and make sure that Isaac would not be able to change divine plan and thus prevent the blessing from coming to her favorite son.

It is easy understandable that Esau would be extremely angry at Jacob for what he had done. Esau seems to have been a good-hearted fellow, but rather hot-tempered, and it would not be at all strange if, in a fit of temper, he might proceed to violence and Jacob might lose his life. The best thing was that Jacob be sent away for a time until Esau should cool off.

The other motive in Rebecca's mind was her own fear that Jacob would do what Esau had already done, ~~that is~~ that is, to marry one of the Canaanite women. Rebecca was extremely anxious that Jacob should marry one of her own relatives, and wanted to send him up to Mesopotamia in order that he should do so. However, this is the sort of thing in which careful, dextrous ~~action~~ is often necessary. Rebecca had two

motives for sending Jacob away. We do not know whether either of these motives alone would necessarily have been enough to lead her to take the step she did. With both of them present she proceeded vigorously, but carefully, to bring about what she desired

The account tells us how ~~the~~ Rebecca spoke to Jacob and gave him the argument that would appeal to him. ~~He~~ He knew that he had cheated his brother and he knew that Esau was hot-tempered. It would not have been at all strange if Esau would proceed to violence and perhaps, without intending it, would cause Jacob's death. It did not take much arguing on Rebecca's part to lead Jacob to see the wisdom of getting out of Esau's way for a time.

Suppose, however, that Rebecca had come to ^{Jacob} ~~Esau~~ with the other motive. Suppose she had said, "Jacob, ~~if~~ I'm afraid that if you stay ^{as} ~~here~~ here now, ~~you~~ you will do like Esau has done, and marry one of these ^{ish women} Canaanite ~~women~~; I would like you to go up to Mesopotamia and see my relatives there and find one of them whom you will desire to marry."

A young man in Jacob's situation is apt to wish to make up his own mind on matters of this ~~kind~~ kind. Such an argument would hardly have led him to take the long and unpleasant trip up to Mesopotamia. He probably would have ~~said~~ dismissed the matter in some light way, but to himself he might have thought, "Well, ^{now} why have I not been noticing these women as Esau has. Why should I make the trip way up to Mesopotamia?" Perhaps one of them is much more attractive than I had realized. I will look around a little here ~~here~~ before I decide to go there." Rebecca gave him the motive that would be effective in his case, and did not mention the one that might even have moved him in the opposite direction.

Now the other part of the alleged parallel~~s~~ tells how Rebecca went to Isaac to get him to send Jacob away. Let us suppose that she had gone to Isaac and said, "I think you should send Jacob up to Mesopotamia to visit my relatives for a while until Esau gets over his ~~an~~ anger. It would be terrible if Esau should kill Jacob." We can be sure that Isaac would not have responded favorably to this suggestion. Isaac already was pretty angry at Jacob for what he had done, and Isaac was extremely partial to Esau. Isaac would certainly have answered her, ~~and~~ somewhat like this: "What a foolish idea! Esau ~~is~~ sometimes/a bit given to ~~a~~ temper,~~y~~ but he is certainly not a murderer; he would not hurt Jacob. He might beat him up, and punish him a bit for what he did, and it certainly would serve him right." Isaac probably suspected that Rebecca was involved in the deceit. It would have been rather difficult for Jacob to have carried it all out entirely on his own initiative. Isaac knew how partial Rebecca was to Jacob. If she had come to him with this argument, he probably would have said, "It would serve the boy right, if he should be beaten up a ~~not~~ bit. There's no real danger; let him take his medicine and get over it." But instead of ~~it~~ this Rebecca went to Isaac with the other motive that was very present in her own mind. Isaac himself had secured his bride from the relatives in Mesopotamia. Abraham, his father, had given very strict orders that Isaac should not marry someone from this land, but one of the relatives from Mesopotamia. Now Isaac probably was displeased that Esau had married one of the Canaanite(ish) women. He may well have ~~wished~~ thought already that it would be much better if at least one of his children ^(sons) would follow ~~that~~ injunction Abraham had given. So when Rebecca went to him with this

argument it was easy to find a favorable response.

Thus the ~~whole story~~ material in both alleged sources is necessary to give the complete story. There is nothing contradictory about the two; there are not two conflicting motives, but two motives which were both present in Rebecca's mind, ^{and} one of which would appeal to one of the men ~~whom~~ she wished to influence, while the other would appeal to the other one. The division into alleged sources is quite artificial and without any real basis.

Another illustration (instance) of this that is often cited is the case of the taking of Joseph. The verses that deal with this in Genesis 37 are separated ~~it~~ into two groups and it is alleged that each of them tells a complete story, but that , put together, they contradict each other.

On examining these two stories we find that the alleged contradictions ~~are mostly~~ are mostly based upon having taken a part of the event and given it to one or the other. Thus it is said that Judah tried to protect Joseph from being treated this way in one story, and that in the other story it was Reuben who tried. Actually, out of twelve brothers it would be rather strange if ~~only~~ only one had tried to prevent Joseph from being killed or sold into slavery. There is no reason why both might not have been involved in it. ~~Reuben~~ Reuben suggested he be put into the pit, with the idea that when the brothers were some distance away he would come and let him out. Judah, however, wished to save his life by causing that he be sold into slavery instead of being killed. Reuben must not have been present when they sold him to the caravan that passed by.

The strongest argument for two different stories here is the fact that the people who took him are called by two different names. They

Ishmeelites
 are ~~called~~ called ~~Ismaelites~~, and they are called Midianites. Our knowledge of the various tribes and nations of that day is far from complete. No one knows enough about the ~~x~~ Ishmaelites and the Midianites to be sure that a particular group ~~could~~ could not properly go under both names. If a group of ^{Texans} ~~Ismaelites~~ were traveling in ~~Europe~~ Europe, someone might say, "Here come the Texans." Someone else might say, "Here come the Americans." It would not be ~~at~~ at all impossible that they could be referred to by both terms in the same context.

It is possible that the Ishmaelites at that time, and the Midianites overlapped, so that this particular group might be composed of people who could properly go under both categories.≠/

CHAPTER IV EXAMINATION OF THE ARGUMENTS FOR THE THEORY AS PRESENTED IN RECENT BOOKS

Since many books have been issued in recent years (some of them new, some reprints), assuming the once independent existence of separate documents J, E, and ~~P~~^X, and attempting to interpret the history of Israel on this basis, it is important that we examine the arguments that are now presented for these theories. Before we are through we shall carefully examine the arguments that were originally presented for the theory, and see the case that was made for it eighty years ago. First, however, let us see what arguments are mainly presented today.

It is sometimes publicly asserted that this theory has been established as the result of the last fifty years of intensive research. It is unfortunate that such a statement should be made by university professors presenting courses in the Bible, since it rests upon no factual evidence whatever. As a matter of fact, no research in recent years has added further strength to the theory. As ~~it~~ now presented in most books the theory is practically identical with the view presented more than sixty years ago. No important point in the theory, as generally presented today, can be said to have been originated as a result of any research produced during the last fifty years. Research in the ~~first~~ past half-century mostly has tended to weaken it rather than to support it.

A somewhat more reasonable claim is the ~~statement~~ statement made in Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament,^① that the theory is the result of two centuries of intensive research. At first this argument ~~was~~ sounds very strong. If great numbers of scholars have spent two centuries intensively studying the Bible, and as a result have reached a certain conclusion, this would seem to lend it great weight. However, when we examine the facts we find that this is not at all the way that the theory came into existence. As a matter of fact, previous to 1878 a great variety of views as to the origin of the Pentateuch was held by critical scholars. During the previous century many different

① Von Rad, Genesis, p. 23

Kuhl, G., The O.T. Its Origins and Composition, p. 52

Anderson, B.W., Understanding the O.T., pp. 12-13

Freedman, D.N., "Pentateuch" in Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible, p. 723

Supers, C.A. "Growth of Hexateuch", Interp. Bible, p. 190

60 yrs -

theories were advanced, some of which had a rather long period of acceptance by a large number of scholars, while others were soon discarded. Any history of the development of the Documentary Theory will show that for the greater part of the fifty years before 1878 the dominant view among critics was the so-called Supplementary Theory. This theory was utterly different in nature from the Documentary Theory. In addition it considered most of what the Graf Wellhausen theory designates as the ~~very~~ latest part of the Pentateuch as instead forming part of its very earliest section.

The view that has now held the field for nearly ninety years was actually worked out by a very small group of scholars. It was not accepted by most of the older scholars, but a new generation of younger scholars took it over almost without change. It is not the result of two centuries of intensive research but of the theorizing of a ^{few} ~~small group~~ of talented scholars, who ^{joined} ~~combined (contrived?)~~ a theory of development with a new hypothesis regarding sources, following trends in both these areas that were widespread in 1878, but that have been almost entirely discarded today. Thus the union of these two different groups of tendencies of the time produced a theory that has ^{subsequently} been passed on from decade to decade ~~since that time~~ with comparatively little change.

A third argument ~~is~~ found in recent books is the claim that the theory represents the consensus of opinion of all trained scholars. Actually this

2
"small
group" s
in this
Parag.

During the nineteenth century there was a widespread trend in ~~the~~ literary criticism which lasted ~~a couple of~~ ^{more than} centuries but which has ~~was~~ largely been abandoned today. This trend might be said to have ~~been~~ two aspects. During the 19th century a trend developed in the literary study which became very widespread. This trend was applied to many different types of literary study. In the course of time, however, theories were developed which ~~very~~ ^{vary} greatly one from the other and views change constantly from time to time. ~~And in the same way~~ An illustration will show what I mean.

In 1795 ~~Woch~~ ^{Wolf} wrote his prolegomena to Homer. This noted German scholar in this book introduced the idea that Homer, the writings of Odyssey and Iliad were ~~actually~~ ^{not} by one man but that a number of different sections by ~~w~~ different writers have been combined together to form each of them. ~~Woch~~ ^{Wolf} was a very attractive lecturer and a man of ~~an~~ ^{very} acute mind. Goethe the ~~great~~ German literary figure used to ask ~~Woch's~~ ^{Wolf's} daughter ~~to let him hide behind the curtain so that he could~~ ^{listen to her father's lecture without} ~~listen to her father's lecture~~ ^{not} embarrassing him. He loved to ~~hear~~ ^{hear} these lectures and thrilled ~~in~~ ^{was} ~~Woch's~~ ^{by Wolf's} acute division of the Homeric poems into various sections, ~~that~~ said to have come from different origins. ~~and~~ Later on, however, Goethe said, as he read, reread Homer's writings, he was more and more impressed with the great genius' displayed in almost every line and more ~~and~~ ^{and} more convinced that there could not be any great number of people who could have written such/outstanding material. Furthermore the unity of it/ impressed him greatly that there must have been an organizing mind in ~~the~~ the whole thing.

Other writers, students of Homer, through the centuries developed various theories. The time came/it seemed almost that anyone should still believe that these great poems came from a single source. Early

in the present century the trend began to change. Today while there are still some who think that Homer came from various sources, most writers believe that each of these great epics received its present ~~form~~ from an active ~~organizing~~ organizing and ~~composing~~ composing genius of one great mind.

Wolff's ~~Schiller's~~ methods were ~~used with~~ *applied to* the early writings of most nations.

The ~~theory~~ *S*cholar after scholar advanced various theories, often sharply contradicting one another. The great variety of these theories and the remarkable unity found in many of these works was along this factor in turning the general literary attitude away from this sort of devices, and now it is a large factor in turning the general literary attitude ~~f~~ away from ~~this~~ this sort of divisive analysis. As recently as fifty years ago there were scholars who ~~delighted~~ *d* delighted in the discussion of Shakespeare to explain any oddities in the poems as the results of the incorporation of ~~the~~ material from some previous ~~source~~ source. Today ~~very~~ comparatively little *of this* is done. It tends to be ~~recognized~~ recognized today that even Shakespeare could write ~~poor~~ poor material as well as good material, ~~and that the style of~~ *T*he style of Titus Andronicus and the style of As You Like It are very different; ~~and~~ yet clearly both *comp* from the same *man* ~~man~~. And therefore it is not a very good guide ~~to~~ selecting of the portions from his ~~writings~~ writings which are to be attributed to earlier writings often by unknown author.

In the study of , In all these fields there were sometimes a fair amount of unanimity among scholars as to a particular theory, but rarely did such a unanimity last very long. There is hardly a case, ~~where today scholars~~ aside from the Old Testament, where today scholars ~~would~~ agree that ~~from~~ ancient writings could be divided up into alleged sources, said to have been

en at different times by different authors and interwoven together after each of them had been circulated separately. A dogmatic agreement as to the details of such a divisive theory is practically non-existent today, except in relation to the Old Testament. ~~We~~ *Do* we have a situation in the Old Testament in this regard which is rather unique.

Recent books that present the J.E.D.P. theory usually begin with the claim that there are many contradictions in the Pentateuch. Then they go on to say that there are many repetitions in it. On the basis of this they proceed and also the fact that God is sometimes called God (Elohim) and sometimes the Lord (YHWH), they proceed to advance the theory.

Actually, even if it were proven that there were many contradictions and a certain amount of repetitions this would not establish the theory. Much more would be needed. We will look into those aspects of it later. At present I want to look a little at the claim that is made in most of the books that there are many contradictions in the Pentateuch.

In relation to the claim first I would like to call attention to the fact that the Bible is describing events in a very different background from our own. In a different cultural or material background ~~there~~ there are many things which are not immediately obvious. Usually these things are not explained because they are perfectly obvious to the one who writes. Yet to the one with a different background sometimes they seem to be contradictions or uncertainties. I remember a very interesting instance which illustrates this quite aptly. When I was a student in Germany I took a vacation by spending about a month in ~~Italy~~ Switzerland. There I stayed at a boarding house where the German proprietor and the few guests became quite friendly. We used to sit at the table and discuss various things. It helped my knowledge ~~my~~ of the German language and also added to my understanding of life.

I remember one day at the table telling about an incident I had just read in the paper. It seems that Aman-ullah, the recently deposed king of Afghanistan, had rented a house in Lausanne, one of the most modern cities in Switzerland. The paper told how Amanullah one day came back to the house at a time when there was no one else in it and found that he had not taken his key with him and was unable to get into the house. Being a skilled acrobat he climbed up to a porch on the second floor and went ~~into~~ in through a window. Meanwhile, however, neighbors/^{had}noticed this man climbing into a house to the second story window and called the police. The police came seized the ex-monarch and carried him off to the police station. There ~~it was~~ ~~it was~~ he immediately declared I am Amanullah, king of Afghanistan and this is the house which I have rented. The police laughed at him and it took several hours before he was able to prove his identity. After I told this story there was a general murmur of amusement and then the proprietor of the little boarding house ~~and~~ turned to me and said there is something very wrong about that story that you have just told me. I said, what is that? He said when Amanullah returned to the house he found that he had locked the door. Now if he had locked the door, he must have had a key with him with which he locked it. There's no reason he could not have un-locked it with a key with which he locked it.

Seeing that those at the table were greatly impressed with this statement which cast great doubt upon the reliability of the story I had told. I said perhaps that door had a lock on it like some that are

very common in my own country. I said over there we have many locks which are so constructed that when one shuts the door it automatically. It does not take a key to lock the door but it does require one to unlock it.

This was a new idea to those gathered at the table. They were ~~people of bygone times~~ by no means unintelligent. They were middle class people, but they had not had personal experience with the type of a lock which was then already very common in the United States. However, one of the women said Oh, yes I had heard there were such locks.

The story that I told seemed to have a hopeless contradiction in it. It appeared to be obviously false. The reason was that there was ~~an~~ an element in the story which was unknown to the culture of those who heard it told.

This is a situation which ^{we} are certain to meet frequently to reading a book describing events that happened so far away from as the Bible lands and with so different a material background.

Another reason why contradictions often appear is that words in every language frequently have more than one meaning. I remember hearing about a foreigner who had recently come to the United States and was making rapid progress in learning the language. However, one day he was very *disturbed*. ~~by~~ He was standing near a window and suddenly he heard someone yell, Look out. Immediately he turned his head to look out the window. The result was that the man who was coming toward him with an armful of things collided with him and the things went all over the

floor. He said, what's the matter, I told you to look out. The man said, I did look out. ~~Th~~ To the American it seemed preposterous that the stranger did not realize that when he said, Look out, ~~take care~~ he meant, take care of yourself, get out of the way. To the one with a lesser knowledge of English he interpreted the words in their natural sense as meaning, see what is visible through the window.

Almost any sentence has various possibilities of interpretation. There has never been a book written ~~the~~ ⁱⁿ which/the liberal ~~contradicti~~ contradictions could not be found, if one were to insist on interpreting every sentence in such a way as to find the greatest possible disagreement with other sentences on the same page or elsewhere in the book. It is so natural that we do not even realize that we are doing it that we interpret sentences in any book in such a way as to fit with other sentences in the book to give a unified impression. This is part of our common experience in all that we do. Yet, when a so called scholar goes to the Bible and takes ^{two} ~~a~~ sentences by itself ~~and~~ interprets them in such a way as to find a contradiction we are all too ready to say that here is proof that they come from different documents.

A young man said to me once, how can anyone believe the Bible when it is so full of contradictions? I said, give me one. He said one striking one is this. He said, you read that Noah took all the different types of animals and put some of each into the Ark, and thus, he/~~and~~ ~~all~~ his family and all these animals were saved from the flood. For this to happen ~~this~~ it would have to be a pretty large construction. Yet, he said

you read a little further on and you ~~read~~^{find} that the Israelites are carrying the Ark on staves all the way through the desert.

Those of us who know anything about the Pentateuch laugh at this alleged contradiction. We know that the Word "Ark" is used in Genesis 8 to describe a large boat. We know that the same word is used ~~ark~~ in the book of Exodus to describe a small chest that was to be placed in the Holy of Holies of the Tabernacle. The word has two different senses and we readily recognize it and never think that there will be a contradiction here.

The same courtesy that ~~that~~ we give to any book that we read ought to be given to the Bible. We should be ready to interpret sentences in such a way as to fit together rather than to insist that be interpreted in such a way as to make them contradict each other. When we do this we find comparatively seldom something that still seems to us to be a contradiction.

After all this is done we must remember that the Bible claims to be a revelation from God. It claims to be an infinite book that gives us Divine knowledge. That being the case we can expect that God will reveal things to us at times that do not appear absolutely pretty reasonable to us because they are out of harmony with our own personal experience. This is no reason^{for}/rejecting the book or for saying that it is made up of a patch work of different documents. It is, instead a reason to study it carefully and to find out what it means. One very interesting instance of

type comes from the statement of the Lord Jesus Christ in the Book of Luke.

As we have seen, the first alleged parallel between J and P consists of two stories of creation. Looking closely at them, we observe that these are not really two different versions of the same thing. The first one gives (better word) *takes* a wide sweep and mentions many important elements in the story of creation that are not touched upon in the second account. The second account recapitulates a very small section of the first, giving us a great deal more detail on this small but vital part of the process of creation. This is a method that is often used in literary works to describe something as a whole, and then to go back and deal with a certain ~~section of~~ *i* section of it. It is not in itself a proof that there are two distinct documents.

We have also noticed that the alleged contradictions between these two accounts do not stand up when closely examined. If we give the Book of Genesis the same *The Book of Genesis* If we make the same effort to interpret ^{it} in such a way that its parts do not contradict each other, as we would do with any other unified writing, we do not run into ~~x~~ insuperable problems.

It is more reasonable to think of chapters one and two 1 and 2 as two successive stages in a unified work than to consider that the alleged duplication proves two different documents.

In chapter 3 we find the story of the ^{fall of man} Fall of Man. This story does not have any duplicate in any other document. As we move on into chapter 4 through chapter 4 we find that the degeneration that is pictured as ~~xxx~~ coming into humanity by Cain's murder of Abel is described as proceeding through seven generations until it reaches a climax in Lamech and ~~his~~ his wives ~~and his sons~~ and his sons. The chapter ends with a mention of the other line of the new line that began with a third son of Adam named Seth, and of the fact that Seth also had a son, and that this began a line in which the worship of ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ JHWH was to be maintained.

Chapter 5 has a genealogy starting with Adam and going up to Noah and his sons. Noah's father is named Lamech, the same one name as the last one of the line of Cain. It is alleged that this genealogy in chapter 5 constitutes a duplicate to the genealogy in chapter 4, and thereby produces evidence of there being two distinct documents.

It must be admitted at ~~xx~~ once that the last two verses of chapter 4 are strikingly parallel to the first part of chapter ~~4~~ 5. We must see the same thing is here described twice in very similar language. However, it is not at all uncommon in writings to have something told more than once. In chapter 4 the writer is showing how there were two different types of developments: the development of evil which he traces to its climax in Lamech, and then the beginning of a new line. In chapter 5 he goes ~~x~~ on to give us a rather stylized enumerational chronological genealogy which was to continue after the Flood

The story of the Fall of Man, as contained in chapter 3, and the resulting development of both evil and ~~good~~ good in the world logically requires two different lines to, the line of evil, and the line through which the knowledge of God was passed on. As the book ~~xx~~ stands, the genealogy in chapter 4, except for the last two verses, is the genealogy of the line of evil. The genealogy in chapter 5 is the genealogy of the line through which the revelation of God was maintained. This must have been the understanding of the compiler of the Book of Genesis. It stands out very clearly in the story as it is stated. It is hard to think that the J document, if it had ever existed as a separate entity, would have told in great detail of the continuance of the line of evil which was destroyed ~~x~~ in the Flood, and have only mentioned the first two and last stage in the line of good which was continued through the Flood. Chapter 5 is really necessary for the completion of the story contained in chapters 2 to 4.

Looking at the names it is said that there is a remarkable similarity between them; yet when we examine the ten names in the one side, and the seven on the other, we find ~~that~~ that both of them begin with Adam, and that a very prominent figure in each of them is called Lamech. This is just about as far as the real similarity extends. There is no other identical name ~~n~~ in the two lists. There are names that are somewhat similar, but certainly not identical.

In the culture of any period many similar names are quite sure to be found. If one were to list principal streets in almost any two cities in the same general area of the world he would be apt to find many striking similarities of name. This would not at all prove that he was talking about only one city. The ~~similit~~ similarities here are actually far from being great or extensive. It is not at all remarkable that in each line at about the same time there would be a man named Lamech who was rather typical of the ~~ix~~ line.

In 1941 ~~53~~ the president of General Motors Corporation was Charles E. Wilson; the president of General Electric Company was a different Charles E. Wilson; the president of the Worthington Pump Corporation, another of our large manufacturing corporations, although not quite in the class with General Motors and General Electric, was also Charles E. Wilson. ^{in 1950} Charles E. Wilson, president ~~f~~ of the General Electric Company, left that position in order to take a prominent place in the government ~~work~~ in Washington. A little later, ^{in 1953} A few years later A little later Charles E. Wilson, president of General Motors ~~Corporation~~, left that position in order to become a member of the president's cabinet in Washington. ^{See reference} The two men were not in Washington at the same time, but one came right after the other. It might be said that the story of Charles E. Wilson of General Motors, and the story of Charles E. Wilson of General Electric are duplicates, and that only one of them actually occurred. The fact, however, which is easily proven by examination, // of Who's Who in America is that this parallel development occurred in the lives of two men with such extremely similar names, and at a very similar time. It ~~x~~ is not

at all remarkable that there should have been two men names Lamech in the two genealogies. It might be ~~said~~ said that it is more ~~remarkable~~ remarkable that there are only two names that are identical. A correction should be noted: I said that there were only two names that were the same. Actually there is another one: there is an Enoch in each ~~genealogy~~ genealogy. In the gnealogy of Cain Enoch is the second man below Adam second man following Adam. In the genealogy of Seth he is the sixth man below following Adam. Such a similarity would not be hard to find in genalogies from about the same time in almost any region of the world. This was a type of mind, an approach that was very common in the last century. Once it is adopted it goes easily to very great lengths. Surely someone following this approach would think it would refuse to believe that when King George III of England established certain oppressive laws against the American colonist the leader of the opposition was General George Washington. Such coincidences are extremely common in life.

As one looks at the two names in the English the name Jared and the name Irad look so similar that one might think that here was a case instance of ~~similarity~~ similarity of name. Actually, however, in the Hebrew the name Jared begins with an ayin, a ~~strong~~ strong guttural sound such as that with which the word ~~Gomorral~~ Gomorral begins, and very sim very different, so this name is actually very different from the name Irad, which begins with the simple "yodh." ~~It should be Jared, of course;~~ which should be Jared, of course. I guess it is.

These names being rather different from the type of names we use today are apt to be it is easy for us to think of them as having been rather similar. As a matter of fact, in view of the great changes in pronunciation and in sounds, it is difficult to know ascertain how near we can get to the pronunciation of these actual names in the ~~original~~ original document. ~~They at any rate~~ ^{They at any} ~~we have~~ ^{give} clear evidence of coming from a time before the Hebrew language

was the language of the writers.

A very striking case instance of a suggested duplicate, once one adopts this type of argument, is the duplicate between Genesis 3 and the beginning of Genesis 6. In each of these we have a case instances of ~~supernatural~~ ^{supernatural} beings ~~coming~~ coming into this world and leading human beings astray. In each case there is a suggestion that the result may be greatly increased strength or greatly increased wisdom. In each case the results lead to moral decline and a judgment follows. So striking is this similarity between the story of the Fall and the story of the sons of God and the daughters of men that it surely would have been given as an evidence surely would be given as a case of duplicates and an evidence of two distinct documents, but both stories are considered by most critics to have belonged to the original document J.

This illustrates the fact if one looks for what perhaps could be considered as duplicates one will find just as many of them within ~~one~~ one of the documents as he can find between any one of the documents and a different one. This argument, carried out to the full, does not give proof of three great documents from which the first four books of the Pentateuch were composed. It rather gives offers proof of a multiplicity of tiny sections. It is now generally admitted by literary critics that great works, such as the Pentateuch, never come into existence through ~~the~~ the simple joining of a multiplicity of small sections. In this connection it is interesting to reach Chambers' discussion of Beowulf epic and his comparison of it with the various shorter lays which deal with the same material. The material, he proves to the satisfaction of most ^{present} literary scholars. the material was well known before the Beowulf story was written. It combines material from a number of different ~~sources~~ sources, but the actual production is the production of one author, and the whole is a unity (better word - same derivation?) unit? it is not simply made by laying end-to-end or by interweaving earlier sources. As Chambers says, you cannot take a lot of motorcycles and out of them make a truck.

It is necessary to build throughout on a different scale. The evidence of one author which is apparent in ~~the=Pentateuch~~ each of the books of the Pentateuch is at least as great as the evidence κ in (the) Beowulf and other ancient writings which are today generally admitted to have been produced by one author.

I don't know whether any of that's any good.

The second independent duplicate that is alleged in Genesis is in between the genealogy in chapter 4 and the genealogy in chapter 5. Now, as the book of Genesis stands each of these genealogies has a very natural place.

Chapter 4 tells about the strife between ~~and Abel~~ Cain and Abel following upon the entrance of wickedness into the world in chapter 3. Then it traces the line of the wicked son until/reaches a climax in a descendant called Lamech whose three sons are named. The next chapter traces the line of the new seed that was to replace Cain named Seth down to Noah, and lists his three sons. It is said that actually there is only one genealogy which has been become confused, and is here given as if it were two.

As the book stands, it would seem strange indeed to have only one ~~gene~~ ~~genealogy~~ genealogy. The two lines have been described, one of them multiplies to such an extent that the Flood it becomes necessary to send a flood to wipe out the wickedness of man; the other/~~one~~ goes on to the one who is to preserve the knowledge of God, and to be delivered through the Flood. It would be strange to have only one of these. The strangeness is compounded ~~when~~ when the critical theory is taken, according to which the J document ~~it~~ tells about the fall of man, and about the strife of Cain and Abel, and then goes on to tell about the Flood in which Noah was saved. It would surely seem extremely strange that such document would give the line of descent of Cain, leading up to those who were destroyed in the Flood, and would not give any line of descent for Noah, the one who was delivered through the Flood. It would surely seem much more reasonable, even ~~if~~ if the J document were an entity by itself that it would contain both genealogies. Certainly the existence of the two genealogies is not in itself an evidence for two different documents unless it can be proven that they/~~are actually~~ ^{are actually} the same actually are originally the same genealogy and that there is a confusion.

In the past century it was a widespread habit of mind to try to show that all sorts of documents had developed by a process of error from one original, or to show how to divide up all ancient ~~writings~~ or mediaeval writings into alleged ~~xxx~~ sources from which they came. When one is in this frame of mind he can see similarities everywhere and find in them evidence for duplication. However, if we look at the two genealogies the evidence ~~fact~~ for duplication actually is immediately seen to be very slim indeed. Each of them ends with a man who has three sons, but the names of the sons are altogether different from each other. Aside from these three sons, the genealogy of Cain, in chapter 4, contains six names, while that of Seth (not counting his father, Adam) in chapter 5, contains nine names. Comparing these names we find the occurrence of the name Enoch in each of them, and also of the name Lamech. Thus out of the nine names in the genealogy of Seth only two of them have exact counterparts in the genealogy of Cain, and these are ~~not=arranged=in~~ ~~an~~ not in an identical arrangement, since the line of Seth has only one name between Enoch and Lamech, while that of Cain has three names between Enoch and Lamech.

In the English Bible the name Cain and the name Canaan look similar.
(why?)
It would be impossible, however, to say whether in the original the two names would be related or not. In the English Bible the name Irad and the name Jared look similar. Examining them in the original, we find that the name Irad begins with a strong guttural, Inayin, such as occurs at the beginning of the ~~xxx~~ names Gaza (?) and Gomorrah. This makes a very sharp difference between these two names, and leaves no valid reason for considering them to be related. It is sometimes said that the names ~~Methuselah~~ Methusael and the names ~~name~~ Methuselah are related, each of them being the ~~parent~~ ^{the} name of/a parent of a man called Lamech. ~~IN~~ the Hebrew, however, the final tu However, the difference between them

is not simply a difference in the order of the last two letters, but that one of them contains a strong ~~gng~~ guttural, ~~heth~~ "heth." This is ~~quite~~ enough to mark the names as belonging to quite a different category from one another quite different categories

and hardly such a change as would be apt to occur between two related in the development of the same name. It is also sometimes alleged that the name "Mahalaleel" and the name "Mehujael" are related. Upon examination in the Hebrew we note that each of them begins with the letter "M" which is in Hebrew a rather common formative element, and each ends with ~~xi~~ "el" which is a rather common element in Hebrew names. The element between in between, however, is completely different, in the one case being ~~heth~~ "he," "lamedh," "Lamedh," "he," "lamedh," and in the other being "heth," "waw," "yodh." In English often the letter "he" and the letter "heth" are represented by a simple ~~h~~ "h," but in Hebrew they are quite distinct letters, and are not confused in copying a fraction as often even a fraction as many times as are the letters "r" and "d" which to our idea seem very different. "He" and "heth" seem to have been quite different in the consciousness of the Hebrews. So actually, these two names, while having similar beginning and ending, are actually very different and there's no more reason to think of them as having been confused than if we had, say the name ~~Abrahamson~~ "Abrahamson" and the name "Adamson."

Thus we see that the actual similarity between the two lists has been exaggerated. Even grossly/~~exaggeratedly~~ even if the similarity were far greater than it is, it would not be proof that there could not be two such genealogies. In any area in about the same period similar ~~xxx~~ names are apt to occur rather frequently.

A few years ago the president of the General Electric Company, Charles E. Wilson, left his ~~xxx~~ position in industry in order to become an important administrative official under President Truman. Three years later the president of General Motors, ~~Robert~~ ~~Car~~ Charles E. Wilson, left his company in order to become a member of President Eisenhower's cabinet. Such

a coincidence would seem too much for accident. If this were in an ancient document, students of a century ago would have insisted that the two were ~~dupes~~ duplicates and represented actually only one event. Similarities as much alike as the alleged duplicates in the ~~Scripture~~ Book of Genesis occur frequently in life if one has his eye open to observe them, even such remarkably similar duplicates as the one just mentioned occur from time to time.

, (7/6/66)

Parallels (cont'd) #4

In the list above it is noticed that a number of these alleged duplicate accounts relate to the naming of certain places. Thus there are said to be three different accounts of the naming of Isaac. There are ~~said to~~ said to be two distinct accounts of the naming of Mahanaim, and other cases of this type. These references to names require a special consideration before we take up the main cases of alleged parallel ~~ism~~ accounts

11;9 In consideration of the matter of alleged name naming it should be noted that the first instances after the flood of the giving of a meaning of a name relates to Babylon. Here it is said, "Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the LORD did there confound the language of all the earth: "

Now the name of Babylon which in the ~~Babylonian~~ Babylonian language is ~~ix~~ "Boby y lee "Bab-ili" is a Babylonian phrase meaning "gate of ~~God~~ God." This is proven not only by the name but by the writing which is commonly used ~~as a sign for a gate~~ which has a sign for a gate and a sign for a god. Everyone in antiquity must have known that "~~Bab~~ ~~Bab~~ Bab-ili" meant "gate of God." Yet (Yes?) here in Genesis we read ~~that~~ that it is called "Babel" which would be the Hebrew way of saying "Bab-ili" (the final "i" being a case ending) because there God confounded the languages. The word for "confound" in Hebrew is "balal." The writer of Genesis would be extremely stupid if he meant to say that people took the word "balal" and from it formed a ~~new~~ word "Babal" or "Babili/." It is very evident that in one case you have a two "b's" followed by an "l", and in the other case a "b" followed by two "l's/."

(7/6/66)

Parallels (cont'd) #5

It is very easy to see that what the writer is attempting to do here is ~~not~~ not to tell us what the word "Bab-ili" means, which everyone certainly knew/ at the time, and not to make a very clumsy and awkward etymology of it which would be obviously false, but to make a sort of pun on the name, to say ~~that~~ it is very appropriate that this place where people tried to make a human way of access to God should be called "Bab-ili" because it was there that ~~Jesus~~ God ~~thru~~ "balaled"? the language of all the people.

This instance give us, I believe, the clue to most of these seeming etymologies in Genesis.

The matter of the giving of names to people or to places ~~is~~ is often very obscure. Sometimes, historically, names come from the most superficial or unnatural reasons. An outstanding case is perhaps that one of the early^d explorers, visitors to South America, although certainly not the first by any means, was a man named Americus Vespuccius^f (Amerigo ~~Vesputi~~ Vespucci?) and he returned home and wrote a book about it, and as a result the whole of North and South America came to be called after his name. Thus the word America represents a rather accidental origin of a name. Sometimes we know exactly where names of people or places come from; other times they have very accidental origins, or they may come from simply be named after something else as children today are very often named after their parents. In ancient Mesopotamia they were apt to be named after their grandparents. When the Scripture refers to a name it does not necessarily mean that this is the first ~~time~~ the name was given; it may mean how appropriate it is that this place or this person should be called by such-and-such a name, just as someone today might say, "Is it not appropriate that Pierre Montet, a famous

(7/6/66)

Parallels (cont'd) #6

French archaeologist whose name means "little mountain" should have been the man designated to direct the excavation of the city of Gebal) (or ~~Biblos~~ Byblos), the name of which in ancient times meant "little mountain'."

Where it is said, for instance, that there are three different reasons given for the name of Isaac, we must say that we are not sure why the name "Isaac" was given. Perhaps he was named after a relative, or perhaps it was a name that Sarai had been anxious to give to her child for some time for some reason or other. Professor Ranke, the noted German Egyptologist, made quite a study of ancient personal names and made the very interesting suggestion that in many cases the name was given in relation to whatever the woman first said after the child was born. This would help to account for such names as "Adi-mati-ilu" - "until how long, O ~~God~~ God", and other names which show many other names which show express gratitude to a particular deity. Whether Ranke is right or wrong, the fact is that we do not know whether the name Isaac was first given to this child or whether it was a name previously used which had been applied to him/ for some reason or other. In any event, the Scripture in ~~these~~ three places points out how appropriate this name was in this particular case. When Addison says that according to one document it was given because Sarai had laughed in increpitude; another case because Abraham had laughed in joy; and another case because

, it is making a division where there is no proper reason for a division. Incidentally, it does not even say in these cases that that is why Isaac was given the name, but it is interesting/in connection with his ~~his~~ birth are these various cases where the verb (word?) is used in connection with the father or mother. Taken all in all, they must have felt it was a very appropriate name to give.

(7/6/66)

Parallels (cont'd) #7

If a personal analogy might be permitted, my own boy was named "John" which was the name of his mother's father and also of his father's father, and also of his mother's brother. When his parents were visiting with either family it was natural to say, "Here is your namesake." The boy was not named after only one of these, but actually after all three. The name Isaac is very appropriate for various reasons.

The same would apply to the ~~name~~ word "Mahanaim/." We read that ~~Jacob's two herds of angels~~ Jacob divided his flocks and herds into two sections, and it says, "Therefore the name of the place is called "Mahanaim" ("two camps"). A little further on it says that Jacob saw a host of angels coming to protect him, and he said "Here are these ^{angels} ~~angels~~ in heaven, and here are my forces on earth; here are two camps." So the name of the place is ~~not~~ "Mahanaim." There are not two parallel accounts giving different reasons why this place is called "Mahanaim." The name may be an old name going back a long way. Jacob noticed ~~how~~ two different reasons why the name was ~~particularly~~ particularly appropriate in connection with his own experiences.

position of quotes?

When we thus understand the nature of the references to names naming in Genesis and Exodus we see that it is not really valid at all as an argument for division into different documents.

List?

All the instances of giving reasons for names in Genesis in the Pentateuch are listed below. It will be noticed how comparatively few of them actually represent any sort of argument for parallel passages.

Now we come to the primary reasons for claim that there are distinct documents on account of parallels being given. The first of these is the story - they claim that there are two stories of creation at the beginning of Genesis. [I have already dictated some weeks ago ^a ~~the~~ discussion about Genesis ^{197,} will not do this at this point, but will continue after that a little later.]

per

PARALLELS - A GOOD ILLUSTRATION

A student to the critical approach to the Bible ~~is~~ generally assumes that if something similar is repeated, or if two events are described which are very much ~~like~~ like one another, there must of necessity be ~~a~~ two different documents involved. This rules out the possibility of coincidence.

~~Yet in ordinary life coincidence is actually quite common.~~ Some of the coincidences ~~is~~ that anyone will come across if he keeps ~~his~~ eyes open for

them are extremely striking. A very interesting one is evident if one will ^{look under} turn to the Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge ^{published in 1955 as an} and

extension of ~~The~~ ^{The} New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, ^{under}

^{the letter} the name "Kelso" ^{Here you will find the name of} "James Anderson Kelso, Presbyterian," ^{followed by that} of James Leon Kelso, United Presbyterian." One of these

men was born in India in 1873. One was born in Duluth in 1892. Yet ~~both~~ ^{each} became ^a professor of Old Testament in Pittsburgh in ~~different~~ ^a Presbyterian

theological seminaries, ^{one under the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., as} it was then called, ^{and} the other under the United Presbyterian Church, ^{as it}

^{was then called} James Anderson Kelso devoted himself mainly to textual and linguistic studies, James Leon Kelso to quite an extent to archaeological ~~study~~ study, ~~at~~ although somewhat also to linguistic study. In November,

1951, I ~~as~~ ^a was interested to read in ~~the paper~~ the newspaper an account of the death of Professor James Anderson Kelso, and to find that the account

attributed to him the excavation work in Palestine that had been conducted in the previous year by ^{Professor} James Leon Kelso. ^{Here is a striking case of rare and}

unusual coincidence ~~is~~ such as would seem to be ^{evidence (2) that} proof of ^{so easy to prove} different documents, ^{of} confusion if it were not ^{so easy to prove} easily shown that it corresponds to actual

fact,

[Insert above]

Since that time the two denominations have merged ~~and~~ and the two seminaries have coalesced, ~~so~~ so that there is ^{now} only one Presbyterian theological seminary in Pittsburgh, ~~and~~ ^{with} one man ~~named~~ ^{named} Kelso ^{as} its professor of Old Testament.

d1-d2

In recent years readers of Sunday School literature/^{in many} of our denominations have come out against something that was entirely new to them. Instead of speaking of the first five books of the Bible as the writings of Moses, as was formerly done the quarterlies and other Sunday school literature many of them speak of the material as having come from various documents which they call J e d and p. These documents are said to have been written hundreds of years apart and all of them long after the events described

A number of popular books such as X a series of booklets "Know Your Bible" by Roy L. Smith and books are somewhat more scholarly level such as Understanding the Old Testament by Anderson have appeared on the book shelves in recent years and all of them _____ this same teaching.

It is hard to believe yet it is a fact that this teaching which appears new to many church members and Sunday school teachers actually is simply a retention of a pre-scientific theory the results of ~~xxxxxxx~~ a method of study which was wide spread in the 19th century but has now been given up since it has been proven to rest on an entirely false basis.

During the 19th century it was common to think that ancient documents were made up of several earlier sources which had been combined together to produce the documents that we have. More than that the 19th century scholars thought themselves capable of separating such documents into their original sources and telling us with certainty what was in each one of them. Today there is hardly a scholar who would take a newly discovered ancient ~~and~~ document and divide it up into various sources which he would dogmatically state to have been the original materials out of which our actual documents

had come.

The Jedp theory as it is taught today is a figment of the imagination. It is the authified ⁸ _____ of one of the many changing attitudes of the 19th century regarding a problem which the 20th century does not consider to be possible a solution with the materials that we have.

No ancient manuscript corresponding to the ^{D document} ~~the/E document~~ ~~copy~~ the D document or the P document has ever yet been discovered. No ancient writing contains any reference to any one of these documents. The very idea that such documents ever existed is entirely a result of an attempt at deduction from materials that are available today. It is an attempt along the line which has proved so faulty that it is scarcely ever even attempted regarding other books today.

During the 19th century just before the beginning of the 19th century the famous scholar Wolf decided that the writings of Homer were not actually by Homer but represented a ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ combination together of a number of different writings written by various men. Later scholars during the 19th century arranged them differently but most scholars ~~f~~ during that century thought that the books of Homer had come together in some sort of an accidental way as little by little writings of various men were combined.

Goethe, the great German genius was annomored of the works of the marvelous thought processes of Professor Woff. On more than one occasion

one of
 Goethe ~~was~~ persuaded/Wolf's daughters to let him hide behind
 behind a curtain in Wolf's lecture room so that he might ~~listen~~ ~~to~~
 listen to Prof. Wolf's lecture without ~~being~~ causing any embarrassment
 by his presence to the lecturer. Yet toward the end of his life
 Goethe himself stated that the more that as he went back to read the
 works of Homer he ~~was~~ more and more convinced that despite occasional
 discrepancies and inconsistencies the marvelous unity of the work
 the wonderfully high standard of poetic excellence maintained through-
 out. The genius that shows through on every page made him feel more and
 more convinced that after all this was the work of one great genius and
 not the fortuitous combination of the work of a number of different men.

Goethe's own work did not escape this sort of literary ~~f~~ dissection
 which was so common in the 19th century. In 1887 Prof. Scherer issued his
 volume of studies in Goethe's works. He took Goethe's great production of
 Faust which had been first published in its ~~entirety~~ entirety in 1825. ~~From~~
 Going through it he pointed out the portions which he believed that Goethe
 had written as a young man which showed the enthusiasm and exuberance
 of Goethe's youth. He showed those portions which came as a result ~~of~~
 particular crisis in Goethe's life. He pointed to those passages which
 had ~~to~~ showed in contrast the tiredness and disillusionment of Goethe's old
 age. How interesting it is he said to see how Goethe at different periods
 of his life used such different styles and such a different approach and
 all of this was fused together into this great work published in his old
 age.

Yet it was long after Scherer published his great work before a
 most remarkable discovery was made. A woman was going through here

grandmother's through the materials in the trunk that had been left by her long deceased grandmother. In it she found a note saying that her grandmother had first met the young poet Goethe when he first came to Weimar, 30 years before he published his long poem of Faust. She became acquainted with the young poet and Goethe lent her his the poem Faust on which he had made a good start. ~~The girl's grandmother copied the young woman read~~ The grandmother of the woman who gave it to the world read over the poem and was thrilled by it. She with Goethe's permission copied long sections from the poem. A German professor was able to publish the world in 1880.

The first part of the material which was copied by the young lady in waiting contained a section which Scherer had been particularly interested in dividing into the portions from Goethe's youth = those from his middle age and those from his old age. Here to the scholar's surprise he found that this particular portion had been written by Goethe in his youth almost exactly in a form in which he published it in old age. All of Scherer's great ingenuity had ~~however~~ accomplished nothing. Here was the actual evidence that his theories were without any real foundation.

Recently I read an account of a preparation of a speech by one of our American presidents. He asked 6 different men to prepare a rough draft for the speech after giving them a general idea of what he wanted included. Each of these men wrote an entirely different approach and entirely different material. Then he set two others to work taking the
12 of the 6 selecting the best passages combining them together.

When the work was finished he himself took over the finished copy looked it over, made occasional changes here and there. The finished product was what he read as his state of the union message that year.

It is not at all strange that a work ~~written~~ ~~by~~ should be written in this way. It might be very strange if a work with a genius of Homer or of a pentateuch would be formed in this way. But what would be far stranger than either would be if someone not knowing any of the men who had helped the president write who had made preliminary drafts for the president's speech not having ever seen any of them or read anything ~~else~~ ^{its} else that they had written was able to divide his speech into/different sections and tell which paragraphs or sentences came from one writer and which part from another.

That is exactly what the JDEP theory claims about the first five books of the Bible. It claims to divide them into sections sometimes as long as a chapter or two, sometimes as short as half a verse and to say that these various sections can be separated out and then can be combined together to produce the actual original documents which according to the theory were combined almost in their entirety by this sort of patch work method to produce the first five books of Moses.

Now it would not be absolutely impossible that a book might have been prepared in such a way. It, however, is highly questionable if such a thing was done whether anyone could ever divide the material up into its actual sources and tell what they were.

The critical theorists who thought themselves ~~able to~~ able to divide the five books of Moses into original sections written by different authors had ~~very a~~ varying theories during the years between 1753 and 1878. There was a great variety of methods of division. One writer would be very dogmatic on one arrangement and another writer would be very dogmatic as to his certainty that another arrangement was the process by which he thought these books had come into existence. Exactly the same process took place regarding Homer and many other ancient works. Since ~~1931~~ 1930 one finds hardly anything of this type being done. It is now widely recognized that it is impossible to make correct judgements of this type. Yet as a result of certain circumstances of particular circumstances that we shall examine later one theory received wide recognition in 1878 when a brilliant German writer named Wellhausen put it into written form. This theory which came to be known as the Wellhausen theory was not accepted by many of the older scholars of Germany. The younger scholars, however, were attracted to him and most of them accepted. Today it is contained in our popular books almost exactly as Wellhausen presented it on the Bible and presented as the fruit of modern research. Actually, it is a product of a 19th century method now almost completely discarded in our 20th century.

The critical idea about the parallels is that if you find what seem to be two similar stories, they must actually represent the same original story, but derived from two different sources. Thus it is assumed that two similar events could not possibly occur, even though in history we find that similar circumstances produce similar events over and over in the history of any nation, any school, any organization there will be found many parallels any book such are found. However, the ~~assumption~~ assumption of the ~~critical~~ critics is that if you have two similar events ~~x~~ it must mean that there are two different sources. Then the/~~then~~ ^{alleged} attempt is made to see on the/basis of differences of style which of the alleged three sources each of the parallels comes from. It is ~~x~~ interesting, however, to notice that the multi-documentary theory holds that Exodus 17:1-7 and Numbers 20:1-13 are parallels, ~~analyze~~ and yet ~~thought~~ finds what is said to be ~~it~~ the peculiar style of P in both of them. Consequently, we find Kuhl on page 78 ^x saying, " An example which amply illustrates this method of working is found in ~~Exodus~~ P's narrative of Moses and the strife about water (Numbers 20:1-13) which he elaborated with details from the older source, although he had already told the same story once before from the same source/ (Exodus 17:1-7).

Does Kuhl mean here to day the redactor was so foolish as to take one account of the story which he found in P and insert it twice, in one case in the ~~original~~ original form, and in the other case, again in the same form, but ~~not~~ adding details from another document, or is it not more likely that he means that he found two accounts of this ~~x~~ in P's narrative, and that ~~■~~ he reproduced one of them as it ~~is~~ is, and reproduced the other with elaborated with details from a similar account which he found in ~~the~~ "the older source." In either case In the latter case it would seem, according to ~~the~~ Kuhl's view, ~~rather~~ that P had two accounts of similar strife about water. In any such trip through the desert as is described in Exodus and ~~Numbers~~ Numbers it would

Kuhl #2 10/25/66

seem likely that there would have been many cases when there was strife about water. It is not strange at all that we have two of them contained in the Pentateuch as we have it. It would seem rather almost to be strange that there are not more than two. As evidence for different sources, it is just as weak as the other instances of parallels at which we have looked, but in this case the situation makes it bring out very clearly the weakness of the whole critical method. This was, as we have noticed, a method which was very commonly used in the last century, but the weaknesses of which have become more and more apparent, so that it is now practically given up, except that the adherents of the multi-documentary theory are still continuing to apply it in relation to the Bible.

We would not need to doubt that the effects of its ~~giving~~ being given up in other studies will catch up with it in Biblical studies, and that it will eventually be given up. The sad thing, however, is that just as this is beginning (wholly?) to happen ~~we~~ we find the story being reproduced more and more widely, and more and more dogmatically in popular and semi-scholarly sources, ^{and} /writings, and thus receiving a wider acceptance on the part of the general public just at the time when it is ~~more~~ more and more out of line with present ideas as to proper methods of interpreting texts.

The first type of parallels, in fact the most cogent, if it can be proven, to ~~be~~ exist, is the case where the critics claim to find two different accounts of the same event presented in the Bible as we have it now as ~~two~~ separate independent stories, but actually, they claim, coming from the same original story. These we shall entitle, "Independent Parallels", in contrast with those ~~cases~~ cases where they take one story and divide it up into, thus claiming to make two distinct original sources. ~~The~~ This latter we shall call ~~Interwoven Parallels~~ "Interwoven Parallels."

1
Merrill
Gunkel

In his book on The Myths of Genesis Professor/often refers to the childish and primitive ideas of the writers of Genesis. Professor Eduard Nielsen of the University of Aarhus, Denmark, has written a book on Oral Tradition in which he presents the idea of the Scandinavian graditio-historical school in opposition to the views of the so-called literary criticism. He refers to "the almost classic, but antiquated commentary on Genesis by Hermann Gunkel." On the word "antiquated" he has a footnote in which he says:

Antiquated, not only because of literary criticism and source analysis with the consequent rearrangement of the material, but especially because the reader is constantly aware of the way in which the 'mature Western European' presents the naïve attitude of 'childish Oriental' towards nature, his naïve moral code, his naïve conception of God, etc.

It is the 'mature' Western European who is naïve in his feeling of cultural superiority."

~~xxxx~~

It is interesting thus to have one critical scholar who considers the Book of Genesis/~~xxxxxx~~ as having come together by a very early process of oral tradition, thus speaking of another who holds to the more widely supported view of so-called literary criticism. The quotation, ~~xxxxxx~~ however, makes a good introduction for stressing the point that any book that is written in a country far remote from our own, and in a time when customs, habits and attitudes were very different from ours, is sure to have many ideas, methods of expression, customs and occurrences that seem strange ~~to~~ from the outlook of our present civilization. This does not necessarily mean that they are more primitive, but simply that they are different. Similar differences could be found even among various ones of our Western nations. What seems quite natural in one will seem

~~d-1~~ (2)

very strange in another.

Here we see one of the basic errors of the whole critical movement. It is assumed that whatever seems strange to us in Genesis cannot be true; that must have come about by a combination of sources or as a result of the primitive or mythical ideas of naïve people.

~~Most~~ Most essential, of course, in causing this attitude toward Genesis and other parts of the Bible is the presence of the supernatural in it. The supernatural is not extremely common in almost any part of the Bible. ~~In~~ most parts of the Bible the supernatural is not extremely common. God is present as a vital force in the lives of the people, but the particular events that could not be thought of as occurring right in our own day are comparatively infrequent. The most frequent expression of the supernatural is when we are told that God spoke to Abraham, that God said something to Adam, that God gave a message to Jacob, etc. We rarely, if ever, in our day have experiences that we ~~can~~ could put into this category. That, however, does not justify us in throwing out the others as impossible or imaginary. If we can believe in a God who is not dead, but who is active, this God may choose to speak directly to human beings in certain periods, ~~while~~ while in other periods he may ~~leave~~ leave them in the main to study the revelation that he has already caused to be written down, and show Himself providentially, but not to any great extent through actual ~~supernatural~~ ~~supernatural~~ expression. If one can believe in a God who could create the universe, one can certainly believe in a God who can speak to His ~~people~~ creatures if and when He chooses.

Readers of Marco Polo's account of his trip to the Orient found many things in it that seemed to them impossible^{and}//fantastic. For a time comparatively few bothered to read the book because they thought of it as quite undependable. However, eventually it was found that many of the things in the book that were difficult to understand fit exactly with what was observed by later visitors to the Orient, thus confidence in Marco Polo's ~~is~~ veracity has tremendously increased.

Today there still remain ~~many outstanding questions~~ mysteries and puzzles in the understanding of Marco Polo's book. However, the attitude of scholars is that since we have found ^{in it} so much that is reliable we can assume that where there are puzzles the reason is that there are factors or facts with which we are not acquainted, but that if we knew them we should ~~should~~ find the book to be dependable in these instances also.

The Bible should be entitled to the same consideration that one would give to the writing of a Marco Polo or of a Sir John ~~Mandeville~~ Mandeville. If it is proven that it contains statements and occurrences that are impossible, unreal, or ~~that~~ that consist simply in a heterogeneous gathering together of myths and legends, containing much that is untrue, then one is justified in refusing to place further credence in the Book. However, no one is justified in assuming in advance that this is the case. The Book should be entitled to the same consideration that we give/ to any other ancient work. We read it to see how much of it is 'credible' and dependable, and we see how much trust we can put in its author.

Christians believe that they know the author of the Bible, and that he is thoroughly dependable. They believe that they have tested the teachings of the Bible in their own lives, and found that they work out. Therefore when they find a statement in the Bible which is different from the ordinary experience of humanity they simply say, "This is a revelation of a fact which was otherwise unknown to us," and they accept it. Or they say, "Here is a statement which we do not understand. Perhaps as we study the Bible further we shall see the principles involved and truly understand what it is. If we have confidence in the author of a book, we can have confidence in what he has written. It is our duty to test carefully to be sure that no error of transmission or of copying has occurred, and also

~~d.1 (4)~~

to make sure that we really understand the meaning of the words, and their' relation to the context. There may be things we'll have to say we don't understand, and we'll ~~ix~~ have to wait until we see the Author ~~ix~~ to ask Him to explain them to us. But we do not ~~x~~ cast it out or develop some theory of origin based on the idea that it contains that which is unreal and impossible.

7/8/66) (adding)

Is the Bible like Marco Polo? or like Sir John Mandeville?

Toward the end of the 13th century a Venetian was asked by a friend to tell him ~~about~~ about his travels in China and other countries of the Orient. He dictated to his friend a long account of the many years that he had spent traveling in those regions. This account contained many statements that seemed utterly fantastic to people in Europe. Marco Polo's account contained many statements that seemed fantastic to Europeans of the day. He said that the Chinese had a chemical substance which they called gunpowder, which would explode with terrific force. Nothing like this was then known in Europe. He also said that instead of always using metal for money they used pieces of paper with something stamped upon it to show the amount that it represented. This and other statements impressed Europeans as very fantastic, and more than a century passed before any great number of people felt that Marco Polo's writings were worth bothering with.

A few years after Marco Polo's work was written there appeared a book of travel which took Europe by storm. The author, who called himself Sir John Mandeville, described his travels in Bible lands and in the distant parts of the Orient, and told of many interesting experiences which he had had. The book seemed to impress people as much more matter of fact and dependable than Marco Polo's, and containing the queer statements such as references to gunpowder and to paper money. Within a few years after its appearance many times as many copies of it were being distributed in Europe as there were copies of Marco Polo's narrative. Probably 25 people were familiar with the name of Sir John Mandeville to every one who had ever heard of Marco Polo.

Today the situation is quite reversed. Today there are probably 100,000 people who have heard of Marco Polo to every one who has ever heard of Sir John

(7/8/66) (adding) #2

Mandeville. Scholarship proved that Sir John Mandeville's was probably not by him at all, in fact the very existence of anyone named Sir John Mandeville is highly questioned. ^{able} It is thought that a man called Jehan Le Barbier may have been the real author of the work. Moreover, he did not actually write the work; most of it he simply compiled from other books. Scholars have found copies of accounts by other travelers, of visits to various lands of the Orient, and find that the book of Sir John Mandeville contains long sections copied almost verbatim from the other works and sometimes erroneously copied. The fact that ^{Mandeville's} ~~this~~ book was thus formed by the interweaving of sources rather than as the production of one who knew what he was talking about caused it to lose favor until today it is only a curiosity.

Is the Pentateuch like the writing of Marco Polo? or like the writing of Sir John Mandeville? Jews and Christians for many centuries believed that Moses had written the Pentateuch. Is it written by a man who knew what he was talking about or did unknown redactors simply combine sections from various documents which contradicted one another and contained much of myth and legends. [?]

There are statements in the Pentateuch which do not correspond to our present knowledge in any more than the statements about gunpowder or about paper money corresponded to the knowledge of these people of Europe. ^{It may?} They seem unreal and fantastic to us. Does that mean that they are false? It all ^{? ?} depends on what our confidence we may have in the author. If we believe that there is a God who created the universe and who knows all things; if we believe that ^{this} God is not dead; if we believe that this God selected the men who would write the books of the Bible, and watch over them as they wrote so as to cause that any erroneous ~~ideas~~ ideas that they had in their mind would not find expression in what they put into those writings that He

(7/8/66) #3

intended to be part of His infallible Word. Then we can have confidence in its statements. We may have difficulty in understanding them. Marco Polo did not explain the fact that the paper money was printed. Printing was unknown in Europe at the time when Marco Polo wrote. It made a great problem in understanding how paper money could be used because, after all, anyone could take a piece of paper and write a statement on it. The fact that the money could be printed made it far ~~less~~ more difficult to counterfeit. There was another ^{here} factor/that people did not know about and that Marco Polo did not explain. Perhaps there are hundreds of factors entering into the history of the universe that we do not know anything about. Perhaps there are many factors entering into God's dealings with man that God has not felt it necessary to take this (the?) time and space to include in the Bible. If we knew all these factors we would understand everything that He had given us. Our minds are finite. His is infinite. If we have confidence in Him, and confidence that this book actually is from Him, there may still be many things in it that we do not understand, but in so far as we can understand it we will feel that we can stand upon it and say that it is true and dependable, and that wherever it applies to our lives it is our duty to obey it.

This is the attitude which the Christian church has taken toward the Pentateuch and toward the Bible all through its history. It is written into the creeds of most of our denominations. Within the last two centuries the co-called "higher Criticism" has developed. This view which in so far as it started largely relates to the Pentateuch as far as the Bible is concerned and the view which it now holds regarding the Pentateuch is the view which we have explained ~~above~~ above. Is it true? or is it false? Everyone

WHAT CHRISTIANS BELIEVE ABOUT THE BIBLE

Before examining in detail the J,E,D,P theory it is necessary that we carefully examine the question just what have Christians historically believed about the Bible.

Christianity has often been called the religion of the Book. As far back as we can trace the great creeds of the Christian church and the statements of its great leaders, and as far back as we can trace the views and attitudes of the leaders of Judaism, both were agreed in holding that the Bible was God's Word to man.

By this it was not meant that the Bible was something magical that these particular sounds had a power in themselves, or that some mystical benefit was derived simply from listening to its reading. What has always been believed was that this book is God's revelation of truth, that it is therefore trustworthy and dependable.

The important question to the ~~Christian~~ Christian has never been who were the ~~different~~ ^{human} authors of the different books of the Bible. This is a matter that has been of interest to him, but it is not of primary significance. No one knows who wrote the Book of Joshua, the Book of Judges, the Books of Samuel or the Book of Kings. It is absolutely certain that Samuel did not write First and Second Samuel since he did right in the middle of First Samuel. This is not of any great importance to the Christian, What interests him is that they are part of God's Word and therefore dependable sources of truth.

The same is true of the Book of Hebrews in the New Testament. We have no statement from the first century as to who was the author of this Book. Great ~~Christian~~ Christian scholars have believed that Paul wrote it, and equally sincere and learned men have been equally strongly convinced that Paul did not write it.

It does not make any great difference to us who wrote it. We believe that it is part of God's Word, and as such that it is free from error.

This, of course, does not mean that we believe that God dictated the books of the Bible. It is strange how often people ridicule the historic Christian attitude toward the Bible by saying that it is **ridiculous** to believe in dictation.

There would be nothing wrong ^{with having} ~~if~~ God/~~dictating~~ the Bible if he had chosen to do so. Anyone of us may dictate to us through a scribe, or perhaps may dictate a whole book for that matter. There is ~~not~~ nothing wrong; however, that is not what we believe about the Bible. We believe that God selected the human authors, and that God selected the human authors, and that He led them in their selection of their material, that He watched over them so as to ~~not~~ keep out of the words and phrases and sentences that they selected anything that would be incorrect. Therefore we believe that while every part ~~of~~ of the Bible shows a character and viewpoint of its human author that it is so directed and so kept from error by the Holy Spirit that it is a dependable source of truth.

This of course does not mean that the Bible is the complete store of all truths. That was not God's purpose. We read even in the book of John that if ~~the~~ things that Jesus ~~did~~ during his earthly were many, many times as numerous as those included in this gospel. John selected the matters which he thought were important for the purpose of his book. This does not mean that we have sufficient material in John's gospel or in the four gospels together to write the full account of life of Christ. We do not know the dates of his birth. We do not ~~not~~ know the ^{great} exact dates of many events in his life. There are many of them ~~that~~ ^{may} we ~~do~~/not know the exact order. There are many important things we like to ask about to which no answer can be secured from the Bible. But we believe that whatever can be properly and definitely derived from the gospel is true and dependable.

When we say that the Bible is a book that is entirely true, we do not say that we can necessarily understand or can expect to understand everything in it. There are always problems of interpretation, and this is magnified when we have a book that expresses the infinite wisdom of God. We can never expect to the bottom of all/^{of}its teaching. It reveals many things for ~~us~~ which we do not have the background to understand the significance for meaning. However, whatever can be properly understood in it we can stand upon as truth.

The Bible ~~does not~~ ^{makes no} attempt to be complete in its coverage/
Any subject, even theology, certainly not history. It tells those matters which are important for our understanding of the relation of God to man and the preparation that God made for the coming of His son/ into the world. If one ~~were~~ writing a political history of Israel, there would be many facts that might be very ~~im~~ important that the Bible does not mention. Some of these hint at and some of ~~these~~ them do not have its occasion to even touch upon ~~any~~ in any way. The selection would be entirely different. We cannot write a complete history of Israel using the Bible as a source. However, whatever we can properly and carefully derive from the Bible about the history of Israel. We can depend ~~on~~ upon as being true. ~~There is~~

There is naturally considerable difficulty in interpreting ^a something. There is dealing with/background that is so strange for us as the background of the ancient Palestine in comparison with the conditions of life and apostasy ~~in~~ in the twentyieth century of America. Much has to be explained by invesitgations of the general background or study or interpretation of one section of the ~~Scripture~~ Scripture in the light ~~of~~ of another section. We may expect that there would be many things

in the Bible on the interpretation of which we cannot be certain. We can ~~not~~ move forward slowly and carefully in increasing our knowledge and understanding. This, however, we can insist upon that the Bible being God's revelation, it is true, it is a proper source of propositional truths. Whatever we can draw from it carefully and exactly we can stand upon.

Christ affirmed this attitude toward the Old Testament. And he declared that it was free from error and entirely dependable. He insisted that the apostle should have studied it ~~not~~ more carefully than they ~~had~~ had, and if they had done so, they would have understood certain things that happened in his life, and would have not been so overwhelmed by them. He called them, fools, slow of heart to believe all that the Prophets ~~had~~ have spoken. He said that not one jot or one ~~little~~ tittle would pass from the law until all were fulfilled.

The apostles followed the Lord's leading in this. Paul in II Timothy 3 expressed his joy that Timothy had been trained in the Holy Scriptures/ⁱⁿ which He said were wise, were able to make him wise unto salvation, which were entirely inspired of God and were profitable in many ways.

Thus the accuracy and dependability of all the books ~~of~~ of the Old Testament are part of the fundamental background of the teaching of Christ, and of the apostles, and of the great creeds of all our great denominations and the expression of our great Christian leaders through the ages.

In recent years, it is unfortunately that comparison has been made between, always between the J,E,D,P theory and the idea that Moses wrote the first five books of the Bible. This has been, It has been misleading

that ~~nothing~~ this has been made the point of emphasis. Thus we read in a book about ... that certain conservative scholars' work has real value in the interpretation of the Pentateuch, but that it is largely vitiated because of his insistence upon the Mosaic authorship. This is a view that a leading scholar holds about it, but the Mosaic authorship is not a vital ~~question~~ question here. But the vital vital question here is ~~the~~ the dependability and reliability of the first books of the Old Testament.

Some liberal books made very extreme statements ~~was~~ such as that the Bible ~~nowhere~~ nowhere states that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, and that the New Testament does not take such a position. We believe that the strong evidence, a strong argument can be made that the various statements in ~~some~~ some of the early books of the Bible about Moses having written commanded to write down certain particular things ~~in~~ imply that he was writing down much larger documents and that the use of the term "the law of Moses" in later books of the Old Testament strongly shows that the belief that ~~that~~ Moses wrote the first five books was held by the Israelite at a very early time. We believe that Jesus said that ~~if they will not believe in Moses,~~ if they will not believe ~~in Moses,~~ neither will they believe if one rises from the dead. He was implying very definitely that the first five books were by Moses. There are ~~in~~ other statements that can be drawn from the statements of the Lord as well as from the statements of the Old Testament which seem to us to be very good evidence that Moses ~~was the~~ is the author of these five books. However, we do not feel that the primary question is whether the books were written by Moses or ~~by~~ by someone else, but the primary question are the books true?

It is impossible to prove that these books came together by the interweaving of the documents written hundreds of years at the time of Moses. And still to believe that the statements in these books are all true and dependable.

This is so, because the very foundation of these theories is the belief that there are errors and contradictions between the different documents, that ~~andztherez~~ are alleged to have been combined together. A recent book published by the press of one our large denominations states ~~thatx~~ at the beginning of it that at first sight it looks as if there were strong evidence ~~thatx~~ for Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and for unity of the book, but as we look into it, we find great numbers of contradictions which are inconsistent with any such unity, and then he proceeds to advance the source ~~thatx~~ theory on the basis of these alleged contradictions.

If as he maintains the Pentateuch has repetitions seeming to tell two different events which are actually due to a misunderstanding of the fact that they were/^{different}contradictory presentations of the story of the same event, and if there are such contradictions in it as to prove that a faulty, a misunderstanding editor ~~wouldx~~ wove together contradictory documents, this of course is quite inconsistent with the historic Christian attitude of believing that these books are true and are ~~de~~ dependable ~~xxx~~ as to anything that can be reasonably deduced from them. Therefore the question whether the J,E,D, and P ~~d~~ theory which is now becoming so widely ~~d~~ taught is true or not is very important to the Christians.

It is not the purpose of the present writing to start from the claim that the Bible is ~~thex~~ entirely true and then on the basis of that to show that the Graf-Wellhausen theory is false. Our purpose is somewhat different. It is our purpose to look ~~at~~ fairly and without prejudice that Graf-Wellhausen theory to see exactly how much of strength and ~~g~~ weakness there is in it, to see whether there is back of it such an amount of evidence as would make it necessary that an honest person reexamine his belief in the truth of the Bible. We wish thus to approach this with absolute fairness, not with presupposition but with an examination of

exactly what is the source of the theory, how it came into existence, what are the evidences for it, and how much strength is there to them. The theory is widely taught today as something that is established as a result of the work of two hundred years Bible critics. Does the examination of the views of the scholars today support this theory? Does the examination of the history of the theory support this idea? Does examination of the arguments which were ~~are~~ advanced for it in the days when it was beginning to be accepted show that these arguments are still strong today as when/^{they were}~~it was~~ first presented? Or do we find that many of the arguments on the~~is~~ basis of which it~~it~~ came to be accepted by many liberal scholars actually can today be so disproven as to ~~be made~~ make it highly questionable whether the theory deserves longer to occupy ^{the prominent}~~so long a~~ place that it holds at present? These are matters we wish to examine in the following ~~pages~~ pages.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

This book has a very limited purpose. It is not concerned with the authorship of the first five books of the Bible, nor is it particularly interested in questions ~~relating~~ relating to their accuracy or dependability. It has only one very definite purpose. This purpose is to destroy the myth that has been established, and that is now being disseminated more widely than ever before, even when leading scholars are beginning to lose faith in it, the myth that there was once a separate document (which might be designated as "J") which included a sizable part of the material in the present books of Genesis, Exodus and Numbers; that there was also a separate document (which might be ~~also~~ designated as "E") which ~~mentioned~~ contained a sizable amount of material in these same books; and that there was also a separate document (that might be designated SP (S~~T~~?)) which included a sizable proportion of the material in these three books, plus the Book of Leviticus; that these documents were written at periods of more than a century and circulated ~~separately~~ separately until finally they were interwoven one with another, and that it is possible to separate (out) precisely the sections which were in each of these documents. This idea is today very widespread, and is being taught in many universities ~~and~~ (colleges?) and theological seminaries as established fact. It is the purpose of the present book to show ~~that this is not possible~~ that there is no solid basis ~~off~~ of fact for the separate existence ~~or~~ and independent dissemination of any one of these alleged documents.

During the ~~past century~~ ^{19th} nineteenth century a method of thought became widespread among literary scholars by which it was thought that every ancient or mediaeval document had come into existence by the fitting together of ~~one~~ selections from other documents, and that it was possible to divide each narrative up into the separate sources from which it had originally come. It is readily admitted that some ~~documents~~ works have come into existence in exactly this way, but it is questioned that ~~any large number~~ it has been true in any large number of cases instances and it is very definitely the contention of the present book that if

such a process did occur it would not be possible to separate (out) the various documents into their ~~var~~ sources unless at least one of these documents had continued to exist as a separate entity. The J, E, D and P theory as it has been circulated is a very complex theory. There are details of it upon which there has been ~~widespread disagreement~~ much variety of opinion, but there are a great number of aspects of it which are taught by numbers of scholars as established fact, and on which, especially during the first half of the present century, there was a widespread agreement among ~~Biblical~~ Biblical scholars. It is ~~that~~ the purpose of the present book to show that this is just as much a myth as the ancient idea that people could be divided into four groups according to the amount of ~~those~~ the four alleged fluids or humors each possessed, and from this measurement from which we derive our present word "^{humility}temperament" the attitude of each person was determined as falling ~~within~~ within one of the four distinct types of temperament. It is just as much erroneous as the idea practice of blood-letting which in 1800 was the common remedy for almost all diseases, and which continued to be widely used, even into the present century. These erroneous ideas, widely held for a time, have been completely given up. The J, E, D, and P idea ~~is-just-as-erroneous~~ has just as little foundation, and, ~~will-doubtless,~~ if people are willing to look at the evidence, will doubtless soon be ~~given~~ equally widely completely abandoned.

Book |

It has occurred to me that there are four general viewpoints which may be taken toward the Pentateuch. I think it proper to say that of these four viewpoints two of them may be characterized as scientific and two of them as definitely unscientific. The first two, which I would characterize as possible scientific viewpoints may be characterized in turn: the first of them as a thoroughly religious viewpoint, and the second as a non-religious viewpoint; that is to say, a viewpoint which is not affected particularly by any religious background of presupposition. The other two views that I consider as definitely unscientific may in turn be characterized; the first of them as being a religious viewpoint, although an entirely different and religious viewpoint from the first to which I referred; ~~then~~ the second as definitely and anti-religious viewpoint.

Before describing these four viewpoints ~~specifically~~ specifically x I should like to give an illustration which I think can make their nature rather clear. For my illustration I am going to suggest that we imagine, - let us suppose that there were another world almost identical with our present world except that it is now substantially in the situation which our world occupied about 100 or 150 years ago. Now ~~in~~ ^{to} this world there comes a man from outer space, and he has come from our world as it exists today. He leaves a manuscript ~~that~~ ^{there} in which he tells about some of his experiences in our world today. These ~~men~~ ⁱⁿ there, who are living x a world exactly like our world 150 years ago look at his manuscript and undertake to make a judgment as to its value or validity.

Of the four views which I have mentioned/in relation to the Pentateuch might be paralleled by four attitudes ~~which that might~~ ^{as possible} which could be taken toward this manuscript. The first of them which in relation to the Pentateuch I called "religious" and "scientific" view is a view which reads the manuscript, finds clearly what it states in it, and accepts it. The reason for acceptance of it

Bood #2

is that ~~these~~ who are thus taking this attitude have come to know the ~~author~~. They have complete confidence in ~~himself~~ ~~him~~. He makes statements that differ very strikingly at times from their own experience; nevertheless they have such confidence in his veracity, and in His knowledge and in His wisdom that they accept these statements as true. Thus their confidence in the ~~author~~ leads them to accept~~ance~~ the statements in this book even though these statements do not seem to them otherwise to fit with their own general experience. These people of course do not necessarily understand everything in the book. There may be many things in it they ~~don't~~ ~~don't~~ understand at all. They also may have ~~original~~ ~~original~~ problems as to the copy of their book = whether it's exactly like the copy as it came from the hand of the ~~author~~. There are all sorts of ~~possibilities~~ possibilities as to variation among them, as to their interpretation of the book or as to their conviction as to the precise text at certain points. They are agreed, however, in this: that the confidence in the ~~author~~ which they ~~had~~ have from personal knowledge of Him, and thorough experience of His veracity and of His wisdom leads them to believe that if they can find what he actually said they can depend upon it as being really true. Thus they read in the book that one day he left Seattle in the morning ~~and~~ that afternoon he had supper in Philadelphia and then attended his son's high school commencement in Philadelphia that night. Now anyone 150 years ago would ~~have suggested~~ say "What a fantastic, silly thing to suggest." Lewis and Clark at about that time had just returned from their expedition to the Northwest. It took them ^{(C?) the capital?} East (C?) to approximately a year to go from the ~~East~~ ~~East~~ the region of ~~Seattle~~ Seattle. How silly to think that a person could have breakfast in Seattle and then could have supper in Philadelphia. It is utter nonsense, and yet, having confidence in the author, even though we do not understand how this can ~~x~~ be, we can

believe that it is tru^e because he said it. When this attitude is taken toward the Pentateuch I call it the religious attitude, ~~and~~ an attitude of one who is looking at it entirely scientifically because his view is based upon his confidence in the integrity and wisdom of the author. After all, the greater part of what any ~~one~~ ^{one of us knows} of us know in any science we have received from others, and we ~~expect~~ accept because we have confidence in the accuracy of their observations, in the clarity of their thought, or in the integrity of their expression.

Now the other view, which I characterized as the non-religious view, would be the view of a man in this world which is exactly as ours was 150 years ago who picks up the manuscript and says "I don't know whether this manuscript is true or not. As I read this manuscript it contains all sorts of impossible things. It represents a man as having breakfast in Seattle in the morning and supper in Philadelphia on the same day. It represents people as being thrown up into the air and shot clear around the world ~~so~~ so that in the course of a day and a half they go as many as twenty times around the world/. And then in some queer way they are brought back ~~on~~ on to the earth safely without any real injury. This sounds ~~it~~ utterly fantastic. Yet, I am not ready to cast the book aside and say it is utter nonsense; nor am I ready to excise from it those sections ^{which} ~~that~~ do not sound to me to be sensible. I will look into the evidence. I will try to learn something about the author. I will see whether there is any satisfactory basis for believing that after all the book may be true, even though there are many details in it that I simply cannot understand and that do not accord at all with my present experience." This is the non-religious scientific attitude. It is an attitude which approaches the book to examine it ~~and~~ ~~and~~ and see what is found there.

Now it is my contention that if one takes this attitude toward the ~~Pentateuch and toward the~~ Bible he picks up the ^{book} and starts to read, and

he reads in it that God spoke to Abraham. He finds that God gave messages to the prophets and ~~that~~ the prophets passed on the messages that they said that God had given to them. He finds that God revealed Himself in the person of His Son, the Lord Jesus Christ, that He spoke through Christ. He reads all these things which are very different from anything that the average man experiences in ordinary human life. The truly scientific approach does not say "These things are simply impossible; we cannot accept ~~it~~ ~~it~~ it." It says, "Let's examine; let's take a skeptical, critical attitude, but let us examine it carefully and see what the evidence is for the dependability of the book; and let us decide that there is real ground for thinking that it is a forgery, or that it represents someone's dreams or wild imaginings, or represents the ideas that developed among primitive people, or let us decide that there is no such evidence, and that the evidence in favor of its/ authenticity is sufficient to believe that God actually did speak as ~~described~~ described in it. And thus it is my conviction that a person who starts with this approach, and goes to the Bible as it stands, and examines it thoroughly, will eventually come to the religious approach to the Bible, as he will find its author speaking to him and leading him to faith and belief in Christ.

~~It is~~ Anyone who approaches the Bible thus objectively, impartially, and without prejudice, I believe will come to this conclusion unless his mind has already been conditioned by the viewpoint or by matters expressed from the viewpoint of those who take what I consider an unscientific approach to it. If he has been convinced by them that the book represents ~~an~~ ~~accidental~~ an accidental collocation of various imaginary thoughts of fables or myths, or that there is some perfectly natural explanation which can account for ~~this~~ its coming into existence, his mind may be insulated from coming into contact with the real message of the book, and thus he ~~has~~ has a haze between him

Book #5

and it that prevents him from really seeing it as it is. This leads us to notice the other two fundamental viewpoints which I consider to be unscientific.

Here again, to revert to the example of the man from outer space who has brought a manuscript telling about events occurring in the world as it is today to a people who are living in a world exactly as this one was 150 years ago. Now here there are the two ~~xxx~~ ~~xxx~~ approaches: there is the one which ^I~~they~~ call the anti-religious approach; that is the one which says, "This book contains utter impossibilities. No one could possibly have breakfast in Seattle, and have supper in Philadelphia. No one could possibly~~y~~ be thrown up into the air with sufficient force to shoot round and round the earth for ~~twentytimes~~ 20 times in the course of a day and a half. And if such a thing were even remotely possible it is ~~an~~ utterly inconceivable that any way could be found to bring such a person back to this earth without his being broken to bits when he landed, or, being burnt up as he came back into ~~the pressure of~~ the earth's ~~an~~ atmosphere. The book abounds in such utter absurdities as the ~~idea~~ ^{idea} that President Johnson could speak in Washington and someone in ~~Philadelphia~~ ^{Seattle} could even see the expression on his face ~~and~~ as he spoke and could hear the very quality of his words ~~and~~ at a distance of hundreds of miles away. This is so utterly impossible and fantastic ~~is~~ that we simply refuse ~~to~~ even to admit its possibility." This is the anti-religious view. This view toward the Pentateuch characterized a number of the founders of the Graf-Wellhausen theory. They ~~know~~ ^{were sure} that God could not speak as the Bible says He did. They ~~know~~ ^{were sure} that the supernatural could not make itself known in this world as the Bible describes it as doing. All these things were utterly fantastic to them. However, the Bible was before them. Here was a book. How did this book come into existence? It was natural then to work out some theory to explain how it came into existence, and once one is determined that it cannot possibly be true, it is easy to develop theories of different sources conflicting with and contradictory to one another, having been put together in a rather clumsy way and eventually resulting in the Book~~y~~ as we have it.

Now the other view, the fourth view: is the view which is in my opinion just as unscientific as this third but which is religious, not anti-religious. This is the view which, like the third view, says, "God could not have spoken." Now it may not actually say this, but it assumes it all through. "God did not speak to Abraham and tell him to go out of Ur of the Chaldees. God did not speak to the prophets and give them messages. God did not take an initiative in ~~the~~ the actual doing of ~~these~~ things, bringing the Israelites out of Egypt and establishing them in the promised land, and so on. Such things do ~~not~~ not happen in the world. ^{They} We simply assume as a starting point that they could not happen, that they are impossible. However, ~~we~~ ^{they} refuse to take the anti-religious view of those who ~~consider~~ consider the book to be simply a group of unhistorical legends. ~~It is~~ ^{they} Instead of that, ~~we~~ start from a religious viewpoint, ^{but} a very different religious viewpoint from this first view to which which reference was made. ~~They~~ ^{They} say that this book, though it tells of many impossible things, and has many myths and legends in it, yet that in these statements, which of course are not to be taken at face value at all, there lies ~~some~~ ^{some} somewhere behind them a wonderful spiritual significance. ~~We get views~~ ^{They believe that they can reach} into the spiritual nature of the human mind and human soul from them, ~~we learn~~ ^{my} something of how man has reached out and ~~gotten~~ ^{deduced} an idea of something ~~that is~~ beyond himself. ^{Why they} We read that God spoke to Abraham and told him to leave Mesopotamia and go over into Canaan, ~~well, we don't~~ ^{they do not} even discuss whether ~~God did such a thing, as that, we assume that, of course, God does not speak in such a way.~~ ^{actually} ~~We think, however, that it shows the wonderful thing that Abraham had a marvelous insight, that the Babylonian idea of many gods simply was not satisfactory; there must be one great force. And so we get a glimpse of Abraham's marvelous spiritual perception from this story. And as we go on through all these stories, we get an insight into human spiritual qualities, in-t into human observations, into human feeling out after truth; it is man who is acting; it is man who is thinking; it is a religion which is a religion of man rather than a religion of God. It is a definite religion, but a different religion from~~ ^{but} ~~the~~

Christianity ~~is~~ contained in the Bible as it stands. It reads one thing in the Bible and interprets it as something entirely different.

Thus we have these four approaches to the Pentateuch. They might be compared to the four approaches that people in our imaginary situation might have taken toward the manuscript that we mentioned. I ~~don't~~ think I explained how the religious ~~one~~ ^{answer for you} would apply in that case, but we might say that the idea of a man having breakfast in Seattle and supper in Philadelphia would give a glimpse of the marvelous outreach of the human mind ^{is} that a person could in his imagination travel clear across the country and visit with old friends and even partake with them in their activities, even though ~~not~~ of course actually, physically, he remained in Seattle all the time. We could get different lessons from it, entirely different from what you ~~would~~ would read on the surface; this might be a comparison to it. The ~~contention~~ ^{this this} contention of ~~the~~/book is that if you approach the Bible from the viewpoint of those who know Jesus Christ as Saviour and as Lord, then we ~~must~~ take the whole Old Testament as true and as God's Word, because that is the attitude He ~~g~~ took toward it. We do not necessarily ~~understand~~ understand what everything in it means. There may be many things which we ~~are~~ are given in ~~g~~ brief, and there are factors behind them about which we know nothing, just as a person 150 years ago, hearing that a man flew from Seattle to Philadelphia in one day, might ~~imagine~~ imagine a person waving his arms like a bird, or make some other imagination ~~utterly~~ utterly different from the jet's plane situation of today. But the central fact would be true, that the person did travel through the air from Seattle to Philadelphia in the one day. There may be many things we do not understand in the Bible; there may be cases where we ~~are~~ are not sure of the exact text, or where we have uncertainty as to the precise meaning of the words. But we know the Lord, who is the Author of the Bible; we believe that He oversaw the activity of the writers, kept them from error in what they wrote. We believe that thus the Book expresses the very mind ~~of~~ of God for us, and we can accept whatever it says →

and if it does not fit with our present-day experience or observation we can ~~certainly~~ search in order to find the reason for this, but we do not cast aside anything that we find clearly taught in it.

Secondly, a person can take the thoroughly scientific attitude of the one who does not know whether this ~~book~~ is true or not. He must approach the ~~book~~ and see what is there. He must not assume that these things are impossible. He tries to find out how genuine the book is, how far back our manuscripts go, how much or how little we can depend upon the accuracy of the text. He finds that it says that God spoke, that God led the Israelites, that God opened the way for them in Canaan, that God sent His Son, Jesus Christ, into the world. He studies these things and tries to find out whether they are true or not. This is the scientific non-religious attitude, the attitude of the one who approaches it without taking a ~~text~~ prejudiced attitude ~~again~~ against accepting its statements, but simply determined to investigate and see whether it is true or not. Then there are the two unscientific attitudes: the attitude of those who assume that such things could not possibly happen, and ^{that they} therefore must find a purely natural explanation of how the writing came into existence, and can reach theories of oral tradition and of the mind of the ancient (aged?) Hebrews, and how it differs from people's minds today, and how such thoughts could have developed, and how various sources could have put them together, it doesn't take much positive objective evidence in such a case to reach a conclusion since one has already adopted ~~pres~~suppositions that rule out ~~the~~ ^{any} acceptance of the book as it stands. And there ~~are~~ is the fourth attitude which baptizes the third attitude, turns away from its anti-religious viewpoint, adopts a thoroughly religious viewpoint, but a different religion from that taught in the Bible, a religion which glorifies the human spirit and sees in all the descriptions of divine acts actually descriptions of human insight and of human development.

It is our purpose in this book to show that the unscientific attitudes are not grounded in fact, to examine the theories that are advanced by those who hold these attitudes, ~~and~~ and to see whether they stand the test of care ^{ful} objective

investigation, to see just how much or how little is the evidence for ~~the~~ theories of the Pentateuch which would say that it had come together through the joining of such documents as J, E and P, and whether there is any real evidence that such documents ever actually existed or not.

An interesting illustration that occurs to me as to how one would know this person, and know that he was dependable, is the case of ^{Sir} Isaac Newton. Newton did a great work in developing the theory of gravity, and also in the study of optics. Up until this past century many people considered him as the greatest scientist who had yet lived, yet Newton wrote a book on the study of the ~~prop~~ prophecies of Daniel. Voltaire said that Newton was the most striking illustration of how a man could on one side of his mind have a most advanced scientific mind, and on the other side be ready to accept unscientific vagaries and superstitions. Now if a person knows Newton's scientific work, and has great confidence in it, this would give him not a ground for thinking ^{that he} necessarily knew what everything in Daniel meant, but certainly it would give him ground for thinking that what he said about Daniel was worthy of serious consideration and not simply to be thrown aside.

(New section)

Now I've been thinking also about the matters of the arguments to be used and one of those is the matter of the argument from ^{parallel passages} ~~Caro-Castis(?)~~ (530), and I was thinking of the possibility of considering under the argument from parallels first the question of just how many real parallels which are ~~supposed~~ supposed to be different accounts of the same thing are actually presented. Of course the outstanding illustration is the first one, the story of creation. I would not take up the story of the flood at this point because that is a case of taking an account and dividing it ^{up} rather than applying two distinct accounts. The next one, I believe, would be the genealogies of Cain and of Seth which the critics ^{again} are two parallel

~~recensions~~ ^{recensions} (?) of the same document. Then I don't think of any other case in Genesis
of an alleged account by J and a different account ~~to~~ of the same event by ~~P~~ ^{P(2)} / (430)
We do
~~you~~ / have of course in Exodus what they claim are two different accounts of the call
of ~~Abram~~ Moses. But as you go on in Genesis you get the ~~relation~~ ^{all} between J and
E, and there each of them is said to have ^{an} account of Abram calling his wife his sister
and the results that flowed from it. This incidentally is complicated by the fact
that one of ~~the~~ ~~documents~~ them has two such accounts, in one of which accounts it's
(? 4) Isaac instead of Abram, ~~it~~ but this other account is not given to P; I believe one is
J and two are E, if I recall correctly. Then there are three or four cases where
something is named, like Mahanaim, and there are two references to its naming, one
of which is attributed to J and one to E; but aside from these I don't recall many
other cases ~~where~~ there are said to be different accounts of the same thing/
(coming from ?)
(?350) - - of the two documents. Perhaps the naming of Isaac would be one that we'll
have to look into. The great bulk of them would consist either in one having a
brief sentence covering a whole account which might take a whole chapter in the other,
which, after all, is just a case of an /introductory statement or a ~~conclusion~~ ^{concluding}
statement or an allusion to an event; and then of course there are the great
number of cases where they claim to have two accounts to have been interwoven to make
one. This we must consider by itself, the alleged interwoven accounts.

~~recognized as existing~~ in Genesis and Exodus . If, however, he felt that Exodus 6:3/ ~~properly~~ ^{could be properly} so interpreted as not to contradict the use of the name before that time, why should not the ~~an~~ original writer of the Pentateuch equally well have understood it that way? *It is easy to show that*

~~The grammar of this verse is not absolutely clear.~~ *The word* "know" in Hebrew is not exactly identical with our English word ~~know~~ "know." Thus we read in Genesis 4:1, "And Adam knew his wife." This does not mean that Adam had been completely unacquainted with Eve during the course of the events in ~~Genesis~~ Genesis 3. It expresses a ~~different~~ different type of knowledge or experience than simply intellectual

understanding of the existence of something. *Similarly, as we read in Hosea 6:3:*

"Then shall we know, if we follow on to know ~~the LORD~~ ^{YHWH}" ~~(SAM said "have this")~~ *of his day, many centuries after the time of Moses, did*

Does Hosea mean to imply that the people, to whom he is speaking did not know before that time that this was God's name? It is very

evident that what he means is that to really know God is to know something of His ~~is~~ ^{and attributes, rather} is to understand His character, His attitudes, and to have a far deeper realization of Him ^{than simply} an intellectual

awareness that He may be called by a certain name. Similarly, when Exodus 6:3 says that He ~~was known~~ ^{appeared} to the patriarchs ~~as~~ ^{for his name} "El Shaddai"

~~(translated in the KJV as "God Almighty")~~ ^{the particular} it may very well mean that ~~this/aspect~~ ^{by the name El Shaddai} of His character ~~was~~ ^{had} which is emphasized in this particular

~~name~~ ^{had} for God was the aspect that was most prominent in the relation of ^{with} the patriarchs to Him, ~~but~~ ^{a different aspect is to be} that now the aspect which is stressed is ~~the one~~

emphases of the name "YHWH" -- ~~the aspect of Redeemer~~ ^{Gods himself at} and of the One who ~~is~~ ^{as} is close

in the ~~covenant~~ covenant relationship with ~~them~~ His people, ~~is the One that~~ is going to be stressed. *what verse means,* If this is the case, there is certainly no contradiction ~~between Exod 6:3 and the frequent use of~~

~~YHWH in~~ *Gen 4:26.*

7.11
Similar alternation of names continues in Genesis. Some chapters have no divine name used in them. Some have only a few occurrences of one name or the other. In many cases both names are used in the same chapter, and sometimes in the same verse. It is a far more complicated matter than the usual critical introductory statement would suggest. seem to imply.

A DIFFERENCE IN MEANING

~~K/2/2/2/2/~~
A FALSE IMPRESSION

As ~~we have~~ ^{above,} noticed, the development that preceded, and to quite an extent ~~condition~~ ^{see} the Wellhausen hypothesis ~~began~~ when it was noticed that the first ³⁴ verses of Genesis use the name Elohim exclusively ~~(35 times)~~ ^(35 times), ~~in fact,~~ and that the next ^{22 1/2} verses (Gen. 2.4-3.12) ~~use~~ the name YHWH ^{12 times} exclusively ~~for God~~. ¹⁴⁴ It is easy to gain the impression that a similar alternation of names, with one name used exclusively for a chapter or so, and then the other name used for a chapter or so, continues throughout the Pentateuch. ~~We have noticed that after the first few chapters of Exodus the name YHWH is used most of the time. In the previous sections, the names are both used many times, but such long sections with one used repeatedly are comparatively rare. Thus in Gen. 3.1b-5 (4 1/2 verses), Elohim is used~~

but that at a later time other documents were written by men who believed that this name was not known until the time of ~~the~~ Exodus 6 and therefore avoided the name altogether until they got to that point and ~~then~~ put it in from there on. This theory, which is necessary when accepting the critical views as held by ~~some~~ ~~practically~~ all who present it today, imposes a very severe stretch on the imagination by the extremely artificial attitude of mind which it believes to have been held by the writers of these later documents. When we look into the ~~the~~ alleged differences in character and attitudes of these documents we will note other features in which the same difficulty ~~exists~~ occurs.

Here we must note again an important feature of this matter of the argument from divine names. It was noticed at a very early time that in Genesis 1:1 to 4 the name "Elohim" is used exclusively; and then from 2:4b to the end of chapter 4 either the combined name "YHWH God" or "YHWH" alone ~~is used~~ is used. It is easy to account for the fact that in chapters 2 and 3 "YHWH" is usually followed by the name "God;" it is as if the writer the writer of these chapters is doubtless saying "The ¹~~One~~ we have been speaking of as God is also the one whom we call 'YHWH'. So for two chapters he usually speaks of Him as "YHWH God," and thus shows that it is the same one we're speaking about. Then, in chapter 4 he simply uses "YHWH" and so on through most of the Pentateuch. This is a very natural usage on the assumption that most Moses wrote the entire ~~the~~ Book of Genesis. The same principle applies on the critical theory that the P document, which includes Genesis 1:1 to 2:4a was added at a later time. According to that idea the redactor who combined it with chapters 2 to 4 inserted the word "God" after "YHWH" in ~~the~~ chapters 2 and 3 in order to make the

transition clear and show that it is the same individual about whom he is talking. Yet if a redactor had intelligence enough to do this, and to understand that this was involved, it is strange that he would be so unintelligent (lacking in intelligence) as to include such a verse as Exodus 6 :3 which, according to their interpretation, and the interpretation which they say was held by the writers of both the E and/J document, which say that the name "YHWH" was absolutely unknown until the time of the early chapters of Exodus.

As the critical theory is presented in quite a number of books it sounds like a very simple and natural explanation of a strange phenomenon. Here is Genesis 1:1 to 2:4a giving us the story of creation, and always using the name E "Elohim"; then, ~~but~~ here is Genesis 2:4b following, again giving a story of ~~the~~ creation, and always using the name ~~XXXXXX~~ "YHWH." As to whether these actually are two different stories of creation, or whether one is a ~~natural~~ continuation of the other, we shall discuss that a little ~~later~~ under the question of alleged ~~parallel~~ parallels between the alleged documents. At this point notice simply that this does sound very natural, and if you have 40 verses always using "Elohim" and then three chapters always using "Jehovah", and if you can go on through the Pentateuch, having a chapter or two always using one name, a chapter or two always using the other name, ~~and~~ such an alternation raises in the minds the very natural suggestion that perhaps actually you have different sources here which have simply been combined (together). This is the idea that occurred to Astruc (sp?) and to Eichorn. The phenomena had been noticed by many people before, ~~and XXXXXXXX~~ and had been reasonably explained, even though these explanations may not have been known to Astruc or Eichorn.

At this point, however, we should note that such an alternative¹⁰⁷

is not common in the rest of Genesis; actually you find both names used in more or less equal amounts (numbers) in the rest of Genesis, and it is only comparatively rare that you find quite a number of uses of one and quite a number of uses of the other. If ~~you~~^{we} look over at the Book of Numbers at the three chapters telling about Balaam we find that the name "YHWH" is used 19 times; the name "Elohim" is used 11 times, and there is no very visible (apparent) reason why one or the other should have been used.

Coming back, however, to Genesis 2:4b,^{to} the end of ~~vi~~ ~~verses~~ 4, we find that the critical books do not say that "Elohim" ~~is~~ is always used in 1:1 to 2:4a, "YHWH" is always used in ~~1:1 to 2:4a~~^{2:4b} to the end of 4. They ~~is~~ say "Elohim" is always used in Genesis 1:1 to 2:4a, and "YHWH" is usually used in Genesis ~~1:1 to 2:4a~~ 2:4b to the end of 4. This is a rather striking difference. Actually, there are six cases in these chapters where the name "Elohim" is used in stead of "YHWH." These six cases occur in chapter 3, verses 1 to 6, which tell the story of the tempta-
tion, which can hardly be taken out of the chapter without making the chapter quite meaningless. Why should "Elohim" be used here, yet this is the J source which can be recognized by the fact that it uses ~~YHWH~~ "YHWH." The critics will answer, "Of course, it is because the serpent speaks; you could not put into the mouth of ~~a~~ the serpent the sacred name ~~YHWH~~ "YHWH;" so naturally ~~is~~ the serpent must use the word "Elohim;" and ~~is~~^{Eve}, in answering the serpent, would naturally use 'Elohim' rather than to use this sacred name ~~is~~ speaking to the serpent." It should be noted, however, that once this explanation is given and accepted, the admission has been made that there is a

The Mythology of Modernism

If one picks up a modernist book today that makes any reference to the New Testament, he is apt to find some allusion to J,E,D, or P, some statements about when the documents are supposed to have been written or something about the alleged contradictions between them. The idea that such manuscripts ever existed was put forward by Julius Wellhausen in 1878. A few scholars ^{had} advanced similar ideas previously, but [most modernistic] most critical scholars had ^{held} ~~had~~ entirely different views. The statements that these documents once existed has been repeated hundreds of times in the last ninety years. As a result it has come to be accepted as an article of faith that this was once the case. Yet, ^{actually} there is no evidence at all that this ~~ever did, this~~ ever was true.

No ancient copy of a manuscript corresponding ^{to} ~~in two~~ JEDP has ever been found. No ancient reference to ^{any} such writers or to any such books has ever been found. All ancient ~~the~~ copies of the portions of the Pentateuch that ^{we} possess have ^{it} ~~been~~ arranged ⁱⁿ substantially the way in which we find it in our modern Bibles. No ancient copy arranges it as the critics sub-divided into these documents.

The word sub-divided is not very good here. There are, as the Bible stands ~~in~~ in our ~~complex~~ Hebrew Bibles there are five books of Moses. In ^{the} Hebrew each of these books is named after ~~one of~~ some word in its first verse or combination of words in the first verse. The Hebrews have often ~~spoken~~ referred to them as the Five Fifths. Thus it is a rather ancient idea that the writing of Moses is divisible into five parts. These might be called sub-divisions, because all the material up to a certain point is put in one and then ^{the material} ~~next~~ from there on ~~into~~ up to a certain ~~part~~ is put in another subdivision. The critical theory

is quite different from this .

According to the critical theory the Pentateuch begins with
30: (Check number of ^{34 1/2} verses) which are said to be from the document P.

Then There are -- ~~42~~ ⁴² verses said to be from ^{the} document J, then so many from P and then so many from J and then so many from ^P D, then so many from J and then so many from ^P D, so many from J.

About somewhere between Genesis 15 and Genesis 20 (the ~~exact point~~ there is considerable variation of ~~ix~~ opinion as to the exact point where it starts) ^{the} The document E begins to come in, and from that point on the overwhelming mass of material is divided ~~ix~~ between J and ^E P with only an occasional , with only one full chapter and ^{an} occasional verse or even half of a verse allotted to P ~~and~~ from there on.

Thus the structure of the Pentateuch as believed in by those who accept the Graf-Wellhausen theory today might be compared in a way to a ~~mosaic~~ Mosaic. If this is the case someone must have taken the ~~document~~, in the various documents, divided ~~up~~ them up/ to sections and then put them together again taking ~~some~~ material from one and then from another, / then from the first, / then from / the third, then from the second, and so on. ~~If~~ there is no ancient reference to anyone ever having ~~any~~ done ~~documentary~~ such a thing with the Pentateuch. There is no ancient mention of any individuals as having taken part in such a process, or as to a process having actually occurred. It is entirely a modern theory as to an event of which otherwise there is no ~~a~~ evidence at all.

Now, how does it come about that people today establish such a theory? ~~It can be said.~~ Here it may be safely said that if a new manuscript is found from the ancient times, no one today would think of dividing it up in this way, ^{and} assuming that he could separate it into earlier documents

written at widely different times, alleged to have come together in this way by a process of editing.

One of our great discoveries in modern times has been the famous Babylonian ~~text~~^{copy} of Gilgamesh~~h~~, the epic of Gilgamesh, and Enuma Elish. Enuma Elish is sometimes called the Babylonian epic of creation. It consists of seven long poems to have been recited on seven days ~~in~~ at an annual Babylonian festival. The Gilgamesh epic consists of 12 large tablets, also of poetry. Students of literature agree that Enuma Elish is rather a low order of literature. Gilgamesh, however, is one of the great productions of the human spirit. Reading in the ~~original~~ original or ^{in a} translation it inevitably impresses the reader as ~~the~~ the great work of art.

~~Both of these ~~works~~ came to light,~~ The greater part of both of these ^{of these} came to light within the last hundred years. ~~Today there are~~ comparatively... We have a number of copies ~~of~~ from ~~the~~ ancient times of most portions of each of them, and the text is quite complete. ~~It has~~ ^{of it} been, Various translations/have been made into English. Both of them are famous poems. It would be altogether possible that either one of them might have been formed by someone putting together ~~the~~ the material from ^{previous} previous poems. In fact, it is extremely probable that at least portions of them existed prior to the writing of the entire work.

~~If we~~ do not find scholars of the Babylonian language and literature today, taking either ^{one of these} of ~~them~~ and ^{it} dividing it into various original manuscripts A, B, and C and D, and attempting to show how these might have been interlaced and joined together at any one time by one or more editors. The possibility of such a process having occurred cannot be ruled out. No one today would be apt to think ~~that~~ it worth his trouble to try to imagine just how the process occurred if it did occur. They

are treated ^{as complete} ~~as a~~ complete work of art which ~~has~~ ^{have} come down to us from ancient times.

If no such ~~an~~ attempt is made to divide up ~~the~~ newly discovered works of antiquity and attribute them to various ~~to~~ otherwise unknown ancient authors, ^{Why} is it done in the case of the Bible? The answer is ~~that~~ ^{since} the Bible ^{is} in our hands before these other manuscripts were discovered. The Bible was available at a time when ~~people~~, ^{when} literary scholars imagined themselves capable of dividing up the ancient documents in such a way as this.

~~About~~ 1800, During the period between 1800 and 1888 there was a large school of literature in Germany, ^{which} ~~To~~ a great extent owing its leadership to ^{Professor} ~~professor~~ Wolf, which assumes that it was possible to show that the development of ^a ~~the~~ literary work and divided it up into various sources which have been fitted together to produce it. For a good example of this, we might notice what Wolf himself did with Homer's Iliad. He divided it into so many different ~~manuscripts~~ ^{of the work}. To each he gave ~~such~~ such and such number of lines. He alleged, for instance, that in book so and so we have so many lines of this one and so many lines of that and so many lines of the first and so many lines of the second, a section from another, ~~and~~ ^{and} altogether ~~from a~~ ^{from} different source and then so many lines of the first again. This was done with most of the works of ~~the~~ antiquity that were then available. ~~In fact~~ In fact it was even attempted, ~~it was~~ done with great works of Greek and ~~and~~ Latin literature. It was even attempted to do it with the works of Goethe!

By the end of the last ~~century~~ ^{had} most ~~scholars~~, people ~~have~~ become convinced that the scholarship was off on a wrong track ~~in attempting~~ in

thinking that it was possible to divide up ~~ix~~ writings in this way among otherwise unknown authors. In many instances the theory^{ies} which this method had developed were proved to be erroneous. Today most of the theory^{ies} as regards the ancient literature have been completely abandoned except ~~for~~^{for} one case, the case of the ~~ix~~ Bible.

This approach was ~~not~~ taken toward Genesis ~~until~~, then toward the rest of the Pentateuch then eventually toward most of the books of the Bible ^{had} applied the same literary method/ that was so widely used at that time. When it was ~~given up~~ regarding other books it was ^{just} beginning to be more widely used than ever in relation to the Bible. Only there was one great change that took place. When the method was given up as regards to the other ~~books, other~~ ancient books it was largely forgotten. In the case of the Bible since 1880 ~~very~~^{have} few men^a attempted to make an entirely new arrangement of the material in the Pentateuch. although various attempts have been made to extend the same methods of division to just about every other book of the Bible. As far as the Pentateuch is concerned, the view which came to be most widely taught at about 1880 became crystalized and has been repeated with comparatively little variation over and over by critical scholars during the past ~~five~~⁵⁰ years. As a result it has been so often stated that the documents J, E, ~~D~~^a and P once existed as separate documents ~~and~~ before ~~the~~ whole army of redactors gradually, ~~under~~^{through} a long process, united them into the Pentateuch ~~into~~ the form in which we have that this theory has ~~come~~ simply come to be accepted as established fact as a result of frequent repetition. During the last few years, new steps have been taken to popularize ~~the~~ this theory and it is being taught to multitudes of people now who have never heard of it five years ago. Yet, it is a pure ^{myth} theory, ~~and~~ an imaginary reconstruction for which, as we have pointed out, there is no solid evidence at all.

Importance of this Argument

A few of the books that ~~are~~ present the critical theory minimize this argument saying that the use of the different names for God is merely one feature of style. Nevertheless, there are a number of reasons why this argument deserves to be treated separately.

The first of these reasons is the fact that many of the critical books lay great stress on it. This is particularly true of the Sunday School helps and related booklets which often give the reader the impression that it is quite easy to divide the Pentateuch into sources simply by the use of the various names for God. Since this impression is rather widespread, it is vital to point out what is the real situation, as far as the names for God are concerned.

Another reason why this argument deserves separate treatment is because it is the criterion which is employed in giving two of the names that are applied to the documents. Thus the letter J originally came from the German writing of the divine name that is represented in Hebrew by the consonants YHWH. This name is indicated in the American Revised Version by the word "Jehovah", which also occurs at a few points in the Authorized or King James Version. The King James Version usually represents it by the words "the LORD", with the word "LORD" written entirely in capitals. We do not know how this name was pronounced in ancient times. It might not help a great deal if we did, since in any language pronunciations are always gradually changing.

difference in meaning between "Elohim" and "YHWH" and that this difference
 which
 is one/~~text~~ could easily lead to the same writer using both names. The name
^A"Elohim" is a name for a class of beings. The word is used of heathen
 deities who are referred to as the "elohim." The word in this plural
 form is used for the one omnipotent God also. It stresses the idea of
 His omnipotence, His greatness, His supremacy. In chapter 1:1 to chapter 2:4a
 which tells the story of the creation of sun, moon, stars, firmament, heaven
 and earth, all the great forces of the universe, it is natural that the
 term which stresses God's ~~an~~ almighty power should be the one that is
 used. In chapter 2 where it tells of God's direct, personal relation with
 man, and man's ~~a~~ fall, it is natural, and then god's provision for man
 after the fall, it is natural that the term should be used which is used
 more as a personal name showing God in His direct personal relationship with
 the man whom He had created. Thus there is a difference in meaning
 between the two different terms that may be applied to God, just as a
 man who is president of a company, and also father ~~of~~ of a family, might
 be referred to in a group which included members of the family, and also
 officials of the company, in some instances as "Father", and in some
 instances as "The President," and both terms would be apropos although
 in some cases one ~~might~~ would be natural, and in other cases the other,
~~and it might even be that~~ and it might be natural to use one
 until there came a special reason to switch to the other, or it might
 be natural sometimes to ~~a~~ switch just for the ~~case~~ sake/of variety.

Thus the alternation of different divine names in Genesis is
 something that is paralleled in many other books, and is paralleled
 in the use occasionally of two different names for the same thing
 (person:) as Jacob and Israel in the Bible. It is a natural

division; ~~is~~ no proper basis for dividing into sources. Such alternation as we find in these first four chapters of Genesis is comparatively uncommon elsewhere in the Pentateuch, but instead, often, both names will be found in one verse, and this is not at all unnatural, ~~and~~ nor is it, in itself, a sufficient reason to say that they must be taken from different documents.



marks / earlier on film by from number

7.6
7.51

(next page table
7.52
etc)

the Wellhausen theory so shatters "Astruc's clue" as greatly to diminish its usefulness.

Another fact that often is not realized is that all of the alleged documents, after the early part of Exodus, use the name YHWH most of the time. Thus this criterion is of no use in separating documents in the last two-thirds or more of the Pentateuch.

The unreasonableness
THE UNREASONABLE CHARACTER OF THE WELLHAUSEN REARRANGEMENT,
AS FAR T AS THE USE OF THE DIVINE NAMES IS CONCERNED

That part of the present multi-documentary theory that relates to the use of divine names became ~~like~~ quite confusing and unreasonable, as a result of the complete overturning of the order of the documents from that which had been advanced by nearly all critics before Graf and Wellhausen. Since this argument is a bit involved, it will be necessary to make a special effort to indicate clearly what is meant, *It as Astruc is*

It is often said that the division of the Pentateuch into documents began with the French physician, Jean Astruc, who wrote a book in 1753 in which he presented a theory as to the sources that he thought Moses used in forming the book of Genesis. It was his suggestion (Astruc ^{revised the text} ~~advised~~) that Moses used two main sources along with ten smaller sources. These two main sources, he thought, could be distinguished from one another by the fact that one of them used the name YHWH, and the other used the name Elohim. All through ~~the~~ the history of the criticism one of its leading arguments has been the argument from the various uses of the divine names. As this argument is a bit involved it will be worth trying to make clear exactly what we mean.

As Astruc in 1753 and Eichhorn in 1796 expressed their theories, each of them believed that a portion of Genesis ^{consisted of} ~~had made up~~ a document written by someone who always used the name Elohim as the name of God, ^{what most of the rest} ~~another~~ ~~part~~ ^{another} portion of Genesis represented a document that had been written by someone who had almost always used the name YHWH for God. Thus it was easy to tell what parts of the book ~~it~~ belonged to each of these two documents. Eichhorn thought that the division could not be carried beyond the first few chapters of Exodus, while Astruc dealt only with Genesis.

Before long, however, other scholars carried the division clear on through the Pentateuch even though after Exodus 6 all the documents generally used the name YHWH. According to the views ~~as~~ held by many ^{critical} scholars during the greater part of the nineteenth century, the first document written was the one that used the name Elohim for God in Genesis and the early chapters of Exodus. According to ^{their} ~~his~~ view ^{is} ~~is~~ had been ~~the only name, the~~ ^{God} principal name by which ^{only} had been known up to the time of the call of Moses, and the name YHWH ~~came into use (only) at that time.~~ ^{(did not come into use until that time),} Therefore the

earliest

omit,

the document used Elohim up to that time, and then used YHWH from there on. Later on, they thought, supplements were added by someone who had forgotten this, and added sections here and there, giving ~~■~~ further ~~evidence~~ events or duplicates of events already ~~recorded~~ ^{included} ~~(given)~~, and in these ~~■~~ additions he did not think to keep ~~■~~ out the name ~~of~~ YHWH, but generally used it all through his portions of Genesis and early Exodus.

Now this view, so far as the divine names are concerned, does not seem utterly impossible. Other considerations have led to its complete abandonment, so that no scholar since 1900 has held such a view.

According to the Wellhausen view, which swept the scholarly world about 1878, and has been ~~held~~ ^{which} held by ~~practically~~ ^{most} ~~(virtually)~~ all critical scholars since ~~about~~ 1900, the oldest document is not the one using the name Elohim, but the one using the name YHWH, (Jehovah). When this document was written, according to the theory, hundreds of years had passed since the ~~time~~ time when Moses lived, ~~but~~. By this time all Israelites used YHWH as the principal name for God, and this name they used generally in writing the story of creation, of the patriarchs, and of the call of Moses, and continued to do so through ^{out} the events of the ~~departure~~ ^{departure} ~~(stood)~~ ^{from} / Egypt and the journey through the wilderness. ~~According~~ According to the theory, about a century or more later another document was written which they called the ~~E document~~ "E document" because in the early part of Genesis it ~~uses~~ ^{uses} the term ~~Elohim~~ "Elohim" for God. However, this document, like the J document, after the early chapters of ~~Genesis~~ ^{Exodus}, ~~always~~ ^{always} uses the term YHWH. According to the theory, the men who composed this document thought that the name YHWH had not been known to the ~~Israelite~~ Israelites until the time of Moses, many centuries before their day, but ~~had~~ ^{that} after the call of Moses ~~been~~ ^{it had become the} the usual name for God. ~~Very carefully and artistically~~ With great care they worked it out so ~~that~~ that their account of the days of the patriarchs and of the events in Egypt prior to the call of Moses should use only the

2

name Elohim, while after that ^{word} they generally ~~usually~~ used the name YHWH. Then, according to the theory, someone combined these two documents, the J and the E documents. Whoever combined them (the Redactor, as he is called) must have been unaware of the theory of the E document ^{writer} that before the call of Moses the name YHWH was not known to the Israelites. Therefore, he simply included parts of the J document and parts of the E document, interweaving these ^m and not noticing particularly that one of the ^m used the name YHWH and the other used the name Elohim. After this document had circulated for a few centuries another document was written which the critics called the "P ~~document~~ document." The men who ~~formed~~ (composed)? ? ? this document in some way came to ^{adopt} ~~299~~ (hard thinks ?) the same theory that had been held many centuries earlier by the framers of the ~~document~~ E document. They believed that the name YHWH had been unknown to their ancestors prior to the call of Moses, but had only then been revealed to Moses, and ^{that} ~~and~~ according to the theory this fact was explained in their document in the verse which is now numbered as Exodus 6:3. Therefore they used even more care than had been used by the writers of the E document to keep from using the name ~~YHWH~~ YHWH in the first part of this story.

- (1) The writers of the E document ^{② would seem to have} slipped up only six or seven times ^{③ on this point} while the writers of the J-document the P ^{document} did so ~~and~~ on only two or three occasions. This P document then circulated for quite a time, ^{but was eventually} ~~and then was~~ combined with the JE document, which had ^{already} been circulating for ~~many~~ centuries. Thus P and JE were interwoven, and, strangely enough, the redactor who combined them ~~(together)~~ was unaware of the theory of the E document and of the P document that the name YHWH had not been used before the time of the call of Moses, ^{simply} and therefore he/kept whatever name he found in each of the three documents. In fact he must have been a very obtuse individual ^{indeed} because, ~~and~~ according to the theory he ~~introduced~~ (?) included (?) in his combined

manuscript the statements in Exodus 6:3 which, they claim, sharply contradicts every use of YHWH prior to that time, and declares that the name had never been known until then.

I hope that the ~~h~~ above statements will make clear the ~~other~~ utter unreasonableness of the critical theory regarding the use of divine names in Genesis ~~and~~ and early Exodus, and the illogical nature of the deductions ~~which are drawn by it.~~ *that* The deductions drawn in the early years of the last century were far less illogical; their idea of documents having become established, Wellhausen ~~and~~ and his associates simply reversed the order of documents ^{while} ~~by~~ keeping the same theory as before, not realizing that this made the whole idea rather absurd.

11.30 Only Wellhausen
 11.31-32 all agree
 12.4-5 all agree
 13.6 all agree
 13.11a Only Harrison, Weiser, Kuhl
 11b-12a all agree except B.W.G. (J), (Also C4 H from 12a to J as well as P?)
 12b Only Wellhausen, Pfeffer, Hamilton, Weiser, Kuhl
 14. Only C4 H
 16.1a all but H & Anderson
 16.1b only Kuhl
 16.3 all agree
 16.15-17-27 all agree
 16.14 (omitted by G. & D.)
 19.29 all agree
 21.1a all but B.W.G. as of Emph E
 21.2b-5 all agree
 (2a only Harrison, Von Rad (typographical errors) Harrison does not specify)
 21.6 only Harrison included
 23.1-20 all agree (Spencer & Hork think J the main writer)
 25.7-11a; all agree
 12-17
 18 only Harrison & Von Rad
 19-20 all agree
 26b all agree (Kuhl all of V. 26)

P Passages

Don 1.1-2.14a all agree
 4.25-26 only Hamilton
 5.1-28 all agree, except Emph dt given 28b to J
 (Also Kuhl from 29 to P as well as to J)
 5.30-32 all agree
 6.9-22 " "
 7.6 " "
 (7.7-10) a few in definite portions, incl. driver, & light,
 7.11 all agree
 7.13-16a " " (Ryle portions)
 17a portion, g.v.
 7.18-21 all agree
 7.24-8.2a " "
 8.3b-5 " "
 8.13a " "
 8.13b (Only Wellhausen) ~~Pfeffer~~
 8.14-19 all agree
 9.1-17 " "
 9.28-10.1a " "
 10.1b all except C4H, SK?, Pf., Hork,
 Emph dt, Von Rad
 10.2-7 all agree
 10.20 all agree [Summary]
 10.22-23 " "
 10.31-32 " "
 11.10-27 " "
 11.28 Only Wellhausen, and ~~Emph dt 28b~~

26. 34-35 all agree
27. 46-28.9 " "
29. 24 all agree except Ryle??,
B.W.A., Spencer
29. 28t all agree except, Ames E,
Giddes J, ~~Har~~^{Spencer} J, Anderson J
29. 29 all agree except, Spencer,
Harrington, Anderson
30. 1p
30. 4w Dr., SK, P., Ensf.
30. 9t Dr., SK, P., Ensf.
30. 22a P Dr., 1913; Giddes, C & H, SK, Brightman,
Pfeffer, Bower?, Hooker;
E Dr. 1891; Comm.; Bower?,
Spencer, B.W.A. JE,
31. 18t all agree
33. 18a all agree
- 18t C & H, Bower, Ensfeld
34. The following give no part yet to P
felt
34. 1-2a Ames, Collins, C & H, Hooker
Nobody found ^{much} Pen. Ch. 34 except
Ames, Giddes, C & H, Hooker
Skinner - "Punctate Reductum"
Ryle - a little P
Skinner & Brightman mainly E

34

Ames, Giddes, C & H, Hooker give
no part to PSpencer, B.W.A. - all J
Van Rief - basin narrative J

P. - S

Ensf - all or largely L (Some E)
C & H, Hooker

35. 15

35. 6w

SK, Brightman, P., Bower, Hooker
Harrington, Ensf, Van Rief - all to P

Ames, Giddes, Ryle, Spencer - to E

all agree

39. 9-13

39.

160 000840 2.3 31.1
THE COMPLEXITY OF GRAF-WELLHAUSEN THEORY
h

2 The production of one of our leading modern ~~mag~~ news magazines is a very involved undertaking. Dozens of reporters all over the world send in accounts of events. Researchers gather past facts that may be of help in interpreting these events, ^{and} rewrite ~~man~~ takes the material sent in by perhaps a dozen correspondences ^{to} and the material gathered by half a dozen researchers, summarize ~~them~~ ^{it} together and puts ~~them~~ it and and writes a preliminary draft of an article. Then ~~in the~~ committee a committee composed of several men goes over this article making changes here and there and rearranging, ~~the~~ changing emphasis and *forging* the *whole* into something written in the particular catchy and interesting style for which the news magazine is famous.

1 Comparatively few people know how complex is the process that goes into the production of one of the magazines.³ Let us suppose that ~~someone~~ had never had any connection with the production of the magazine, had never had it explained ^{to} /him just how it is done, had never talked with any ~~one~~ of the people who did it, [but that he worked ~~to~~ simply to see one of the copies for the first time.] Can you imagine ~~that~~ ^{what} the success ~~that~~ he would have in trying to determine simply from the ~~them~~ ^{hundreds of} same product exactly what were the sources from which the material had come. What had been written by one writer which ~~sections~~ by another writer. What changes were made by the ~~editorial~~, by the final editorial committee. What particular statements were gathered together by which particular researchers. If he were then to produce the results of his work and say here is how this article came ~~to~~ into being, ^{it} /It would be strange indeed, ^{if} if even one of his suggestions as to the source of the various parts of it were ~~to be~~ ^{to prove} proved to be true.

The situation ~~is~~ would be quite different, if an article ~~were composed~~

ideas from various sources. There are simply not ^{enough} ~~enough~~ ~~able~~ ~~highly~~ ~~capable~~ ~~men~~, highly capable writers for many writings to be complex in origin.. And when they are complex, unless we have available other material by the same men with which to check, it is practically an impossibility ^{attempt to} to/disentangle.

Now, as the critical view is presented in popular writing or ~~in~~ semi-popular writing or even ^{Sometimes} ~~in~~ college text books ~~sometimes~~, it seems like a very comparatively simple thing. Writers sometimes speak as if it were quite simple to ~~dis~~tinguish between the ~~xx~~ style of J, ^E B, D, and P and ^{to} tell what was written by one and what was written by another of these alleged writers. Actually the critical theory as it developed is far more complex than the impression of it that is received from popular writings.

It originally began as a rather simple thing, Astruc and later Eichhorn suggested that Genesis ~~was a composite~~ was composed of two different sources which ^{had} ~~have~~ been interwoven. After ^a series of very great and sweeping changes in critical opinion ^{through} lasting three fourths of a century, eventually the system which has prevailed during the subsequent ninety ~~xxx~~ years came to be presented. This system, ^{known as the G.W. Theory} took the original idea of two writings ^{one of} which used the name Yahweh for God and the other used the title Elohim, and tremendously increased the complexity. According to this view, what was previously considered to be the ^E document and to be the earliest document is actually itself a composite (document) made up of two distinct documents, ~~and of these two distinct documents~~ which are called E and P, and which were written at ~~very~~ different times and which are alleged to have ^a ~~them~~ ~~utterly~~ very different viewpoint and extremely different style.

P
According to the Graf-Wellhausen theory ~~there were~~, there was an early writing which is called J which used the name Yahweh for God. A century or so later ~~another~~, there was another ^{writing} ~~writing~~ which ~~it~~ told substantially much the same material as in the J document, but told it from somewhat different viewpoint, and which always used the name Elohim for God instead of the name Jehovah. This ~~manuscript~~ ~~this~~ document then ~~as~~ ^{the} critics call E. According to their view a redactor combined these two into a new document which was called JE. ~~The's~~ combination was done so skillfully that often it is very difficult to disentangle J from E. Frequently the only basis ^{which} on/the division can be made is/~~that~~ ^{the use of} the Divine name and there are many ~~such~~ sections in which no ~~is~~ Divine name at all is used. ~~The claim~~. It is admitted that the style of J and E are so similar that it is very difficult to tell on this basis what belongs/~~to these~~ ^{in each of} documents. The ~~claim~~ claim is made that E has ^a slightly more advanced theological viewpoints ~~that~~ than ~~that~~ that of J. ^{That is} It is said that J ^{is} strongly markedly anthropomorphic while E is more ~~p~~ apt to be more anthropopathic. According to the critical view ~~these~~ ^{this} combined documents JE circulated for a number of centuries. Then a new document was written which they call ~~R~~. This document, however, is found in the later books of the Pentateuch rather than in Genesis. ~~Any more~~ In these later books JE ~~were~~ ^{was} united with D by a redactor, so that the combined work JED ~~is~~ united ~~Genesis with~~ the material in ~~Genesis~~ ⁱⁿ J E Genesis ~~which~~ with these material in these other ~~books~~ ^{and} was circulated for a time. Then quite separately from this, a group ^{of} of priests combined ~~the~~ work which most critics consider not the work of an individual but the work of a whole school of writers. In this work the name Yahweh was not used for God, but simply the name Elohim. This ~~work~~ work circulated by itself for a time, and then a redactor combined

it with J,E,D. Thus in Genesis there ~~are~~ are three strands ~~of~~ united J, E, ~~and~~ and P while in some other parts of the Pentateuch there are four strands united ~~with it~~ according to this theory.

Good point

~~The redactor,~~ The various redactors thus ~~were~~ who made ~~this~~ ^{this} union are sometimes represented as having simply done ^a ~~the~~ paste and scissors' ~~work~~ uniting ~~the~~ sections which ^{often} overlap, which often contradict each other ~~and~~ and are often so fit together so poorly that one ~~wonders~~ wonders how anyone could be so stupid as to have ~~arranged~~ them ^{at} arranged ^{at} this way. Yet, ^{claimed} other times it is ~~calimed~~ claimed that they are united so skilfully that the features of each are carried over in the wording of the other to some extent.

During the first three quarters of the last century ^{19th} there were many critics who carried on the ~~attempt~~ attempts to divide the Pentateuch into ~~these~~ documents just as they did with most ^{other} ancient writings and even with some modern ones. ~~This was supposed to be done purely on the basis of,~~ Most of them ^{claimed to} do this purely on the basis of literary form and structure and style and variations of the types of ideas.

Quite distinct in the main from this was another movement ^{which was} largely a movement ^{that attempted} attempting to account for the origin of Christianity as ^{being} purely ^{the} results of natural development. An outstanding leader in this movement was Prof ^{Reuss} Reuss of Strassburg. As early as 1823 (Check date) Prof. Reuss advanced the idea that the ~~Prophets~~ Prophets preceded the law while the ~~poets of the psalms, while the~~ psalms came much later. Thus he alleged ~~that~~ that there was a development ^{of} process by which the idea of the Pentateuch ~~came~~ came into existence. ^{During most of the century this idea was not} ~~This idea was not during~~ ~~the~~ ~~century~~ ~~most of the century,~~ particularly thought of by ~~the~~ the men who were trying to divide the Pentateuch into documents. ^{person} Toward the end of the third quarter of the century ^{these} these two movements were united largely by the

EFFORTS OF ~~the scholar~~ by a scholar named Graf. Prof. Graf took up the theory (advanced in 1853 by Hupfeld) that divided the old E document into two (now called P and E) and ... said that E was actually ~~more~~ more like J than like P. When this theory was first presented most scholars paid ~~very~~ little attention, but Graf in 1863 (Check date) advanced the idea that in the latter part of the Pentateuch the so-called P sections, which most ~~critics~~ ^{previous} had thought to be the very earliest and ~~oldest~~ ^{oldest} part of the Pentateuch, were actually the latest and represented the most advanced ^{Stage} of the development. The literary critics criticized his theory saying that it was impossible to separate the style of the E sections of the latter books of the Pentateuch from the P sections of the Genesis. Graf answered this by saying that the P sections of Genesis, which practically all scholars before this time had thought to be the very earliest part of Genesis, were actually the the very latest part.

Previous to this time most scholars had thought that the section known as E comprising ~~of~~ the later P and E was the very first writing of the Pentateuch, and its foundation or its general structure. Hupfeld's theory or Graf's theory completely upsets this idea ~~making it~~, making the main ~~structure~~ ^P structure of the book of Genesis, as far as it is supplied by the document, ~~and it would~~ ^{to have} come much later ~~than~~ ^{and to have been} added on ~~to~~ something alleged to have been written ~~so~~ ^{at a} far earlier time.

The development theories of Reuss and others fit in with ~~the~~ the generally widely spread idea that the religious beliefs were not revealed by God, but that they represent ~~the~~ ^a natural human development. Whatever one believes about God, the existence of the Pentateuch is a fact. How are we to explain this fact? Graf presents ~~his~~ ^{ed. in} explanation on naturalistic terms to show how it had developed. This ~~is~~ ^{was} taken by Wellhausen and published after Graf-Weilhausen's death in

very clear and attractive German style, ^{and it} carried ~~by storm~~ ^{by} ~~the~~ young ^{or} scholars who ~~were, who~~ had accepted the development idea as opposed to the idea of religion having been revealed by a living God, and consequently they adopted the whole theory of development of the religious ideas of the Pentateuch and of the development of the various alleged documents. ^{Most} ~~Both~~ of the older scholars including such great ~~scholar~~ names Dillmann never accepted the Graf-Wellhausen theory. But the younger scholars accepted it and as the older scholars died ^{off} ~~out~~, the Graf-Wellhausen theory completely carried the field.

In subsequent years the methods which were used ~~in the methods~~ which were used ^{to} ~~divide~~ the Pentateuch into these alleged main documents came to be ~~applied~~ applied to each of these documents, and scholars claimed ~~to divide~~, to be able to ^{divide} ~~divide~~ up J, E, D, and P./ J1, J2, ~~J3~~ J4, J3, and J4 and E1, E2, D1, ^{D2} D3, and P1 and P2, P3, P4, etc. This was simply applying the same method ^{the} to various documents that ^{had} ~~have~~ been first used to divide the Pentateuch, ^{to} to prove the existence of these documents. The result of it is, however, ~~it~~ to have something which was written actually by dozens of different writers, ^{which} and came together by a process of constant editing, reuniting and reediting over a period of centuries. We have no evidence of such a process having been ^{thus} ~~carried on~~ anywhere. We have no evidence that in ~~the~~ ancient time documents were thus ~~broken~~ broken up, ^{edited} and united together ⁱⁿ in ~~this in~~ such a fashion.

~~The~~ Many leading critical scholars in recent years have moved away from some of the basic principles of the Wellhausen theory ^{although} not from its idea of documents. This movement comes in two directions. One, the ~~old~~ idea of the development of the laws and of the documents, ^{and it}

3/8

Saudi cal

is to quite ~~extent~~ extent to ignore. In fact many of these scholars, while holding to the Wellhausen's idea of the time of coming into existence of these documents, maintain that each of them contains a great deal of material from extremely early times. All are now ready to admit for instance that ^{the} P document contained a great deal of accurate historical information from a time even long before the alleged production of the D document. Thus the latest document contains the material that is earlier than ~~an~~ almost anything in the early document, ~~that~~ [!] The date of the documents hardly tells ~~of anything~~ anything according to ~~the~~ present ideas about the origin of the material or ideas in them. Thus the foundation of the development idea is to a large extent given up as a result of the new ~~1/~~ discoveries and new understandings of the ancient civilization and ^{of} ancient beliefs.

VII. THE THIRD ARGUMENT -- PARALLELS AND REPETITIONS

One of the arguments most stressed in books dealing with the multi-documentary theory is the claim that the Pentateuch, and in particular the Book of Genesis, has many parallel accounts or duplicates. This argument, when presented in a superficial way, sounds extremely strong. On careful examination it proves to be not nearly ^{as}~~so~~ strong as it sounded at first.

The alleged parallels can be divided into various types. One of these types consists in the occurrence of short sentences which say almost the same thing. Thus Carpenter-Harford (page 511) gives the first part of Genesis 30:22 to P, the next to E, and the last third ^{of the verse} to J. The verse reads: "And God remembered Rachel, and God hearkened to her, and opened her womb."

A little reflection should show the inadequacy of such reasoning. ^{It is a} In all ^{common device} ~~periods of time it has been customary~~ to repeat ideas for emphasis. Any public address that is at all effective will contain sections in which the same thing is said two or three times in different ways. Not only is this true of all writing and all literature; it is particularly true at certain periods of ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~earth's history~~ ^{world} when repetition becomes a very frequent literary ~~device~~ ^{device}. Thus, if one looks at the Book of Psalms or the Book of Proverbs, or at one of the Books of the prophets, he will find innumerable cases where a statement is made and then repeated in slightly different language.

Repetition of an idea for emphasis or for literary beauty is a particularly common feature of Hebrew writing, and is found ~~in~~ in all parts of the Old Testament, even in those where there is no doubt of the unity of authorship. It is not at all strange that such repetition ^{is} is found not only in this verse about Rachel, but at many other places in Genesis and Exodus.

Other alleged parallels are short summaries of something that is told elsewhere in detail. Some of these might be compared to a modern ^{"newspaper lead."} It is customary in our newspapers to give a brief summary of ^{an entire} ~~A~~ story in the

(7/6/66)

VII. The third

121

Parallels

One of the arguments most stressed in books dealing with the multi-document theory is the claim that the Pentateuch, and in particular the Book of Genesis, has many parallel accounts or duplicates. This argument, when presented in a superficial way, sounds extremely strong. On careful examination it proves to be not nearly so strong as it sounded at first.

The alleged parallels can be divided into various types: one of these types consists in the ^{occurrence of} fact of having ~~two~~ short sentences which say almost the same thing. ^① Thus, ~~in~~ ^② ~~the verse~~ ^{Carver's - Harford (511) gave the first part of Gen. 30.22 to P. The rest to} ~~it says, "And God remembered Rachel, and God had compassion on Rachel, and He did unto her as he had promised."~~ ^③ ~~The multi-document theory divides this verse into three parts, saying that "God remembered Rachel" is one parallel, belonging to one document; "God had compassion on Rachel" is a second parallel, belonging to a second document, and "he did unto her as he had promised." is a third parallel, belonging to a third document.~~ ^{it says, "And God remembered Rachel, and God had compassion on Rachel, and He did unto her as he had promised." [COPY from KJV]}

A little reflection should show the inadequacy of such reasoning. ^{In} At all periods ~~of~~ ^{that had been} time it is customary to repeat ideas for emphasis. Any public address ~~that one ever hears~~, that is at all effective, will ^{contain sections which} have in it the same things ^{repeated} said ~~over~~ ^{at least} two or three times in different ~~language~~. Not only is this true of all writing and all literature; it is particularly true at certain periods of the earth's history when repetition becomes a very frequent literary device. Thus, if one looks at the Book of Psalms or the Book of Proverbs, or at ^{one of the Books of the prophet} any of the ugaritic hymns, ~~he~~ ^{revealed in} will find innumerable cases where a statement is made and then ~~almost exactly~~ the ~~same thing is said in~~ slightly different language. We might cite here a few instances, first from the Psalms, then from the ~~Proverbs~~, and then from the ~~Ugaritic~~ hymns.

In addition we might give one or two similar instances from Isaiah and from Jeremiah.

first sentence or two. Then the account again begins at the beginning and describes the events in detail. Thus an introductory summary, or, sometimes, a concluding summary, is occasionally found in Hebrew literature.

Aside from such alleged brief parallels, longer types are found which might be designated as complete parallels and interwoven parallels. We shall look first at the alleged complete parallels.

It is stated in many books that the Bible begins with two distinct and contradictory accounts of creation. It is said that there are two parallel accounts of the genealogy from Adam to the time of the flood. It is said that there are two parallel accounts of Abraham calling his wife his sister and as a result getting into difficulty from which he has to be rescued by divine intervention. Actually, there are not nearly so many parallels of this ~~type~~ type as the general statements made in critical books would lead one to suppose.

3.

~~10.8~~
10.8

Most of the parallels of this type consist of ~~incidents in which~~ instances where, according to the critics, two contradictory accounts of the same thing had become sufficiently confused that the redactor thought them to be different events and therefore included both accounts. The critics say that it is inconceivable that ~~two~~ two different events that are so similar could have occurred. In many of these instances our answer is to say that given similar characters and similar situations, similar events not only may but often do occur. Even aside from any such natural cause, coincidences are far more common in ordinary life than most people realize.

PARALLELS IN MODERN LIFE

PARALLELS IN MODERN LIFE

10.13

Some of the coincidences that anyone will come across if he keeps his eyes open for them are extremely striking. A very interesting one ^{can be seen by} ~~is evident if~~ ~~one will~~ look ^{ing} under the letter K. in the Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, published in 1955 as an extension of The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. ~~Notice~~ Here ~~it~~ ~~will find~~ the name of "James Anderson Kelso, Presbyterian" ^{is immediately} followed by that of "James Leon Kelso, United Presbyterian." One of these men was born in India in 1873, ^{the other} ~~one was~~ ~~born~~ in Duluth in 1892. Yet each became a professor of Old Testament in Pittsburgh in a Presbyterian theological seminary, one under what was then called "The Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.", the other under "The United Presbyterian Church." James Anderson ~~Kelso~~ Kelso devoted himself mainly to textual and linguistic studies; James Leon Kelso ^{has been active in Biblical} ~~to quite an extent to~~ ~~archaeological~~ ~~study~~, although ~~some~~ ~~what~~ ~~also~~ ~~to~~ ~~linguistic~~ ~~study~~. In November, 1951, I was interested to read a newspaper account of the death of Professor James Anderson Kelso, and to find that the account attributed to him the excavation work in Palestine that had been conducted in the previous year by Professor James Leon Kelso. Since that time the two denominations have merged and the two seminaries have coalesced, so that there is now only one Presbyterian theological seminary in Pittsburgh, with one man named Kelso as its professor of Old Testament. Here is a striking case of ^a rare and unusual coincidence such as would seem to be evidence of a confusion of two different documents, if it were not so easy to prove that it corresponds to actual fact.

18222 Any good history of the wars ~~that were waged~~ between Great Britain

10,14

Any good history of the wars between Great Britain and Germany in the present century ~~is~~ will tell of two interesting events. If the story of ~~the~~ ^{such had been} two events ~~was~~ contained in an ancient writing found a century ago it would then undoubtedly have been taken

~~Islands. This occurred in the first year of~~
squadron of ships met a group of German ships off the eastern coast^t of South America. After heavy fighting the German ships were sunk and Vice-Admiral Graf von Spee went to the bottom of the ocean with his fleet on December 8, 1914,

Twenty-five years later, in the first year of World War II a German battleship named Graf Spee met a British fleet off the east coast of South America. After heavy fighting the Graf ~~Spee~~ Spee was disabled. It put into the port of ~~Monte~~ Montevideo, Uruguay, and attempted to repair the damage. Being unable to do so in the time that it was permitted to remain, the ship steamed out of the harbor and there was scuttled by its crew, so that the new Graf Spee also went to the bottom of the ocean off the east coast of South America. This occurred on December 17, 1939.

The similarity between these two events is so great that any good literary scholar a ~~x~~ century ago would have had no doubt that the two accounts described the same ~~events~~ event. There was of course a difference. In the first case Graf Spee was a man; in the second case it was a ship; but any good critic would say that such ^a confusion could very easily occur, while to believe that actually two such similar events had happened in this way would have been said to be beyond the bounds of historical possibility.

(2)

10,142

~~would certainly have been considered to be simply two accounts of the same event with a few minor contradictions and differences that had come in in the course of transmission. The two events are the same.~~

~~are as follows:~~ The man who was elected president of the United States in 1860 was shot to death by a southern sympathizer who was himself shot not long afterward. The deceased president was succeeded by the ~~xx~~ vice-president, who was named Johnson and who had been a ~~xx~~ senator from a southern state the name of which began with the ~~letters~~ letters "Te" ~~(Tennessee)~~ (Tennessee). The man who was elected president of the United States in 1960 was shot to death ~~in the south~~ in the south, by a man who was himself shot ~~to death~~ on the next day. This president also was succeeded by a ~~man~~ vice-president named Johnson who had formerly been a United States senator from a southern state the name of which began with "Te" (in this case, Texas). Such a coincidence as this goes beyond ~~any~~ similarity that is to be found between any two ~~events~~ different events in the Pentateuch that are alleged by the critics to be evidence of having come from two different documents ~~and~~ ^{while} being actually distorted pictures of the same thing.

If one is on the lookout for coincidences he will find them constantly, for life is full of them. In the case of the assassinations of Lincoln and Kennedy a number of other remarkable coincidences, in addition to the striking ones already mentioned, have been pointed out. The three illustrations I have given should surely be enough to ~~show~~ show the great danger of thinking that because two ~~of them~~ ^{stories} are somewhat similar they must necessarily be distorted ~~pictures~~ accounts of the same original, ~~as is~~ ^{is constantly} assumed by ~~why~~ the critics in their presentation of this argument.

Now let us examine the instances where it is claimed that this has occurred.
THE SO-CALLED TWO-CREATION ACCOUNTS

The critics assign Gen.1.1-2.4a to P and 2.4b-4.25 to J. As we noticed above, 2.4b-4.25 does not use YHWH exclusively, but has ~~only~~ 4 uses of Elohim in the ~~only~~ 4 1/2 verses from 1b-5. These verses are so tightly knit to the context that it would be difficult to consider them an insertion from a different document. It is generally agreed that it is not out of place to find Elohim used here in the J document, since it would be strange to put the sacred name YHWH in the mouth of the serpent. Once this is admitted, it ~~is~~ must be recognized that one document could use both names, ~~having~~ and that there is a difference in their meaning. On p. 15 of his Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (1913 edition), Professor S.R.Driver admitted as much, saying in a footnote:

on 1.13

Once this has been admitted, it seems that the argument for use of divine names as a means of distinguishing documents has lost most of its power. The word Elohim stresses God's power as the great Creator. In chapter 1, ~~where~~ which tells of His powerful acts in creating the mighty universe, this is the natural term to use. After 2.3 the new section and tells of His relation to Man in creating him, placing him in Eden, laying down the conditions of his existence. ~~Here~~ Here the more personal name is the natural one to use, stressing God's relation to His people. Sometimes ~~it~~ it is natural to stress God's power, and sometimes His relationship to

81/10

Later on the first and longest of these two alleged documents was said to be itself made up of two distinct documents, one of which was much more similar to J than to the rest of the document using the word "Elohim." for "God." Eventually the present theory was developed.

It should be noticed that all of the documents use the name "YHWH" in the overwhelming mass of cases, after the early chapters of ~~Genesis~~ Exodus. Thus it is only in Genesis, and the first few chapters of Exodus that this use of divine names is of any help in dividing material into the three documents. Why should one document use the name "YHWH" in ^{the section} these ~~60~~ ~~50 or 60 chapters~~, and the others ~~only use the name "Elohim"~~ use only the name "Elohim" in them? The rationale of it, as presented in all of the critical books on the subject is quite definite, but not particularly logical.

According to the theory of the critics the J document held the view that the name "YHWH" was used from the very earliest times, while the writers of the E/ document, and the P document believed that this name was unknown until the time of the exodus and then became the name of Israel's God. (god?)

The theory might have some reasonableness to it if the documents were considered as arranged(?) ranged(?) as originally thought by

the great bulk of the critics of the last century. However, the Wellhausen theory, as presented by Wellhausen in 1878, and as contained in practically all critical books published in America in recent years, presents and arranges the documents in a way which makes the theory actually quite unreasonable.

Let us think for a minute (moment) of what the theory involves. ~~Accof~~ According to it there was a document which was in circulation for a century or more which used the name YH ~~YHWH~~ for God right from the beginning because its author believed that this had been the name of Israel's God right from the beginning. Later on another document was written by men who believed that this name had not been used until the time of the exodus when it came to be the name of Israel's God. Here, definitely, a new idea was introduced, quite at variance with the idea in the manuscript that had already been ~~circulating~~ circulating for a considerable period of time. Yet when the two documents were combined the redactor evidently had forgotten this idea because he simply combined the material from the two documents, interweaving it, keeping the names as he found them in his document, with apparently (evidently) no thought of any necessity of bringing them into line with one ~~thery~~ or the other. This is hardly reasonable.

The irrationality of the assumption, however, becomes far more pronounced when we realize that, according to the theory, several ~~centur~~ centuries later the P document was put together, and the writers of this document believed ~~xxxxx~~ what had been believed by the writers of the E document, namely, that the name 'YHWH' was unknown until the time of the exodus. Even though they were constantly using the name now, and

even though they used it constantly in the last four-fifths of the ~~book, of the~~ document that they wrote, they took great pains to avoid using it before the ~~time of~~ time of the exodus, since they did not think that it had previously been known. ~~Thus~~ Thus the same theory was developed by the writers of the E document ~~and~~ and by the writers of the P ~~document~~ document many ~~centuries later~~ centuries later, a theory quite at variance with the facts as believed as represented in the J document which had already been in existence a century before the writing of the E document.

Now comes the still greater incongruity. According to the critical view, the P document was eventually interwoven with the manuscript that has already been formed by interweaving J, E, and D. In this interweaving, the redactor must again have completely forgotten the theory which the P writers had so carefully tried to maintain, because into the combined work he ^{interweaves the} ~~interweaves the~~ material from the J document, using the name "YHWH" right from the beginning, and yet retaining a statement which the critics tell us clearly and definitely means that the name was not revealed until the time ~~of~~ of the exodus.

Thus, if the documents are arranged in the order in which the critics have almost ~~unanimously~~ unanimously arranged them since Wellhausen's day, the theory involves not an ~~accidental~~ accidental development, but the development of a ~~new~~ new idea which, in order to carry through, had to be very carefully and punctiliously observed, and yet which was laid aside and completely forgotten when the J and E documents were united, was again brought to the front, and carefully, and even more punctiliously than in the E document, carried through in the formation of the P document, and then ^{again} ~~was~~ completely forgotten in uniting of the P document with the other parts ~~of~~ of Genesis.

Copied / /

III A METHOD - ... By - June Egan

Anyone who lives ^{beside} near the ocean or near a large river is apt ⁽²⁾ to have ⁽¹⁾ experienced at some time in his life, ⁽³⁾ ~~exactly~~ experienced a great flood, ^{when} as the water rises and completely changes the landscape ~~for~~ for a time. Then the water recedes, and the landscape looks substantially as it did before, except that often there are bits of wreckage ~~or~~ that have been deposited by the flood waters that remain ^{stationary} in place unless ^{a considerable} some effort is made to remove them. Sometimes these changes are good, and worthy ^{of preservation} to keep ~~worthwhile keeping~~ ^{generally, however,} being kept ~~as they are~~. More often, what the temporary tide has deposited needs to be removed as merely the symbol of a by-gone stage that has now passed away.

It is the purpose of the present chapter to show that this is the situation ^{regarding} so far as the theory that ^{ever} one time there existed as ~~separate~~ ^{documents} separate documents ^{anything} ~~something~~ corresponding to the so-called J, E and P, of Pentateuchal Criticism. ^{Such an idea is the result of} These ~~we believe were deposited~~ by certain trends of critical thought ^{which} that were extremely prominent ^{in the study of literature} in the period between approximately 1790 and 1930, but which have ^{now} almost entirely receded. The results of these trends have ^{by this time largely} almost completely ^{the various} disappeared in ~~a dozen different~~ fields of ~~literary~~ literary study ~~to which~~ from which evidence will be brought.

It is only in the ~~fixed~~ field of Biblical study that one particular stage of the result of these movements of thought became crystallized and ^{remains} ~~has been retained~~ as a sort of petrified evidence, ^{of} a by-gone attitude.

Unfortunately, ^{of} in the case of Biblical studies, ^{many of} while the ideas and background principles upon which these results were based ~~many of them~~ receded with the tide of the ideas of the nineteenth century, ^{they} and many of the alleged evidences have been eradicated by advances in thought ~~during~~ and in research during the twentieth century. ^{Yet} the result in the theory described above remains in crystallized form and is now being popularized and distributed far more widely than ever before.

A-15

THE METHOD OF A BY-GONE ERA

3.2
31

The ~~multi documentary theory~~ of the Pentateuch, the J, E, and P multi-
~~documentary~~ theory of the origin of the Pentateuch came into existence as the
result of certain trends and tendencies which were very prominent in historical
and literary criticisms in the 19th century. These trends went to an extreme in
that century, ran their course, and have mostly been followed by a strong
reaction in the opposite direction.

The application of these theories to Biblical studies was begun by a
comparatively small group of scholars in Germany at about the beginning of the
19th century. During the century they were applied ^{in a series of ever-} ~~to varying extent and in many~~
~~different directions~~ by various groups of scholars in Germany and other countries.

In 1878 the brilliant writing of an outstanding German professor, Julius
Wellhausen, crystallized one particular phase of these theories into a definite
form, and this form has been preserved unchanged in any major regard, ever since,
Meanwhile the trends and tendencies ^{that} ~~which~~ gave birth to this constantly changing
flux of ideas and attitudes in the 19th century has spent its course. Present-day
scholars mostly simply take over the ^{documentary} ~~theory~~ of the Pentateuch as presented by
Wellhausen and ^{reproduce} ~~reproduce~~ it with little change.

The tendencies which ^{It will be interesting to examine} ~~it will be interesting to examine~~ the tendencies ^{that} ~~that~~
which were so prominent in 19th-century study, ^{to see to what extremes they} ~~to see to what extremes they~~ then
ran, and ^{to note the way in which they have so largely} ~~to note the way in which they have so largely~~ disappeared in the
course of the present century.

~~These tendencies may be summarized under three heads: the first of these~~
~~would be an attitude of skepticism toward~~ ~~ancient history and ancient~~
~~documents in general.~~ All three of the tendencies of which we wish to speak
find a strong ~~connection~~ expression in connection with the work of Professor F. A.
Wolf, a noted German scholar and lecturer, ^{who lived from 1759 to 1824.} They did not originate altogether
with Wolf. Evidences of their rise were already visible before his time, but

he presented them in such a brilliant and forceful way that ^{later} ~~subsequent~~ supporters ~~came to~~ largely considered themselves as following in his footsteps.

The first of these ~~tendencies~~ ^a was the tendency toward extreme skepticism as regards ^③ ancient documents and ^② ~~ancient history~~ ^{in general} ^⑤. Wolf did not believe that writing had been in existence when the great epics of ancient Greece were originated. He questioned that there ~~ever~~ ^{had} been such a city as Troy, and suggested that various poems ^{formed by the imagination of a} originated by a ~~great~~ great number of different minstrels had gradually been gathered together to form these great epics. Some scholars welcomed his ideas; ~~some~~ others were ~~terribly~~ ~~xx~~ shocked by them; but for a number of decades the tendency ^{that} that he represented generally won ^{their} ~~its~~ way.

The followers of this attitude took the approach that nothing in ancient history was to be accepted as true unless it could be ^{absolutely proved} ~~abundantly~~ ~~proven~~. ~~This was a natural result of the discovery of errors in the accounts of~~ ^{certain ancient documents} ~~ancient history, and of the rise of fables of stories and myths which had~~ ^{that} little or no foundation. In 1439 ^{Soranzo} something Valla had proven that the donation of Constantine was a fraud, ^{it had been demonstrated} and that the Decretals of St Sylvester, so far from coming from ~~St~~ Bishop Sylvester in the early part of the fourth century ^{AD} ~~AD~~, actually represented ideas and phraseology of the ^{9th} ~~8th~~ century ^{500 year later} A.D.

^{AD} ~~The discovery~~ ^{These and other} ~~thus~~ of various frauds and forgeries led naturally to an extreme attitude in this direction.

AN APPARENT DUPLICATE

~~DECLARATION!~~

If one were to read in a book about the history of the United States in the 1820's the following statement, in connection with an account of events in Massachusetts:-

On July 4, ~~1825~~ 1826 John Adams died. This was exactly 50 years after ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~date~~ ^{date} upon which he signed the Declaration of Independence. Since Adams had been Vice President of the United States for two terms, and had been President of the United States for one term, it was remarkably appropriate that he should die on the fiftieth anniversary of the day on which (he had signed) the Declaration of Independence. ^{was adopted by the Continental Congress}

Suppose that one were to read in the section on Virginia in the same book a statement somewhat as follows:

On July 4, 1826 Thomas Jefferson died. Jefferson was a signer of the Declaration of Independence. He had served one term as Vice President of the United States, and two terms as President of the United States. It was a remarkable coincidence that he should die exactly on the fiftieth anniversary of the ^{adoption of} ~~date on which he had signed~~ this famous Declaration, ~~which he had himself composed~~ ^{written} ~~signed~~

If two statements like this were found in a book, and the students of the book were men with the mentality that was so common in the last century, they would have immediately said, "There is very obviously a duplicate narrative here. The names differ, but the events are so strikingly similar that it cannot possibly be a coincidence. Aside from the difference of names, the only contradiction is that in one case the man was said to have served two terms as Vice President and one term as President, while in the ~~next~~ other he is said to have served one term as Vice President and two terms as President. It is easy to see how such a slight alteration could ^{have} come in, and the fact that it got listed under two different States led the ~~redactor~~ ^{editor} to think that two different men were spoken of, yet it is certainly inconceivable that two men, both signers of the Declaration

of INdependence, should have had such strikingly similar careers, and should both have died on the same day exactly fifty years after the Declaration was signed.

A little further consideration of this point might be mentioned: according to the ~~earlier~~ view of many critics prior to Wellhausen, the early documents were those that used the word "Elohim" for God. ~~XX~~ The J document, according to them, was the last of the documents in Genesis to be written. It is not extremely hard, on this hypothesis, to imagine that when the earlier documents were written it was realized that the name ~~E~~ ~~God~~ "God" had been used only up to the time of the exodus, and that from that time on the name "YHWH" had been almost universally used; but then to consider that at a much later time, when the J document was written (or the J supplementations were added), as ~~believed by~~ thought by so many of the critics ~~in~~ ^{XX} during ~~the~~ 50 years before Wellhausen), ~~that during this time~~ that by this time the supplementer or writer of the new document had ~~just~~ forgotten that the name "JHWH" JEHOVAH had not been used in the time of Genesis, and therefore in ~~his~~ writing this document he used it constantly. Such an idea might be fairly conceivable, but, as the Wellhausen theory holds that the J document is the oldest document it makes a severe stretch on the imagination to think that the oldest ~~document~~ document held that the name JEHOVAH "JHWH" had been known and used from the very beginning,

sources.

Professor E. A. Housmann, (author of the "A Shropshire Lad") who was a noted classical scholar in the early part (years) of the present century, reacted ~~via~~ violently against this ~~"Quellenforschung"~~ "Quellenforschung." In his introduction to his edition of the Satires of Juvenal he said, "You will not find this in my work." He said, "You will have no difficulty finding other works which will tell you that the Satires of Juvenal were derived from the Satires of Turnus (a writer whose works have entirely disappeared). Professor Durerard (sp?) ~~Guerrard~~ Professor of General Literature at Stanford University, wrote in 1940:

This ~~idea~~ idea of searching for sources and of believing that it is possible to divide a work into its previous sources, and on this basis to reconstruct the previous sources, was applied in all sorts of literature. Professor Wellek, in Professor of Comparative Literature at Yale University, in speaking of A. W. Schlegel, says, "He began the long course of aberrations in study of the ~~Nibelungenlied~~ Nibelungenlied."

Sometimes as a result of the infinite ~~of~~ knowledge of God there are matters in the Bible which are not understood at that time at which they were given. An interesting instance of this is in Luke 17 where Jesus ~~preix~~ predicted a future event in which there would be a great division among people. He said in Luke 17:34, " I tell you, in that night there shall ~~be~~ be two men in one bed; the one shall be taken, and ~~he~~ the other shall be taken, ~~and the~~ and the other shall be left. " In verse 36 he says, "Two ~~women~~ women shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left."

When Jesus spoke these words in Palestine, When Jesus ~~doctum~~ thus said these words in Palestine, they must have been very difficult for the people to understand. He was evidently describing, discussing some events which would occur at one time. And at that time there would be men ~~in~~ sleeping in bed and they ~~will~~ will be also men working in the field. And at that time artificial light such as we have today was not known. No ~~factory~~ factories worked at night, and then they ~~would~~ would do their work in the day time. How could it come about that at the same time that there will be two men in one bed and ~~at the same time~~ there will be two men working in the field? There will be numbers of men working in the field. About half will be taken and about half will be left. It must have been quite unclear to those who listened. Now, human knowledge has moved forward, and we know that the earth is round and probably both people in Palestine at that time thought of it as flat, and know that the earth is round, and that in parts of the earth it is midnight while other parts it is the middle of the day, even in the same area we have people working in the night shift, and who may be sleeping in the day time while other men are working in the field. The passage sounds perfectly ~~to~~ natural today know these ~~new~~ factors. In the day of Christ some of his *hearers must have been*

puzzled by it .

Since the Bible is an infinite book, it is not at all, it is not to be expected that we should understand everything in it. Since much of it refers to it and the situations. Long ago and in an entirely different part of the world there are many things which we do not understand at first sight, and in which we may not even have the material available to understand. During the last hundred years new archaeological discoveries have given us a far greater knowledge of the nature of the ancient life of the Near East than we had before. Many of these things which seem like incongruities or inconsistencies in the book of Genesis now seem to be perfectly natural at the time at which it was written.

THE BOOK OF GOD AND MAN

The Book of God and Man: A Study of Job by Robert Gordis

Published by the University of Chicago Press - 1965.

On page 216 we read, "With regard to the dating of the book, opinions have varied widely. Because of the patriarchal setting of the ~~(prose)~~ prose ~~tale~~ tale the Talmud ascribes it to Moses. The view apparently was shared by the Dead Sea sectarians. The documents in Qumran Cave No. 11 in January 1956 include the text of the Book of Job in Hebrew, and in an ~~Arabic~~ Aramaic targum. It is striking that the Qumranite Hebrew text of Job, like the Pentateuch, are (is?) sometimes written in ~~an~~ a palio(?) palio-Hebrew script, thus testifying to the belief in the Mosaic authorship of these books. The next ~~paragraph~~ paragraph says, "Other ~~rabbis~~ rabbinic sources suggest a variety of periods in which Job may have ~~lived, ranging from the time of Isaac and Jacob and Joseph to that of Cyrus and Ahasuerus.~~ lived, ranging from the time of Isaac and Jacob and Joseph to that of Cyrus and Ahasuerus.

It is very interesting to note that after the word in the previous paragraph where it says ~~Mosaic~~ "Mosaic authorship of these books" it gives reference to Note 31, while after the word "Ahasuerus" it ^{gives} gives (better word) a reference to Note 32. These notes are found on page 361; the first of them, No. 31, reads, "Cf. B. (?) Baba Bathra 14b, 15a: 'Moses wrote his book and the section on Balaam and the Book of Job.'"

Note 32 simply says, "See chapter 16." In chapter 16 on page 225 he refers to these various views that have just been mentioned, and in connection with them gives ~~Notes 31, 32 and 33.~~ Notes 31, 32 and 33. These notes, Note 31, says "Compare B. Baba Bathra 15b..." Note 33 says, "Compare ... B. Baba Bathra 15b." Thus Gordis says that the Talmud attributes it to ^{Moses} Job, and says that individual rabbis assign it to various periods, most of which are much later than Moses, and refers for all of these to the same passage in the Talmud, so it's rather incorrect to say the Talmud teaches one thing when it instead actually suggests a lot of different things. Incidentally, this Baba Bathra

is a very difficult thing to understand. Many of its statements simply don't ~~nk~~ make sense from almost any viewpoint. It's not a very solid thing to build anything on.

Also the references that are made to the Dead Sea Scrolls go beyond the actual facts. All that we have evidence of as yet from the Dead Sea Scrolls in this regard is that an older type of script is used in them for writing the Pentateuch and for writing Job. We have no evidence of any statement as to why this was done. It is making (better word) quite a logical jump to say that it indicates that they believed they were written by the same author.

An even more striking case occurred in the United States where two important events that happened about a century apart were remarkably similar. The man who was elected president of the United States in 1860 was shot to death by a southern sympathizer who was himself shot not long afterward. The deceased president was succeeded by the vice-president who was named Johnson and who had been a United States senator from a southern state the name of which began with the letters "Te" (Tennessee). The man who was elected president of the United States in 1960 was shot to death in the south, by a man who was himself shot to death on the next day. This president also was succeeded by a vice-president named Johnson who had formerly been a United States senator from a southern state the name of which began with "Te" (in this case, Texas). Such a coincidence as this goes far beyond the similarity that is to be found between any two different events in the Pentateuch that are alleged by the critics to be evidence of having come from two different documents while being actually distorted pictures of the same thing.

If one is on the lookout for coincidences he will find them constantly, for life is full of them. In the case of the assassinations of Lincoln and Kennedy a number of other remarkable coincidences, in addition to the striking ones already mentioned, have been pointed out. The three illustrations I have given should surely be enough to show the great danger of thinking that because two stories are somewhat similar they must necessarily be distorted accounts of the same original, as is constantly assumed by the critics in their presentation of this argument.

Now let us examine the instances where it is claimed that this has occurred.

THE SO-CALLED TWO-CREATION ACCOUNTS

Most books that present the multi-documentary theory of the Pentateuch make much of the alleged fact that Genesis begins with two accounts of creation.

consistently. When one form has been used for a little time, there may be a tendency to keep on using it unless a reason for switching to another usage forces itself on the speaker's attention. 2

In many types of writing and in many periods of history it has been common to use various names for the same individual, interchanging them often for the sake of variety. Anyone who has read the novels of Dostoevsky has probably found it hard at times to be sure who was being referred to, because the person would be called by one name, and then by another name, and there would be considerable interchange. In the Old Testament the name of Jacob is always used until God said that his name would be changed to "Israel." After that, however, the names of Israel and Jacob are both used: sometimes one is used, sometimes the other, and frequently in the course of one verse both names are used, even in cases where no one would think of suggesting that the two parts of the verse came from different sources.

In the Ugaritic documents, discovered at Ras Shamra in the years following 1927, we find the same deity often represented by two names which occur repeatedly in parallel and with much interchange. The same is true in various portions of the Koran where the Arabic word for "Lord" and the Arabic word for "God" are frequently interchanged. A sports article in one of our college newspapers is quite to refer to the same team by various titles. It is a matter of style which creeps up in many different places, and there is no reason why it should not have been used in writing the Pentateuch just as it is in other portions of the Old Testament.

In some presentations of the critical theory, the impression is given that division according to the use of various divine names is a sufficient criterion to divide the Pentateuch into original sources by itself. This comes near to being the first approach of Astruc and Eichhorn, and most of the critical scholars during the period from 1798 to 1870 tried to follow through along this line. However, the suggestion made by Hupfeld, and eventually adopted by Wellhausen, and since then accepted as part of the dogmatically held theory, actually breaks up this criterion rather badly. It does not consider the sections of Genesis that use the name Elohim as forming one document with a distinct style and a strikingly different viewpoint from those which contain the name YHWH. Instead it divides the sections that predominantly contain the name Elohim into two groups, one of which, it says, in opposition to the ideas of practically all critical scholars, before Hupfeld, is really much closer to the sections using the name YHWH than to the other sections using the name Elohim. Thus the Wellhausen theory so shatters "Astruc's clue" as greatly to diminish its usefulness.

Another fact that is often not realized is that all of the alleged documents, after the early part of Exodus, use the name YHWH most of the time. The P document, which is said never to use the name YHWH in Genesis, almost always uses it in the passages after Exodus 6. In the remaining parts of the Pentateuch there are occasionally sections, sometimes even a chapter or so in length, which use the name Elohim consistently rather than the name YHWH. The critics have no satisfactory explanation to give for the occasional passages of this type after the early chapters of Exodus.

xxxxxxx

A very tough problem in planning a book on the Pentateuchal criticism with the purposes that we have in mind is the problem as to how to translate the tetragrammaton. Of course, we know that the King James Version represents THE LORD in captials, and the same thing is done in RSV. I am now sure, however, how many Bible readers realize that. You say God and we ~~hi~~ think of ~~ti~~ it. We tend to think of it almost as a proper name God. When we say the Lord, it sounds like a title. Actually of course the exact opposite is true. God is the only God and yet God is the name of a ~~xxxx~~ class of being of which He ~~there~~ is only one. You could speak of other gods, False gods, but he is the one true God. It is a title. It is a title. It is a class of being. The tetragrammaton is a proper name. It is the name of God in His relation with human beings, particularly with those whom He is ~~going~~ going to redeem. Therefore, it is altogether appropriate that God the great name of the Creator, the great title of the ~~the~~ Creator and the sustainer of the universe should be used in Genesis one with its survey of His marvellous creative acts. It is also entirely appropriate that the ~~tetragrammaton~~ tetragrammaton the personal name of God in His quality as Redeemer should be used in His relationship with man as described in Genesis 2, 3, and 4. In Genesis one, only the name God is used. In Genesis two, ~~tw~~ three, and four the word tetragrammaton is used, most of the time not exclusively... in Genesis two and three and four the word tetragrammaton is used, most of the time not exclusively. We find in the account of the serpent that the serpent says... Eve, hath God said? ~~Most of the times~~ ^{when} And/the serpent speaks with Eve, there are here a few cases in which both ~~the~~ the serpent and Eve use the word God instead of the ~~te~~ tetragrammaton. The critics explain this very simply. They say that while the tetragrammaton is just a normal name for God in document J, ~~A~~ yet they say it would be utterly out of place to have the

sacred name of God put into the mouth of the serpent, and the serpent uses the general title ~~Ed~~. God and so does Eve. Now, of course, once we get their statement on this in the midst of the sections chapters 1, 2, 3 and 4, it is logical for us to say if you can recognize ~~their~~ there, why can't you recognize there the same thing in relation between chapter one and the following chapter.

In other words our whole discussion requires an understanding of the ~~xxx~~ nature of these names, These two ~~names, but with~~ words, but the average English reader never think of the Lord in capital as being the ~~xxx~~ sacred name of God in His relationship to the people or expressing this idea any more than it does His ~~qualification~~ quality as the Almighty Creator of the universe. It just does not get the thought across.

Now, I thought, I ~~xxxx~~ remarked my class now that a few years ago I hated to take the word Yahweh on my lips. I felt that it had so many profane connotations the way it has been used by critics. I used to hate to say it. I used to refer to it Jehovah. This all seems to me to I used to prefer to say Jehovah. Jehovah seems to me to be, even if it is not ~~at all~~ at all always pronounced, it seems to me to have the suggestion of reverence. I much prefer it. Now, the American standard version which uses Jehovah throughout is disappearing from its use. People are largely either using the King James which has the word Lord or they are turning to the RSV which also has the term Lord. I do not feel that the ~~xi~~ critics today speak in quite the ~~profane~~ profane way/~~xx~~ they did ~~in~~ thirty years ago. While it is true that their teaching is ~~true~~ just as anti-Christian as ever, they tend to enclose in it certain pious-~~phrases~~ phrases of the phrase and speaks with certain reverence which makes their use of Yahweh not merely

as objectionable as the use of it thirty years ago. And if one were to use ~~ix~~ the word Yahweh, it ties up with the letter J and ~~xx~~ makes clear what they are talking about and it is easier ~~xxxx~~ conceive of it as the personal name of God in His relationship with His people and thus and it is easier to keep His ideas in mind. So, I would be inclined to use the name Yahweh.

Another thing that occurred to me is that, I think it was twenty years ago, that, I would have said, I would much prefer to use Jehovah. I would have tried to use that. Now, we have this cult Jehovah's Witnesses which has so much false teachings that ^{it is} ~~are~~ widely circulating and I think that to some extent it is bringing the word Jehovah in this rebuke. Of course, there is no ... it is possible that the sacred name was pronounced with the word Jehovah. But it would seem extremely unlikely since we have such a natural explanation of it as having coming into existence through scribes' ignorance in combining the vowels of ADONAY with the consonants of the tetragrammaton. On the other hand, we cannot say that the name was pronounced Yahweh, but there it fits with the general etymology. It fits well with its ~~sage~~ as parts of the Hebrew proper names it has a good interpretation the one who causes things to happen. It is .. I would think that that there ^{is} ~~are~~ a strong reason to think that this may be the way it was pronounced. So, I was inclined toward ~~Yahwehxxx~~ using ~~Yahwehxxx~~ Yahweh.

In my class, however, Mr. Taylor ~~point~~ pointed out that he believed that there are very considerable number of ministers who would be greatly shocked at ~~ix~~ a book using the name Yahweh, and would be prejudiced against it, and would not wish to give to ^{their} college students to read it or study it if that was the case. That would then cut down the usefulness of the book right at the start.

I see great disadvantages in using the term Jehovah since it is not so much used in the Bible any more as it is used to be and since this false cult has given a rather unfortunate connotation to the name rather widely to that form.

Yet, I cannot feel very happy about ~~§~~ using the Lord since the word itself does not give a clear idea at all of what it really stands for in the Hebrew, and you have to explain again on every page. That this is the proper name of God, the sacred name dealing with His people, and every time you explain it alternately, the Lord and God you have to explain ~~again, /and that~~ again, /and that is what the Lord is. But if you have anything that looks like a name, that is rather obvious. You see the problem now? It is a tough ~~problem~~ problem, just what to do. Somebody said to me, What is the I addressing in this book? There, I said, there is a problem there, but six different groups any one of which it would not be too hard to write a book ~~and~~ that would be tremendously helpful to them, but to write one that would be helpful to all six and will not ~~immediately~~ immediately aroused an antagonistic ~~reaction~~ reaction in one way or rather of them that would ~~prevents~~ ^{its} prevents the book from having ~~the~~ influence. It is a problem.

Whatever we do it would be helpful to put it in discussion in preface. On the ~~the~~ other hand Mr. Taylor suggests that ~~he would~~ he read a book by Rowley in which he had such a long introduction before you get into it you get tired out. He said the discussion should ~~be~~ have been in the Excurses in the back. It seems to me so vital to it ~~that~~ that you have got to have some explanation at least in the beginning, but ~~you~~ if you can get a usage that will remind people ~~constantly~~ constantly. They will read the thing and they will forget it. They will skip it over and open somewhere else and

do ~~not~~ bother reading ~~it~~ any. As you say, one group I like to read you if I can ... is liberal. It would remove an awful lot of prejudice against the book if he would use the word ~~J~~ Yahweh. If you could write a book that could discuss ~~these~~ these things in such a way as to show them that this is a pseudo-scientific business. It might win some of them away from it, it might ~~it~~ lessen the ~~its~~ strength of holding with it with some others. If you use the word Lord, if you use Jehovah, their reaction to that would be that you are an unscholarly person. And I think what is more important than that is the person who does not know much about it will get the false idea of the Lord... and of course the word Jehovah now suggests the holy ... I think that a ~~person~~ person who does not know much about it would get the false idea of the word LORD. After of ~~course~~ course Jehovah now suggests the Jehovah's Witnesses. There is an interesting suggestion from Mr. Kuntz to use the ~~son~~ consonants YWH. Mr. Taylor says, why don't you just use the tetragrammaton? We ~~could~~ not put Hebrew letters that would be too expensive. But ~~Maybe~~ we could use these letters. And then let them translate them the Lord or Jehovah or whatever ~~hex~~ as they choose. But I do not know whether it would diminish the ease of the reading, ... might affect the effectiveness. It might get away from the ~~not~~ ministers who would have the reaction against ~~Yahweh~~ Yahweh might/have the same reaction to these four letters. Maybe that is the way it is. Maybe that ~~the~~ is the best solution. I do not know whether that is going to be the same thing that we had better ~~do~~. We cannot explain in the beginning of our business about it if you put in Jehovah or Lord, people may open it and then get the false impression. ~~And you put in Yahweh and Jehovah~~ Maybe that is the best solution, too. I do not know if ~~that~~ that is the name that we had better do. We ~~cannot~~ explain in the beginning of our business about it, ~~and~~ *if you* we put in Jehovah or Lord, people can ~~exp~~

~~exp~~

open in the middle of it and get a false impression. You put in Yahweh they can open in the middle of it and say Oh, here is a critical book. They will get a false impression. If you put in the four letters and they've got to look and see ~~what~~ what they are. They only immediately ... revoke a reaction quite the same way. So, maybe that is the ~~best thing~~ best thing to do.

On page 50 he begins one of the most superficial sections of the book and yet one which can be most disturbing to the face of those who do not know the facts. Thus he says, 'Moreover, it is remarkable how many reports are given of the same event. Thus there are two creation stories, two stories of the flood, of Hagar, Genesis 16:4-14, and ~~20xxx~~ 21:9-21), of the calling of Moses (Ex. 3:6), and of many other events, especially in the stories of the patriarchs.' This sounds very formidable, but when we ~~examine~~ examine it, however, we find that it is far from factual. It is true that there are two creation stories, but it is not true that there are two stories of the creation of the universe. Genesis 1 gives the ~~historical~~ story of the creation of the universe. Genesis 2:4ff. gives the more detailed story of the creation of the man. Someone has compared this with having ~~two~~ a map that starts with , ~~with~~ an atlas that ~~starts~~ starts with the map of the world followed by a map of the North America. ^{I think} A better illustration would be a map of the world followed by a map of the United States. A map of the world and a map of the United States would have a few of the same names on both. There ~~is~~ would be a small amount of overlapping, but ~~most~~ most of details on ~~of~~ each of them would be found on the other at all. This is the exact situation of Genesis 1 and of 2. Genesis 1 gives a rather formal survey of the creation of the entire universe. Genesis 2 ~~gives~~ deals ~~with~~ only with the creation of man. To say that there are two creation stories ^{gives an impression} that is utterly false to the fact. There is no contradiction between these two stories. One has ~~much~~ more details than the other, and the ~~the~~ other covers many things that are not even touched upon in the one.

The ~~statement~~ ^{statement} that there are two stories of the flood is entirely

119

different. If we take a story of the flood, we find a certain amount of repetition in the early part of the story. In any literary picture there is bound to be repetition. A purpose of ~~it~~ ^{an account} is not merely to give principal facts, it is to make an emotional impact as to the importance of the situation. So the events leading up to the flood are told and reiterated. Thus ^{is} the wickedness of man/stressed and touched upon and repeated. The coming of the flood is mentioned in great details. It is very simple to divide this up into two stories but it would be just as easy to divide up into six or seven parallels, that it is simply a matter of repetition, in other words, for emphasis. However, when one comes to the latter of the story of the flood, ~~it~~ here the artistic approach is very different. The excitement is already so great that all that is necessary, that the most effective way to present it is simply to state exactly what happened. So, the events in connection with the end of the flood are stated only once with no repetitions. Yet, it is quite ~~simple~~ simple to take the material from the first part of the story of the flood and divide it up so as to ~~make it seem~~ make it seem to have two stories by taking a verse here and a verse there, a few verses to this and a few verses to the ~~the~~ other, ... the other parallels and thus to get two stories out of the first half of the flood-story, the flood account. However, it would be just as easy to get four or five stories of this flood. When it comes to the last part ~~the~~ events are described only ~~once~~ once and there is no ~~duplication~~ duplication whatever. Thus ^a it is/fallacious ~~is~~ statement to say that there are two stories of the flood.

~~times~~

The next two instances that he mentions calling that there are two stories of Hagar, and two stories of the ~~story~~ ^{calling} of Moses, ~~are~~ are simply the fact that there are two rather similar events ~~in~~ in the life of

Hagar. It is not at all strange that there would be similar events in the life of a person. There was an explosive situation with Sarah and Hagar and Ishmael in the tent of Abraham, and it is not at all strange that two rather similar events occurred in given a situation of high emotional intensity rather similar events are apt to happen in the life of almost any of us, not merely twice, but probably three or four times. I well remember in college having had ~~a~~ similar experiences which seemed to repeat with great similarity, experiences that I have had before. This can be found in the life of anyone.

Moses in his early life had been full of zeal and enthusiasm to ~~deliver~~ deliver the children of Israel from their bondage. He made ^{an} efforts ~~in~~ in his own strength, and dismally failed and had to flee for his life. After that he settled down to the hum drum life of a shepherd in the desert and gave up his previous visions and dreams. It took a great deal of urging and insisting before the Lord changed his attitude to the point where he was ready to come back and perform tremendous efforts to deliver the children of Israel, to deliver his own people. This can be ~~not~~ duplicated over and over in human life. Often a young person tries something and fails and loses his heart and after that he is never willing to ~~take~~ make a step in that direction again. There have been times when such a person after he has acquired the ability and maturity to accomplish the task, ⁸ ~~the~~ task has been prevailed upon to do it, but in most cases it has taken a considerable amount of ~~extra~~ effort to bring him to the point. This can be duplicated over and over in human life. To say that there are two stories of calling ~~of~~ of Moses is bringing in duplication where there is no reason whatever to do so.

~~Back~~ Further down on the same page the author tries to show not merely that there are different stories a but that these stories contradict each other.

Thus he says: "One creation story has Man created ~~at~~ last, the crowning glory of ~~the~~ the creation, but the other (Genesis 2:4ff.) Man was created first, then the vegetation, and then the animals." --- This is purely a superficial criticism of the Bible as ever has been made. The picture of the creation of the universe tells about the creation, the creation of the skies, the bringing together of the bodies of water, the dry land can appear, the creation of light, the provision of the sun, moon and stars as measrues ~~time~~, creation of vegetation, the creation of animals, and reaches its great climax, creation of man. Most of these elements ~~in~~ in the creation of the universe are not even mentioned in the second, in the so called second creation story. It is not a story of the creation of the universe, but simply ~~a~~ more detailed about the creation of man. To say that Man was created first is most ~~ridiculous~~ ridiculous, because the story begins with the earth already here and the dry condition upon it. Soon after the creation of the heaven and the earth described in Genesis 1 there is a watery chaos. After land ^{masses} and water/are separated, it is natrual that dry, ^{and} ~~serial~~ sections should develop, it is perfectly obvious that the story started at an entirely different places, ^{then} To say as ~~Kohl~~ Kuhl does "Man was created first, ~~and~~ ^{then} vegetation," is about as ~~of~~ superficial a statement as one can well imagine. There is ~~no~~ absolutely no statement whatever in ~~of~~ Genesis 2 that God created vegetation, all it says is that God planted a garden. If every time one of us plant a garden, someone says we created vegetation, there will be many, many creations of vegetation. To read a creation of vegetation into the statement that ^{that} man, ^a /God planted ~~the~~ garden is ~~confounding~~ confusion.

The same process of examination of other alleged contradictions and alleged duplications would show that most of cases it is a very superficial interpretation and quite remote being a solid argument.

In interpreting any book it is easy to find innumerable repetitions

(7/8/66)

lib

Heading

What About J, E, D, P, - - A Study in Myth
The Importance of the Subject

It is today almost universally agreed that the Bible is a unique book. A century ago there were those who ridiculed it as a book of myth, or legend, of ancient tradition, and folklore. Today, ^{al} most everyone ^{acknowledges} ~~gives lip service to~~ its greatness, whether he bothers to read it or not.

It is widely ^{recognized} ~~acknowledged~~ that the ^{is} book lies at the foundation ~~f~~ of our Western civilization. Its teachings have entered into the warp and woof of our lives, but many of us think that a successful life for all eternity must be based upon careful study of this book. Even ~~though~~ those who consider many parts of it as myth and legend often speak at length about the greatness of the other parts, and urge that our universities and colleges give ~~courses~~ courses for the proper study of the Bible.

All this brings into wide great relief the
importance of finding the right approach to the study of the Bible.

In ~~the~~ the last few years our country has been flooded with literature speaking about the J, E, D, and P documents. This ~~is~~ idea has been receiving wider impetus in our educational ~~in~~ institutions and among our religious people. The Sunday School lesson quarterlies of most of our large denominations, when the lessons are related ~~to~~ to the first part of the Bible have long discussions of the origins of the so-called "Jah w ist" and "Elohist" documents and their relation to the ^P "priestly" documents. Sunday School manuals under such titles as "The Mighty Works of God" or "God's Message ~~for~~ ^{Messages} for Our Day" and other similar titles, ^{and} have discussions of the ^{alleged} ^{origin,} ^{importance,} ^{and} ^{interrelation} of these ~~books and~~ ^{represent these documents,} ^{representing} ~~these documents~~ as having been written ^{at} ^{times} ~~at~~ ^{periods} many centuries apart, and ^{as} ~~as~~ contradicting one another at many places. During the past 15 years at least ^{books} ~~25~~ ^{at least} have been printed or reprinted in the United States in which a fair amount of space is devoted to the presentation ~~f~~ of matters relating to the origin and differences between these alleged documents.

(7/8/66) #2

7.2
h2b

Three of these books ^{contain rather and} ~~are quite~~ full discussions ^① ~~from a~~ detailed ^② ~~viewpoint~~ ^③ of the alleged evidence for the existence of these books, of their precise material in each, and of their relation one to another.

Under these circumstances it becomes very important for everyone, and particularly for people with interest in churches or in religion, to ^{those} ~~reach~~ ^{reach} take a definite decision as to what the truth is about the Bible and about these alleged documents.

It may come as a surprise to many to know that no ancient copy of any such manuscript as the ~~xxx~~ alleged ^② ~~in~~ D, J, E, ^① or P has ever been discovered. ^{ancient} No ~~book~~ ^{more than 200 years old} ~~has ever been found~~ which contains a reference to the existence of any one of these documents. The theory that they ever existed, and that they were united together, is something that has been originated within the past century. It is widely taught today as fact. Is it fact? or is it purely a myth? The matter deserves careful investigation.

For many centuries all ~~the~~ ^{accepted} scientists ^{statements} ~~followed~~ the ~~words~~ of Aristotle ~~who~~ ~~said~~ that bodies ~~would~~ ^{speed} fall toward the earth at a ~~rate~~ proportionate to their weight. It was universally agreed that this statement must be true. Then Galileo dropped various weights from the top ~~f~~ of the Leaning Tower of Pisa and it became obvious to those who saw them that objects weighing as much as 20 times as much as other objects ~~that were dropped~~ reached the earth at just about the identical instant. The theory which had been universally accepted came to be universally discarded.

Not long ago all scientists believed that there is an invisible substance called ether which permeates all space and ⁱⁿ which all light waves and radio waves move. Today most scientists have completely given up the idea. One scientist whom I questioned about it said, "If there is any scientist left who believes in the existence of this ether he is certainly being very quiet about it."

The fact that an idea has been held fo-r- for a long time is no reason why it is necessarily true. The fact that a great many people believe there were ~~xx~~ such documents as J, E and P does not prove there actually were. It demands investigation. In most matters that have been discovered further investigation brings to light new ~~arguments and simpler~~(?) arguments so that it is possible to put the evidence in very ^{clear} ~~simple~~, plain, and yet convincing language. In this case we have an extremely complex theory, so complex that comparatively few people have ^{confidence} any real idea exactly what it is.

Stripped to its bare essentials, and giving only ^{what} ~~abstract~~ is agreed upon by practically all who hold to the theory, it can be said that according to the theory there was a manuscript to which the name of "J" might be given because of certain peculiar characteristics ^{It is said to have} ~~this has~~, which was written sometime between 1050 and 800 B.C. Some scholars are very dogmatic as to the particular century, but there is a certain variation on this. This manuscript would contain about a fourth ~~third~~ of the material in the first five books of the Bible.

According to the theory, another document was written about a century after this one which, because of certain of its characteristics, might be called the "E" document. ~~This-~~ This document ~~paralleled~~ paralleled (sp?) the J document to quite an extent. Both documents circulated separately for a time; then someone ^(them) combined ~~the two~~ together. This man, who is called a "redactor", ^{any} is often spoken of as the ~~redax~~ "Redactor of J/E", or represented by the symbol ^R JE, ^{is} ~~is~~ ^{supposed to have} ~~intervene~~ the two accounts so that sometimes a chapter ^{would take} ~~will~~ be from one, and then a chapter from the other, sometimes as little as ^{any} half a verse from ^{and} and then a half ^{or} verse, or more, from the ~~or~~ other. After this ^{had} ~~had~~ circulated for a long period, ^{perhaps} ~~perhaps~~ as much as two centuries or more, ^{then} ~~then~~ a new document was written which ^{paralleled} ~~paralleled~~ it, ^{only} ~~only~~ to a comparatively ~~small extent~~ ^{small extent}. This document was ~~it~~ called "D", and includes the greater part ~~f~~ of the present Book of Deuteronomy. After it had circulated separately for

The Fantasy of J, E, and P

Is it conceivable that a theory, with no solid basis to support it, would become widely established that it would be taught in universities all over the world? Is it conceivable that such a theory would be taught all over the world as established fact? Is it conceivable/which rests purely solely on circumstantial evidence of the most shaky (better word?) type would be accepted by dozens of prominent, highly intelligent people, and dogmatically taught as established fact? Is it conceivable that such a theory would hold its own for eighty years, and that the view presented by one scholar would be accepted almost/as he presented it eighty years later?, would be accepted eighty years later almost exactly as he presented it, by Protestant, Roman Catholic and Jewish scholars, and ~~dogmatically~~ dogmatically taught?, even though there was no real factual evidence whatever in support of it?

It not only is conceivable; it has happened in various fields of thought. It seems strange that it should have occurred in the Biblical field, but it is a fact.

No ancient manuscript of the so-called J, E, ~~Document~~^{or} P document has ever been found. Every ancient copy of Genesis that has been found, whether in Hebrew or in a translation, has given the material substantially as we have it in our present Bibles. No ancient copy has been found which gives ? St. Omi? the chapters which this theory attributes to J or to E or to P, yet the theory not only became established but has been presented as settled fact in more than a score of books published in America in the last twenty years.

How could it come about that such a thing would occur? Examination of tendencies in historical and literary thought showed the way that it occurred. shows?

During the 18th eighteenth century a certain approach began to make its way into literary study. During the 19th nineteenth century this approach was carried

to great lengths and applied with ~~xxx~~ tremendous variety to all sorts of ancient documents. As teh 20th twentieth ~~x~~ century began more and more scholars began to see that this type of approach led into a dead end. ~~More and more~~ More and more it came to be seen that nothing was gained by it, but the ~~xxx~~ establishment of unprovable hypotheses which added nothing to the sum of human knowledge. As a result the whole approach has been ~~quite quietly~~ quietly dropped as far as most historical and literary scholars are concerned. Reading of books in this field today, in comparison with those published fifty years ago make this great change of climate immediately obvious. Yet in the Biblical field, not only has this approach been retained, but it has been carried out to an extreme hardly to be paralleled in the case of any/ other ancient writing, and it is held with a dogmatism such as is hardly to be ~~paralel~~ paralleled elsewhere.

Surely it is time that the foundations of this theory be carefully examined and that the whole matter, if it rest purely upon imagination, supposition, guesswork and hypothesis (aren't guesswork and hypothesis about the same?) be swept into the discard along with outworn and abandoned ideas such as that the earth is flat, that the universe is filled with ether, that ghosts walk at night, ~~and that there are flying saucers.~~

Sometimes the question is even asked of freshmen in college: "You say you believe the Bible account of creation? Which do you believe, the first account or the second account?"

It is claimed that Genesis begins with two contradictory accounts of creation, one of which uses the name Elohim throughout, while the other uses the name YHWH. Let us examine the facts.

First, let us examine the statement that Genesis begins with two accounts of creation. This is true only in the same sense that a book with a chapter on a trip from America to Europe and a second chapter telling of a trip from Europe to Asia, might be said to begin with two accounts of a trip. Both are accounts of creation but it cannot be said that both are accounts of the creation of the universe.

Someone has said that Genesis 1:1-2:3 and Genesis 2:4-25 can be compared to the beginning of an atlas, with a map of the world first, and then a map of the Western Hemisphere. Such an analogy is true up to a point, but is hardly exact. A much better analogy would be to say that they were like a map of the world followed by a map of England. The map of the world would show certain things that would be on the map of England, and the map of England would show certain things that were on the map of the world. There would be a small amount of overlapping. But most that would appear on the map of the world would not be on the map of England, and most of the detail that would be on the map of England would have to be omitted from the map of the world.

This is exactly the situation as regards Genesis 1 and Genesis 2. Genesis 1 is an account of the creation of the universe. The greater part of Genesis 2 is an account of the creation of man, and of God's earliest dealings with him. Genesis 1 includes the creation of matter (v.1), of the firmament, of

vegetation, the establishment of sun, moon and stars as measures of time for the earth, the creation of all the various types of sea and land animals, and the creation of man. Actually none of this is included in chapter 2 except only the creation of man.

It is alleged that there are contradictions between the two chapters. Some books say that the first chapter starts with a watery chaos, while the second chapter starts with a dry waste. This is an extremely superficial statement when one realizes that the second chapter gives, in more detail, only a very small portion of what is covered in the first chapter. If someone describes a trip from London to San Francisco the trip might begin with a sea voyage. If he writes another description that goes far more into detail in telling how the man crossed the Sierra Nevada mountains in California on his way to San Francisco, this portion might start with a journey by rail. The two start differently because they begin at different points.

It is also alleged that the order of creation in the two accounts is different. Thus, on page 50 of The Old Testament: Its Origin and Composition Professor Curt Kuhl says, "The one creation story has Man created last, the crowning glory of the creation, while in the other (Genesis 2:4ff) Man was created first, then vegetation and then the animals."

Let us look at the matter. Kuhl says that in chapter 2 the creation of man is followed by the creation of vegetation, yet in chapter 2 we find no mention of creation of vegetation. We read only that God planted a garden. If every time a man plants a garden he is said to have created vegetation, it would be a strange situation indeed. The planting of a garden is in no sense the creation of vegetation, and most critical books omit this very superficial alleged contradiction.

Let us notice another feature about the planting of the garden. After the statement that man was created and became an animate being, we are told in verse 8: "And the LORD God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed."

It should be noticed that the verse does not say, "God caused a garden suddenly to come into existence, with great trees standing one hundred feet high." It merely says that He planted a garden. The context makes it very clear that the meaning of the word "planted" is pluperfect. Having described the creation of man, the writer calls attention to a less important action that had undoubtedly preceded it.

A sentence in any writing must be reasonably interpreted, so as to fit with the whole context. It is possible to insist on interpreting each verse by itself without relation to context, and reading it as if a rather stupid primitive had written it. But this can be done with any writing. If the author of Genesis 2 is to be given credit for ordinary intelligence he will not be considered to have thought that God created man and then pondered as follows: "I wonder what I should do with the man I have created. I think I will plant a garden and lay the man aside to dry for a few hundred years while the trees grow to proper height, and then put the man in the garden."

If we give the author credit for ordinary intelligence, we must understand that the garden had been planted long before the man was created, and was ready for use when it was needed.

This chapter has no description of the creation of vegetation but merely a reference to the planting of a garden which had fully grown before man was created.

Kuhl and many other writers say that Genesis 2 inserts the creation of animals between the creation of man and the creation of woman. However, this is not the only possible interpretation of the passage. In fact, to interpret it this way requires one to assume that the writer of Genesis 2 was indeed primitive in his whole manner of thinking. One can take almost any ancient story and interpret it in such a way as to make it extremely primitive. Actually one can do the same with many recent writings. It is more reasonable to interpret the writer as being a man of intelligence when he says that God formed the animals out of the ground and brought them to Adam to see what he would name them. The idea would be better expressed in English by the words, "the animals that God had created He brought to man." Thus the sense is pluperfect, just as it was in the verse about the planting of the garden.

It would be ridiculous to consider the writer as having been so primitive in his thinking that he believed that after creating man God created numerous animals, one after another, to see which would make a suitable helpmeet for man. After making a hippopotamus He saw that it would not do, so He created a giraffe. Then He tried a lizard. Next He made an alligator. After hundreds of false attempts He decided that the only thing to do was to make a creature similar to man himself, and thus, as a sort of by-product, all of the animals had come into existence.. Any attempt to interpret Genesis 2 in a sensible way will recognize that what it means is not that God was trying to make a helpmeet for man by a great number of unsuccessful experiments, but simply that He was bringing before man the animals that He had already made in order to demonstrate to man his need of a help like himself, and thus to show man the reasonableness of creating a woman.

So we see that chapter two, if reasonably interpreted, only describes the creation of man and woman, thus giving more detail about the event briefly sketched in Genesis 1:27, and referring back to God's previous planting of a garden and to His creating of the various animals. There is no difference in order from the order of chapter one. The subject is not the creation of the universe, but the creation of man and the establishment of the first relationship between God and man.

Thus if one is to use reasonable methods in his interpretation of the work of the author of Genesis, Genesis 2 naturally follows Genesis 1, adds more detail on the last portion of it, gives important information necessary for fuller understanding, and in no way contradicts it. It is quite incorrect to call it a duplicate narrative.

As to the difference in names for God between the two chapters, this matter has already been discussed in chapter 5.

58

(7/8/66)

The Higher Criticism - a Viewpoint of the Last Century that is Today Quite Out of Date

Some books on the Bible will explain how the term "higher criticism" is the term that is simply taken over from literature and that it means the examination of a book to answer questions about its dependability, about its source, about its origin and so on. This was very true a century ago. Today, however, books on literature rarely use the phrase "higher criticism". I have looked through a dozen books on literary criticism written within the last twenty years, and only in one of them have I found the phrase "higher criticism" and in that case it was referring to the Bible.

*See The German Version
by Heyman, p. 18
Concepts of Criticism, by
Rene Wellek, p. 264*

This was not the situation a century ago. It is true that the term did come from ~~literary~~ literary criticism. The fact is that the so-called "higher criticism" of the Bible represents a phase(?) of literary study which was common between 1795 and 1930/^{but} which has now largely disappeared.

dl

The book~~s~~ entitled The Old Testament: Its Origins and Compositions written by Curt Kuhl, translated by C.T. M. Herriott, and ~~is~~ published by the John Knox Press in Richmond, Virginia, ~~1~~ in 1961, is written in a veyr ~~pleasing~~^s ~~d~~ tone. It seems to have a certain pious attitude toward ~~the~~ Christianity in general that leads the reader to feel that this is a book that is going to help him in his Christian life. Yet, as he looks into it, he finds that it adopts the whole critical view of the Pentateuch and of other books ~~and~~ that it does this on the basis of extremely superficial observation of the alleged discrepancies and disagreements. It might be of interest to look at the statements on page 47 where ~~it says~~^{he says}, "Firstly, there is not one single instance of Moses ~~himself~~ stating that he is the author!" -- I really do not believe, know what he means by this. The Pentateuch gives a number of cases where Moses is ordered to write something down or states that he did write something down. *Such as*
So & so... Some of which passages I will himself note as we shall mention directly.
 It continues, "and secondly, there is no suggestion that the Pentateuch itself ~~is~~ that this is the case." I do not know how this differs from the ~~first~~ first statement, unless one already assumes that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, and if that assumption is made, then the first statement is utterly ~~meaningless~~ meaningless, since we ~~have~~ have nothing else, except that one of the Psalms that claim s to be from Moses.

He contines, "such information as there is on this point refers only to the authorship of the individual sections, ~~at~~ e.g. The Book of ~~the~~ Covenant (Ex. 24:4,7), the words of the Covenant (Ex. ~~34~~ 34:27 ff.)"; the report on the war with Amalek (Ex. ~~17~~ 17:14), the list of the encampments (Num. 23:2),/ the code of Deuteronomy (Deut. 31:9).--"
 After quotin g all these statements that Moses wrote certain things it seems rather senseless to say that there is not ~~one~~ one single instance of Moses himself stating that he is the author.

As we examine the writings of various critical scholars relating to the Old Testament history during the 19th century, ~~f~~ we find that there was a great variety of opinion. ~~Early~~ Early in the century there were those ~~who would divide up the book of Genesis~~ who thought that the book of Genesis could be divided up into two main sources one of which uses the name God and the other the proper name which is represented in our English King James Bible as the Lord and which may perhaps have been pronounced something like YAHWEH. These two documents were said to have been interlaced together to form the book of Genesis. During the next few years many scholars divided each of these documents up into several others ~~and~~ and a view was widely taught that the Old Testament came into existence through the coming together of the great many often rather small fragments. The great German ~~S~~ scholar W/ Ewald attacked this fragmentary theory in his great writing in 1826 in ~~which~~ which he showed the marvellous unity of the book of Genesis and the rest of the Pentateuch. As a substitute for it, ~~it~~ ^{he} offered ^a ~~the~~ supplementary theory whereby the parts that used the name of God were written first and the other parts were added ~~by~~ ^a later by/supplementer. This theory went through a number of variations during the ~~it~~ in the hands of various critical scholars in the following fifty years. In 1853 Hupfeld suggested that the document is said to be characterized by the name God ~~and~~ must in turn be divided up into two other documents which were interlaced, which could be extracted from it. And there...

which he called the first ~~and~~ Elohist and the other second Elohist. Hupfeld's ~~theory~~ theory did not win much sanction for a time, but 16 years later a Hegelian scholar named ~~Ross~~ Graf utilized Hupfeld's suggestion to build a ~~his~~ theory which would completely reverse the previous idea ~~xxxx~~ as to the order of the document, and put the so-called first ~~Elohist~~ Elohist which had formerly been thought to be the ~~f~~ very foundation writing, the very end of the combining process, and it was a new documentary theory was worked out according to which there were documents which might be called J,E,P, and P, which had been equally circulated separately for a time until one by one they were interwoven together. Eventually reaching the present condition of the Pentateuch.

This very complicated theory was advanced largely on the basis of an idea of a natural development of ideas of God and particularly of a religious institution. This fits exactly into the Hegelian developmental ideas of the time. ~~It is a natural development~~ A brilliant German writer named Welhausen presented the theory in beautiful German in 1878 and it was widely adopted by the younger scholars, although very few of the older scholars clung to various viewpoints ~~to~~ which they had previously held. However, the particularly documentary theory fit so well with ~~this~~ particular philosophical idea of a natural development of religious ideas and institutions that soon came to be widely accepted by the younger critical scholars ~~and the~~ and the older ones died out. It became more and more standard view. This view thus representing particular philosophical attitude of the particular point in history became ossified, and when the tendency to study documentary theory/ies has largely disappeared. ^{This view,} This one particular stage of this type of literary analysis became fixed and has been passed on traditionally now for almost ninety years. Today most of the ideas of the particular type of

developments lay back of this theory has largely been given up. But the ~~theory~~ theory came to be established on the basis of this historical theorizing had become ossified and is taught as fixed and definite result of scholarship, even ~~the doctrine~~ though there is actually no solid basis for it to rest upon. Very few ~~of~~ scholars have ~~been known to study~~ spend much time studying the evidences for the theory. Many, however, repeated as something that is fixed and definite and cannot be ~~ben~~ trusted. It has become an article of faith rather than a scientific conclusion.

Most ~~scie~~ scientific books written thirty years ago if they speak of the space described as filled with "ether," the hypothesis that there was an unproved substance through which radio waves and so forth could move was widely taught for a long time, and today the scholarly world has given ~~it~~ up this hypothesis altogether after being widely held, it has now disappeared. The same should happen with the theory of J,E,D, and P.

P R E F A C E

This book is intended both for the layman and for the scholar. The attempt has been made to explain every concept and every idea so clearly that the layman with no background in the study of Biblical criticism will be able to follow the argument and to understand the facts presented. At the same time it is the intention of the writer to handle each matter with such accuracy and such thoroughness that the results will be useful for those who are thoroughly trained in this area of scholarship.

Extensive research has been conducted in books and articles in various languages, yet it is the author's desire that as far as possible every reader be able to check for himself on the statements made and the facts adduced; therefore special emphasis has been laid upon publications in English, such as would be available in most large city libraries.

Detailed references are included to most of the books published in English in recent years that deal extensively with this problem, and also to the most important books on the subject that have appeared during the present century.

J,E,D,P THEORY

It is sometimes said that the multi-documentary theory of the Pentateuch simply represents the extension of the standard literary methods, methods of literary study to the Bible. There is a sense in which this is true, but there is a greater sense in which it is false.

In the case of the Pentateuch there is ~~not a great deal~~, there is comparatively slight amount of attention given today to attempting to divide sections into sources and to prove ^{to} what sources they belong. Most of the present books on the subject simply take ~~over~~ ^{ed} the division found in the earlier books and assert, ~~and accepted~~ ^{the source division} as a fact that ... *that arose* in connection with Wellhausen's theory of development, ~~a~~ ^{this} particularly idea of sources became widespread nearly 90 years ago and ~~today~~ ^{it} is being almost ~~thoughtlessly~~ thoughtlessly followed by great numbers of ~~the~~ present ~~writing~~ ^{real} writers. It is no longer a living method, but ~~mainly~~ ^{mainly} a preservation, somewhat like ~~the fossil~~ a fossil, of something that has to a great extent ~~disappeared~~ *disappeared.*

3.01

skepticism among critical scholars as to the factual ~~nature~~ nature of the Biblical statements has to a large extent been replaced by an entirely different attitude, because evidences have come to light supporting so many statements of the Bible and in fact often supporting statements that had been previously most strongly doubted.

It is not the purpose of this particular book to deal ~~with~~ to any great extent with evidences of the accuracy and dependability of historical and factual ~~statements~~ statements in the Bible. At this point we are merely mentioning the fact that this ~~change~~, this general change has occurred as a result of archeology.

began as part of a widespread movement from about 1795 when Wolf published his Introduction to Homer until about 1930. In the early part of this period there was an extreme skepticism regarding the factual nature of any ancient document. It was felt that all ancient records and documents must be doubted, must be proven correct before anything could be based upon their statements. If something stood alone, it was almost inevitably assumed to be false. This attitude of skepticism was passed on to the attitude toward the Bible, and for a period, during a very considerable period a great number of Biblical critics took, seemed to take the attitude that any ~~a~~ factual statement in the Bible, no factual statement in the Bible was to be given much weight unless there is a very strong corroborative evidence elsewhere in its favor.

This attitude has changed completely in the intervening years as regards all other documents than the Bible and also to a very great extent as regards the Bible. The reason for this is primarily the greater amount of ~~additional~~ additional information about the ancient times that have come to us from archaeology. So much ancient material has been discovered fitting together with so many statements in the ancient documents that the ^{general} tendency today is to accept ^a the statements ^{as} in ancient documents as true unless it can be proven false rather than ^{the} contrary.

As far as the Bible ~~itself~~ itself is concerned, the ^{widespread} ~~great attitude of~~

C-1 (4)

Revised 10-
20

grammatically there can be no sound objection that can be raised against interpreting it this way. However, if any philologist wishes to dispute this point it is not necessary to argue it because the whole object(?) logic(?) of the situation requires a pluperfect interpretation whether the form is pluperfect or not. The writer is no so primitive in his thinking that he says "God created man and then said, 'Let's see whether we can find a proper helpmeet for him. Let's make a giraffe. No, a giraffe is not suitable for a helpmeet; let's try another. Let's make a hippopotamus.' And so on. It is very evident that there is simply an allusion back to God's creation of animals which, as we know from Genesis 1, had preceded the creation of man. The purpose here, unless the writer was ~~extreme~~ extremely primitive, in his ideas, is not to determine in order that God will find out what will make a helpmeet for man, but it is to demonstrate to man his need of a helpmeet like help ~~kick~~ like himself.

It is to show man the reasonableness of the creation of a ~~woman~~ woman.

Thus we have a reference to God's planting a garden, a reference back to His creation of the animals, an account of His creation of man, his placing man in the garden, explaining to him the situation in which he is put, showing man his need of a proper helpmeet, and then the story of the creation of the helpmeet. There is no difference in the order here from the order of chapter 1. The subject is not God's ~~re~~ creation of the universe, nor God's creation of vegetation or animals; the subject is God's creation of man and the establishment of the first relationship between God and man.

Importance of this Argument

In practically all of the critical books today such statements will be found as, "we can tell that this section is part of the J document because it contains the name YHWH", or, "this is clearly part of the E document, as is seen by its use of the name Elohim.

Thus the argument from divine names is widely used today, even by those critics who do not give it the great prominence in their general discussion that it receives from others.

Actually, however, the argument is not really valid. In the first place, to say that one document would always use one name for God, and the other document would always use the other name, goes contrary to normal human usage. It is true that there might be a situation in which a man was known by only one name among a certain group of people, while another group would know him only by another name. It cannot be said, however, that this was the case in regard to the alleged documents of the Pentateuch. All of them use the name YHWH constantly after the first few chapters of Exodus, so the name YHWH was definitely known to all of them.

Elohim also is found in all of these sections. Besides, while habits of using names differ from time to time, it has been customary in most periods to use various proper names for the same person on account of different situations. Thus if a man is speaking to his own wife he is apt to call her by her first name. If he is in any sort of public life he is quite apt to refer to her as "Mrs. Smith" when he speaks to others about her. If he speaks to their child he is apt to call her "Mother." However, these usages may not be carried through

WHY ^{and the} BOOK ON THIS SUBJECT?

There is urgent need for re-examination of the theory that divides the first books of the Old Testament into alleged original sources designated as J, E, D and P.

During the last few years this theory has begun to be disseminated much more widely than ever before. Sunday School literature has many references to it. ~~is~~ Sunday School helps contain charts called ~~the~~ "The Date-Line of the Bible" showing listing J, E, D and P as if they were well-known ancient manuscripts or ~~wiki~~ writings. Many people ~~(persons)~~ who previously knew nothing about the theory are wondering whether it is true or not. Such ~~people~~ ^{individuals} should be greatly interested in a thorough discussion of the problem.

However, the book has in mind ~~also~~ performing a service ^{not only for them, but also} for all ~~others~~ who are interested in the Bible.

~~Other~~ ^{Many} American Bible readers today can ~~almost~~ be divided into two distinct groups: those who think that this theory is utter nonsense, hardly worth their time to investigate, and those who think that it is so well established that there is little need of questioning it.

The attempt has been made to present material in this book that ought to be of great value and interest to both types of readers. I would like now to give reasons why each of these two different types of Bible readers should desire to ~~investigate~~ to make a real investigation of the theory.

Why Conservative Readers Need to Learn about Pentateuchal Criticism

The ~~so-called~~ ^{present} Multi-document Theory of the Pentateuch ~~which~~ ^{in Germany} began about 90 years ago, and was for a time confined to the studies of a few scholars. However, it spread rapidly among the ~~leaders (better word?)~~ ^{English speaking world} of theological seminaries and great numbers of ministers in the past 50 years believed the theory but said little ~~about~~ about it ~~in their sermons~~ to the members of their congregations.

WHY A BOOK ON THIS SUBJECT?

(2)

In recent years it has begun to be more widely popularized. I have already mentioned the fact that within the last five years nearly all of our large denominations have issued Sunday School lessons, quarterlies, and religious textbooks in which the theory substantially ^{as} presented ~~by~~ ^{by} Wellhausen ~~and~~ nearly 90 years ago has been shown in chart form and in ~~the~~ narrative presentation as established fact. During the last ten years, aside from books of rather popular nature, there ~~has~~ have been printed or reprinted in the English-speaking world a great many books in which this theory is set forth as the main feature of the book or as a very important portion of its teaching. The advertising for one of these books claims that it is ~~now~~ used as a textbook in 1400 colleges. The theory is being very widely taught and if the present trend continues will soon permeate the educated class of America.

The time has come when every Christian, regardless of his previous views, has a duty to examine the matter, ^{not only so as} and to decide definitely for or against

this view which is becoming so widespread, ^{but also to be able to present a reasoned statement of the bases for his views.}

No matter how conservative a man may be in his views about the Bible, ^{he is sure} to come into contact with others who are convinced that this theory is true. If he has children who attend present-day colleges or universities, or even high schools, they are almost certain to find that some of their ~~textbooks~~ textbooks teach the theory as established fact.

Every conservative Christian ^{ought to} know enough about the theory to be able to give a reasoned argument for or against it.

~~Why~~ ^{Why} Those Who are Convinced of the Theory Need a Further Book on the Subject

There are multitudes of people in America today who believe that this theory is proven as definite fact, yet this does not make it so. Many of the best scholars are raising questions about it. Large groups of individuals are suggesting theories that are very different in nature. After all, no ancient copy of any one of these alleged documents has ever been discovered,

WHY A BOOK ON THIS SUBJECT? (#3)

① nor has ^a ~~any~~ reference ^② to any ^{one} of them, ^③ ever been found. ~~to any of them~~

④ The whole idea has originated within a comparatively short time. Many ideas in science have been almost universally held for decades, or perhaps for centuries, and then have been proven false. If a person desires to be in line with truth, it is his duty to keep his mind open, to investigate facts ^{are} to be ready to re-examine the evidence ^{for} of ~~any~~ theory, no matter how well established he may consider it to be. In this book the attempt has been made to examine all the evidence that has been considered important in support of this theory, and to see just how much weight deserves to be placed upon it
(reword)
it will bear

insert "ether"?

?

No matter how convinced a man may be of the theory, if he desires to know the truth he has a duty to be willing to approach the subject with an open mind and carefully to re-examine the evidences.

For people in this category the suggestion is made that instead of reading straight through the book you might prefer to ~~run~~ glance through the table of contents, to note the references to those arguments which /you have been led to believe to be most firmly established, and then to read those sections first. If the ideas there presented seem ^{to you} to raise really valid questions, ~~to you~~ ^{then} you will feel justified in reading the other sections, some of which at present ^{may} ~~(first)~~ seem to you ^{not} to be of such vital importance.

J, E, and P -- FACT OR ~~EX~~ FAKE

In recent years a great deal of literature has appeared which speaks very positively about the D document, the E_G document and the P document. Most of this literature gives an approximate date when each of these documents is said to have been written, and speaks of them just as definitely as one might ~~never~~ speak of Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address" for Franklin's Autobiography. It will therefore surprise some to ~~learn~~ know (learn) that ~~no~~ no copy of any one of these ~~manuscripts~~ alleged documents has ever been found. There is absolutely no manuscript that has come down to us from ~~antiquity~~ antiquity that contains the material said to have been in one of these documents, while not containing material that is claimed to belong to one of the other documents written anywhere from one to five centuries later. There is no mention in any ancient writing of any ancient writing of any such documents ever having existed.

The ~~impression~~ impression that the average reader gets (derives) (acquires) from the mentions of the J and E document(s) is that there was a story of ~~the~~ the early history of Israel written by someone who always used the name Jehovah (YHWH) for God, while another was written by someone who always used the name Elohim for God, and that later someone combined these, and that it is easy to disentangle them by seeing which name for God is used. Actually the whole matter is far more complex than this simple idea would suggest.

It is not the view of any of those who have ~~promoted~~ promoted during the last century promoted the idea of the existence of a J, E or P document that the original ~~writer~~ writer of the particular document called God only by the "YHWH" or only by the name "Elohim." According to those who hold the theory all ~~of~~ of the writers of all three of them used both names for God. As a matter of fact all three documents asked (?) the critics claimed that they ~~once~~ existed separately used both names, the name Jehovah (YHWH) occurs in all three of them in most of the ~~whole~~ verses ^{of} in the latter portions, although even

here the name Elohim occasionally occurs. The difference between them, according to the critical theory, ~~x~~ is not ~~alone~~ that one believes that knew God by ~~one~~ one name, and the other - another by a different name, but that the writers of these documents had a different theory as to when people began to use one particular name, and tried, in writing their account(s) of events which they supposed to have occurred many centuries before that time to restrict themselves to using the name that they thought was current at that time.

It is thus obvious that the theory is far more complicated than the impression that the average reader ~~is~~ gets. In fact it is so complex a theory that, looked (viewed) at in the light of present literary practices, it really is amazing that it ever should have ~~been~~ gained a ~~foot~~ foothold. It is typical, however, of many other theories, few of them anywhere near so complex as this, but many somewhat ~~is~~ similar, about ~~many~~ various types of literature which gained wide circulation in the last century, most of which have completely disappeared from the mind of present-day man. It is the purpose of the present book to show that this theory is a survival of a bygone era, that it is something that is quite out of line ~~with~~ with present ideas of literary history or literary study. It is too bad that just when the evidences upon which it is supposed to be based are more and more falling to pieces, the ~~theory~~ theory is being presented more and more dogmatically, and more and more widely. Sunday School books, popular writings, ~~and~~ ^{and} college textbooks contain it far more frequently than ever before. It represents the survival of a myth which actually is without foundation any foundation of fact. Perhaps the word "faith" (?) ~~fake~~ "fake" (?) is a bit strong but for it still to continue, now that the bases upon which it was said to have been established have been almost ~~it~~ completely demolished is indeed a fake.

~~xxxxxxx~~ He continues, "observations that 'Moses ~~thix~~ wrote this book of laws~~xx~~' (e.g. Deut. 28:61,31:24) also refer only to strictly the limited sections but never to ~~xxxxxxx~~ the Pentateuch as a whole." ---
 On what ground does he ~~claim~~ claim that the statement that Moses wrote this book of laws only refers ~~to the~~ only to the strictly limited sections. There is surely at least a possibility that it refers to the Pentateuch as a whole.

On page 48 he says, "the witness of the New Testament/~~xxxxxxx~~ little value/~~as~~ the evidence that ~~Moses wrote~~ Moses wrote the Pentateuch and as the few passages in the Old Testament where/~~the~~ ^a reference is made to the law of Moses." Here under note 2 he , Under the NEW Testament, He has a footnote which says, Luke 22,24:44, John 7:23, etc. Just how can he say that this witness is of little value? Similarly under the Old Testament he has a note, a ϕ footnote where it says, ~~xxxxxxx~~ Joshua 1:7-8; I Kings 3:2;II Kings 21:8; Mal. 4:4. Perhaps ~~if~~ he is right to say that the witness of the New ~~§~~ ~~xxxxxxx~~ Testament is of as little value as for a few passages in the Old Testament. However, these few passages in the Old Testament are of great value,~~as witness~~ and the witness in the New ~~§~~ Testament is also of great value. The statement is equally true, but the impression that it makes is quite different from the real fact. This is a case of rushing aside the witness with the wave of the hand. It is hardly valid reasoning.

He says further, "it is significant, too, that Psalms ~~xx~~ often refer to the Law of God, or Yahweh, but never the law of Moses." ---I fail to see how this is particularly important~~xxxx~~ Calling ~~thix~~ it the law of God or the law of the Lord, does not prove that Moses did not write it. It is simply ~~xxxxxxx~~ the use of another title. And there is nothing significant about it.

He continues "the idea that ~~the~~ Moses was the author of the Book of ~~the~~ Laws is first met in the historical writings of the Chronicler." Here he has a footnote, II Chron. 23:18, 25:4; Ezra 3:2,7:6."---- This is an instance of making a statement with no evidence whatever. He says that the idea that Moses was the author of laws is first met in the historical writings of the Chronicler, and previously he has ~~it~~ already given a reference to these books being called the law of Moses as early as the book of Joshua.

After this, his next paragraph says that "the whole series of the instances can be cited as the evidence for rejecting the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch." Most of these alleged evidences to which he devotes the whole page ~~were~~ presented as much as three hundred years ago and were discussed and fully refuted by ~~some~~ conservative scholars ~~for~~ of the time before ~~the~~ critical theory had even come into existence. Most of them are quite simple to answer.

Then he continues and says, "so a ~~new~~ question arises, if not Moses, who is the author of the Pentateuch? Is there any literary unity at all? After saying that at first glance it looks as if there were, he continues to give some actually very weak arguments to show that it is not by saying that certain sections interrupt the general narrative, break its continuity and actually this is something one will find in any book that ever was written. Writing has to be linear. We have to go straight ahead. We cannot ... Writing is not like a picture. If one ~~one~~ wants to describe a ~~picture~~ map, he can start at the top and go down to the bottom and then start again or he can start at the left and go to the right in different sections of it, and then pick out the main features and then talk ~~not~~ about others, but whatever written in words has to be linear and therefore there

10/25/66

Probably many people (persons) think that the difference between (among) the various documents into which critics divide the books of the Pentateuch is that one always uses the name JHWH, ~~while the other~~ while the other while one or two of the others always use the name Elohim. This would be a very natural conclusion from the fact that one of the documents is named after the word JHWH, and another is named after the word Elohim, and that critical writers say that the P document is even more consistent than the E document ~~in~~ in avoiding the use of the name JHWH. Yet such an idea is ~~now~~ very far from the view held by those who believe the theory.

According to the multi-documentary theory no one of these documents ever ended with the events in the Book ~~of~~ of Genesis; all of them run through the entire Pentateuch, or, as many critics maintain, through the entire Hexateuch, which would include also, of course, the Book of Joshua. Every one of these documents has a far more occurrences of the name JHWH than it has of the name Elohim. Thus, according to those who teach the multi-documentary theory both names were known to the writers of every one of these documents.

As a matter of fact, according to the theory, the documents were not written ~~until~~ at least until the time of David, and perhaps until a great deal later. By this time both names were frequently used as can easily ~~be~~ be seen by an examination of the historical books or ~~the books~~ of the Book of Psalms. While the critics may argue about the dates of certain of the (these?) sections, there is no doubt that ~~according~~ according to their belief there were many books written before these documents were written, at least before the last of these three ~~documents~~ documents was written, in which the writers used the two names, changing, sometimes using one, ~~sometimes~~ sometimes the other, and ~~for~~ often, in fact, using both names even within one verse.

(separation into verses ~~prior~~ prior to that time?)

Thus the critical theory does not hold that a man who always used the name JHWH wrote the J document, and a man who always used the name Elohim wrote the E

document, or the P document. The view is quite different ~~from~~ from this. According to the view, the writers of the E document and the P document, while themselves generally using the name JHWH, believed that previous to the time of Moses this name had not been used, and therefore consciously determined in their description of events at that time always to use the name Elohim. It is somewhat as it would be if a person were to describe events in New York before its conquest by ^{any} ~~the~~ British in 1864, and to consciously determine [?] consciously to determine to avoid the name New York, and instead always to call it New Amsterdam. Any such effort ~~is~~ inevitably requires a definite belief that a certain name was not used at a certain time, and a determination to keep from using the name which ~~is~~ is commonly used in his ordinary discourse or in his other writings, and also in the later ~~latter?~~ parts of this writing, but in the part of it dealing with events before that time, to avoid altogether the name which he did not think to have been introduced until ~~a~~ later ^{on}.

It might not be altogether unnatural to think that such a theory had been held, and documents had been written by men who ~~strich~~ (?) worked hard to keep this document this idea in mind, and that later on another document had been written by someone who had completely forgotten this theory, and therefore used the name JHWH right from the/beginning of his writing./ ^{very} ~~it~~ is hard in such a case to see why such a man since in his daily life ^{sits} early life he used both names more or less interchangeably, should have ~~tried~~ tried to bind himself to the one name instead of occasionally using one and occasionally using the other. It might be possible to think that such a ^{is} after the original theory had been ~~for~~ forgotten one who had forgotten it wrote a book utterly disregarding it, and then that others who ~~forgot the other theory~~ had forgotten the theory eventually interweave his document with documents written earlier when a different theory was held. This, however, ~~was~~ not at all what was ~~it~~ held by the multi-documentary theory as taught for the last ~~80~~ eighty years. According to this theory,

10/25/66 (3)

as propounded by Wellhausen, and held by most of its supporters ever since, the earliest document written uses the name JHWH throughout, while the later documents follow the theory that this name was unknown until the time of Moses, and therefore scrupulously avoided in that part of their writing which later was combined into the Book of Genesis or ~~it~~ into the earlier part of the Book of Exodus. Yet, according to these men, that theory was completely forgotten by those who interwove the E document into the J document, and later on when the P document was written the theory was revived and maintained in the P document even more consistently than it had been in the E document. And then when the final redactor put all three documents together he again completely forgot about it.

How utterly confused and ~~inconsistent~~ inconsistent and illogical such a theory is. How much simpler to believe that ~~it~~ one man wrote the entire Book of Genesis, or the entire Book of Exodus, ~~follows~~ following the practice that was common in his day of sometimes using ~~one~~ one name, and sometimes using the other name, but after the establishment of the covenant relationship between God and the nation of Israel, using particularly the name that stressed this covenant relationship.

For many years it has been customary in books on the Old Testament to speak ~~about~~ about the J, E and P documents. This, however, is in itself no proof that such documents ever actually existed.

Many great discoveries have been made in the ancient Orient. Hundreds of thousands of cuneiform documents have been unearthed. The Dead Sea Scrolls carry back out text of the Old Testament to a period many ~~■~~ centuries earlier than was possible before their discovery. A whole new world has risen from the dust as a result of archaeological research and investigation during the last century and a half.

during this time
Yet/no one has even claimed to have discovered a copy of the J document, the E document, or the ~~Book~~ P document ~~(the D document)~~ (the D document principally consists of the Book of Deuteronomy as we have it today; naturally copies of this have been discovered).

Many ancient tablets tell us about the culture, thought and life of the ancient world. No one of these ~~works~~ even makes a reference to any writing which would seem to ~~be~~ include even approximately the material that is alleged to belong to the J ~~document~~ document, the E document, or the P document.

The Dead Sea Scrolls have now brought to light copies of many portions of the Hebrew Old Testament from a time before the beginning of the present era. The Septuagint manuscripts ~~show~~ show that the Old Testament was translated ~~it~~ into Greek before the time of Christ. Yet no ancient evidence of J, E or P has even come to light.

The whole idea that such documents ever existed is a theory advanced during the last hundred years. Previous to that various theories were held by ~~■~~ scholars of the divisive school ~~Divisive~~ Divisive School, but none of them but none of them very similar to the Pentateuchal theory as presently held. The fact that this theory has been widely taught for almost 90 years is no proof that it is true.

Professor Cyrus Gordon of Brandeis University says, "I know men who are professors in Roman Catholic seminaries, in Protestant seminaries, in Jewish seminaries, who tenaciously/^{hold}~~hold~~ to the existence of these documents. Some of these men will not let even/^{admit}~~the~~ possibility that they may not have existed. It is almost an act of faith with them."

Yet Professor Gordon goes on in his discussion to show how extremely weak are the arguments that are commonly alleged for the once existence of these documents.

no
indica-
tive
verb

In ancient times many people believed that the earth was a sphere. When a great Greek scientist even constructed a plan for ~~measuring~~ measuring its circumference, and came, according to Professor Hoyle of Cambridge University, within ~~with~~ .7 of 1% of measuring the exact distance around the/~~earth~~ earth. During the middle ages the culture of the ancient world was forgotten, and it was widely thought that the earth was flat. For centuries anyone who suggested anything else would have been considered demented. Yet today we all know that this universally-held idea of the middle ages was completely false, and that the ancient idea of the sphericity of the earth is true. Men have sailed around it, have flown around it, and have even orbited it in the sky. The fact of the approximateness (?) of the generally spherical shape of the earth is today unquestioned even though the contrary was universally believed for ~~so~~ so long.

Aristotle stated that ~~when~~ when objects of different weights were dropped they fell at a speed proportionate proportional to their weight. The authority of this great philosopher was sufficient to lead scholars for hundreds of years to accept unquestioningly that this was a fact. Galileo dropped bodies of different weights from ~~the~~ the Leaning Tower of Pisa and demonstrated conclusively that bodies fall to the earth at a rate which is unaffected by their comparative weight. The idea universally held had to be given up because it did not correspond to fact.

In 1878 Professor Julius Wellhausen wrote his brilliant book on the Prolegomena

WHAT ABOUT J, E, D, AND P?

411

belonging to a long American denomination

A discussion between Mr. Christian, a lay member of a church, his son Henry, who is ^{a freshman in} ~~attending~~ a church-related college, and Dr. Allan A. MacRae, President of Faith Theological Seminary.

Mr. C.: Dr. MacRae, during the last year or two there has been a great deal in our Sunday School ~~Quarterlies~~ and other church literature about the origin of the first five books of the Bible. We have been told that parts of it were written at about ⁸⁵⁰ 1000 B. C. by a writer called J, and parts at about 500 B. C. by a writer called P. This is quite different from what I have always understood, ^{that the accounts of} I have always understood that Moses wrote the first five books of the Bible. Are there some ^{recent} ~~great new~~ archaeological discoveries that prove this new idea? ^{copies of} Have these manuscripts J, E, D, and P been found in ancient ruins?

Dr. M.: No, Mr. C., there have been no discoveries of this sort. No copy of any manuscript corresponding to the so-called J, E, D, or P has ever been discovered. No ancient reference that has ever been found mentions any such documents. The theory to which you refer ^{claim only to be based on} ~~is entirely a~~ deduction from the words of the Bible as it has been passed down to us. ~~Everyone of our~~ ancient copies of the first part of the Old Testament contains the books of Genesis and Exodus as we have them in our Bible today, and not as they are divided up in accordance with this theory.

Henry C.: At college we often have talks in chapel about new archeological discoveries, but we have never heard of the discovery of such documents. One of my friends who is taking a course in Bible tells me that in ^{that} this course this theory is taught, ^{merely as} ~~to them, not as something that is~~ the result of a recent discovery, but as something that has been believed for many years. It is strange that

no matter how long ^{(2) people have} it, ⁽⁴⁾ ~~has been~~ believed by some, ⁽¹⁾ ⁽⁵⁾ needs to be ^{re-} examined ^{from time to time.}

Henry C.: My room-mate has a text book in which this theory is presented. I glanced through it and was surprised to notice that very little evidence was given in its support. ~~It seems mostly to be taken for granted.~~ The principal stress was on the ^{claim!} idea that the theory represents the results of 200 years of critical study, or that "all scholars agree that this theory is true."

Dr. M.: You have correctly analyzed the situation. In recent years hardly anything has been written attempting from a careful and thorough-going viewpoint to prove ^{the} ~~this~~ theory, ~~to be true~~, yet many books have been written which assume it to be true. Its acceptance today is largely based upon an authoritarian attitude, rather than upon a careful examination of facts. Many seem to think that as long as it has been so widely accepted, no one has a right to question it. This is an unscientific approach. The arguments in its favor have been mostly presented just as well before 1900 as they have ever been since. In fact, better, because more effort was then made to prove that the theory was true. If you would like to examine some of these arguments I would be glad to look them over with you.

Henry C.: My roommate told me that when you look at the beginning of the book of Genesis you find two different stories of creation. He said one of them runs from Genesis 1:1 to Genesis 2:4a. He said that the other runs from Genesis 2:4b to the end of Chapter 4. He said that in Genesis 1:1 to 2:4a the name of God was always called Elohim which he said is the Hebrew for God. He said that from Chapter 2:4b to the end of Chapter 4 God is always called "Yahweh" which is the way this book represents the Hebrew name that the Authorized Version calls the LORD with the word written entirely in capitals, or Jehovah which is the way the old American Standard Version of 1901 represented this name. He said that the

style of these two passages is ^{so} very different, ~~that actually~~ it is easy to see that they come from two different documents. Then he said you could take one of these and find other long passages throughout the book of Genesis with similar styles each using entirely the word Elohim for God. He said you could also take the second account and find other passages all through Genesis every one of which uses Yahweh (YHWH) for God. Thus you could get two complete stories of most of the events of Genesis, one of them always using one name for God, and one always using the other name. He said that this seems to him to be pretty conclusive proof that actually there were two different documents that were united once into one book. In addition, ~~to this~~, he said, that when you put these two together, you could notice quite a difference in the ^{style} ~~of them~~. You could notice the different way in which each described the same events and the different ways they had of speaking about God.

1000

Dr. M.: As your roommate expressed it, the theory certainly sounds strong. I doubt if it would be expressed quite that way in any of the books though. → That is nevertheless the impression that many people get. If we examine the facts, however, we will find that they are quite different from this impression. Would you be interested in examining these facts?

1000

Henry C.: I certainly would. My roommate is very convinced of this theory. I would like to know whether he is right.

Dr. M.: Let us take the first of these ideas and look at the question of whether the book of Genesis can be divided into sections simply on the basis of the use of different names for God and as a result get two different and complete documents. This is a proper place to start to examine the theory because this is where it began historically. ~~way~~ ^{away} back in 1753, a French physician named Astruc wrote a book on the sources of Genesis in which he suggested that Genesis

1000

was written by Moses putting together two different documents one of which always used the name JHWH and the other always used the name Elohim. He divided the book into two main documents this way leaving over ten short passages which he said were separate sources that did not fit into either of these two documents. This is how the theory began.

However, the theory as taught today is very different from the way it was presented in the early days, the period between 1800 and 1869, when critical opinion swerved in one direction and then in another, and many theories were advanced. Finally a suggestion was made in 1853 which very few scholars paid much attention to but which Graf took up in part in 1863 in a suggested arrangement and then quite thoroughly revised in 1869. Then this theory was developed further by a Dutch scholar named Kuenen, and ^② it was ^② ~~written~~ ^{presented} in beautiful German style by a brilliant professor named Wellhausen, ^① in 1878. Therefore the theory is ^{often} ~~sometimes~~ called "the Wellhausen theory" or "the Graf-Wellhausen theory." The form in which Wellhausen presented the theory is substantially the same form held by most of those scholars today who believe in any form of a documentary theory.

Mr. C.: But Dr. MacRae, what objection would there be ^{to} in thinking that Moses had used documents in writing Genesis?

Dr. M.: I see no objection to ^{that} ~~so thinking~~. Some people think that by verbal inspiration it is believed that God dictated every word of the Scripture. Now, there would be no harm in holding such a view if it were true. I can dictate letters to ^a ~~the~~ stenographer and no one thinks any worse of it. However, the Bible ^{thinks the method God used} ~~nowhere says that God dictated it~~. What the Bible teaches is that God directed the work, and that he led the writers of Scripture in selecting words and expressions from their own vocabulary to write ^{what} ~~things that~~

- remembered*
- (1) they had seen, thought, or heard from other sources, as well as facts and ^{the}
- (2) ideas that God ^{had} Himself directly revealed to them, ⁽⁵⁾ the Bible teaches ^{(7) of this kind} ~~that~~ ^{activity}
- ~~that God so directed the writers~~ ⁽⁶⁾ that as a result the whole Bible expresses
- (10) the mind of God to us. Now it would be possible for God to have dictated every word of Genesis to Moses if He chose. Certainly Moses could not have written *Genesis* ~~everything that he wrote~~ from personal observation, ^{sure} because he lived hundreds of years after Abraham, ~~whose life he describes~~. God could have dictated every word, but we have no reason to think that he did ^{so}. It is entirely possible that Moses had documents from which he gathered a great part of ^{the} ~~his~~ information in Genesis. However, we believe that the Holy Spirit of God so directed Moses in his selection from these documents and in his writing that what he wrote was free from error.

Henry C.: Then if Moses could have had written documents, what is the harm in accepting the Graf-Wellhausen theory?

Dr. M.: It is one thing to say that a man may have used documents as sources in something that he wrote. It is another thing to be able to divide up his writing into the different documents. We have no question that Moses may have used documents. We do question whether anyone can prove that he followed such documents so closely that we can separate his work into the documents he may have followed.

In addition to that, the Graf-Wellhausen theory holds that every part of the Pentateuch was written long after the time of Moses, and that these documents ^{frequently} ~~which were put together~~ clash with and contradict one another. It holds that some of these documents are very primitive and show very early ideas of God, while others are very advanced and show a much more developed ^{concept} ~~idea~~ of God and that we can trace these ideas by comparison of the different documents. This is an attitude that can hardly be squared with belief in Mosaic authorship of the

Pentateuch, or even with the idea that there is a great God who created the universe, as described in Genesis 1.

Mr. C.: Is it true then that we can go through the book of Genesis and find certain chapters always using the name "God" and others always representing him by the term YHWH?

No, indeed, that is not the situation at all. As
Dr. M.: ~~That is not the way the theory holds today at all. It starts~~
~~out with two long passages like this, but as we go on through Genesis we find~~
that the use of these names is not nearly ^{as} consistent as the theory would lead us to believe. Sometimes one name will be used for several verses and then another name will be used for a few verses. Sometimes both names will be used in the same verse. Sometimes ^{certain} ~~we have~~ chapters ~~with~~ no specific name for God ~~used~~ at all. The use of the names for God is not a sufficient criterion to divide Genesis into documents.

However, we should notice something that goes ^{far} beyond this. We should notice the fact that the Wellhausen theory, as held by practically all who accept any documentary theory today, holds that there are three documents in Genesis instead of two. One of these three documents, they say, always uses the name ^{Elohim} ~~YHWH~~, and this document, they say, has a style very different from the other two. The other two, they say, have a style so similar that they are often very difficult to distinguish from one another. Yet, of these two documents one, they say, always uses the name Elohim and the other ^{generally} ~~always~~ uses the name ^{the} YHWH. These two they call J and E, and they say that ^{the} J and E documents are very difficult to distinguish from one another, although they think that it is quite easy to distinguish both of them from P. Thus the alleged division on the basis of the style goes one way, you see, and the alleged division on the basis of the proper names goes in an entirely different way. So that the division on the basis of the names for God is far from sufficient to establish

the theory.

Henry C.: This sounds very complicated. Does this mean that the ordinary person is unable to understand and must simply take what the experts say?

Dr. M.: It has often been found that new scientific theories seem very complicated. However, after they have been investigated further, the complexities usually iron out and the results generally become so simple that they can be explained to a young student. When something is so complex that only a highly trained man can understand it, we tend to wonder whether it really is true at all or not. Certainly if the ^{Prof. Wellhausen} ~~theory of the higher criticism~~ were true, it should be possible to give the proof in simple language and in such a way that the untrained person could examine at least some of the evidences and see that it bears out the claim.

Henry C.: My roommate seems to feel that this can be done. He says that there are four main arguments. These are: (1) the consistent use of the proper names for God in the different documents (2) the ^{claim} ~~fact~~ that each document taken by itself presents a complete story without needing any of the other documents (3) the ^{claim} ~~fact~~ that each document has instances where there is a parallel to a story in the other but where the compiler evidently did not realize this and so kept them both as if they were separate incidents, and (4) the style of different documents is strikingly different from one another.

Dr. M.: Let us examine these ^{arguments} ~~theories~~ one after another and see just what the evidence is. One needs to look at the Graf-Wellhausen theory in perspective. Perhaps one reason why there is so little change in it today is the fact that people's minds do not work in this century like they did in the last century. About 1800 there began a literary movement in Germany which took the attitude

that nothing from ancient times was to be accepted as true unless abundant supporting evidences could be found. This theory questioned every ancient document and many modern ones too. According to this theory, it was possible to take ancient documents and divide them up into different alleged sources on the basis of differences in style which were thought to be found in them. This was done to practically all ancient writings. Thus, the writings of Homer were said to have been written by about 30 different writers. It was thought that the styles of the different writers could be detected. There were two main writers each of which wrote about a fourth of the material in the Illiad, and these two were considered as often being interlaced with a passage from one and then a passage from the other, and then perhaps a passage from a third writer, and then a passage from the first, and then perhaps a passage from a fourth writer, and then from the second, and then from the first again. Professor Rieu who has translated Illiad for the Pelican Series states in the introduction of his new translation that when he was a student it was considered as certain that the writings of Homer came together that way. He said, that today ^① however, ^② most people recognize that there must have been one great mind that composed the Illiad. Doubtless he had sources ^③ previous stories and ideas that he had heard, but they are fused together in a way that shows the style and genius of one great mind and ~~no one would be able to separate out the various sources which~~ ^{from which would be impossible} may have entered into his ideas.

Scholars today take the words of Shakespeare and show how he got different stories and different ideas from earlier writings. But all marvel at the way the genius of Shakespeare transmuted these to make a great unity infinitely superior to the sources from which he drew. In this case there is a clear difference from the situation we find in relation to the Pentateuch. We have the literature ~~from which we think Shakespeare drew.~~ ^{that} We can see where he got the different ideas that he incorporated into his writings. But in the case of the Pentateuch we have no

existing earlier document or previous books from which it might be alleged that the writer drew. The critics reconstruct the sources simply by taking the parts of the Pentateuch as it stands and endeavoring to fit them together. This was a common practice between 1800 and 1870. It is a practice which today has been almost entirely given up. Today if an archaeologist discovers a great Babylonian work, no one tries to divide it up into two or three or four different sources and ^{to} suggests how these were combined together. We have the Gilgamesh story from Babylon which was doubtless the work of a great literary genius. We also have various stories about Gilgamesh in Sumerian from an earlier time. This makes it possible for us to see where the writer of the great Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic got some of his ideas, but no one today would think that ~~we~~ ^{he} could divide the Gilgamesh Epic into various original sources and suggest that they were simply combined together as they stood. Such a method simply is not used today except as regards to the Bible. Even there most ^{of the} liberal interpreters simply ~~follow~~ ^{follow} rather slavishly ~~follow~~ what Graf and Wellhausen presented. The method is out-of-date today, and the continuance of the theory is an anachronism.

Now to get back to the alleged evidences. We note that the situation is not at all what many students seem to think. You cannot take whole chapters or large sections of chapters and say that one group always uses the name YHWH and the other group entirely uses the name Elohim, and that the putting of them together gives you a different document. Nobody believes that today. The Wellhausen theory makes the division in an entirely different way.

Henry C.: But Dr. M, even if you say that you cannot carry through the theory consistently, isn't it strange that this should be the case with Genesis one and two? If these two chapters are as strikingly parallel and yet as strikingly different as my roommate says, doesn't that go a long way toward establishing the theory?

Dr. M.: I'm not ready to say that it would do so, However, that is not necessary. We can examine these chapters and find that actually the situation within them is very different from what your roommate thinks. First, let us look at the difference of names. Your roommate says that Genesis 1:1-2:4a always uses the name Elohim, and that is correct. He also said that Genesis 2:4b to the end of Chapter 4 always uses the name YHWH. Now, that is not quite accurate. In Chapters 2 and 3 ~~so~~ many times we find the words which the King James Version represents as the "LORD God" or as the critics would say "Yahweh Elohim." This occurs throughout chapters 2 and 3 and hardly ever again in the Bible. Thus you have the term Elohim which is used so many times in Chapter one also used in (this) combination ^{with YHWH} all through Chapters 2 and 3.

Henry C.: I pointed that out to my roommate and he said that the Redactor -- the man who combined the two documents -- put the word Elohim after YHWH in Chapters 2 and 3, in order to show that the one he was speaking about here was the same one that was called Elohim in Chapter One.

Dr. M.: That is a reasonable explanation of why a redactor might have made such a combination, but wouldn't it be an equally reasonable explanation of why the original writer might have done it if that one writer wrote all four chapters?

Henry C.: I never thought of that, but it certainly sounds reasonable. However, why should a writer have used the name Elohim all through the first chapter and then use the name YHWH for the rest?

Dr. M.: I think that the answer can be suggested in the first place by looking at a further fact. In Chapter Two and Three it is true we have YHWH Elohim ~~so~~ many times, and in Chapter Four we have YHWH alone ~~so~~ many times.

However, there still are four instances where Elohim is used right in Chapter Three. It is used in verses 1, 3, and 5.

Henry C.: Yes, I noticed that. I asked ^{it} my roommate about ~~that~~, and he asked the ^{instructor} ~~man~~ who was teaching his class. The ^{instructor} ~~man~~ said that it is because the Serpent ^{is} speaking. He said, "You would hardly expect the writer to ^{place} use the sacred name of God in the mouth of the Serpent. Therefore, he ~~would~~ simply use the general term "God", and when he represents Eve as answering the Serpent, he represents her as using the same general term ^{to} "God".

Dr. M.: Once we admit that, don't we admit that there is a difference in meaning between these two terms? We do not always call someone by the same name. If I am addressing a public gathering and speaking about a friend of mine who became a United States Senator, I would always say, Senator ^{Smith} ~~Martin~~ has done this or Senator ^{Smith} ~~Martin~~ has done that. However, if I am speaking to a group of close friends who knew him as a boy as I did, I would refer to him as Bob. Thus, in one connection I would call him Senator ^{Smith} ~~Martin~~, and in another connection I would call him Bob ~~in certain connections~~. Thus I might use one name quite a while and another name quite a while, or I might use them interchangeably.

Henry C.: I noticed that in our school paper that when it writes about sports events it never seems to like to use the same name for the opposing team. It will call them the Orange and then it will call them Panthers, and then it will call them the opposing team, and it uses various titles to avoid similarity, or repetition.

Dr. M.: Yes, we often use various titles to avoid confusion. Then again we may use one name for quite a long period. It is sometimes very difficult to tell

just why we use one name for a time and why another name. In the case of Genesis 1 and 2 a fairly easy explanation is available. Elohim is the name

for God that stresses his great power. This is ~~then~~ the appropriate name to ~~tell of~~ *describe* his creative act in forming the universe and ~~everything that is in it.~~ *all its contents.*

That is the theme of Genesis 1:1 - 2:4a. Here the name "God" occurs ~~so~~ many times, and we are given a vivid impression of the great power and majesty of the One who could create this tremendous universe. After Chapter 3:4 we speak in more detail about God and his relation to men. When we do this, we use the more intimate name of God, the name that stresses his relation as the Redeemer of his own people. And so it is natural here to use YHWH except in the dis-

cussion between Eve and the Serpent *where the Creator name of God is appropriately used when Satan tried to get man, the creature, to act independently and outside of the will of his Creator.*

Henry C.: Isn't it strange that we would have two different accounts of creation at the beginning of the Bible? Once I was in a class where one of the students said he believed the story of creation in the Bible, and the teacher answered, "Which account of creation do you believe? The one in Genesis One or the account in Genesis Two?" This was a new thought to that student and he did not know what to say.

Dr. Mc: It is too bad when young students sometimes are confused in this way by men who ought to know better. However, I do not take this as necessarily a criticism of that particular teacher since there are many men today in important teaching positions who have simply taken over un-Christian ideas from others without really examining them for themselves. This man may have been simply repeating what he heard from others without really examining the evidence for himself. Everybody does this to some extent. No one can know ~~all knowledge~~ *every thing. But* *something* if we are going to make up our minds on ~~anything~~ though we should get back to the facts and be careful that we do not simply repeat what someone has said.

Now let us look at the situation. Genesis 1:1 tells us that God created

heaven and earth. It says that he created a firmament. It says that he created the sun, moon, and the stars. It says that he created the plants, the fish, and the other denizens of the sea. It says that he created the land animals, and that he created man. Now, it is true, we have another ^{creation} account in Genesis 2:4 and following. We do not simply have a continuation, but a new start. Suppose you had a book that had a map of the world on the first page and a map of the United States on the second page. You would find that three or four of the cities of the United States were also on the map of the world. But most of the cities on the map of the United States would not appear in the world map at all. The map of the world would have many things in it that were not on the map of the United States. There would be some overlapping, but not much, because one map would be taking a wide general view of a very big subject, and the other map would be going into detail ^{about} in a much smaller section of the globe.

Now, of the things that are described as created in Genesis One, how many of them are described as to their creation in Genesis Two? Chapter Two nowhere says God made the earth or that God made the heavens. Chapter Two nowhere says he made a firmament or that he made the sun, moon, and stars. None of these are mentioned as being created by God in Chapter Two. What kind of creation account do we have that leaves out all of these matters? The answer is that Chapter Two is simply dealing with the creation of man and it gives more detail concerning God's relation to man. It does refer to the fact that God created the animals. It does not mention them in detail as Genesis One does. Some books ~~will~~ say that Chapter Two also tells of the creation of vegetation, but most scholarly books ~~will~~ not say this, because the statement is so patently false. All that Genesis Two says about God having made vegetation is that God planted a garden. Last spring my son planted a garden, but I would never think of saying that my son created the vegetation. Actually the only overlapping as far as creation is concerned between Genesis One and Genesis Two is that Genesis One says God

created man male and female, and Genesis Two says that God created man and woman and makes a reference to his having created the animals. Thus it is quite incorrect to say that we have two various contradictory accounts of creation here.

Henry C.: Oh Dr. M., my roommate said that the second story of the creation contradicts the first. He says it contradicts because the first starts with a watery chaos while the second starts with a dry waste. He says also that these chapters have a different order of creation. In Chapter One the order is first the vegetation, then the animals, then man and woman, whereas in Chapter Two the order is first the creation of man, then vegetation, then animals, and ^{finally} then woman, *formed from a rib of the man.*

Dr. M.: The best answer to questions about the Bible is to look right at the Bible and see what it says. When we look at Genesis One we find the order as you have stated it. The vegetation is made on the third day. Animals are made ~~partly~~ on the fifth day and partly on the sixth day. Man and woman are made on the sixth day, ~~and~~ after the making of the animals. However, when we look at Chapter Two, we find that the creation of man is described in verse 7. Then verse 8 says, "The Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden, and there he put the man whom he had formed and out of the ground made the LORD God to grow every tree pleasant to the sight and good for food." You notice here that it does not say that God said, "Let there be a beautiful garden filled with great trees standing 50 feet high." It says "out of the ground" the Lord made the trees to grow. Now, this would probably take many years for these trees to grow to this height. *To have* ~~Before~~ this garden or park ^{a)} ~~was~~ ready ~~to be~~ an ideal place for an earthly man to live, God ^{may} must have planted it many years in advance. There is no Hebrew verb form corresponding to our English perfect. Hebrew has far less variety of verb forms

and there is possibility of more range of meaning in them. The verb that is translated God "planted" could equally well be translated God "had planted". Even if it is not so translated, any sensible person would understand that the preparation of the garden occurred before the creation of the man. Does anyone think Genesis Two presents the idea that God formed man and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and then said, "Where is the man going to live? I'll have to plant a garden for him and prepare a good place for him to live." And so God planted trees and put man off in a corner somewhere to wait for 50 years till all these ^{trees} had grown and a beautiful place was prepared for him to live! No matter how primitive one might think of the author of this chapter as having been, he certainly would not think that the creation of man occurred before the preparation of the garden in which he was to live. So then, Genesis Two does not tell us the story of the creation of vegetation but simply the story of the planting of a garden. But it clearly means that the garden was planted long before God created man.

Then we go on to the next alleged elements ^{of} the creation in Chapter Two. We read in verse 18 that the Lord said, "It is not good that man should be alone. I will make a help meet for him, and out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air and brought them to Adam to see what he would call them. And whatever Adam called every living creature that was the name thereof." Do you think that the author of this meant that after God made man and grew the trees to make a nice place for him to live, that he said, Now the man ought to have a companion. Let us make one. So he made a humming bird and he brought the humming bird to Adam, but he saw that the humming bird would not make a satisfactory companion. So then God made a tiger and brought it to Adam, and he saw that the tiger would not make a satisfactory companion. Then he made an ostrich and so on, making one animal after another, and no one was a satisfactory companion for Adam but all had now been created ^{and thus had come} coming into existence. Certainly

this is not what the writer means at all. The bringing of the animals before Adam was not to enable God to see if one would make a satisfactory companion. It was to demonstrate the fact that Adam needed a companion of his own kind. The reference to God having ^{formed (v.14)} made them is a reference to what had happened before this time. The idea of it is pluperfect, just like the idea of planting the garden in verse 8. Thus we have in this chapter only two creative acts -- the creation of man and the creation of woman, both described in more detail than in chapter one. A reference is made to the planting of a garden which would have taken place before the creation of man, and ^a the reference is made in relation to the creating of the animals which also would have taken place before the creation of the man.

So the idea that Chapter One and Two are two parallel accounts of the same thing is a complete misunderstanding of the story. Also, the idea that they contradict each other is a complete misunderstanding.

Mr. C.: But Dr. M, you did not say anything about the fact that Genesis One starts creation with the watery chaos, and Genesis Two starts it with a dry waste. What about that?

Dr. M.: The creation in Genesis One does not start with a watery chaos. It starts without anything. Verse 1 tells us that in the beginning God created the heaven and earth. Then it says that this earth was a formless void and it was covered with water and God proceeded to bring it into shape, into an organized condition. Chapter Two is an account of a much smaller part of ^{the} creation story. It begins after the animals have been created and it deals with a section of the earth which was then a dry waste. The two accounts start at different places and naturally start with different circumstances. Suppose that I were

ORIGIN OF THE NAME YHWH

It is claimed by the supporters of the ~~the~~ multi-documentary theory that the use of the difference in/divine names between J, E, and P reflects a different idea as to the time when the ^{name} first came into use, and that this shows itself in ^a the sharp contradiction between ^{the} statements. Thus it is claimed that the J document considers the use of ^{the} a name as beginning in Genesis 4, ^{26, while} ~~where~~ ~~it reads,~~

~~while the E document shows the name as being~~ ^{represented as} first given in Exodus 3, ¹⁴ and the P document ~~as being first given in~~ Exodus 6. Let us look at these

~~made as follows:~~

Gen. 4: 26

When the method was given up as regards the other book ~~was given~~
~~up~~ the other ancient books, it was largely forgotten. In the case
of the Bible since 1880 very few men have attempted to make an entirely
new arrangement of the material in the Pentateuch although various
attempts have been made to extend the same methods of division just
about every other book of the Bible. As ~~far~~ far as the Pentateuch is
concerned, the view which came to be most widely taught ~~about~~ at 1880
became crystalized and has been repeated with comparatively little
variation over and over by critical scholars during the past 85 years.
As a result it has been so often stated that the documents J, E, D, and
P once existed as separate documents ~~before~~ before a whole army of
redactors gradually ~~under~~ under a long process united them into the Pentateuch
in the form in which we have that this theory has simply come to be
accepted as established fact as a result of frequent repetition. During
the last few years new steps have been taken to popularize the theory,
and it is being taught to multitudes of people now who have never heard
of it five years ago. Yet, it is purely a myth theory, an imaginary
reconstruction for which as we have pointed out there is no ~~any~~ solid
evidence at all.

The book is intended for educated people who are interested in the Bible. Since this includes people with training in many different fields, and with interest in many different areas, and also, naturally, without training in various fields and areas which would be commonplace to other readers, it has been thought wise to try to explain the factors in each area touched upon to a degree that will seem unnecessary to those familiar with the particular area, but is necessary if equally trained people who have not studied the particular area are ~~to~~ to be able to follow the discussion properly.

there is urgent need of reexamination of the theory that divides
the early books of, that divides the first books of the Old Testament
into alleged original sources designated as J, E, D, and P.

American Bible readers today can almost be divided into two distinct
divisions; - those who think that ~~these alleged~~, that this theory is
a lot of foolishness, hardly worth their time to investigate, and those
who think that it is so well-established that ~~there~~ there is little need
of questioning it.

In this present chapter I hope to give specific evidence that should
show both types of readers why it is ~~undoubtedly~~ highly desirable that
the theory be ~~investigated~~, be thoroughly investigated, ^{and that the} as to its bases
upon which it is said to rest be fully examined.

Conservatives who are not interested in the theory may be surprised
to learn how ~~greatly and how~~ ^{very} widely it is becoming disseminated, particularly
in recent years, particularly in its ~~at~~ present form rest largely upon the
work of four European scholars. In 1853 Professor Hupfeld advanced an
idea of literary division of the Pentateuch which was extremely different
from the views that most critical scholars have held during the previous
thirty or more years. Hupfeld's idea did not attract a great deal of
attention at that time. About 15 years later Professor Graf united
Hupfeld's theory with an idea of development of religious ideas and
institutions. A Dutch scholar Professor Kuenen modified Graf's suggestion
and a brilliant German Professor, ~~Wellhausen~~, Julius Wellhausen combined
these views and wrote them in unusually a clear and convincing German
style in a book ~~which~~ which he published in 1878. Wellhausen's book
carried today with most of the younger scholars although most of the
older scholars refused to accept his views. ~~But~~ However, in a few years,
older scholars died out and younger scholars carried the field. The view
as held by most of the critical scholars today differs hardly at all from
the view of the literary or of the first five books of the Bible advanced
by Wellhausen in 1878.

D.1

THE HIGHER CRITICAL THEORY OF DIVINE NAMES AS APPLIED TO J, E AND P

The higher criticism of the Pentateuch began with the suggestion made by Astruc in 1753 that Moses might have used documents in the preparation of the Book of Genesis, and that the two main documents that he used could be distinguished from each other by the fact that one of them by finding that

A few of the books that ~~now~~ present the critical theory minimize this argument, saying that the use of the different names for God is merely one feature of style. Nevertheless, there are a number of reasons why this argument deserves to be treated separately.

The first of these reasons is the fact that many of the critical books lay great stress on it. This is particularly true of the Sunday School helps and related booklets which often give the reader ~~the~~ ~~reader~~ the impression that it is quite easy to divide the Pentateuch into sources simply by ~~the~~ ^{the} use of the various names for God. Since this ^{mis}impression is rather widespread, it is vital to point out what is the real situation, as far as the names for God are concerned.

Another reason why this argument deserves separate treatment is because it is the criterion ^{that} ~~which~~ is employed in giving two of the ~~titles~~ ^{names} that are applied to the documents. Thus the letter J originally came from the German writing of the divine name that is represented in Hebrew by the consonants YHWH. This name is indicated in the American Revised Version by the word "Jehovah", which also occurs at a few points in the Authorized or King James Version. The King James Version usually represents it by the words "the LORD", with the word "LORD" written entirely in capitals. We do not know how this name was pronounced in ancient times. It might not help a great deal if we did, since in any language pronunciations are always gradually changing.

The Argument from the Various Uses of Divine ^{Name} ~~Means~~

Importance of this Argument (Cont'd)

7.2

Someone has said that if we were to hear George Washington speak today we would hardly understand a word he said. I do not know whether pronunciations are changing quite as rapidly as that would suggest or not, but there is no doubt that they do ^{constantly} ~~steadily~~ change in all languages, so it would be impossible, anyway, to say just how the name of God was actually pronounced when the Bible was first written. ^{at a} ~~in the~~ later ^{time} ~~days~~ the Hebrews adopted the custom of not pronouncing it at all, for fear of taking the name on unclean lips. Instead, for a time they substituted the words "the Name." A little later this custom was replaced by the habit of reading the words "the Lord", whenever the sacred name of God occurred, unless it was preceded or followed by the ordinary word for "Lord", in which case they would simply say "God." In such cases the King James Version represents it by the letters "GOD."

We can be rather sure, however, that this feeling was not present in the early days of Israelite history, since the names of ^{a number of} the Hebrew kings very evidently have this particular name of God as one of their components, either at the beginning or at the end. Thus in Jehoiakim and Jehoahaz it is at the beginning, while in Hezekiah and Josiah it is at the end.

From these and other evidences many scholars have thought that the original pronunciation of the name was something like "Yahweh."

~~In practically all of the critical books today, such statements will~~ *as this occurs*
~~be found as,~~ "we can tell that this section is part of the J document because it contains the name YHWH", or, "this is clearly part of the E document, as is seen by its use of the name Elohim."

Thus the argument from divine names is ^{still} widely used, ~~today~~, even by those critics who do not give it the great prominence in their general discussion that it receives from others.

WHY THIS ARGUMENT IS NOT VALID
Actually, however, the argument is not really valid. In the first place, to say that one document would always use one name for God, and the other document would always use the other name, goes contrary to normal human usage. It is true that there might be a situation in which a man was known by only one name among a certain group of people, while another group would know him only by another name. It cannot be said, however, that this was the case in regard to the alleged

documents of the Pentateuch. All of them use the name YHWH constantly after the first few chapters of Exodus, so the name ~~YHWH was definitely~~ *must have been* known to all of them. *Is a supposed preference for one name a sufficient basis for assuming the existence of different documents?*
~~Elohim also is found in all of these sections. Besides, while~~

PH Habits of using names differ from time to time. It has been customary in most periods to use various proper names for the same person ~~on an~~ *account* of different situations. Thus if a man is speaking to his own wife he is apt to call her by her first name. If he is in any sort of public life he is quite apt, ^⑤ to refer to her as 'Mrs. Smith', ^① when he ^④ speaks ^③ to others, about her. ^⑥ If he speaks to their child he is apt to call her 'Mother.' However, these usages may not be carried through

consistently. When one form has been used for a little time, there may be a tendency to keep on using it unless a reason for switching to another usage forces itself on the speaker's attention.

In many types of writing and in many periods of history it has been common to use various names for the same individual, interchanging them often for the sake of variety. Anyone who has read the novels of Dostoievsky has probably found it hard at times to be sure who was being referred to, because the person would be called by one name, and then by another name, and there would be considerable interchange. In the Old Testament the name of Jacob is always used until God said that his name would be changed to "Israel." After that, however, the names of Israel and Jacob are both used: sometimes one is used, sometimes the other, ~~and frequently~~ *In* the course of one verse both names ^{may be} ~~are~~ used, even in cases where no one would think of suggesting that the two parts of the verse came from different sources.

In the Ugaritic documents, discovered at Ras Shamra in the years following 1927, we find the same deity often represented by two names which occur repeatedly in parallel and with much interchange. The same is true in various portions of the Koran where the Arabic word for "Lord" and the Arabic word for "God" are frequently interchanged. A sports article in one of our college newspapers is quite *sure* to refer to the ~~same~~ ^{home} team by various titles. It is a matter of style *that* ~~which~~ creeps up in many different places, and there is no reason why it should not have been used in writing the Pentateuch just as it is in other portions of the Old Testament.

1.2a

At first, a great section of the Christian world refused even to consider the idea that the Pentateuch instead of being written by Moses was formed of various sources written centuries ~~in~~ apart and eventually interwoven by series of redactors in such a way as to form the book that we ~~in~~ now have, ~~the~~ the books that we now have. Gradually, however, this view was extended/^{to}more and more institutions of learning, and more and more scholars came to accept it. More and more books were written which, in which it played an important part, and in the last few years its extension has been tremendously ~~publicized~~ publicized.

Within the last five years nearly all of our large denominations have issued Sunday School Lessons, ~~Quarterlies~~ Quarterlies and religious textbooks in which the multi-documentary theory substantially, as presented by Wellhausen 80 years ago has been, nearly 90 years ago has been shown in chart form and in ^{narrative} ~~impressive~~ presentation as established fact. During the last ten years aside from the books of rather popular nature and there have been during the last ten years almost 25 books ~~in~~ published by various or reprinted by various American publishers in which this theory is set forth as either the main feature of the book or as a very important portion of its teaching. The time has come when every Christian regardless of his previous views has a duty to examine the matter and to decide definitely for or against this view which is becoming so wide spread.

There are certain scholars today particularly in the ~~last~~ Scandinavian lands who reject the theory wholesale. There are a few who maintain it, who makes rather sweeping changes in it. But the great majority of the books that look at the Bible from the critical viewpoint present the theory substantially as the documents are presented ~~in~~ and arranged by Wellhausen nearly ninety years ago.

If one desires to find a full and ^{he} extensive presentation of arguments in favor of the theory/almost has to go ~~back~~ back to books of half a century ^{more} or /past. Recent books give a few rather superficial arguments and rest their claims principally upon the statements that this view represents the result of the intensive research of the last few decades or that this book this view is accepted by most scholars today.

1.3

It is not a sufficient reason to accept a view because it is widely held. In history or science we find many cases ~~where~~ where views have been widely held and then have later been ~~completely~~ completely discarded. The truly scientific attitude requires that the facts be reexamined from time to time.

Four hundred years ago most people ~~to~~ believed that the earth was flat. It was given as a ~~conclusive~~ conclusive argument in its favor, in favor of this view. If the earth were not flat the people would fall off as soon as they came to the other side of it. This statement which sounds foolish to us today was perfectly reasonable in view of the idea of the time that everything naturally fall off. After Isaac Newton advanced his brilliant theory that things do not fall down, but instead ^{that} ~~the~~ objects are attracted toward ~~a~~ one another. And therefore on every side of the earth ~~would~~ would be drawn it came to be reasonable to see ~~it~~ it became easy to see that the ^{earth} ~~earth~~ might be round. ~~Various~~ Various evidences ~~were~~ were adduced for this. But there was no longer need of such evidences once it had been once ~~Margelland~~ ^a had circumnavigated the earth.

It is interesting to remember that when ~~Margelland~~ ^a 's men returned to Spain after the period of 26 ~~months~~ months (check the precise number) that had been spent on a trip around the world in the course of which ~~Margelland~~ himself had been, had died, they found that their reckoning of date was different was one day earlier than that which people of Spain considered to be, believed to be a fact. Actually they had had one less night during these so many months than the people in Spain had experienced. As a result of their going around the world, all their days have been slightly ~~lengthened~~ lengthened and the number of days and nights have ~~been~~ been decreased by one.

Now it is ~~impossible~~ possible ~~to~~ to orbit the earth. The matter is clearly settled by a very simple argument. It is not necessary to make involved or make difficult arguments to prove that the earth is round.

The situation, however, is very different/ regarding the Graf-Wellhausen theory./ or /multi-document theory as it is sometimes called. The evidences alleged today to prove it are mostly very superficial and can be quite easily answered. ~~When~~ When we go back to the books of the half a century ago, we ~~find~~ find that the arguments are extremely complex and involved. It is

11/2

worth looking at them to see whether they stand, if they stand the test of careful investigation. It can be said, however, that during the last half a century no new clear convincing has been found to prove that the multi-documentary theory. Practically every bit of valid evidence that can be given in its favor today was available in the time of Wellhausen ~~theory~~ theory. Most of the new discoveries that have been made in fact point in the very opposite direction.

3.81

Most Shakespeare scholars a few years ago spent a large part of their time going through Shakespeare's works ~~g~~ trying to guess which lines were from Shakespeare = which lines were by Shakespeare himself and which lines he might possible have copied from an earlier and inferior playwright. Today Professor Wellek of Yale University points out ~~that~~ it is recognized that great as Shakespeare was, not all of his writing was on the same level, and it is not at all ~~surprising~~ surprising that occasionally he would write poor lines. It is interesting, sometimes, as in the ~~play~~ ^{play} of "King Lear" where we have an earlier play which is ~~in~~ in many ways similar, and ~~from~~ ^{from} which Shakespeare undoubtedly took a good deal, to see how in some instances we can compare two lines and see that Shakespeare took the line over but made just a slight change in it, and this slight change made it, instead of mediocre poetry, in sublimely beautiful poetry. Shakespeare, like every writer, ~~used~~ used sources for those materials which did not come within his own personal observation or experience, but like any good ~~at~~ author, he ~~transmitted~~ ^{transmuted} and changed these materials as he wrote them so that his personality and his genius is seen ~~to some extent at almost every point~~ to some extent at almost every point. The present ~~generation~~ generation of Shakespeare scholars thus has a

(7/8/66)

very different attitude toward the study of Shakespeare than was taken by the bulk of the Shakespearean students of a generation ago. ◊

Thus we see that the J, E, D, P theory, and particularly the extreme dogmatism with which it is held, is a carry-over from a pre-scientific attitude of the last century, almost entirely given up -by the bulk of literary scholars today. Thy then, is the theory still held? Let us examine the arguments in its favor which are found in the various publications of the last few years, and see how much, or how little, validity they have.

The ~~second~~ feature of ~~the~~ this literary movement was the attempt to divide ~~up~~ most ancient documents up into sources which were alleged to have been interwoven together to produce the document as we have it. This attempt was carried to a ~~g~~ very great extreme --- ~~some~~ sometimes in fact to an almost ludicrous extreme. It was applied to classical and other writings before it came to be ~~applied~~ applied to any great extent to the Bible. The frame of mind of ~~the~~ literary critics from 1795 to 1930 was largely a matter of assuming that almost any ancient, ~~any old~~ ~~written~~ writing ~~change~~, was the result of the ~~efforts~~ ^{work} of large groups of authors, each of whom contributed a portion to it.

This phase of the ~~ancient~~ ~~the~~ literary attitude of the last century has to a very great extent disappeared well before the present time. The reason for this is partly that in many instances evidences have come to light proving that the attempted division into sources is wrong. Another reason for ~~this~~ the moving away from this attitude is the fact that so often different scholars had such widely varying ideas as ^{the alleged} to sources ~~from which some came~~. Still another element that has entered into this literary

change has been the increasing realization of the importance of an author in giving the final ~~tone~~ to whatever he wrote.

It is of course to be recognized that every writing has sources. *Even*
If a man simply describes what he has seen and heard, the activities of other people ~~have entered~~ *will have a part* into the events ~~with which he deals~~ *that he describes*. If he writes an ~~imaginative~~ imaginative production inevitably a great part of the ~~ideas~~ ideas ~~that~~ that he presents come from things that he has heard or read. Yet, if a work has any outstanding literary value, such as to make it live for a length of time, ~~it~~ this is usually due to the ~~special~~ special ability of the man who gave it the final form. ~~It is~~

It is recorded of the great German poet Goethe that he was thrilled by the efforts of ~~Wolfe~~ Wolfe to divide Homer's Iliad and Odyssey up into various sources and to point out contradictions ~~and~~ ^{or} inconsistencies as evidence ~~of~~ for the ~~parcelling~~ ^{parceling} out of the work ~~of~~ among a number of different alleged ~~writers, originators~~ poets.

It is reported that Goethe asked Wolfe's daughter, *to pull down* behind a curtain ~~in her husband's~~, in her father's lecture room so that ~~she~~ she could be thrilled to hear Wolfe's lectures, without embarrassing *the* Professor by his being aware of the presence of the famous poet. Yet, ⁽²⁾ Goethe ⁽¹⁾ said, as ⁽³⁾ he approached the end of his life and reread the Iliad and Odyssey, that he was so impressed with the great genius displayed in these works that he inclined more and more ~~to come~~ to the belief that there must have been one great writer, corresponding to some extent ~~at least~~ ^{the} to Homer of the tradition, ~~who put them~~, who had a great ^{part} ~~year~~ ^{to} in composing them and organizing them in their present form.

-8-

M Many of our American Presidents in recent years have written their speeches ~~through~~ through a long process in which various speech writers assisted. If one were to take a speech given by President Johnson, and to know that four speech writers worked on this speech before the President himself gave it the final touches and decided on ^{the} a precise form he wished to use. If we were to have other ~~speeches~~ ^{things} written by these men, even then it is extremely unlikely that we could divide the speech and tell which words come from which of the various speech writers. If we had other books written by each ~~of~~ of them, we would be able at certain points perhaps to recognize the style of one or the other, ^{as to} but to speak dogmatically which part came from each of them would in most cases be quite impossible. In the case of the Pentateuch it is alleged that ~~the~~ different parts ~~from~~ come from different sources but we have nothing else whatever written by any one of these sources. The only possible basis on which to establish a ~~style~~ style of each ~~is~~ is by fitting ~~them~~ together sections of the Pentateuch and saying that from these we can deduce/certain styles, ^a ~~to~~ ^{claim a benefit, now claim} do this, as is, ~~done~~ with the Pentateuch, ~~now~~ is quite unparalleled.

in connection

In the ~~next~~ remaining chapters of the book we will examine the various evidences that are presented in books on the subject today, ^{purpose} ~~to prove~~, to show that the ~~multi-documentary~~ multi-documentary theory ~~is~~ is true, and we will see how much or how little valid/ity there is to each of these arguments.

For many centuries the great name of Aristotle ~~back~~ backed up the idea that ^{various bodies} ~~the weight of body~~ falls at the rate proportional to ~~their~~ their weight. ^{this} Until Galileo disproved/~~it~~ by showing ^a an actual experiment at the leaning tower ^{at} of ~~Pisa~~ ^{Pisa} that different weights fell just about exactly ~~at~~ the same speed, all students agree/^d that Aristotle was right. Today no one who claims to know anything ^{about} the science would ~~repeat~~ ^{hold} such a view.

In the case of the Pentateuch, ^{is it} it ~~is~~ a view simply being passed on ^{by} ~~through~~ authority, which individuals have taken over from others, ~~and~~ adding ~~to~~ their authority to it or is [?] there any solid evidence to back it up? ~~That~~ ^{this part}

① We shall investigate ^{remain} ~~we will examine~~ in the ~~subsequent~~ chapters of the book. ③

~~disappeared.~~

In the case of the Pentateuch a new element is found that did ~~not~~ not often occur ~~ed/xxxxxx~~ in the case of other writings. If we take the theories about Homer that were common in 1830 or 1860 or 1900 we find considerable variety ~~among them~~ among them. We take the ideas of source division of the Pentateuch that were common in 1800 or 1830 or 1860 or 1880 we find tremendous variety among them. A certain special form, however, which was presented by Wellhausen in 1878, came to be accepted by the younger scholars and became fixed, and since that time has been presented with ^a dogmatism that is hardly to be found in the case of ~~writings~~ ancient other/writings. Thus we find in various books the statements that in such and such verses ^{that} the words ^{"And"} God remembered Rachel come from the ^P document, ^{the} and the next few words and God had compassion upon her come from ^E document and ^{that} the next few words ^{"And"} He ~~did~~ ^{had} did unto her as He promised come from the J document.

It is not at all out of line ~~with~~ ^{to} with the great extremes ~~with~~ which they divisive theories went in the case of various ~~writings~~ writings during the last century, to divide a verse this way into three alleged components, but to retain a ~~xxxxxx~~ certain division and state dogmatically that it ~~can~~ ^{shall} be divided this way with each group of four words belonging to a different document and so meaning that the document as designated by other parts of the document belong with it is a dogmatism in relation to the Pentateuch which is almost unique. Yet, this very statement is found in each ~~f~~ of the following books;

4.2
also 3.91

Thus the dogmatism of the J,E,D,P theory is rather unique.

There has been equal dogmatism found at many times in various parts of the natural science. However, in most cases, where such dogmatism has been held it has been, ~~if~~ it had to be greatly modified or, ^{has been} disproved.

In the case of the Pentateuch, at about 1925 the feeling was general that a sweeping change would soon come in the critical division of the Pentateuch, However, even though the archaeology, point after point has shown that Wellhausen's idea that the documents tell us nothing ~~about~~ of earlier times, but only of the times when there ^{are} alleged documents were ~~supposed~~ supposed to have been written. ~~So~~ Though archeological evidence has shown at point after point that this is untrue, and today the tendency is to say that each of these documents includes a great deal of earlier material; nevertheless, the general outline of the documents and even the precise ~~of~~ division sometimes as to the ~~phrase~~ very phrase, is still maintained almost unchanged. It is a type of thought and work ~~which~~ which has largely disappeared and critical scholars in recent decades tend simply to repeat what they read in ~~the~~ earlier books.

I heard a professor who taught a course in the Bible as ~~is~~ literature in a state university recently make a statement that he was teaching this multi-documentary theory because it represented the results of the last five decades of careful scholarly research. The fact is that the multi-documentary theory as it is taught today is, ^{practically} identical with ~~the~~ what ~~with~~ ^{almost} as to its divisions and ~~the~~ ~~the~~ identical ~~as to~~ as to its dating with what was taught fifty years ago. ² The scholarly research ³ has added practically nothing ~~at~~ ¹ to it ⁴ during that time, ⁵ perhaps ⁶ save in a few cases ⁷ to prune of some of its excesses. In concluding this chapter

3.21

(7/8/66)

Both of these ancient works were thus divided up a century ago. Today this has largely been given up.

The Professor ~~Quiller-Couch~~ Quiller-Couch, Professor of Poetry at Cambridge University, in his lectures on *poetry*

?

in 1927 - 37

said

A third argument found in recent books is the claim that the theory represents the consensus of opinion of all trained scholars. Actually this is now the most commonly used argument. It would be quite safe to say that most people who have accepted the documentary theory today have done so on the basis that "it is what all scholars believe," or that it "is so obvious that all scholars accept it," rather than because of any carefully details analysis or examination of evidence.

Yet this is really far from solid. As a matter of fact, the agreement was never absolute. There have been many differences of detail. In case after case a verse which one scholar declares to be "very obviously the peculiar style" of a particular document is attributed by other equally scholarly books to a different document. In examining the precise division into documents given in many recent books dealing with the critical theory, we have not been able to find any two books of scholarly type that have exactly agreed as to which verses they would attribute to each document, even though in general following very closely the lines laid down by Wellhausen ninety years ago.

It is not true to say that all critical scholars have accepted this theory. Most of the older scholars, many of whom were highly esteemed, including such men as Dillman, Baudissin, and others, never accepted it. Such a man as Professor Theophile^{Meek} of the University of Toronto states in the introduction to his book that he always had great question about certain vital features of the theory. Today a large group of Scandinavian critics completely rejects the theory.

As a result of archaeological developments of recent years many of today's scholars, even while holding to the theory in general, suggest very important reservations or revisions.

In this connection it is interesting to note that of the books that have

presented the theory to the English-speaking world in recent years the two which have the fullest presentation of evidence, and which, from the viewpoint of careful, thorough dealing with the Pentateuchal problem, could be considered as the most scholarly, are Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, and Bissfeldt, Introduction to the Old Testament. Most critical scholars today would consider one of these books containing the fullest and most complete recent presentation of the Documentary Theory. Yet each of these books makes a sweeping alteration in the theory. Pfeiffer advanced the idea that the so-called J document actually was made up of two distinct documents, one of which he called "S," and he traces the difference between J and S right through the whole of the Pentateuch, attributing to the S document many sections that others would place among the most distinctive J sections. This "S document" he considers to have been added to the Pentateuch at the very end, instead of having formed a part of the very earliest document of the Pentateuch, as is claimed by most others who hold the theory.

Similarly, Bissfeldt divides the alleged J document into two different documents, one of which he calls the "L" document. His theory of the L document is very different from Pfeiffer's theory of the S document, and similarly makes a very extensive revision in the whole documentary analysis. Nevertheless, hardly another scholar of any standing has accepted either Pfeiffer's theory of the S document, or Bissfeldt's theory of an L document. Thus each of the two men who have made the most thorough recent study of the theory and who have presented it in most scholarly fashion, have introduced a very sweeping alteration which has not won the acceptance of other scholars. This, in the opinion of the present writer, strikingly suggests that the widespread statement that the theory represents the consensus of opinion of all trained scholars is hardly accurate.

It is the purpose of the present book to show that there is no reason not to believe that each of the books of the Pentateuch might have been written at one time by a single author. ~~It is said in each of them there is a unity and a progress of thought such as would be difficult to~~

It is true that the style and arrangement is in many ways different from a book that someone would write today, but this is true of almost any literature written at a different period or in a different part of the world.

The multi-document theory that holds that in order to understand the present books of the Pentateuch it is necessary to assume that once there existed a separate document which they call the J document, another which they call the E document, another they call the D document, which is more or less the same as our present Book of Deuteronomy, and another which they call the P document; that these were all written at different times, and that they were interwoven together, one after another. This theory is ~~purely~~ purely a matter of ~~xxx~~ assumption. No one of these documents has ever been found. No section of the ~~Pentateuch~~ Pentateuch has ever been found from ancient times which contains any sizable portion of any one of these documents while omitting those sections of that part of the Pentateuch which the critics would attribute to another document. No ancient ~~manuscript~~ ~~ancient statement~~ ^{come to light that makes} has ever been discovered which ~~made~~ ^{make} any reference to the writers of any such document, or to ^{the} redactors who ~~were~~ ^{are} supposed to have interwoven it, ^{them,} or to any such course of continuous composition and joining together of written material as is assumed in the critical theory.

The purpose of this present writing ~~then~~ is to show that such a theory is the result of an attitude of mind which was commonly applied in the last century in literary and historical research, but which today has been almost ~~totally discarded~~ (completely abandoned), that the evidences for the one-time separate existence of these documents are not valid in the light of present-day

methods of thinking, and that it is ~~entirely reasonable~~, in fact,
~~It is~~ far more reasonable to consider that each of these books of our
present Pentateuch was written substantially in the form ^{in which} we have it, by
one author at one time in the past.

This is not to rule out the possibility of insertions or interpolations
① at a later date. ^{Even if such} ^{② ③ ④ that} ^{insertions might be placed} should be proved ^{at various points in the}
⑤ the Pentateuch, ^{but} ^{would not disprove} ^{individual authorship} ~~the possibility of one author having~~
~~written each~~ ~~each of these books having been written by one author~~
and it certainly would not prove the present multi-document hypothesis.

If the Pentateuch is made up of interwoven documents which can be recognized because of their differences of viewpoint, attitude and style, and often because of the sharp contradictions ~~which are alleged to be contained~~ ^{that are said to} ~~exist~~ ^{in them,} this raises serious questions as to the dependability of the book as a whole. Is it a ~~xxx~~ book of legends, or is it a book of facts? Historically the Christian churches have held that it is a book of facts. They have held that God caused that certain ~~xxx~~ men whom He ~~xx~~ selected and prepared for the purpose should compose writings dealing with the material that He intended the Bible to cover.

The Complexity of the Multi-Document Theory

If a person is to examine the Graf-Wellhausen theory (otherwise known as the multi-document theory), as it is being widely disseminated today, it is very important that he have a clear idea what it is. It has been my observation that many, not only of those who oppose it, but also of those who support it, have little idea of its real teaching, and particularly ~~is to~~ ^{of} the complexity that it involves. During the nineteenth century ~~many~~ ^{② it was the regular practice to} ancient and medieval books ~~were~~ ^{③ divided into alleged sources by various critics} divided into alleged sources. I have examined many of these theories about early writings, but have never come across a case in which the theory advanced was ~~anywhere~~ nearly as complex as the present widespread teaching about the five books of Moses.

The fact that an idea has been held for a long time is no reason why it is necessarily true. The fact that a great many people believe there were such documents as J, E and P does not prove ~~there~~ ^{that they ever existed} actually ~~were~~. It demands investigation. In most matters that have been discovered further investigation brings to light ^{and} simpler arguments so that it is possible to put the evidence in very clear, plain, and yet convincing language.

Stripped to its bare essentials, and giving only what is agreed upon by practically all who hold to the theory, it can be said that according to the theory there was a ~~manuscript~~ ^{document} to which the name of "J" might be given because of certain peculiar characteristics it is said to ~~have~~ ^{possess}, which was written sometime between 1050 and 800 B.C. Some scholars are very dogmatic as to the particular century, but there is a certain variation on this. This manuscript would contain about a fourth of the material in the first five books of the Bible.

According to the theory, another document ~~was~~ written about a century ^{later,} ~~after this one~~ which, because of certain of its characteristics, might be called the "E" document. This document paralleled the J document to quite an extent. Both documents circulated separately for a time; then someone

combined them. This man, who is called a "redactor", and is often spoken of as the "Redactor of JE", or represented by the symbol R^{JE}, is supposed to *have so* ~~have~~ the two accounts ~~so~~ that sometimes a chapter would be taken from one, and then a chapter from the other, sometimes as little as half a verse from one, and then a half ~~verse~~ verse or more from the other, After this *combined* ~~work~~ *now generally called JE* had been circulated for a long period, perhaps as much as two centuries, ~~or more~~, a new document was written which somewhat paralleled it. This document was called "D", and includes the greater part of the present Book of Deuteronomy. After it had circulated separately for a time it was combined with JE. *after this second* ~~this latter document~~ *then* had been in circulation for a time, an entirely new document was written, which *is said* paralleled JED to a remarkable extent. This document has come to be called P. After it had circulated for a considerable time another redactor combined JED with P, interweaving P into what had already been composed, starting the whole thing with 33 verses ~~from P~~ from P, then adding three chapters that had originally belonged to J, but were now included in JE, ~~then~~ ^{then} about a chapter from P, then more material from J, then a verse from P, then a few verses from J, and so on, sometimes as much as a chapter from each, often only a few verses or perhaps only half a verse from one or the other.

Those who hold the view are *generally* ~~often~~ very precise and specific in their claim as to ~~precisely~~ *exactly* which words of the Pentateuch belonged originally to a particular one of these four documents.

There is a certain amount of variation in the theory as held, but the *about* ~~statements mentioned above~~ *summary* would correspond to what is stated by nearly all who accept the ~~theory~~ theory, even though some would add *to it still* other complexities, ~~in~~ *and a few of its present promoters would* ~~addition~~ *reverse the order of*

~~if the~~ *combining the last two documents*

for 1

The present writer believes that the Pentateuch is substantially the work of Moses. However, it is not the purpose of the present publication to prove this.

There are a number of statements in different places in the Pentateuch which are alleged to have been impossible to have been written by Moses. ~~The~~ opinion of the ~~w~~present writer that in most or perhaps in all of these cases careful ~~examination~~ examination and reasonable ~~assumption~~ ^{might have} ~~would~~ ~~permit~~ ~~one~~ ~~to~~ ~~believe~~ ~~that~~ ~~Moses~~ ~~written~~ ~~the~~ verses involved. However, these are in the main isolated verses. Even if an occasional verse should have been inserted at a later time that would not destroy the possibility of Moses' having written the first five books of the Bible substantially as we have them. However, ^{it} that has been ^{this} stated, ~~is~~ is not the purpose of ~~this~~ the present publication.

The present publication has one definite purpose. This purpose is to show that the theory that ~~was once known as the Wellhausen~~ is known as the Wellhausen theory which finds its expression in statements about the alleged documents that are usually designated by the letters J,E,D,P, is a theory that long ago outlived its usefulness. It is the purpose of the present writing is a very simple one. It is to ~~show~~ show that this is the result of the development, intellectual development in the last century have long been superseded ~~it~~. Its rise was part of a widespread literary movement which now commands little attention among the scholars in other fields and it is hardly ever applied to newly discovered ancient writings. The basis upon which this theory was advanced have most of them been given up and the arguments which are advanced for it today, which incidentally are comparatively a small portion of the arguments which formerly were advanced ~~which~~, which were advanced 80 years or 90 years ago,

are far from being strong enough to support the weight of such a theory.

That is the purpose of this present writing.

A number of books have appeared, books of semi-popular nature and some of scholarly nature appeared in the last few years which present this theory with strong assertions in such a way as to make appear that its truth is practically certain. /recent that it is now./ Very few of these /publications attempt to give sufficient evidence to establish such a theory. Most of these presentations rest very strongly on arguments from authority such as .. this theory is the result of the work of two hundred years of scholars. Great ~~xx~~ number of ~~scholar~~ scholars ~~work~~ working for a long period have established with recently /almost ~~with~~ absolute certainty ~~that~~ the ~~xxx~~ truth of the theory. this theory. Such statements as these are found in recent writings. A little evidence is given in each of these ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ writings for the theory. Usually the evidence which is given could be ~~fairly~~ fairly easily demolished.

It is the purpose of this paper to take the evidences that are commonly given ~~to~~ and to examine them carefully and show that they rest upon misunderstanding or misinterpretation ~~xxxxxxxx~~ our insufficient to support the theory.

There is actually only one ~~xx~~ solid basis upon which this theory can be maintained. That basis is the strong establishment of presuppositions that God never spoke to anyone to a human being or directly interfered ~~with~~ in the affairs of this world. This is assumed to be true. If this conclusion is assumed to be ~~p~~ true, then of course, there are many statements in the Pentateuch which cannot possibly be true. This, however, is an argument somewhat philosophical presuppositions rather than an objective examination of facts. Because ~~xx~~ one of us has not heard God speak or has not seen anything

happen that he knew to be a definite ~~of~~ Divine interposition is no proof that God ~~of~~ cannot ~~make such~~ speak directly to human beings or directly intervene ~~in~~ in the affairs of this world if He chooses. The Pentateuch as it stands contains a number of ~~claims~~, claims to be a direct revelation from God. It does not claim to be as the results of man's searching after God, but the result of God's revealing Himself to man. It contains much that is said to be what God has revealed to man. And it tells of many human ~~historical~~ events in the course of which there are occasional situations occasional events that are alleged to be Divine ~~interventions~~ interpositions. The greatest of these, of course, is that which is found at the very beginning/ ~~the beginning~~ the claim ~~that~~ that God created the heavens and the earth.

If one assumes the philosophic standpoint that such ~~Divine~~ ~~revelation~~ revelation or interposition is possible, naturally we can only consider the Pentateuch as a combination of myth and legends and that must conclude that it came into existence through ~~some sort of~~ some sort of ~~human process~~ a human process. However, such an assumption does not prove that the very complicated theory, the Wellhausen theory which is today sometimes described as a moderate documentative theory is actually true. Nor does it prove that ~~it proves that~~ any substantial portion of this ~~theory~~ theory is ~~the~~ factual.

Even if ^{though} the present writer ~~believes~~ believes firmly that the ~~five~~ first five books of Moses are true, they are a part of the Bible and that they as given by the original writers were, ~~originally~~ originally written were free from error. However, it is not His purpose in the present publication to prove this belief. It is my present purpose to prove that the dogmatic ^{once} statement widely made in the semi-popular or even in rather scholarly books about the ~~the~~ independent existence of the documents J, E, D, and P rest upon a basis that it is not sufficient to prove ~~that~~ ^{then} and most part

and many parts of the basis upon ~~the~~ which they rested have now completely disintegrated.

When Wellhausen wrote it was the claim that it would have been impossible to have written these in the time of Moses. Now, we have documents, we have very extensive and involved documents that have been discovered from the ancient time written long before at the time of Moses. The possibility of their having originally written can no longer be doubted.

When Wellhausen wrote, it was the claim that the content of each of these documents correspond to the alleged developments at different periods of the Israelites' ~~history~~ history and at that particular time, those particular times, not one of them earlier ~~than~~ than 750 B.C. the documents were ~~not~~ written in order to express the ideas of that time. Some of the scholars who were influential in establishing ~~the~~ of this theory categorically stated that we learn nothing of the earlier century from these documents, but only what were the ideas and beliefs and attitudes of people in various periods from 8th century onward. This attitude toward these documents is not completely disproved. The most ~~informative~~ informative illustration of this is found in the book called by Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament. In this book Anderson gives the chart showing these documents. He draws in this chart from a very early period he draws a dotted line which he claims represents ~~oral~~ oral traditions. This line changes at various points into a solid line beginning at the times when J, E, D, and P are supposed to have begun. Even then he puts the ~~from~~ from dates/two to three hundred years ~~of~~, two or three hundred years earlier than was done by the original supporters of the Wellhausen school.

During the last five years many archaeological discoveries have been made and our knowledge of the ancient world has been tremendously increased. It is now evidenced that point after point everyone of these alleged documents where they ~~contain~~ contain the information which exactly ~~corresponds~~ corresponds with the situations at the time of the alleged events and which would ~~hardly~~ hardly have been known, to people writing them at the time, writing them centuries later at the time when the Wellhausen theory said that these documents were written. This is evidence is having its effects. It is ~~is~~ no longer claimed that we know nothing, we have ~~no~~ no knowledge of the earlier period from these documents. It is widely recognized that even if they were written at the time alleged, they contain much material that would have been passed on accurately from a far ~~far~~ earlier period. Thus a great part of the alleged evidence for the establishment of these documents has disappeared with new discovery. That part of the evidence which is still considered validly presented in the recent books shall be investigated by us and we shall show that it actually does not establish what it claims it is. Thus a great part ~~not~~ of the alleged evidence ~~from~~ ~~for~~ ^{these} for the establishment of the ~~alleged~~ documents has disappeared with ~~new~~ ~~discoveries~~ a new discovery. That part of the evidence which is still ~~considered~~ ^{considered} valid and presented in recent books shall be investigated by us and we shall show that it actually does not establish what it claims to ~~be~~ prove.

J, E and P--Fact or Fiction?

It is being widely taught that the Book of Genesis was not written as a unified production, but was formed by piecing together sections from ~~three~~ [?] documents some of which had existed for many centuries previously. ~~These documents are designated;~~ According to this theory which is very x widely taught, these documents are indicated as J, E and P.

If something is repeated often enough people tend to accept it without much question. This theory is at present taught in seminaries and universities. It is contained in Sunday School lessons of many denominations. It is referred to as fact in books on many subjects. Therefore it will come as a great surprise to many who have accepted it without much thought to be informed that there is absolutely no evidence that such documents as J, E and P ever had a separate existence, and that there x is no ancient reference whatever to such a process of editorial combination as is assumed in the theory.

KNOWLEDGE advances by the discovery and establishment of new truth. Almost equally important, however, to the progress of knowledge is the disproof and abandonment of false ideas that have been widely held.

A century ago it was customary to treat many illnesses by bleeding the patient. This was considered almost a cure-all for most of the ~~illnesses of~~ ills of mankind. For hundreds of years it had been the principal method of improving health. Many people, simply as a prophylactic/ measure, in order to prevent illness, many people had themselves bled. The sale of leaches, as a convenient way of ~~cutting-down-the-amount-of-blood~~ removing blood from a person's body, was a great business, even within comparatively recent years. Today x it is recognized that one of the greatest means of medical help is the very opposite of bleeding. Rarely is blood taken from a ~~man's~~ body. Frequently blood is transfused into a body. Important as has been the advance in medicine through learning how to give one blood taken from someone else, equally important has been the abandonment (2nd) of the false idea that bloodletting was beneficial.

(superfluous?)

It is even said that George Washington, the first President of the United States, lost his life because of well-intentioned bloodletting which sapped his strength.

The fact that the theory of J, E and P is today widespread by no means proves it true. When we find that there is no solid objective evidence whatever for the existence of these documents, or of any similar documents, it becomes incumbent upon us to ask the question, "How did this theory become established?" Has new material been discovered in recent years to strengthen the theory, or is it simply being ~~maintained~~ based upon arguments advanced eighty years ago? Have the particular arguments that were/advanced for it ^{originally} increased in strength from further consideration, or have they been found to be insufficient for the establishment of any such ~~theory~~ theory?"

The Book of Genesis is the ~~far~~ very foundation of the Bible of the book Book that Christians have always considered to be the foundation of their knowledge of eternal things. If this book is simply a compilation of sections of previously existing mutually contradictory documents its authority is not great. Is the widespread teaching of J, E and P a proper basis on which to destroy the authority of Genesis, or must the question of reliability or unreliability of this Book book be ~~set~~ determined upon other bases? For anyone desiring to take a position on this important matter the question of the existence or non-existence of J, E and P is a matter of real importance. (2nd)

3, 4-3 A third tendency which developed rather naturally out of those already
mentioned, which received its first strong impetus from the work of Professor
Wolf, was the idea that great works of literature had come into existence, not by
the work of a single writer or compiler, but as the result of a long process of
bringing together of material from various sources. Professor Wolf worked out
brilliant theories of this type in regard to Homer's Iliad and Odyssey. Wolf
began his presentation with the statement that since writing was unknown at so
early a period these books would have to have come into existence as the result
of a long process. Now we know, of course, that writing was in existence long
before the time of Homer, and a considerable part of the argument that Wolf
presented has now been discarded.

Wolf was a most intriguing lecturer, and Goethe was tremendously fascinated
by his theories about Homer. It is even said that Goethe persuaded Wolf's
daughter to secrete him behind a curtain in his classroom so that he could listen
to Wolf's lectures without embarrassing the professor by having him know that
Goethe was present. Goethe was thrilled with this approach for a time, and he,
himself, applied it to the Bible, and to various other works. However, as Goethe
reread the Iliad and the Odyssey he was impressed anew with the great genius of
the author and the marvelous unity of the works, and in later years he strongly
repudiated the idea that Wolf presented. Wolf's theories spread rapidly in Germany. In

England there was considerable resistance to them. A few outstanding men, like Coleridge and Carlyle adopted them immediately, but others, such as Gladstone, wrote strongly against them. In the latter part of the century, however, they won their way in England. In a recent translation of the Odyssey the translator tells us in ~~the~~ preface that when he was in school the Odyssey and the Iliad were considered as having been formed by the combination of a number of different sources, and wherever any seeming contradiction could be found it was taken as clear evidence of multiple sources. In the process, the author says, "Homer completely disappeared." "However," he says, "Homer has ^{now} been ~~re~~ re-established in his place of importance in Greek literature, and it is recognized by most that there was a great mind active in the formation of each of these outstanding ~~epic~~ epics.

The discoveries of Milton Parry in the 1930's in his investigation of oral epics, sung by the minstrels in Jugo-Slavia, has put the Homeric question in ~~an entirely~~ ~~different situation~~ a situation today entirely different from what it was before 1935. The repetition of similar epithets, which is so common in Homer, and certain other features, seem to fit with features found in the Jugo-Slav Slavian epics, none of which, however, show anything like the genius ~~f~~ of the Homeric writings. It is interesting to note, however, that though there may be a long process of gathering of ideas, previous to the Homeric poems assuming the form ~~n~~ in which they have been preserved, there is little doubt of their general unity today. One or two authors still fight for multiple authorship, but they seem to be fighting a losing battle.

Great epics have been found in cuneiform writing, and ^{interesting} ancient mythologies mythological tales have been discovered in Egypt during the past century. If these had been known half a century earlier they would doubtless have been divided into various sources which were alleged to lie behind them (in the back of them) Practically nothing of this sort has been done, however. So far as literary criticism is concerned the source hunting has largely become purely an interesting historical phenomenon of the past century.

34B
8.9

edition

In the first ~~edition~~ of the Cambridge Ancient History which appeared in 1925 it was interesting to note that the position was taken that the former attitude of denial of the historical accuracy of any events back of the Homeric poems was given up, and they were considered to tell a great deal about Mycenaean civilization. However, it was said in the beginning of this history that so far as the Bible is concerned this history takes the attitude that we can divide the Pentateuch into sources and know exactly at what period each of them was written.

A. E. Houseman (sp?), the famous poet, author of ~~the~~ "The Shropshire Lad", whose actual profession was ~~that~~ that of a classical scholar, in his introduction to "Juvenal" (sp?) rather ridicules the common source-hunting attitude of the day. He refers to a previous satirist named ~~Terentius~~ (sp?) Turnus, to whom references are found in ancient literature, but ~~none~~ none of whose works have been preserved. He says other writers will tell you that everything that "Juvenal" wrote can be traced back to Turnus. "You need not look for any such evidence in what I write."

When it comes to the Pentateuch, an interesting evidence of the way that literary attitudes have changed, turned away from this idea of hunting for sources of ancient writings, is illustrated by the ~~x~~ fact that today comparatively few scholars do much study to try to determine whether a verse ~~belongs~~ belongs to J, E, or P. Instead, the theories advanced by Wellhausen 70 years ago are advanced practically without change as something that is established and can be accepted without question. The few recent scholars who have endeavored to construct new ideas of sources ~~of~~ of parts of the Pentateuch have mostly been ignored by other writers. [Footnote: Further evidence on this point will be found lower down on page I

~~The turn away from source~~ The turn away from source ~~criticism~~ hunting today is remarkably well expressed by Professor Helen Gardner of Oxford University in her book on the business of criticism (actual title?) where she says: (insertion of quotations from Helen Gardner)

The three widespread attitudes of the last ~~century~~ century mentioned above have persisted to a large extent even as late as 1930. Today they have been almost entirely abandoned. They have sunk without a trace in the main. Rarely to ~~xx~~ books on literary criticism even refer to them. The present writer has thumbed through most of the recent books on ^{literary} ~~higher~~ criticism, but from among them he has found hardly any references to source-hunting at all. Most of what he has found have been quoted in this chapter already. Aside from these, most of these books simply ignore these tendencies of a past century, tendencies which have largely lost their effect, so far as literature is concerned, and remain only in their outworking in Pentateuchal criticism.

It should be stated that the present writer has investigated to quite an extent the theories that have been advanced about Homer, about the Indig (?) epics, about various Greek writings and other areas in which this source-hunting attitude has been taken. in no case have I found a theory anywhere nearly so involved ~~xx~~ or as precise as the Wellhausen theory of the Pentateuch to have been advanced and accepted by any large number of scholars.

This leads to a fourth point of attitude which differs from the three we have already mentioned, in that it applies only to the Bible. ^{During} ~~Bring~~ the last century the scholars of Germany applied one theory after another to the Bible Pentateuch with the original documentary theory ^{of Astroff(?)} ~~Astroff(?)~~ the rather / similar theory of Eichhorn(?). Then the method was carried on, point after point, until it reached a ~~reductio ad absurdum~~ reductio ad absurdum in what was known as the ~~fragmentary~~ "Fragmentary Theory" presented by scholars in Germany and in England. After reacting strongly against this the "Supplementary Theory" held the dominant position for about 50 years, but details were worked out variously by various scholars. Eventually a modified documentary-theory was presented by Hupfeld(?) in 1853. Then in 1869 Graf turned the previous period completely upsidedown ^{formerly} upside-down(sp?), alleging that what had/been thought to be the very foundation, the earliest part of the Pentateuch, was actually the very last part to have

been written. Thus the Pentateuchal criticism among those who ~~used~~ use the ~~divisive~~ divisive methods went through the same sort of involved and continuous and tremendously complex change from ~~one~~ one theory to another theory, just as was done with Homer, with Hesiod(?), with the Nibelungenlied, and with many other writings. However, in the case of the Pentateuch Wellhausen presented a theory ~~which~~ which fit with an idea of development that intrigued the imagination of those who were seeking for a natural explanation of the origin of Biblical ideas, and this theory ^(?) seemed to be advanced with extreme dogmatism. The dogmatism of the details of the Wellhausen theory is quite unparalleled in literature, but continues right to the present day.

unprar
unparalleled

THE COMPLEXITY OF THE GRAF-WELLHAUSEN THEORY

leading

The production of one of our/~~great~~ modern news magazines is a very involved undertaking. ~~Doz~~ Dozens of reporters all over the world send in accounts of events. Researchers gather past facts that may be of help in interpreting these ~~xxxxxxx~~ events. A rewrite man takes the material sent in by perhaps a dozen (2nd) correspondents, and the material gathered by half a dozen researchers, summarizes it together, and ~~puts it~~ writes a preliminary draft of an article. Then a committee composed of several men goes over this article, making changes here and there, rearranging, changing emphasis, and forging the whole into something written/~~into~~ ⁱⁿ the particular catchy and interesting style for which the news magazine is famous.

Comparatively few people know how complex is the process that goes into the production of one of these magazines. Let us suppose that someone had never had any connection with the production of the magazine, had never had it explained to him just how it is done, had never talked with any of the people who did it do it, but that he worked simply to see one of the copies for the first time. Can you imagine what success he would have in trying to determine, simply from the finished product, exactly what were the sources from which the material had come, what had been written by one writer, which sections by another writer, what changes were made by the final editorial committee, what particular statements were gathered by which particular researcher. If he were then to produce the results of his work, and say, "Here is how this article came into being." it would be strange indeed if even one of his suggestions as to the source of the various parts of it were/^{prove} to be true.

The situation would be quite different if an article were ~~composed~~ written by three men each of whom had written several large books. It would be possible

in studying these books to learn something of the particular style of these men. Then, with this as a background, there would undoubtedly be particular sentences which could immediately be allocated to one or other another of the writers. There would be many sentences of which it would be impossible to tell from which writer they had come. if, however, no other writings by these writers (writings - writers - -) were available, nothing ~~would~~ was at hand except the complex product that they had made, working together, it is highly questionable whether anyone would be able to make any substantial progress in determining the sources from which they had come.

~~Recognition-of-this-complex-nature~~ Recognition of the extremely ~~difficult-nature~~ difficulty of the task of thus dividing a complex writing into its sources has led most present researchers in most fields of literary study to give up all such attempts except when they have an original before them with which they can make comparisons. In the case of the Pentateuch, and in fact in all the books of the Bible, we have no existing previous writings by alleged authors, or no ~~of~~ original~~s~~ separate ~~productions~~ productions from which we could gather the distinctive features of particular styles in order to try to disentangle these from the ~~next~~ writings as a whole. The complexity Even supposing that they were formed in a very complex way, the difficulty of disentangling the complexity would be very great indeed. It is doubtful if any/^{careful}present-day writer would attempt the task of doing this on a new writing.

~~One~~ One hundred years ago there were many who thought themselves capable of doing this sort of ~~disentangled~~ disentangling. It was then assumed that practically all writings were complex, and ~~it~~ it was assumed that they could thus be disentangled. We know today that most first-class writings are written by one writer (writings written writer) and even if he gets much of his material, and many of his ideas ~~from~~ from

various sources, there are simply not enough able highly capable ~~men~~ writers for many writings to be complex in origin, and, when they are complex, unless we have available other material by the ~~same~~ same men with which to check it practically an impossibility to attempt to disentangle.

Now just as the critical view is presented in popular writings, or semi-popular writings, or even in college textbooks, sometimes it seems like a comparatively simple thing. Writers sometimes speak as if it were quite simple to distinguish between the style of J, E, D, and P, and to tell what was written by one, and what was written by another of these alleged writers. Actually, the critical theory, as it developed, is far more complex than the impression of it that is received from popular writings.

Originally it began as a rather ~~xx~~ simple thing. Astruc, and later Eichhorn, suggested that Genesis was composed of two different sources which had been interwoven. After a series of very great and sweeping changes ~~x~~ in critical opinion, lasting through three-fourths of a century, eventually the system which has prevailed during the subsequent ninety years came to be presented. This system took the original idea of two writings, one of which used the name Yahweh JHWH for God, and the other used the title "Elohim," and tremendously increased the complexity. According to this view, what was previously ~~considered~~ considered to be the E document, and to be the earliest document, is actually itself a composite made up of two distinct documents which are called E and P, and which were written at very different times, and which are alleged to have ~~an=etter~~ a very different viewpoint, and an extremely different style.

According to the Graf-Wellhausen theory there was an early writing which is called "J" which used the name Yahweh JHWH for God. A century or so later there was another writing which told substantially much of the same material as in the J document, but told it from a somewhat different viewpoint, and which always used the name Elohim "Elohim" for God, instead of the name "Jehovah." This document then, the critics called "E." According to their

view, a redactor combined these two into a new ~~document~~ document which was called "J-E" "JE." This combination was done so skilfully that often it is very difficult to disentangle J from E. Frequently the only basis on which the division can be made is the use of the divine names, and there are many sections in which no divine name at all is used. It is admitted that the style of J and E are so similar that it is very difficult to tell (bw) on this basis what belongs in each document. The claim is made that E has a slightly more advanced theological viewpoint than that of J. Thus it is said that J is markedly anthropomorphic, while E is more apt to be anthropopathic. x According to the critical view this combined document, JE, circulated for a number of centuries. Then a new document was written which they called "D." This document, however, is found in the later books of the Pentateuch rather than in Genesis. In these later books JE was united ~~with~~ with D by a redactor, so that the combined work, JED, uniting the material in JE in Genesis with the material in these other books, was circulated for a time. Then, quite separately from this, a group of ~~the~~ priests combined the works (not clear) which most critics consider not to be work of an individual, ~~but~~ but the work of a whole school of writers. In this work the name of JHWH Yahweh was not used ~~for~~ for God, but simply the name Elohim. This work circulated by itself for a time and then a redactor combined it with ~~XXXX~~ JED . Thus in Genesis there are three ~~strands~~ strands united, J, E. and P, while in some other parts of the Pentateuch, there are four strands united according to this theory.

The various redactors, thus, who made these unions, are sometimes represented as having simply done a paste and scissors job uniting (together) sections which often overlap, often contradict each other, and are often fit together so poorly that one wonders how anyone could be so stupid as to have arranged them this way. Yet at other times it is plain that they are united so skilfully that the features of each are carried over into the wording of the other to some extent.

During the first three quarters of the last century there were many critics who carried on the attempts to divide the Pentateuch~~xx~~ into documents just as they did with most other ancient writings, and even with some modern ones. ~~This was supposed to be done purely on a basis~~ Most of them ~~xx~~ claimed to do this purely on a basis of literary form and structure and style and variation of types of ideas

Quite distinct, in the main, from this was another movement, largely a movement of attempting to account for the origin of Christianity as purely the result of a natural development. An outstanding leader in this movement was Professor Reuss of Strassburg. As early^{ly} as 1823 (? day?) Professor Reuss advanced the idea that the prophets preceded the law, while the Psalms came much later. Thus he alleged there was a development ? ? process by which the ideas of the Pentateuch came into existence. This idea was not during most of the century particularly thought of by the men who were trying to divide the Pentateuch into documents. Toward the end of the third quarter of the century these two movements were united, largely by the efforts of ~~the scholars~~ a scholar named Graf. Professor Graf took up the theory, advanced in 1853 by Hupfeld, that divided the old E document into two (now called P and E) and said that ~~Ex~~ E was actually more like J than like P.~~xxx~~ When this theory was first presented most scholars paid little attention to it. But Graf, in 1863 (check date) advanced the idea ~~that~~ that in the latter part of the Pentateuch the so-called P section which most ~~prefor~~ previous critics had thought to be the very earliest and oldest parts of the Pentateuch, were actually the latest, and represented the most advanced stage of development. The ~~literary~~ literary critics immediately criticized his theory, saying that it was impossible to separate the style of the B(?) sections of the latter books of the Pentateuch from the P(?) sections of Genesis. Hupfeld answered this by

saying that the P sections of Genesis, which practically all scholars before this time had thought to be the very earliest part of Genesis, were actually the very latest part.

Previous to this time most scholars ~~had~~ had thought that the section known as E, comprising the later P and E, was the very first writing of the Pentateuch, and formed its foundation ~~of~~ or its general sculpture~~(s)~~. ~~Hupfeld's theory~~ Graf's theory completely upset ~~this~~ this idea, making the main structure of the Book of Genesis, so far as it is supplied by the P B? document to have come much later and been added on to something alleged to have been written at a far earlier time.

The development theories of Reuss and others fit in with the ~~general~~ generally widespread idea that religious beliefs were not revealed by God but that they represent a natural human development. Whatever one believes about God, the existence of the Pentateuch is a fact. How are we to explain this fact? Graf presented an explanation on naturalistic terms to show how it had developed. This was taken up by Wellhausen, and published after Graf's death in very ~~clear~~ clear and attractive German style, and carried by storm the younger scholars ~~who~~ who had accepted the development idea as opposed to the idea of religion having been revealed by a living God, and consequently they adopted the whole theory of development of the religious ideas of the Pentateuch, and of the development of the various alleged documents. Most of the older scholars, including such great names as Dillman, never accepted the Graf-Wellhausen theory, but the younger scholars accepted it, and as the older scholars died off the Graf-Wellhausen theory completely carried the field.

In subsequent years the methods which were used to divide the Pentateuch into the alleged main documents came to be applied to each of these documents, and scholars claimed to be able to divide (up) J, E, D, and P into J1, J2 ~~J3~~ J3, J4, E1, E2, B1, B2, B3, and P1, P2, P3, P4, etc. This was simply
(B's are new to me)

applying the same method to the various ~~document~~ documents that had been first ~~not~~ used to divide the Pentateuch to prove the existence of these documents. The result of it is, however, to have something which was ~~not~~ written actually by dozens ~~of~~ of different writers, and came together by a process of constant editing, ~~reuniting~~, uniting and reediting over a period of centuries. We have no evidence of ~~not~~ such a process having been thus carried on anywhere. We have no evidence that in ancient times documents were thus broken up and edited and ~~not~~ united(together) in such a fashion.

~~Not~~ Many leading critical scholars in recent years have ~~not~~ moved away from some of the ~~basic~~ basic principles of the Wellhausen theory, though not from its idea of documents. This movement comes in two directions: ~~One of the~~ 1. ^{of the} The idea / development of the laws and of the documents is to quite an extent ignored. In fact, many of these scholars, while holding to the Wellhausen idea of the time of coming into existence of these documents, maintain that each of them contains a great deal of material from extremely early times. All are now ready to admit, for instance, that the P document contains a great deal of accurate historical information from a time even ~~not~~ long before the alleged production of the D document. Thus the latest document ~~not~~ contains material that is earlier than almost anything in the early documents. The date of the documents hardly tells anything, according to present ideas, about the origin of the material or ideas in them. Thus, the foundation of the whole development idea is to a large extent given up as a result of new discoveries and new understanding of ancient civilization(s?) ^{of} and/ancient beliefs

The New Testament in the Twentieth Century, Maurice Jones, London, 1924

p. 4 First, and perhaps the most important, of all these factors is that religion itself has become the centre of interest rather than the documents, texts, and manuscripts in which the doctrines and history of that religion lie embedded. In this respect the first decade of the twentieth century presents a very marked contrast to the nineteenth century as a whole. The most characteristic element in the New Testament criticism of the last century was the "Battle of the Books," and its main purpose has been aptly described by Professor Saintsbury in his comment upon nineteenth-century literary criticism as a whole. "It has been the mission of the nineteenth century to prove that everybody's work was written by some one else, and it will not be the most useless task of the twentieth to betake itself to more profitable inquiries."

find quote ↗

The statement quoted above from Professor ~~Kuhn~~ Kuhl is extremely superficial. It is quoted as a good ~~an~~ example of a very common claim that the order of events in the two is different.

It is true that writings have occasionally been made by a conglomeration of fitting together selections from other writings. Such writings, ^{usually} however, have ~~usually~~ not lasted. Their quality has not been such that they would continue to have significance.

A century ago it was widely taught that Homer's Iliad and Odyssey had been formed by the juxtaposition of a number of separate small writings. Supposedly These writings had been fitted together in a mechanical way and it was possible to separate them (out) into the many different ~~many original~~ sources which had arbitrarily united to produce these great ~~po~~ poems.

Hardly any scholar of standing would hold such a position today. The essential unitary authorship of the Iliad and the Odyssey is almost universally believed. There are some who would insist that every bit of it came from one great writer whom we might call Homer. Others would say that such a writer had written the main core of the book and then interpolations and additions had been made later. Still another might say that after a long process of ~~the writing of~~ ~~different~~ many ~~different~~ of the oral formation and singing of many different epics, a man of genius had combined sections from them, transmuting them by his genius into one great work. The theory, though, of simply ~~the trans~~ the ~~putting~~ placing end-to-end of a number of different lays which ~~x~~ could be separated (out) today is one which has disappeared.

A century ago it was customary to think that the old Anglo-Saxon epic of Beowulf was formed by the combination of earlier lays ~~x~~ dealing with different incidents which are combined in Beowulf. Today a larger ~~large~~ number of these lays are available than were formerly available. ~~Max~~ ^{Sam} Many of the ~~incidents in~~ Beowulf are developed at length in these various lays. It is recognized that the author of Beowulf did not originate the ideas, but had a large background of heroic stories dealing with particular individuals ~~who~~ ~~whom~~ in his ~~his~~ mind as he wrote ~~in~~ the Beowulf. Yet ~~it~~ it is recognized by nearly all scholars that the

from that ~~syncretic~~ nature of an epic such as Beowulf is completely different/of the lays which preserved some of the elements some of the ideas or incidents that enter into it. As Professor Chambers of London University has said, "You cannot combine a number of motorcycles to produce a truck (we must get the exact words of this illustration). ^{Rolls-Royce.} The nature ~~of-the-lay~~ of the epic is entirely different from that of the lay. It takes one mind to produce such a work.

A century ago it was generally ~~recognized~~ believed that the old English writing of Piers Plowman had been formed by the fitting together of various sections by different people. Today nearly all scholars recognize that William Langland (sp?) wrote it. Very few still remain who would question that this is a fact.

It is only in the field of Biblical study that the discarded attitudes of a century ago still hold sway among large groups of scholars.

There is no doubt that occasionally writings are fit together by using earlier sources. ~~Now~~ Hardly anyone today, however, believes that it is possible to separate such a composite work (out) to its original source sources. (In) a really outstanding work will not be formed by simply fitting sources together. It will be transmuted by the complex work of the ~~writer~~ writer. As far ago ~~long~~ long ago as 1827 1847 (not clear) the noted German scholar, Ewald, gave struck the death blow to what was the commonest critical attitude of his time, the so-called "Fragmentary Theory," by pointing out the remarkable /unity of the Pentateuch. He showed that it contains a ~~definite~~ definite plan inconsistent with the idea of simply fitting together of fragments or of isolated materials. As a result of his presentation the ~~xxx~~ so-called "Supplementary Theory" began became dominant in was dominant in Germany for nearly half a century. (until) Eventually it was displaced by the new " Documentary Theory" similar in form to the original Documentary Theory of 1800, but more complex and developing

developed constantly in increasing complexity until it actually became very similar to the abandoned Fragmentary Theory. This theory, almost exactly as presented in 1878, continues to hold sway in liberal circles. ~~When~~ Recent discoveries of ancient documents have not been treated as such documents were treated a century ago. The whole attitude of scholarship today is to recognize that most of them are unified works. The tendency of insisting on composite nature of almost any writing has been abandoned, except in Biblical study.

New works that are discovered, even if they contain material or ideas that also are contained in earlier works(?) (not clear) are considered as unified works, even if we do not know who the author was or anything about him. It is not expected that we can divide them (up) into alleged pre-existing sources. Only in Biblical studies is such an omniscience still acted upon as if it really existed still assumed to exist. It is safe to say that if the books of the Pentateuch were newly discovered/~~in the~~ present century, after having been buried for some thousands ~~of years~~ of years, it ~~would~~ would be assumed by everyone that one of two things was true: either that the books from Genesis to Deuteronomy formed one unit, or that there were five units. It might be The possibility might be recognized that there might have been interpolations or changes in the course of copying, but the idea that any one of them could be divided (up) into a number of pre-existing sources ~~would~~ would hardly occur to any present-day literary or historical scholar.

Many religious leaders who today are considered radical by some are actually ultra-conservative in a very important regard.

Religion should preserve the great truths that have been known in the past. It should, however, be ready to apply these truths to new situations as they arise, and should not insist upon retaining old forms that have lost their meaning. In architecture it has often been the case that when people have moved from one area to another they have built their houses and their stores by using the materials of the area to which they have gone, but in religion they have tried to imitate the the materials and the forms of the country where they formerly lived.

This type of unreasoning conservatism in religion is today found among many who are generally considered as progressive, or even radical. I refer to the so-called Higher Criticism.

A century ago there were certain trends that were very prominent in the world of literary and historical study. Certain methods were applied to all sorts of literature. People had an exaggerated idea of their ability to take an ancient writing and ~~split~~ divide it up into alleged sources from it came. It was thought that almost every writing of importance was actually combined mechanically from a number of previously-existing ~~text~~ writings.

Today, in the field of literary and historical study, this idea has been almost entirely abandoned. Scholars have come to realize more fully than ever before the complicated nature of creative writing. A masterpiece may derive many of its ideas and many of its attitudes from previous writings, but if it is really a masterpiece, we can be sure / it shows the creative activity of one writer. The tendency today is to recognize unity ~~f~~ of authorship in every production that has survived for any considerable length of time.

8/2/67

The present book has ~~one~~ distinct purpose: to examine the widely held multi-document multi-documentary theory of the Pentateuch, and to see whether there is evidence sufficient to warrant its continuing to be held.

It is not our purpose at present to discuss the truth of the statements in the Book of Genesis. We are not dealing with the question as to whether it was written by a man who knew the facts regarding the matters that he discussed, or whether it was written by a man who had divine revelation as a means of knowledge, or whether it was written by a man who simply used his imagination or put down things that he had received from the imagination of others. As between among these three approaches it is not the object of the present article to discuss them. / ^{They are} naturally of great importance, but ~~they~~ it is not our present purpose to handle them.

If a person is absolutely convinced that God could not have created the world, and is determined to hold to this view, no amount of argument or discussion will convince him that the Book of Genesis is true when it described God as having done so. (A man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still.) On the ~~other~~ other hand, if a person is convinced that that this God

hole in disc)

was corrected a great God who controlled directed the writing of Genesis so as to be entirely true and free from error. Such a person is already settled regarding this matter. There would be no point in trying to convince him. It is not the purpose of the present writing ~~to~~ either to increase his certainty or to decrease it to either increase his certainty or decrease it as to this viewpoint. The present writing is concerned with only one question: is the Book of Genesis a unity, ~~not~~ written at least in the main by one author who composed ~~it~~ ^{it} ~~with~~ with a definite plan, or did it come together through some sort of involved and complicated process, joining combining the results of two, three or more different writers.

It was the common prevalent attitude of the last century to take every ancient or mediaeval writing and assume that it had come into existence by a conglomeration of things written by many different people, which were joined together, either placed end-to-end, ~~or~~ (the people?) or interwoven by redactors. The present century Literary students of the present century realized realize (?) keenly the difficulty of producing an impression of unity in anything formed in this way. A book of extracts from various discussions of the life and activities of Lincoln is entirely different from a life of Lincoln written by one man, even if he should use the other for most of his course material. There is an impression that be gained only by unified authorship, entirely different from the impression gained from compilation. Literary scholars of the present generation are very conscious of the complexity of the process of composition, and ~~therefore~~ therefore tend ~~to~~ to avoid any theory that suggests that ~~what~~ anything that appears to be a unified composition is actually simply formed by a conglomeration of the writings of various people.

This is not of course to suggest that a ~~writer~~ man writes without any sources whatever. Every writer has sources if his work is entirely imaginative or autobiographical, these sources may consist only ~~of~~ of what he has seen and heard. If he deals with factual matters outside the realm of his immediate observation, or even imaginative matters of this type, he is quite sure to have had impressions, approaches, sources, ^{add/or} materials in his hands that come from many different directions. This material, however, he weaves together into a unity by the rather complicated process of composition. Present-day literary scholars are very hesitant about ~~suggesting~~ denying individual ~~responsibilities~~ composition to any work of art. Moreover, even in those cases instances where two or three hands have worked on a ~~the~~ production, present-day scholars realized how difficult it ~~is~~ would be

to disentangle the contribution made by each one. The naive conviction of personal ability to tell exactly what was written at what time, and from what source it came, that was so characteristic of the last century, has now largely disappeared been abandoned.

Similarly, it is not the purpose of the present writing to discuss the question as to who wrote the Book of Genesis. Was it written by Moses? was it written by someone earlier than ~~Moses~~ Moses? was it written by someone later than Moses? These are interesting and important questions, and there is little material which can properly be used to reach a conclusion regarding them, so far as the Book of Genesis is concerned. However, they fall quite outside the ~~pro~~ purview of the present writing.

It is somewhat different when we ~~take up~~ take up the books from Exodus to Deuteronomy. ~~There~~ There is much evidence, within the books, and in other parts of the Bible, that these books here claim for themselves, or were considered by others to have been the work of Moses. They deal with with all of material/which Moses could conceivably have had first-hand knowledge. ~~With~~ The question, however, whether ~~no~~ Moses wrote them, or whether they were written by a later writer, is not the purpose of the present writing. Our interest at this time is exclusively centered upon the question, "Did each "Is each of these books a unitary production written ~~by-one~~ in the main by one author, or are they simply a compilation or interweaving of various documents written by different people persons at different times?

Such a question can be considered as quite out of date in the present century, since it is simply not applied to new documents that are discovered from ancient or mediaeval times, and there is ^{comparatively} little discussion ^{nowadays} of it anymore as regards ancient and mediaeval materials already in hand. However, it is still a very live question as regards the Pentateuch, since it is taught very widely that the books came together by a certain definite were brought

process. While there is disagreement in detail, the overwhelming majority of those who teach such a multi-document multi-documentary hypothesis definitely hold the view that there is one ~~x~~ large document, including sections scattered throughout Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers, that might be designated as the J document. Some would hold that this document extends into Joshua, or perhaps even on into Judges and Kings. Almost all who hold this view ~~will~~ maintain that a second document written a century or two later starts about ~~x~~ Genesis 20 and runs on through most of the books named. All these critics hold that the third document written several ~~cent~~ centuries later than either of the others, and later combined with them, was made up of what are now large sections of Genesis and Exodus and Numbers and of the whole of the Book of Leviticus; possibly also including sections that are not ~~not~~ included in later books. This view we are interested in examining carefully and in seeing whether it is as ~~completely~~ completely out of date as far in the present to be held in the twentieth century as the tone and attitude of ~~x~~ present-day literary and historical scholarship ~~would~~ would suggest.

as chapters 2 to 4. Such devices may be comparatively little used. To say that one writer could not write the style of Genesis 1 and the style of Genesis 2 goes far beyond what it would be to say that Shakespeare could not have written the melodramatic Macbeth and the graceful, cheerful As You Like It, or that Milton ~~could not~~ could not have written

The way the argument is sometimes given, one thinks that you ~~could~~ could easily take chapter 1, or 1: to 2:4 (a?) and see all the words that are used, and then find these words or phrases elsewhere in the Pentateuch, and it would separate (out) the sections of the P document as distinct from the sections of the J document. Yet on page 131-135 of his Introduction (Mr.) (Dr.) Driver gives a list of ⁵⁵~~58~~ different words or phrases that he says are distinctive of the P document. Of these ⁵⁵~~58~~ words (or phrases) only ⁷~~58~~ occur among the ¹⁰³~~104~~ different words that are found in Genesis 1:1 to 2:4. ⁷~~7~~ words is a very small amount of material to find as distinctive evidence of the P style in this chapter. Other alleged distinctive words of P, however, are noted in the discussion in Driver's (no Mr.?) commentary Commentary and also in Skinner's Commentary. In these we find a number of statements calling directing attention to certain words as being distinctive words of the document P. These are as follows:

This was the starting point of the multi-document multi-documentary theory of Genesis, which was presented in substantially this form by Astruc in 1753. A generation later Professor Eichhorn presented substantially the same theory in the successive editions in his Introduction to the Old Testament. ~~Later scholars found~~ Then the idea was extended to the entire Pentateuch. Later scholars, however, found great difficulty with ~~this~~ this two-document theory, and in the form presented by Astruc and Eichhorn it has been held by hardly anyone since about 1825. Critical scholars presented various other theories, and there was a great variety of opinion as one theory after another was presented, advanced, accepted by many, and then abandoned. Finally a consensus was reached upon what is actually a three-document theory, so far as the first four books of the Pentateuch are concerned. This theory, which has been widely taught, since 1878, and which I have ~~referred to as~~ ^{"J, E, and P"} therefore referred to as the J, E, and P theory, ~~holds~~ ~~that~~ holds that the first two chapters of Genesis give us the foundation for two of these documents, but that large portions of Genesis do not belong to either one of these, but to a third document which generally parallels the other two, which begins about Genesis 20.

Let us then examine the criteria mentioned above and see whether ~~we~~ they really carry through the Pentateuch as one might think.

that the Book of Genesis can be ~~diffic~~ divided ~~up~~ (up) into sections using ~~the same~~ the one name, and sections using the other name, thus showing the two different documents from which it is alleged to ~~emerge~~ have been formed. (The theory as at present held holds that a ~~the~~ third document begins at chapter 20 (some would say ~~at~~ there are a few traces of it earlier than that) and ~~it~~ runs on through a great part of the book.)

was 26

3. It is said that the style of these two ^{documents} is quite different; ^{that} The first is a type of literature that has a very excited, almost ~~the~~ rarefied idea of God. He speaks, and creation ~~creation~~ occurs. The second is said to be ~~much~~ much more anthropomorphic. God comes down. He ~~looks~~. He talks. He is grieved. He walks in the garden, ~~etc.~~

The style of the first document is repetitious, ~~and~~ formal, and ~~f~~ dry. The style of the second document is narrative, moving, down-to-earth. The first document, which is the document found ~~in~~ in chapter one, which is called ~~the~~ ^{said to be} ~~the~~ ^{the words and phrases used} ~~document~~, is characterized by has many unique words, which it uses often.

^{document} ^{mg} ~~Thus by different words and forms and phrases it said the distinction between the two documents can be made apparent.~~

②

③

③

each of them has
is hardly ~~necessary~~; if it can be shown that ~~they have~~ a distinctive style that can be fairly easily recognized, and that many words which are characteristic of one document, and used frequently in it, occur seldom if ever in the other document, a strong argument would seem to have been made for the idea that Genesis was formed by a combination of these ~~two~~ two documents.

The theory in substantially this form was advanced when ~~more than a century and a half ago~~. It was originally presented in 1753 by Astruc. Eichhorn presented substantially the same theory in 1790, and in succeeding editions of his ~~book~~ Introduction to the Old Testament. But the theory in this form has hardly been held by anyone since about 1825. It would be a waste of time to examine such a theory now, since so many difficulties were found with it that various expedients were attempted to improve it or correct it until finally a eide consensus was secured upon a form of it, the form of which is generally known as the Graf-Wellhausen theory Theory.

~~All who held to this form~~ Practically all who hold to a real documentary theory of the Pentateuch today--and that includes the overwhelming majority of critical scholars--feel that the two documents that they find in the first ~~few~~ few chapters of Genesis can be traced through the Pentateuch, but that starting at about Genesis 20 (some would say there are a few parts of it earlier) and going on through the Pentateuch, there is a third document which they call "E." It is therefore unfair today to examine the theory as if it were a two-document theory. So far as the first four books of the Pentateuch are concerned, it is ~~practically~~ practically speaking a three-document theory, these documents being called ~~the~~ J, E, and P. Let us then examine the evidence for the separate existence of J, E, and P as based upon the first few chapters of Genesis.

First, as to the claim that we have here two stories of creation. While this is true in the broadest ~~in~~ sense, the statement is inaccurate because when we speak of creation the question must be asked, "Creation of what?" Genesis 1 tells the story of the creation of the universe.

In verse one it tells ~~about~~ about the original creation of matter. Verse 3 tells of the creation of light. Verse 7 (or verses 6 and 7) tells of the creation of the firmament. Then we read of the ~~the~~ separation of the moisture in the atmosphere from the water upon the earth. Then of the forming of dry land upon the earth. Then of the creation of vegetation. Then of the creation of sea ~~monsters~~ animals aquatic animals fish. Then of land animals; and then of man. Genesis 2 is an account of creation, but not an account of the creation of the universe. It has in it no mention of the original creation of matter, no mention of creation of light, no mention of the creation of a firmament; no mention of separating the waters moisture in the sky from that on earth, no mention of the separation of dry land and water. No mention of the creation of sun, moon and stars. It is sometimes said that it contains an account of creation of animals and of vegetation, but this is an incorrect statement. The only reference to vegetation in it is that the Lord planted a garden. This is certainly not a statement of creation of vegetation. The reference to creation of animals here is properly interpreted in the pluperfect, as we shall show on page . The only creation presented here is the creation of man. This creation, however, is described in much more detail than in the first chapter. God's dealings with man after he is has been created is are described in considerable detail here, while it is barely touched upon in chapter one. The two are stories of creation, but the overlapping between the two is actually very slight. One is the creation of the universe, and all that is in it, with many aspects touched upon, mostly rather briefly. The second is simply the story of the creation of man, with little reference to other aspects of creation, and much more detail about the creation of man. The two stories are ~~supplementary~~ ~~are~~ complementary to each other. They are not parallel at all. When this is recognized the idea of contradiction between the stories also disappears.

Now let us look at the ~~next~~ second point of the argument. The first chapter uses the name Elohim; the second uses the name JHWH. Does this necessarily show a different writer and a different document? Why may not the same writer use different names? An account of the President of the United States appearing before Congress and presenting a great message to them ~~is~~ may refer to him many times, and may always simply call him ~~the~~ the President. An account of a picnic at which the President is together with his immediate family with a group of brothers and sisters might constantly refer to him by his first name, and never once use the word ~~the~~ "President." There are various ways in which any person may be referred to, depending upon the situation and background. It was recognized in the middle ages that the name ~~the~~ "Elohim", representing God as the great, powerful One who controls all nature, while the name JHWH shows God/in His ~~own~~ particularly relation with mankind, and ~~specific~~ specifically in His covenant relation with the people of Israel. Mr. S. R. Driver Dr. S. R. Diver, *LOT* say on page - 13 (*footnote*) of his Literature of the Old Testament that Elohim represents the God of ~~creation~~ *nature* creation, and JHWH the ~~same~~ *revelation* God of redemption. If thus different aspects may be represented by the different names there is no reason why the same writer might not use one for a certain section in which it was particularly appropriate, and then use the other in a section in which it was appropriate. He might reasonably switch from one to the other as reason occasion occurred for emphasis upon one or ~~the other~~ other aspects. ~~Or~~ Or in many cases instances where ~~one~~ either one would fit equally he might simply continue to use the one that ~~he~~ he had been using or he might switch to the other for emphasis. This is entirely natural and can be paralleled in almost any book in which/ an individual is frequently referred to.

It should be remembered that no critic holds that either of these documents was written at a time when only one of these names was known. No

important critic gives a date for the ~~xxx~~ writing of either of these manuscripts which is not long after the time when ~~xx~~ he would admit that both names ~~xxx~~ were in common use. Why then should a writer necessarily use only one of these names in a long account which he wrote.

In connection with this argument it should further be noticed that sections in the/~~section~~ which the ~~criticisms~~ critics give to each of the documents the names are not always uniformly used. Thus although from 2:4b to the end of chapter 4, which passage is generally attributed to J, the name JHWH or JHWH-Elohim JHWH Elohim is generally used. In chapter 3, viere verses 1 to 5, the name Elohim occurs ⁴ times. This is explained in most critical ~~commentaries~~ commentaries by saying that it would not be appropriate to put the sacred name, JHWH, into the mouth of the serpent, and therefore the name Elohim ~~xxx~~ is used when the serpent is represented as speaking, and also when Eve speaks to the serpent. Once, however, this has been admitted, the case has/completely ~~been~~ given away.

~~It~~ It has already been admitted that the two names, while referring to the same person, have a different significance, and that there are circumstances under which one or the other might be appropriate, and that the same writer might easily use ~~both~~ both names.

This fact about chapters 3:1 to 5 is often passed over in silence when the argument is presented, and it may not be noticed that we have these occurrences of Elohim in the course of these three chapters which are ~~said~~ said to use almost entirely the name of JHWH. The impression is given that the whole book of Genesis can ~~be~~ simply be divided on the basis of these two names. It should be noticed though, that chapters 1:1 to 2:4 uses the name of Elohim ~~xxx~~ ³⁵ times, and that all the rest of the passages in Genesis that (Mr.?) (Dr.?) Driver attributes to P altogether use it only ^{39 to 41} * times. Thus there are (more than half) as many ~~xxx~~ uses

* Driver says 30.22a may have fragments of P (p. 159). 30.22b be divided between J and E. Elohim occurs ^{almost as many} twice in what may be the a section.

in this first section as in all the succeeding sections as in those portions of P in all the succeeding sections of Genesis put together. This shows actually how weak an instrument this name is upon which to tie a whole division of documents or of theory that P ~~is~~ ever existed as a separate

~~document~~ document. It is true that there are many passages/^{which} that the critics now give to the document E which is said to parallel passages in the J document and that most of these use the name Elohim. However, in all of Genesis put together, after chapter 2:4a, there are only 130* uses of the name Elohim. Thus we see that the frequent use of this name found in Genesis 1 is not a sample of what can be found as a means to divide the documents, but is in fact a very unusual section, and not? hardly to be ~~parallel~~ paralleled in any other section either of the P document, or of the alleged E document.

So far as the story being complete in either document, without the other, we have already noticed how much is told in Genesis 1 that is not even mentioned in Genesis 2; and we notice also that there is considerable (noun) in Genesis 2 to 4 that is in no way referred to in Genesis 1 or at any later time in the P document. The two alleged ~~document~~ documents are far from being complete parallels with one another.

Now let us turn to the argument that we have a different style in these two. It is true that in Genesis 1 there is much repetition, and comparatively little in Genesis 2 to 4. We note, however, that there is a different subject. Genesis 1 is giving portraying a picture of an orderly process whereby an omnipotent God brings the universe, and in particular, this present earth, into existence. The steps in it are clearly outlined and stressed. It gives (bw) a marvelous picture of the separateness of God from His universe, and yet of His absolute control over it. Devices of repetition and orderly arrangement, such as found here, are found in (the ~~works~~ works of) many writers

in sections of similar type, even when in sections of more narrative type, such

* I have counted these several times and got 130 other times. This does not include Jehovah - Elohim

8/1/67

The idea that the Book of Genesis was formed by ~~putting together sections~~ ^{combining} of various documents that had previously existed in a separate ~~state~~ ^{by}, found its beginning with the observation of an interesting difference between Genesis 1 and Genesis 2. Although this difference had been ~~noted in the middle ages~~ ^{noticed centuries earlier}, and definite explanations ~~of it~~ ^{for} had been advanced, it was not until ~~two~~ ^{about} hundred years ago that it became the starting point for the documentary theory.

These two chapters form a very convenient starting point for presentation of the documentary theory, and often are the basis upon which it is now presented. As presented, the argument at first appears very strong. Let us see just what ~~the argument~~ ^{it} is, and then examine its ~~various points~~ ^{more closely}.

While the argument is given somewhat differently by different people, it amounts in general to the following:

1. It is alleged that Genesis begins with two different and contradictory accounts of creation, one of them running from ~~chapter~~ 1:1 to 2:4a, and the other starting at 2:4b.

2. It is noted that the first of these refers many times to God, and always speaks of Him as Elohim, while from chapter 2:4b to the end of chapter 3 He is frequently referred to as JHWH Elohim." It is suggested that Elohim was inserted in chapters 2 and 3 when the two documents were combined, in order to show that the JHWH of chapter 2 was the same Being referred to in the first chapter by the ^{word} Elohim. This suggestion for the use of the compound name is strengthened by the fact that this compound name occurs very rarely in the Bible after Genesis 3, while both the name JHWH and the name Elohim are very frequent. Thus it is alleged that ~~the~~ two earlier documents were combined, ^{of which} one always used the name Elohim, the other generally using the name JHWH, and that they can be distinguished by this fact.

3. It is said that the ~~style~~ ^{theological attitude} of these two documents is quite different; that the first is a type of literature that has a very exalted, almost

4. The literary style of the two is said to be quite different, the first being repetitious, formal and dry, while the second is narrative, moving, down-to-earth.

5. Each of the two documents is said to be characterized by ~~xi~~ quite a different use of various words and phrases.

These arguments seem to present a very formidable proof of the idea that Genesis was formed by combining two or more documents that originally

existed separately. ~~The sections can be divided~~

alleged If the documents can ~~be~~

be separated from each other by properly using ~~the~~ criteria

to be used as the ~~already-mentioned~~

two chapters that have been mentioned, and are ^{*then*} found to fit together and give a complete

in such a way as to give us

~~a comparatively that we get comparatively complete~~ fairly complete

documents covering in general the same ^{*material*} ~~story~~, but contradicting each other at

various points, it would seem to be indeed a most cogent proof.

The claim that it is possible to take a document such as Genesis and divide it (up) into sections, and tell when each was written, and how they came together ~~is a claim~~ is a claim to a knowledge that would not be possible if one had all the facilities of modern investigation at his disposal, and were trying to do it with things that happened today. Suppose that someone were to take one of Franklin D. Roosevelt's speeches on which he had about six different ghost writers who worked with him, as has been the case with most of our recent presidents Presidents. We could try to find ~~other things~~ other things written by these ghost writers to get an idea of their style, to see just which part of each speech that President Roosevelt wrote came ~~from~~ supposedly from each one of them, and what changes were made from other members of the team. We could also try to trace what particular sentences President Roosevelt himself inserted, or which were suggested to him or to one of the team by things that they had heard ~~some~~ somewhere. Doubtless with the knowledge the great number of books, magazines and other letters and/~~other~~ ^{other} material available today, a certain amount could be definitely shown as to the origin of some of the statements, but the great mass of the statements in any one of his speeches it would prove utterly impossible to trace as to who put the words together into the form in which they exist now.

(no more tokens in Phila.)

Suppose that as you are buying a token to go on the subway/you are handed a dime. It would be interesting to look at this dime and think of its history. You can tell from the date when it was coined. Let us say that it was ten years ago. Then, when coined, it was sent to a bank. (Fed. Res. first) At this bank it was taken out by the representative of a ~~company~~ ^{store} which store that desired change. Here it got into a certain department. Then it was given out in change to a man from Baltimore. It went was carried in this ,am's pocket to Baltimore. There he made a phone call ~~and~~ and put the dime into the receptacle coin box It was collected by the phone company and was taken to a bank there. It was taken out again by the railroad company.

A man bought a ticket to San Francisco, and in his change received this dime. He put it into his ~~purse~~ pocket. As he was passing through Nebraska he gave the dime as part of a tip to the waiter. When the train stopped for a few minutes at a station the waiter bought a newspaper and gave the dime to the man there. The man from whom he bought the newspaper gave the dime to a ~~as~~ ~~part=of~~ change to another man coming through who was on his way to Michigan. It has passed through various vicissitudes (bw) through the course of the last ten years, and finally found its way into the pocket of one of us today. It would be very interesting if one could trace the history of a dime during ten years. However, it can safely be said that it is absolutely impossible to do it. There is nothing but imagination that can ~~en~~ enable us to reconstruct the history of a dime, and the chances are that most of our guesses would be ~~completely~~ completely wrong. If this is the case with trying to trace things in recent years, what possibility is there that people can take things written three thousand years ago, in ~~difficult~~ situations in which we know very, very little about the whole background except for the statements in the Bible, a few written documents that have been found, a very tiny part of the total that was ~~xxx~~ written in those days, and the total written in those days was a fraction of the amount of writing that ~~xxx~~ would be done today in an area of equal size in our country. The material for knowledge of people's lives there is a tiny fraction of what is available today. It would be a very difficult task to ~~reconstruct~~ reconstruct people's thinking and show ~~what~~ when a certain phrase was ~~x~~ written, or how it came to be fit in with another into a particular article. These are simply illustrations to show the absurdity of the claim that is made by these critical writers to be able to trace the origin of particular phrases in the Bible.

When we take the form criticism the approach characteristic of Gunkel, and the way it has been worked out by the Scandinavian writers, we

have the same thing to an even far greater extent even to a far greater extent. They claim that different ~~sorts~~ stories, different statements, different little bits of the narrative, were formed at certain periods in response to certain situations. Yet practically all these situations are imaginary. They are reached by imagining that something that has been found in some part of the world must have had a similarity to something that happened in the Near East at some particular time which they designate. A great deal of it is reasoning in a circle, because from the Biblical statements they imagine what a situation might have been, and then say that this situation led to the ~~form~~ formation of this little statement of small bit of narrative or law. The whole approach assumes a knowledge that is absolutely unattainable.

If one even tries to know exactly what happened in connection with events within the last few years often he reaches a point where it is simply impossible to tell. ~~Notice~~ In the few situations that I have had in my life where there have been breaks between divisions over issues between different people, and personalities have entered into it, I have heard the same story told by four different people in utterly different ways, and my own recollection would be quite different from any of them. This ~~is~~ relates to things within our own lifetime ~~or~~ or perhaps within the very year in which we present them. How then can we expect three thousand years ago to reconstruct such things and rearrange the Bible on the basis of our ideas?

Driver lists as one of the peculiarities of the P document the use of the word ~~nepelesh~~ nepesh ~~as meaning~~ as meaning a dead body. This usage seems to me highly questionable. The word ~~nepelesh~~ nepesh ordinarily means "soul" or ~~nepelesh~~ "life." Why should it ~~mean~~ mean "dead body?" Sometimes it means ~~nepelesh~~ Frequently it simply means "person." I incline to think that all the cases where it is translated "a dead body" (that) it simply means "a ~~nepelesh~~ person," that one is defiled for a person. We read that a Nazarite must not defile himself for any person in general, but may for a close relative. I question very seriously that it is reasonable simply to take ~~nepelesh~~ nepesh as meaning "dead body." If it ~~simply~~ simply means "person" and is used in ~~nepelesh~~ contexts where defilement on account of a person thought of as deceased is involved, then it hardly seems to be a special usage which could warrant being designated as a special feature of the P document. It may be of course that the sections that the critics give to the P document have much more to say about defilement through dead bodies than other sections, but there is at least some of the same reference in the Book of Deuteronomy, even though the word nepesh does not happen to be used there in this particular way. This, however, about ~~Deuteronomy~~ Deuteronomy requires a little further examination.

Wellhausen, Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher
des Alten Testaments 2nd printing mit Nachträgen. Berlin, 1889.

Sections attributed to P (which W. calls Q).

pages
3-4 III 392

Gen. 1.1-2.4a

5. except 5.29

6.9-22; 7.11-8.5 (except 7.12, 16a, 17, 22ff. and 8.2b,
8.13-19; 9.1-17; 9.28f.

10 (with important exceptions)

11.10-26

11.27-32 (exc. v.29)

12.4b, 5; 13.6, 11b, 12; 19.29; 11.30; 16.3f, 15, 16

17.1, 27; 21.2b, 3-5; 23.1-20; 25.7-11a, 12-17.

25.19, 20...26c; 26.34, 35; 27.46; 28.1-9

29.24, 29.

31.18 (exc. 4 words)

36.6-8, 40-43

37.2 41.48//9 50.26//9

46.6f. also perhaps 46.8-27

47.5-11. except 6b; 27b, 28

48.3-7; 49.29-33; 50.12f.

(48.7questionable; perhaps add 49.28)

17 405

31 420

37 425

39 427

52 440

53 440-1

54 442

Zend - Avesta

Original doc. of relig. of Zoroaster

Parses simply call it "Avesta"

Ms. simply MS gives it in entirety

* Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol. 28, p. 969

"Impossible to draw a sharp distinction between that which they found missing ready to their hand and that which they ^{themselves} added, or to define how far they reproduced the traditional fragments with scrupulous fidelity or indulged in revision & remodeling.

presented the theory to the English-speaking world in recent years the two which have the fullest presentation of evidence, and which, from the viewpoint of careful, thorough dealing with the Pentateuchal problem, could be considered as the most scholarly, are Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, and Eissfeldt, Introduction to the Old Testament. Most critical scholars today would consider one ^{of other} of these ^{two} books ^{to} containing the fullest and most complete recent presentation of the Documentary Theory. Yet each of these ~~books~~ ^{proposes} makes a sweeping alteration in the theory. Pfeiffer advances ^S the idea that the so-called J document actually ~~was~~ ^{is} made up of two distinct documents, one of which he called "S." ~~and he~~ ^H traces the difference between J and S ^{right clear} through the ~~whole of the~~ Pentateuch, attributing to the S document many sections that others would place among the most distinctive J sections. This "S document" he considers to have been added to the Pentateuch ~~at the very end,~~ ^{last of all} instead of having formed a part of the very earliest document of the Pentateuch, as is claimed by most others who hold the theory.

Similarly, Eissfeldt divides the alleged J document into two different documents, one of which he calls the "L" document. His theory of the L document is very different from Pfeiffer's theory of the S document, and similarly makes a very extensive revision in the whole documentary analysis. Nevertheless, hardly another scholar of any standing has accepted either Pfeiffer's theory of the S document, or Eissfeldt's theory of an L document. Thus each of the two men who have made the most thorough recent study of the theory and who have presented it in most scholarly fashion, ~~has~~ introduced a very sweeping alteration which has not won the acceptance of other scholars. This, in the opinion of the present writer, strikingly suggests that the ~~widespread~~ ^{frequent} statement that the theory represents the consensus of opinion of all trained scholars is hardly accurate.

Theophile James Meek, HEBREW ORIGINS, Harper & Row, New York and Evanston (1936) 1960 ¹⁹⁶⁴ ^{7.11.64}

Page 1, footnote 1

"We have knowledge of three other Hebrews who rose to positions of great power in the ancient Near East; see J. Lewy, Hebrew Union College Annual, XIV (1939), 618 f., and notes 25 and 26 below."

Page 140, paragraph 2

"It surely cannot be without significance that the association between the bull and Israel is so frequent in the Old Testament and that the term 'abîr, "bull" (later vocalized 'abbîr, "mighty one," when the bull cult fell into disrepute), as an appellative of deity, is used only of the god of Jacob (Gen.49:24; Is.49:26; 60:16; Ps.132:2,5) or of Israel (Is.1:24), and never once of the god of Judah."

THE FACTS ABOUT J, E AND ^P

Many books today speak of the J, E and P documents. Most of our major denominations include material in their quarterlies that speak of such documents ^{as} if they once existed as separate ~~entities~~ ^{entities that were later} ~~combined~~ to form ~~the~~ Genesis and the following books in the Bible. Yet it does not require any great gift of prophecy to predict that a few ~~in~~ years from now the J, E, and P documents will be completely forgotten, and all Bible students will ~~simply~~ regard them as simply a queer ~~superstition~~ idea that ~~developed~~ ~~that~~ was widely disseminated for a number of years and then completely discarded and forgotten.

Thirty years ago many books contained pictures of the ~~Neanderthal~~ Piltdown man. These bones were photographed; they were illustrated in museums; they were talked about as presenting a definite stage in man's history. Today this name has been quietly dropped and forgotten. In that case ~~proof~~ proof was presented that the Piltdown man was a fraud, ~~formed~~ formed from the ~~combination~~ combination of bones from two different creatures, and it is so recognized by all scientists today. In most cases, however, it is quietly forgotten, and the new generation will not remember that such a ^{being as} ~~reference~~ Piltdown man was ever mentioned ~~or thought of~~. The same will be true of J, E, and P. Only ~~some~~ ^{the} students of ^{the} vagaries of past ideas will recall, a few years from now, that there was a time when such an idea was extremely ~~widespread~~ widespread.

During the past century evidence has been mounting to show that these so-called documents ~~are~~ ^{represent} merely an idea that fit with the general trend of ~~the~~ thought of a century ago, but that is ~~today~~ ^{now} quite out of harmony ~~with~~ with present trends in literary and historical study. Facts have been accumulating for a century or more ~~to show the~~ ^{that contradicted the idea} ~~non-existence of~~

~~the fact~~ that such documents as separate entities ~~never~~ actually existed. In order that readers of this pamphlet may be up to date ~~on the facts~~, some of ~~the~~ these evidences will now be ~~presented~~ *mentioned*.

1. No ancient copy of a J, E. or P document, nor of any recognizable portion of such a document, as distinct from an ancient ~~copy~~ copy of the Book of Genesis or of part of it, has ever been found.

2. There is no mention of any such document, either under these names or under any other name, ~~that can be pointed to~~ in ~~any~~ anything ~~that was~~ written prior to ~~200 years ago~~ two hundred years ago.

3. There is no ancient evidence of the type of editorial revision that is involved in the theories about the once independent existence of such documents.

4. This theory represents an idea that was common a century ago, ~~namely~~, ~~the idea that~~ *was* According to this idea most ancient or mediaeval writings were formed by the simple adding together or interweaving of previous writings. This theory first received wide prominence through the lectures of Professor Wolf in Germany about 1780. Professor Wolf maintained that Homer's Iliad and Odyssey were formed by the fitting together of a number of separate lays which were combined almost unchanged, ~~to form (2nd)~~ ~~these complete works~~. Similar theories were then ~~applied~~ applied to the Nibelungelied, and to many other ancient and mediaeval writings.

In recent years almost all literary scholars have rejected this approach to literature. In dealing with the English epic, ~~The~~ Beowulf, ~~(is "The" a part~~ ~~of the title?)~~ which many had ~~said~~ *said* was formed by putting together various ~~small~~ small poems, Professor/Chambers of the University of London said that the idea that an epic work with the unity and ~~the~~ organization of ~~The~~ Beowulf could be ~~formed~~ *composed* by simply putting together separate small works like the

② Eddas, ~~eddas~~ *eddas* of Scandinavia, many of which dealt with the very same stories *material* as contained in The Beowulf, was like suggesting that a truck could be ~~from~~ *RollsRoyce*

?

made by fitting motorcycles together. There are similarities, but the general approach ~~x~~ is so different. ~~a=great=work~~ It is today almost universally recognized that a ~~great piece of~~ work of art requires an individual author. He may ~~ix~~ derive his ideas and his material from many sources, but he writes his work as one unified thing. The great ~~complex~~ complexity of the process of composition is appreciated in our century more than before, and it is ~~ix~~ not believed that any great number of ancient works came into existence simply as a patchwork proposition by the fitting together of previously existing documents. ~~The~~ ~~scholar~~ The Scholars today speak of the unknown ~~author~~ Austrian writer of the early ~~ix~~ thirteenth century who wrote the Nibelungenlied. The tendency to divide Shakespeare (up) and attribute whatever lines show less genius than other lines to attribute ~~these to~~ *different* other writers has today ~~almost~~ *largely* disappeared. The whole attitude that found expression in the theory of the once separate existence of a J, E. or P document is today largely a thing of the past. It takes no great genius to predict ~~that~~ that the Old Testament scholars who believe ~~believed~~ in the J, E, and P documents will eventually catch ~~up~~ with the attitude of present literary scholarship and abandon these ~~out~~ *out* theories. revised
original
elements

5. Even though it be admitted that there are works that have been written by a process of combining previous writings, taking a little from one and a little from another, and interweaving them, and though it be recognized that there are ~~ix~~ writings ~~which~~ *that* were produced in collaboration by two or more authors, hardly any literary or historical scholars today would think it possible that such writings could be separated into their previous divisions. As we shall see later, there is much evidence ~~ix~~ against the idea that Genesis was composed by interweaving previously existing documents. However, ~~ix~~ even if this had been the case, ~~ix~~ most literary scholars today ~~would~~ would recognize that to separate them ~~out~~ would be utterly impossible. Such a work as

Simpson's, The Formation of the Pentateuch¹

would be impossible in any other literary area. Professor Simpson ~~xxxx~~ divides (up) the so-called J document into what he thinks was the first part of it, which he calls J1, and then shows just which words have been added by ~~x~~ one whom he calls J2, and which by another whom he thinks of as ~~the redactor~~ a still later redactor. His book of 600 six hundred pages gives a complete rearrangement of the material of the ~~xxx~~ so-called J document. I know of no other ~~other~~ other leading prominent ~~xxxx~~ scholar who has accepted (Professor) Simpson's work in detail, yet the method that he uses ^{in this disintegration of the so-called J document} is exactly that which is implied in the whole ~~xxx~~ effort of dividing Genesis into ~~J, E, and P~~ J, E, and P.

A sort of omniscience was assumed by many scholars of a century ago as they studied Homer, Nibelungenlied, the Bible, and other ancient or mediaeval documents. Hardly a prominent literary scholar of today, ~~at~~ outside of the ^{would even} Biblical field, ~~could~~ ^{could} dream of possessing such ability. Such a man scholar as Professor ~~of~~ of Bennington University speaks of the dividing of Genesis into these documents by the critics as "almost miraculous." He would consider it as ^{either} ~~almost~~ miraculous ^{of} of nonsense if such a thing were done in any of the literary fields ~~xxxx~~ which are his own ~~field~~ area areas of specialization.

Importance of this Argument (Cont'd)

Someone has said that if we were to hear George Washington speak today we would hardly understand a word he said. I do not know whether pronunciations are changing quite as rapidly as that would suggest or not, but there is no doubt that they do steadily change in all languages, so it would be impossible, anyway, to say just how the name of God was actually pronounced when the Bible was first written. In the later days the Hebrews adopted the custom of not pronouncing it at all, for fear of taking the name on unclean lips. Instead, for a time they substituted the words "the Name." A little later this custom was replaced by the habit of reading the words "The Lord", whenever the sacred name of God occurred, unless it was preceded or followed by the ordinary word for "Lord", in which case they would simply say "God." In such cases the King James Version represents it by the letters "GOD."

We can be rather sure, however, that this feeling was not present in the early days of Israelite history, since the names of ^{a number of} the Hebrew kings very evidently have this particular name of God as one of their components, either at the beginning or at the end. Thus in Jehoiakim and Jehoahaz it is at the beginning, while in Hezekiah and Josiah it is at the end.

From these and other evidences many scholars have thought that the original pronunciation of the name was something like "Yahweh."

Humayun Kabir, The Indian Heritage (Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1955)

J. N. Farquhar, A Primer of Hinduism (Oxford University Press, 1912) (frequently reprinted)

Louis Renou, Religions of Ancient India (University of London, Athlone Press, 1953)

Maurice Bloomfield, The Religion of the Veda (New York: Putnam's, 1908)

A. Berriedale Keith, The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads (Harvard University Press, 1925)
The Thirteen Principal Upanishads, trans. by R. E. Hume, 2nd ed.
revised (New York: Oxford University Press, 1931) (most reliable
rendition of those texts into Eng., tho not always smooth reading)

Franklin Edgerton, The Bhagavad Gita, 2 vols. (Harvard University Press, 1944)

T. W. Rhys Davids, Buddhism: Its History and Literature, 3rd ed. (New York: Putnam's, 1918)

Sir Charles N. E. Eliot, Hinduism and Buddhism, 3 vols. (London: E. Arnold and Co., 1921)

Arguments Advanced for the Higher Criticism of the
Graf-Wellhausen Theory

I In popular books and ~~in somewhat scholarly books of the~~ in most scholarly books of the present day one ~~of~~ of the most prominent arguments that one finds is all scholars agree that ~~this is~~ ^{the G.W. Theory} ~~this~~ represents the intensive research of the last five decades, ~~or~~, this represents the patient study of scholars for 200 years.² It is thus represented that great numbers of very careful scholars have spent a long time studying the Pentateuch, and they have reached results which the rest of us must simply accept.

Here it is unfortunate the great majority ~~of~~ of people are ~~not~~ unfamiliar with the history of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis. It is true that during the period when the divisive method was common in literary circles, it was widely applied to the Pentateuch. It is not true, however, that the researches of a great number of scholars produced the theory which is being taught today. Actually, most of the principles that enter into the present theory represent the actual work of only about four men between 1853 and 1878.

During the years between 1800 and 1900 there was a great variety of ~~were great variety~~ ^{ies} of approaches taken toward the Pentateuch. First there came the two-document theory. This theory had been suggested as early as 1853 by ~~Astrook~~ ^{Astroc} ~~Astrook (sp?)~~, a French writer, but little attention had been paid to his work. Shortly before 1800 a German writer, Eichhorn(sp?) / Eichorn, who seems not to have been familiar with the work of ^{Astroc} Astrook or of others who had hit on a similar theory at an earlier time, independently advanced the ^{2. document} theory and ~~his great~~ Eichorn's great name and ability at clear writing caused his theory to become ~~widely~~ accepted rather widely. This theory was that the

Book of Genesis could be mainly divided into two documents which could be distinguished by the fact that one of them ^{generally} used one name for *Deity while the other generally used a ^{quite} different name for God. This theory, ~~which might be called the two document theory~~, seemed to have a very simple straight-forward ^{approach} and to have considerable in its favor. For a time most critical scholars adopted it.

Then the principles upon which this theory was founded were carried further by a group of scholars, and what has been called the "Fragmentary Theory" developed which considered the Pentateuch to have come together from a great number of separate, of independent writings.

IN 1826 a great German scholar named Ewald gave the deathblow to the Fragmentary Theory with his work on the unity of the Pentateuch in which he ~~showed~~ ^{demonstrated} the marvelous unity and the central plan running all through it, ~~and~~ ^{He} showed* how impossible it was that ^{The Pentateuch} could have been developed simply by the coming together of a great number of separate fragments. Yet Ewald did not carry his argument to its logical conclusion, that the whole thing represented the work of one writer. He was so much under the influence of the spirit of the times* that he felt it necessary to advance a new critical theory for it. This theory which came to be accepted for about 50 years by ~~about~~ a great number of scholars was called the "Supplementary Theory." According to this the parts of the Pentateuch which had previously been considered as belonging to one of these two documents, the one that used the name "God", or "Elohim", was the foundation, and upon this a man who used a different name for God inserted supplements at ~~fx~~ various places. ~~For~~ For about 50 years this Supplementary Theory was the leading theory among scholars who denied

the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

However, before long ~~it~~ it came to be seen that there were great difficulties with the Supplementary Theory. Various scholars suggested ways to try to get around these difficulties. Ewald, himself, suggested what has been called the "Crystallization Theory," a theory involving not one supplementation, but a series of different supplementations. No theory was advanced ~~which~~ which did not have great ^{and obvious} ~~flaws and obvious flaws~~ in it.

Now we come to the development of the Graf-Wellhausen Theory. The first step in the founding of this was a suggestion by a German scholar named Hupfeld* in 1853 that what had been thought to be the foundation writing, the original first Pentateuch into which all the ~~later~~ ^{later} supplementation had/been put, was ~~itself~~ itself composite and could be divided into two parts, one of which was primarily legal, analytic, ~~and~~ ^{and} consisted of lists, ~~tables~~ tables and formulae, while the other consisted mainly of narrative. This division of the Elohist into two Elohist did not impress many scholars at the time. Eventually, however, it was taken ^{over} into the Wellhausen Theory ^{what became known as} with Hupfeld's * second Elohist ^{was} being called by the initial "E", while his first Elohist ^{was} is now called by the "P", ~~represented by the letter "P"~~ and ^{for} called the Priestly Document

7/8/66

Arguments Advanced for the G-W T. #4

About ¹⁸⁶³~~ten years later~~ another German professor named "Graf" advanced a theory based upon the ideas of certain Haeftalian(sp?) philosophers who had proposed a complete reconstruction of our idea of ~~the~~ [the development of the] thoughts* and institutions of ancient Israel in accordance with certain developmental principles. Graf, in suggesting this rearrangement, at first left Hupfeld's idea as to the first ~~and~~ and second Elohist intact, but ^{he} proposed rearranging the assumed order of the writing of the laws in the later books of the Pentateuch. A Dutch professor, ~~Ruffess~~ Professor Kuenen, of Leyden, declared that Graf's arrangement was impossible and suggested instead that the part of the Pentateuch that was formerly thought by all investigators to be earliest [the part earliest], should be made latest in accordance with Graf's suggestion. Graf accepted Kuenen's idea and another worker in the field, a brilliant German professor named Julius Wellhausen presented the entire view in attractively written German prose which carried the day so far as the younger scholars were concerned.

The old German scholars continued to advance varying types of literary theories as to the origin~~s~~ of different parts of the Pentateuch, but among the younger scholars the developmental ideas of Wellhausen were so generally accepted that his ideas of the ~~criticism came to be~~ division of sources came to be considered as established and are~~x~~ presented in substantially the form in which he presented them in the books on the subject that have been published within the last ten years.

(7/8/66)

Arguments Advanced for the G-W T #5

~~Thus the critical theory of sources~~

~~It~~ is utterly false to say that the critical theory of sources of the Pentateuch as now taught in so many books, and in so many courses, represents research of the last 50 years. During the past 50 years no new evidence ^{for the Theory} ~~of it~~ has been found nor has any substantial change in its arrangement ~~been~~ suggested in such a way as to win the approval of any sizable number of critical scholars. In fact, practically all of the effort that went into the establishment of the view that ~~xxx~~ is now so dogmatically taught was done by the ~~three~~ four ~~prof~~ professors whom we have named, Hupfeld, Graf, Keunen and Wellhausen between the years 1853 and ~~1857~~ 1878. Thus the present view does not represent the result of careful researches of scholars over a period of 200 years or of any great number of scholars, but only the suggestion of a very small number of men as to how to fit Biblical ^{into} research together ~~with~~ a particular idea of the development of the the institutions of ancient Israel.

The second reason that is alleged in most books that have been published recently ^{containing} ~~about the~~ ~~that~~ contain the multi-document theory of the origin of the Pentateuch, is the ground of authority. It is asserted that all scholars hold this, or that practically all investigators hold it, and sometimes terms are used which make it look as if only people with no sense or no intelligence doubt it.

Now, this claim is far from ~~xx~~ true. There have always been those who have insisted upon the divine origin of the Pentateuch and its accuracy in the original manuscripts, and who have denied the whole idea that it can be divided into sources. Most of these men have believed that the whole Pentateuch, or at least most of it, was written by Moses. An occasional one has held that it received its present form from a

(7/8/66)

Arguments Advanced for the G-W T #6

later writer who was writing under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, thus kept from error, and that all of its contents are true, and the greater part of its material naturally actually from Moses.

Even among critical scholars the Wellhausen view ~~does not hold absolute~~ is not unanimously ~~is~~ held. There have been individuals at every period since the time of Wellhausen who have advanced other theories, often very strikingly at variance with the views contained-in ~~in~~ of the Graf-Wellhausen school. In recent years, most conspicuous among these have been the Scandinavian writers who have seemed to move more in the direction of the old Fragmentary Theory. Some also in recent years have seemed to move ~~in~~ in the direction of the Supplementary Theory.

It is true that the great bulk of scholars have simply taken over uncritically what was taught by Wellhausen, but this ^{is not} ~~is~~ no ~~is~~ proof that the theory is true. If a fact is true there should be evidence of-the available for it, not merely the counting of noses.

In this connection a very interesting fact should be mentioned. ~~The~~ Among ~~the~~ books that have been published in the English language within the last 30 years there are three which show more direct study of the problem of ~~the~~ sources of the Pentateuch and deal more extensively with arguments in its favor than any others/ written by members of the critical school. One of these is the work of S. R. Driver originally published in 1890; its last revision occurred in 1929. ~~This~~ This work has been reprinted by Meridian Books in 1962. ~~The-other-two-are~~ One of the others is the Introduction to the Old Testament by the late Professor Robert H. Pfeiffer of Harvard University, originally

(7/8/66)

Arguments Advance for the G-W T #7

published in 1941 with a revised edition in 1948, and the latest printing in . This book is a larger book than Driver's, and goes into great detail, and has been accepted by many critical scholars as a substitute for Driver's presentation. More recently the Introduction to

the Old Testament by the noted German Professor, Otto Einfeld of Halle ^{Germany} in Germany ^{was first published in 1934, the second edition appeared in 1955, a further revision in 1964} has been translated into English and published by ^{2 1965 Harper & Row} ^{published it in English} Press in 1963. Many of the reviews say that Einfeld's

Introduction will probably replace those of Driver and Pfeiffer as the leading Old Testament Introduction ~~text~~ in the English-speaking world.

Now the two most recently written thoroughgoing scholarly studies of this problem in the English language, those by Pfeiffer and by Einfeld, while both of them maintain substantially the Wellhausen Theory both of them differ radically from it at important points. Pfeiffer advances the idea that a great part of the so-called J Document is actually an entirely distinct document which he calls the ~~E²~~^S? Document. ^{calls} Instead of holding as others do that the material that he ~~call~~^{calls} "S" was part ~~and~~ of the very first material to be incorporated into the Pentateuch he holds that it was not incorporated until the very end, even later than the incorporation of the "P" document.

Similarly, Professor Einfeld ~~cuts~~ the J Document into two parts, one of which he calls the "L" Document. This part he thinks was early, but very different from the rest of the "J" document.

Most The majority of other critical scholars stand on the views of Wellhausen and Driver with almost no change and often speak rather disparagingly of such aberrations as the idea of an "L" Document or of

(7/8/66)

Arguments Advanced for the G-W T #8

and ^S Document, yet the two men whose books are accepted as the most scholarly presentations in English of the multi-documentary theory in recent years ~~the~~ differ very radically at a basic point from the original ~~theory~~ Wellhausen theory. Thus we see that the argument of unanimity and the ^{are} argument from authority is actually a very weak argument. ^s Even if a false view should be accepted by scientists ~~by~~ or ~~x~~ by scholars for many decades or centuries, that would not make it true. If a view is true it should be possible to give solid substantial evidence on which it may be established. Let us look at the arguments that are given for the multi-document theory in recent books, and see just how much or how little validity there is in each of them. The first of these that we will discuss is the argument from the divine ^{Names} means. [Next will come a chapter ~~from the~~ on the argument from divine means]

10.5 - 361

THE APPARENT SIMPLICITY OF THE CRITICISM

When the statement is made that the divisive theory of the Pentateuch ~~ix~~ rests upon 200 years of research, it usually means that it is considered as having begun with the observation made by Jean Astruc in 1753 of the remarkable difference between Genesis 1 and Genesis 2. Astruc wrote a book in which he ~~claimed~~ suggested that it was possible to show what the sources were which Moses had used in writing the Book of Genesis, and alleged that there were two main sources and about a dozen subsidiary sources which had been combined by Moses in writing Genesis.

Little attention was paid to Astruc's theory except to criticize it until a German, Eichhorn, in 1795, wrote his Introduction to the Old Testament in which he advanced a similar theory.

This fact which Astruc and Eichhorn noticed about Genesis 1 and 2 was by no means unobserved previous to their time. Long before Bible scholars had noticed the ~~x~~ great difference between Genesis 1 and Genesis 2. It is indeed a striking difference: In Genesis 1:1 to 2:4a the word "Elohim" is always used for God. In the rest of chapter 2 the word YHWH is always used for God. Besides, the style of the two chapters is very different. Genesis 1 has a great deal of repetition in it. There is a description of activity on six different days, most of which are (~~x~~ is?) introduced with ~~statements~~ a declaration of a divine command, and then a statement, often in almost the/words of the command, that the command was fulfilled. Some important feature of nature is then presented as coming into existence. Then it generally says that God saw what He had made and it was good, and it became evening, and it became morning, a fourth day, a fifth day, and so on.

This is very different from the more narrative and informal type of style used in chapter 2. Astruc and Eichhorn suggested that the difference in style, ~~xxx~~ and the difference in a divine name showed a different author.

Earlier writers, however, had had quite a different suggestion, and one which is well worthy of consideration. They suggested that the change in style was due not to a different author but (this suggestion probably had never entered their heads), but to a different subject. Actually the subjects of the two chapters are very different.

It is sometimes said that the Bible begins with two distinct accounts of creation. I have even known of students being told by an anti-Christian teacher: "Do you believe that the Genesis account of creation is true? Which do you believe: the first account or the second ~~account~~ account?"

Such a statement is very confusing, and is besides, an over-simplification. It is true that Genesis 1 and Genesis ~~two~~²/each contains an account of creation. However, the two accounts overlap, but actually to only a very slight extent. (degree) It is like saying to a man: "You come from America, do you? Do you come from North America or from South America?" ~~Now~~ North and South America are by no means parallels with each other; there are many features in common, but ^{have} ^{between them} there are many features that are different. There is also an area called Central America which, while normally considered to be a part of North America, could in one sense be considered as part of South America.

The allegation that Genesis 1 and Genesis 2 contradict each other, or contain statements/^{about creation}that cannot possibly fit together will be discussed separately later on. At present we are satisfied to notice that the subjects, while overlapping slightly, are very different. Genesis 1 is a picture of God's creation of the universe; Genesis 2 is a description of God's creation of man and of His entering into his first ~~relationship~~ relationship with the man whom He had created.

Genesis 1 has a very brief mention of the creation of humanity. This is the only overlapping between the two chapters. Less than half of the activity described on one of the six days in Genesis 1 is in any way parallel to what is described in Genesis 2. The two accounts can be considered as supplementing

each other. It is only by forcing them that they are taken as contradicting one another (for further discussion of this claim see below).

Since the first chapter of Genesis is an account of the creation of nature and the second chapter of Genesis an account of the ~~creation~~ establishment of man upon the earth and of God's entering into relationship with him, the subjects are so very different that quite a different style would seem to be very natural. It is quite to be expected that the same man would use a very different style in dealing with different subjects. The style of Shakespeare's Titus Andronicus, and the style of As You Like It are extremely different, for the subject matter is extremely different, yet few people today doubt that Shakespeare wrote both of them.

The subject of Genesis ~~in~~ 1 is best expressed by the style that is there used. The writer is bringing out the supremacy of God over His creation. He is stressing the fact that everything that exists in the universe and in nature is a result of divine activity. He is stressing the tremendous power of God who can cause all nature to move at simply a word of command. He is stressing over and over again the distinctness of God from His creation. ~~Pantheism~~ Pantheism is not only not present here; it is repeatedly ~~is~~ denied on the constant stress on the ~~the~~ separateness of God from His creation. The writer is stressing the early manner of God's activities(?) as He divides His creative activity into six separate stages, and shows a beginning ~~and~~ and an end to each stage. A whole philosophy of God and His relation to the universe cannot only be gathered, but found stressed and emphasized ~~in~~ in Genesis 1. For this presentation the type of style that is there adopted is particularly appropriate.

4.25

Genesis 2 describes God's relationship with the man whom He creates. A ~~(strictus?)~~

^{narrative}
informal style is adapted to this picture which shows God creating

one who should be able to enter into relations of fellowship and communion with his creator. Everything is done for the welfare of man, and a very simple test

The Apparent Simplicity of the Criticism

is placed before him. God and man are here shown in intimate relationship, just as God and the creation ~~are~~ are shown in sharp distinction with God utterly supreme over His creation (of course, including man), in chapter 1.

This means the difference between the two chapters is altogether natural that a different term should be used for God. When a man speaks before a dignified assemblage he is apt to use the most formal terms about his colleagues, referring to them by ~~their titles~~ their precise titles. When he is in personal fellowship with them he may refer to them by their more intimate names. This is common practice in human life. The name of God which is used in Genesis 1 is a name which stresses His greatness, His power, His supremacy. It is altogether appropriate for this chapter. In Genesis 2 the personal name of God, YHWH, a name which showed Him in intimate relationship with the men whom He has created, is the name that is used throughout.

In Genesis 2 the name YHWH, is always followed by the word Elohim in order to stress the fact that the YHWH here spoken of is the ~~same one~~ same one that the Elohim of chapter 1. Those who consider the book as a unit find it entirely natural that the author would thus combine the two names in the second chapter in introducing ~~it~~ the second name before going on to use the second name alone. The critics say that the redactor inserted the word "Elohim" in the second chapter in order to show that in his opinion the one here described in this chapter is the same one as the one described in Genesis 1. It is an altogether reasonable interpretation of these two chapters that they thus form a unity with different styles, and a different name of God because of different subject matter.

If the theory of Astruc and Eichhorn were correct it would be natural to expect that many chapters in remaining portions of the Pentateuch would contain ~~exclusively~~ exclusively the name Elohim, and many chapters would contain exclusively the name JHWH, that these chapters would be characterized by styles similar to those of Genesis 1 and of Genesis 2, and that thus large portions of material could be gathered out and put into each of these two groupings. As we go on, however, we find that ~~no~~ such divisions do not occur. It is true that chapters 3 and 4 mostly use the name YHWH. ~~(Astruc)~~ However, at the beginning of chapter 3 there is a passage of several verses in which the name Elohim is used instead. Thus we have the name Elohim used _____ times in Genesis 1:1 to 2:4. In Genesis 2:4b to the end of the chapter the name of ~~JHWH~~ YHWH is used so many times. In Genesis 3:1 to 6 Elohim is used so many times. In Genesis 3:7 to the end of chapter 4 ~~JHWH~~ YHWH is used so many times. However, in the rest of Genesis we find very few passages where one name or the other is used as many times as this in succession. ~~But~~ Instead, there is frequent use of Elohim where it seems natural to stress God's great power and majesty. There is frequent use of YHWH where it seems natural to stress His relationship with and interest in His people. From the middle of Exodus to the end of Deuteronomy where it is dealing with God's relationship with His ~~chosen~~ chosen people whom He has rescued ~~from~~ from Egypt and whom He is leading into the promised land, the name YHWH is used almost exclusively, yet even here there is an occasional short passage in which the name Elohim is used.

Thus the apparent simplicity of the ~~critical division~~ critical division which is so apparent and striking as we look at Genesis 1 and 2 almost entirely disappears as we go on into the rest of Genesis and on through the Pentateuch.

The idea that the Book of Genesis, and in fact the whole of the Pentateuch, is a composite of a number of books which have been joined, is presented in perhaps its strongest light by beginning at the very first part of Genesis. Here, it is said, we find a complete story of creation going from Genesis 1:1 to 2:4a, followed by another story of creation that includes ~~there~~ the rest in the rest of chapter 2. The first of these stories of creation always uses the word "Elohim" for God. The second always uses the word ~~JHWH~~ "JHWH." The style of the two accounts is markedly different, since the first contains a great deal of repetition. Six periods are ~~sharply~~ sharply distinguished, one from the other; ~~each~~ a statement is made as to the beginning and end of each. In each of them certain commands are given, and then the fulfillment of the command is stated, and in a number of cases it is said that God saw that it was good. There is thus a very considerable amount of enumeration, and repetition, what one might perhaps call an enumerative style, in this first section of the book. ^{B?} The second section is straight narrative without such repetition or enumeration. ^{Account} Thus we notice four arguments for having these two sections taken from two different books. The first of these arguments is based on the fact that one uses one name for God, the other a different name. As long ago as 1795 it was stated that one of these might be called the E document, because it uses the name Elohim; the second might be ~~the~~ called the J document because it uses the name JHWH. It was said that the principles noticed here in these two chapters could be carried on through the rest of the Pentateuch.

Upon examination, however, what at first ~~sight~~ glance ^{Seems} to be so simple ~~does not~~ does not carry through. Before noticing this fact we note first that it is not quite so simple here as it sounds as it may at first appear. We do not have two complete stories of creation. The first story of creation has a little to say about the creation of man, and

enumerates most of the other elements in the universe. The second so-called story of creation has much to say ~~about the~~ about the creation of man and woman and little about a few other elements, and noting at all about most of the elements of the universe. Thus it says nothing about the original creation of matter, which may be understood to have been expressed in Genesis 1:1. It says nothing about the creation of the firmament, nothing ~~about~~ the creation of vegetation, nothing about the creation of ^{herbs,} sea animals, ~~of fishes~~ and nothing about creation of sun, moon and stars. It can hardly be said that both are complete accounts of creation. They might be compared to a map of the world and a map of the United States; there is some overlapping, but one gives all of the ~~main~~ main features of the universe in brief, while the other deals with a small part of the universe: man, and that which is most closely related to him, and details this section of creation more at length. Aside from this rather important exception, however, we may say that this appears to set a pattern which, if carried consistently through the Pentateuch, ~~(it)~~ [?] it will raise a strong argument that the book has been formed by joining together sections from two or more different ~~or~~ documents that originally circulated independently.

First we look at the ^{alternation} alteration of the names for God. We can immediately see that there is a reasonable basis for using the name Elohim through 1:1 to 2:4 since here it is speaking of the universe as a whole, and it may very well use the general name for God which emphasizes His great power and majesty. In Genesis 2:4b following ff. it is dealing with God's ~~■~~ relation to man, and the use of the personal name, which emphasizes His relation to man, would be quite natural. So the alternation here is not necessarily a sign of a different writer. However, if we can trace through the Pentateuch and find that large sections which fit naturally together form use one name, and other large sections use the other name, it might be taken as a sign of different writers. We shall examine this in a minute moment.

Now, as to whether this alternation continues, we find that in chapter 3 it begins with the name JHWH; this is followed with four occurrences of the name Elohim, and the rest of the chapter uses JHWH, as does all of chapter 4 except the last verse. After this, however, we find verses using only one name; verses only the other; only one, the other. Actually, going through the Book of Genesis, we find chapters and have no use of the name for God at all. There are actually only chapter and that have only one name for God. All the others have either no name, or more than one, or very few uses. Such cases of a whole chapter using only one name, and using it frequently, are rare indeed.

As to completeness of the story, there is much to be said against the idea that each of these two documents, or three, as we see later is what is now held, is actually very complete in itself. As to having parallel sections, the idea is found that there are two stories of the Flood by separating up our story of the Flood into two parts, giving some verses to one, and some to the other. We shall examine this to see how well it works out. As to the idea that the styles are different, there is no other chapter anywhere in the Pentateuch that has a style that involves a narrative of events with the same sort of frequent repetition as contained in chapter 1. Naturally, chapters containing laws or genealogies, or lists of peoples, may be said to be more nearly similar to this enumerative style than to a narrative style. However, any one writer may use both a narrative and an enumerative style; the difference is one of subject matter rather than necessarily of authorship.

It is ^{the} / Genesis 1:1 to 2:4a is ~~generally~~ generally said to be the beginning of the P document, and the style is said to indicate a very late date. Most critics place it after the exile. The narrative style of the J document is said to be early; some place it as early as 1050; others as late as 850; but most critics put it somewhere ~~not~~ within this range.

As to an enumerative style such as the style of Genesis 1, or ~~as~~ the style of the genealogy in Genesis 5, being a characteristic of a late date, it is interesting to note that from as early as ~~2000~~ 2000 ~~B.C.~~ B.C. we have genealogical texts from Mesopotamia which have a very similar sort of style, giving the ~~list~~ list of kings, ^{and} / how long each ~~reigned~~ reigned. Laws are found as early as the time of Hammurabi, and in fact considerably earlier, in Mesopotamia. To say that this style would necessarily be a sign of a late date is quite without foundation.

All the books about the J, E and P theories, or books ~~about~~ on understanding the Old Testament which assume these theories to be true, speak as if a difference of style was were readily noticeable, and the different documents could be separated out on the line of the difference of style. Some even ~~go~~ go so far as to say that the difference of divine names is merely one of ~~different~~ many different features of difference of style.

It was very common in the last century to think that works could be divided up on the basis of ~~difference~~ different alleged styles, and thus it could be decided what the various sources were from which they were alleged to come. As we have noticed, Homer was divided up in those times into many different styles coming from many different periods. In more recent years there has been a tendency to recognize that even Homer may occasionally nod, and that ~~it-is~~ we cannot expect that everything that Shakespeare ever wrote will ~~always~~ always be at his very best. The fact that there are some lines poorer than others used to be considered evidence that these lines could be ~~given-to-other-people~~ assigned to other writers who might have ~~collaborated~~ collaborated with Shakespeare or from whom Shakespeare might have borrowed. Today there is no longer as much certainty in dividing materials up in this way.

There can be ~~a~~ no doubt that one of the ~~main~~ major foundations of the idea that there ever were distinct documents which might be designated as J, E, D, and P is the claim that we can recognize a ~~distinct style~~ different style as distinctive/~~as~~ ^{of} each of these. ⁽¹⁾ In approaching this, however, it would be well to recognize that ⁽²⁾ among the various views which were held ⁽³⁾ between ~~18~~ 1795 and 1880, ~~extended~~ by those who divided the Pentateuch up among different authors, ⁽⁴⁾ although there was a considerable variety of ideas expressed ⁽⁴⁾ the overwhelming majorities ^{majority} [of those who took this approach] felt that we could definitely say ~~that~~ that there were two main bodies of material which ^{could} could be distinguished in style, that ⁽⁴⁾ one of these bodies they sometimes ~~is~~ called E,

and other times called "the foundation ~~writing~~ writing"; the other one was in certain periods considered as having been a separate document which was interlaced with this, but during the period from 1825 to 1878 it was regarded by most of the critical scholars as being a supplementary material that was inserted into the foundation writing. The foundation writing, however, during all this period, was held by the great majority of critical scholars to be recognizable as distinct from the other material which they called by the name of J, ~~and~~ and to be substantially a unit as far as its style was concerned.

It is important to note that the suggestion of Hupfeld (~~and~~) in 1853, which came to be adopted and assumed as part of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis, made a complete turnabout/so far as ideas of style were concerned in the ideas of the ~~overwhelming~~ overwhelming mass of critical students. Hupfeld took this foundation ~~right~~ writing and divided it into two parts, one of which he called the ~~first Elohist~~ "the first Elohist" and the other "the second Elohist." These parts ~~were~~ contained, respectively, about 368 verses, ^{of Genesis} ~~and the first~~ in the first Elohist, and 363 ^{verses of Genesis} ~~verses~~ in the second Elohist. As the Graf-Wellhausen theory adopted ~~the~~ Hupfeld's suggestion, the position taken, and which now is maintained to this time is that the difference between the so-called ~~the~~ "first Elohist", now designated as P, and the so-called "second Elohist" now designated as E, is far greater than the difference between the second Elohist and J; in fact it is quite generally admitted that in many cases it is absolutely impossible to make any clear distinction of style between J and E. ^{Some} ~~Many~~ critical writers, particularly in the material from Exodus on, do not make much effort to divide material between J and E, but simply call "JE" that material ~~the~~ which they think is ~~so~~ different from P, and yet nearly half of this material was thought by all critical scholars during three-fourths of a century to be at one in style with the material that is now designated as P.

The above development should be sufficient to indicate how very ~~shaky~~ shaky is the claim that four distinct documents can be recognized in the Pentateuch by differences of style.

This whole matter of difference of style is one which was greatly exaggerated in past times. It is now almost universally recognized that a difference of subject matter can make a tremendous difference so far as style is concerned. Beaumont and Fletcher cooperated in writing of many plays. It has been impossible to separate out which lines were written by Beaumont and which lines were written by Fletcher. Professor Wellek asserts that Chaucer has practically ~~practically~~ a different style for each of the stories in his Canterbury Tales fitting the subject matter of the story. If a writer has a a very marked and distinct style such as Pater, it is often easy to recognize his style as distinct from others, ^{but with} ~~with~~ most writers this ~~can simply not be done~~ simply cannot be done.

*Wellek's name
p. 60*

When an effort is made to make distinctions in accordance with differences of style it is extremely important that there be a ~~base~~ ^{one} basis on which to determine what the particular style of ~~a~~ ^{one} writer would be. If we have a whole volume ~~written~~ written by ~~Mr. Jones~~ Mr. Jones, and another whole volume written by Mr. Brown, it is possible to go through the two volumes and to ~~see~~ see whether we find certain distinctive usages of syntax or of vocabulary which are distinctive of one and not of the other, and that the other uses an entirely different type of expression in similar circumstances. Having thus laid down certain definite criteria as characteristic of the style of one or the other, an attempt might be made to separate out the sections of a composite work upon which the two had collaborated. It is not at all certain that such an effort would succeed. However, the chances of success would be far greater than what is done with the Pentateuch ~~where~~ where it is alleged that distinct styles can be recognized even though ~~nothing~~ nothing else is known than can be said to come from the pen of the individuals or schools that are supposed to have used these distinct styles.

When the matter is ~~well~~ really examined it comes down to this. Narrative material~~ly~~ is practically all considered to be one style and attributed to E. Material that gives dates or lists or enumerations or a detailed laws/loss (?) is considered to be a differnt style and is attributed to P. Nearly all the material attributed to P would fall definitely under this category. To say, however, that this is a different ~~style~~ style which ~~would~~ would necessarily ~~shed?~~ betray a different /author rests upon no logical foundation. One writer may write lists, tables, statistics, and also may write an interesting narrative. There are many instances where the same author has included both types of material in one work or has written different works of these two types.

The principal point at which there is considerable agreement among the critics as to the division of documents is between P and JE. There is far more unanimity among them as to what is in P than as to what they attribute to ~~any-one~~ either J or E. Yet the difference is, as stated, not a difference of author, but a difference of subject matter.

Almost every instance where we have a ~~list~~ list or a statement about somebody dying, ~~how~~ how old the person was, it is attributed to P. Why should J ~~also~~ not be interested/in vital statistics or in the time of people's a person's deaths?

W One sharp contrast/~~is~~ occurs in this in that of the two genealogies in the early part of Genesis, ~~it~~ it is alleged that/~~parallels~~, that ~~one~~ one is the distinctive style of P, and the other the distinctive style of J. Actually, however, both are lists and enumerations giving dates and telling / numbers of years and telling of people's ~~persons'~~ persons' ~~births~~ births and deaths. The alleged difference of style between the two is far less than the difference between many different various sections of what is considered part of the P document. About the only real differ~~ence~~ between them is ~~that~~ that the verb "yalad" is used in the ~~hiffete~~ ~~(?)~~ in one instance ~~and on the~~ ~~text~~ ~~kell~~ ~~(?)~~ usually in the other. (In is) usual in Biblical genealogies ^{"yalad" is used} to use it

in the ~~hiphil~~ hiphil, yet we do also occasionally find it ~~x~~ used in the qal. On page 242? Skinner in his ICC? Commentary on Genesis says that the story of Abraham is contained in the following ~~verses~~, and he says that each of these verses has the distinctive style of P, ~~but together they~~ and yet that ~~they~~ together give a ~~a~~ continuous account of the life of Abraham. Actually, as a continuous account ~~is~~ it is mighty slim. It leaves one thinking that these verses have been selected out in order to try to give such a continuous account. This we have looked at already in our chapter on "Parallel Passages." Here let us look a little at these verses to see just what is meant by saying that they have "a distinctive style of P."

"Difficult practical problems are raised by the existence of prevalent styles, by the power of a single author to excite imitation and vogue. Formerly, the idea of genre had a great influence on stylistic tradition. In Chaucer, for example, there is a wide differentiation of styles between the individual stories of the Canterbury Tales and, more generally, between his works of different periods and literary types. In the eighteenth century, a Pindaric ode, a ~~sat~~ satire, a ballad had each its own required vocabulary and style. "Poetic diction" was confined to specific genres, while a homely vocabulary was permitted or even prescribed in low genres. Even Wordsworth, in spite of his condemnation of poetic diction, wrote very differently when he composed an ode or a topographical reflective poem like Tintern Abbey, a Miltonic sonnet, or a "lyrical ballad." If we ignore such distinctions, we characterize but futilely the style of an author who has cultivated many genres or passed through a long personal evolution. It is probably best to speak of the "styles" of Goethe, since we cannot reconcile the enormous differences between the early Sturm ~~und Drang~~ und Drang style, that of the classical period, and the late, pompous and involved manner of the Elective Affinities!"

in 1753 and Eichhorn in 1795, that the use of the two most common divine names would give a basis for division, but from that start they moved out in various directions. ~~May~~ Many different theories were presented during the period prior to 1878. One theory would be held for ten ~~years or so~~ to thirty years and ^{utterly} then/completely abandoned. Other theories would replace it. There was a constant change in the views of those wished to divide the Pentateuch up into alleged documents. Many different views were presented. Arguments went back and forth. Eventually most of these views were given up when Wellhausen, with his cogent German style and his argument that fit into the philosophical and historical attitude of liberal scholarship of his time swept the field with his ^① masterly book.

Actually, it must be said that the present theory represents mainly the ideas ~~f~~ of four men. Hardly anyone else/^{who} works in the field of literary criticism ~~could~~ can be said to have contributed much to the theory as it has been taught for the last (past) eighty years.

The first of these four men, and the one who made the least contribution to the theory, and yet/^{perhaps} the first the most necessary of all, was a German scholar Hupfeld. ~~in 1853~~ In 1853 Hupfeld ~~presented~~ presented an idea which was very similar to one which Ilgen had presented thirty years before, but which had received very little attention from other scholars. Hupfeld presented again the general idea that Ilgen had presented, and idea which actually flatly contradicted the main basis ~~for~~ of the division as previously held. (For a full explanation of this see the ~~discussion~~ discussion in the chapter on Divine Names) This view of Hupfeld's in 1853 did not impress most scholars as ~~being~~ being a step forward, but it was utilized by Professor Graf in his book in 1863 in which he presented the basic idea of the Wellhausen theory in a rather elementary stage. A Dutch professor, ~~JA~~ Abraham Kuenen, of the University of Leyden, criticized Graf's idea, but accepted its main portion, and carried it further than Graf had. In 1869 Graf accepted Kuenen's suggestions, and thus

Chapter 4

Arguments Now Advanced in Support of the Multi-Documentary ~~Theory~~ Theory

In our last chapter we saw that the Multi-Documentary theory of the ~~the~~ Pentateuch was simply one of many applications of a certain trend of thought common in the last century, but now practically abandoned by ~~the~~ literary and historical scholars. We saw that this theory went beyond all the various trends which gave it birth, ⁱⁿ that it was worked with a detail ⁱⁿ hardly to be ~~even~~ equalled in the study of any other ancient writing, and that it was presented with a dogmatism ~~now~~ going far beyond the kinds (?) minds times of those who used similar methods in the study of such materials. Today those tendencies have disappeared, but this theory remains a vital and widespread force today. Just within the last twenty years many books in English have been published in ~~English~~ English to say ~~nothing of those~~ nothing of those in other languages which have dogmatically presented the theory as if it were established fact.

It is now necessary that we look at the arguments which are today advanced for the theory. We shall try to examine them very fairly to see exactly what the evidence is, to note just how much force is ~~properly~~ properly to be attributed to any of the ~~argument~~ arguments upon which this very elaborate and very complicated theory is supposed to rest.

1. The Claim that it Represents the Consensus of Scholarship

In most books that present the matter today, particularly those more or less popular in nature (appeal) some such statement is found as this/ : statements such as this are found:

"All scholars today recognize that the Pentateuch is made up of four distinct strands which may be designated as the J, E, D, and P documents. It is ~~the~~ the actual claim ~~is~~ that all who know anything ~~accept~~ accept the theory is probably the/basis upon which more people have accepted it today than any other. In fact it may

questioned how many critical scholars there are today who are in a position to give a really strong defense of the theory, since the general attitude has become one of simply saying, "This is what all believe. If one is a scholar he must accept this theory."

It should be noticed that this is not really a proper basis upon which to accept anything. It is true that as human beings we do not have time to examine every idea that enters our heads. Inevitably a great part of the ideas that people have are often simply taken over from others/^{often uncritically.} ~~very uncritically~~/ But it is extremely unscientific to take over ^{a theory} as elaborate and as complicated as this ~~one~~ one, and accept it as fact simply on the allegation that, "All scholars believe that it ~~is true~~ is true."

Truth is not to be discovered by counting noses. Time and again most of the people of the world have believed something and it has been proven to be completely false. The Encyclopaedia Britannica states that during the nineteenth century most scientists believed that there ~~was~~ was a substance which they ~~called~~ called ~~ether~~ ether which pervaded all space. Today hardly a scientist holds such a view any longer believes in the existence of this so-called ether. Popular books and ~~some~~ articles sometimes refer to the ether waves, ~~or sometimes refer~~ or make some other allusion to such a belief. But, as a scientist wrote me recently, "If there is any scientist are any ~~scientists~~ scientists today who still believe in the ether theory they are keeping ~~extremely~~ extremely quiet about it." Here was a theory held almost ~~universally~~ universally among scientists in the field with which it deals. Today, abandoned by all. Many similar examples come readily to mind. It was thought a century ago that electricity/moved in a certain direction. Believing that it moved in this direction, charts were made with arrows pointing in that direction. The plus sign was used for the side from which the electricity came, and the minus for the one into (toward) which it would go it would move it moved Today all electrical scholars know that so-called electricity consists of the movement of electrons, and that these electrons move in the exact opposite

in exactly the opposite direction to that which is indicated on all the charts. The device is sometimes resorted to of saying that electricity moves from the positive to the negative pole, but upon question ~~is it~~ it is always explained that when we say that electricity moves in this direction what we ~~really~~ really mean is that there is a flow of electrons in the opposite direction. All scientists held one ~~v~~ view at one time. Today all hold the opposite view. -- fact, even if it were a fact that it was unanimous that the Graf-Wellhausen theory was unanimously accepted, this would not necessarily make it true. It still would need to be examined.

In addition, however, it must be said that this alleged unanimity is ~~not~~ not at all complete. When the theory was first presented many of the older critical scholars refused to accept it, but held to various others of the views which had been current during the nineteenth century. Younger scholars, it is true, mostly have adopted the theory, but today among critical scholars there is a very sizable and vocal group of Scandinavians critical scholars who utterly deny the multi-documentary theory. There have always been some who did not accept the critical view at all, and insisted that the theory had no solid basis.

When it comes to this matter of consensus it is interesting to note that of the most scholarly comprehensive treatments of the view presented in recent years two outstanding ones in the English language would be the work of Professor Pfeiffer of Harvard, and of Professor Eissfeldt of the University of Halle in Germany. Yet these ~~to~~ two, the most scholarly perhaps of all the presentations in recent years of the critical theory, each of them have added an extra complication to the theory by insisting on a fifth document which takes about half of the material in the J document as accepted by the other scholars. The two disagree, one of them thinking that this other party, the J document represents a very early writing, the other that it ~~represents~~ represents a very late ~~writing~~ writing. Thus the two most scholarly presentations differ at a

very vital point from the view as generally held among scholars among critical scholars.

In addition, it might be noted that in the last few years even those who hold to the theory ~~are giving~~ have given up quite a number of the basic points upon which Wellhausen ~~writes~~ and his ~~is~~ associates originally advanced it. This has occurred to so great an extent that one prominent scholar /who said that there was no one in a ~~Chair~~ Chair in a university in America or Europe who still held the Wellhausen ^{chair} ?

theory. This man, however, did not deny the multi-documentary theory, so he did not mean that the theory had been given up today, but rather that the Wellhausen idea ~~f~~ of development upon which it was ~~written~~ originally based was largely given up had been largely given up. This and other points of it have disappeared from teaching in recent years. This ~~phase of~~ phase of the matter will be discussed later on in the chapter on ~~the erosion of the~~ "The Erosion of Wellhausenism." For the present we summarize our discussion of this argument by saying that the unanimity of scholarship never was complete. Today there are a considerable number of critical scholars who do not hold the multi-
is
~~is~~

documentary theory as generally taught who do ~~not~~ not believe in the one-time separate existence at any time of the J. E, D, and P ~~documents~~ documents, of the theory? that the two most scholarly presentations/in English of the theory in recent years have added further complication and thus really differ quite considerably from the theory as held ~~in~~ ^{books} in most/in which it is presented. And that, most important of all, counting noses does not establish truth. Even if all the world believes something it adds no that's no reason for it to be ~~accepted~~ accepted, unless there is solid evidence in its favor