

upset an

on

insertion
on
opp. p.

Thus, Hupfeld ~~split the two original criteria~~ ^{by which the} sources of Genesis had been identified, so that two ^{different} documents now used ^{as the name} Elohim ^{using different names for God,} for God and two ^{had almost the same style.}

~~Some have called this the "Copernican revolution of Higher Criticism," because of the drastic change it wrought in the documentary theory of the Pentateuch. Unlike Copernicus' theory, however, this view was more complicated than its generally accepted predecessor. This was not the first time E had been split into two documents, but as Karl Ilgen had done this earlier without attracting much attention so in 1798. But he had found 17 documents in Genesis, and his work was not influential.~~

no 91

— Hupfeld also suggested that the documents composing the Pentateuch had been written in the order P, E, J, D (~~Deuterocanonical~~ ^{code}), and that they had been put together by an editor or redactor (~~labelled R~~) who added a few comments and occasionally put a ~~Jah~~ in P or E or an ~~Elohim~~ in J.

— But Hupfeld's ^{ordering of the documents} dating was not satisfactory to those who ^{stressed development} believed in the evolution of religion. The complex laws of P could not have come first! Therefore, Karl Heinrich Graf, ² in 1866, suggested that P be split up and the legal material in it be dated even later than D. The Dutch scholar Abraham ³ Kuenen replied to Graf, in 1869 (in De Geschiedenis van Israël) ⁴⁻¹⁰ arguing that P could not be split because of its uniformity of style. He suggested that all of P should be dated after D.

With this revision, the stage was finally set for the appearance of Julius Wellhausen's Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels I ^(in German) published in 1878. This book contained no significant innovations in dividing the Pentateuch into documents, but Hupfeld's view was stated brilliantly and