

predecessors, Hupfeld considered P as basic and the oldest of all. Then E. Riehm (1854) proposed De Wette's Deuteronomy as the fourth distinct source in the Pentateuch. Thus the three sources in Genesis, first distinguished by Ilgen and then more clearly by Hupfeld, were proposed, together with Deuteronomy, as providing all the material for the Pentateuch. The task of substantiating this theory, revising some details, and filling in others remained.

The major revision was the reversing of the relative chronology of the sources. What had been considered the earliest of the Elohist documents was, mainly through the work of E. G. E. *Reuss (1833) and H. Graf (1866), considered to be postexilic in composition, at least with regard to its legislative sections. The latter scholar then followed W. Koster (1868) in extending this conclusion to the narrative section of P. Thus, what once had been considered the oldest document of the Pentateuch was recognized as the youngest. The acceptance of this by the scholarly and influential A. Kuenen (1870) assured its acceptance by many others. The relative chronology as still held today had become more or less fixed.

Work of Julius Wellhausen. The great work of synthesizing all these conclusions and presenting them in a convincing way to the scholarly world was performed by J. *Wellhausen. The year 1876 marked the appearance of the first of his articles, which were later put in book form. This became the basis for almost all liberal critical work on the Pentateuch after that time. While he showed more clearly than any before him that the Yahwist was the oldest and the Priestly Code the youngest of the documents, he also provided an absolute dating for each, assigning the Yahwist to the 9th, the Elohist to the 8th, Deuteronomy to the 7th, and the Priestly source to the 5th centuries B.C. The determination was made on the basis of religious, social, and legal concepts supposedly found in the documents themselves.

Wellhausen made brilliant and full use of the science of literary criticism as developed at that time, a fact that helped in the wide diffusion of the documentary hypothesis as proposed by him. His writings, however, were partially vitiated by certain historical and philosophical preconceptions. He was completely skeptical about the ability to reconstruct any part of Israel's history that predated the beginnings of the monarchy. While some historical facts underlie the accounts of the Exodus, wandering, and conquest, they cannot be reconstructed, he argued, into any kind of organic story. And anything before that is, of course, pure legend or myth.

The lack of sufficient documentation for the history of the surrounding nations made it difficult also for Wellhausen, and others, to place Israel's history within its proper context. Hence they could more readily apply to OT literature criteria based on an evolutionary concept of religion. All the forms of religious belief, from animism to monotheism, were found to be expressed, and their expressions were dated in accord with the developing science of comparative religion. This science, as practiced by the majority at that time, left no room for the possibility of divine intervention and hence precluded any development of religion within Israel different than that among the pagan peoples.

Wellhausen's aprioristic reconstruction of Israel's religious history cast a shadow over the brilliance of his insights and presentation and was chiefly responsible for the reaction he met on the part of the more conservative scholars of his day, a reaction that has since been justified. The documentary hypothesis, however, in its determination of the four sources with their "constants" has retained the allegiance of the great part of the scholarly world, with the modifications to be noted.

Classical Four-documentary Hypothesis. The characteristics of the documents or traditions, along with the principal passages attributed to them, determined by the process described above and as reflecting the generally accepted position, will be briefly presented.

Yahwist (J). This document was first recognized by its use, from the very beginning of its history, of the name "Yahweh" for God, although the name was revealed only in the time of Moses (Ex 3.15). The narrative is colorful and interesting; the painting of scenes and the delineation of characters are superb. The dialogues especially are presented with consummate skill and artistry (e.g., Gn 24). It is through the stories that J presents its religious convictions, which are quite profound and which reveal deep psychological insights into the human condition. The origin of evil, man's propensity to sin, the relationship between civilization and morality, the relevance of the apparently least significant events to the divine plan, and the grand sweep of that plan are all subjected to J's analysis. The underlying conviction is that God has intervened in Israel's history and manifested His loving concern for this people. In presenting this God, J makes bold use of anthropomorphisms, which easily distinguish it from E and P. God forms man, breathes into his nostrils, plants a garden, talks to man, walks in the garden, makes garments (Gn 2-3), is pleased (Gn 4.4), regrets, and is grieved (Gn 6.6), etc. Wellhausen and others placed the composition of J in the kingdom of Juda in the latter part of the 9th century B.C. There were to be later refinements of this, but the southern provenance during the monarchical period would continue to be maintained. Following are the principal passages attributed to J: Gn 2.4b-4.26; 6.1-8.22 (mixed with P); 9.18-27; 10.1-32 (mixed with P); 11.1-9; 12.1-13.19; 15.1-16.16; 18.1-19.38; 21.1-21 (mixed with P); 24.1-67; 25.1-26.35 (mixed with P); 27.1-45; 28.10-32.22 (mixed with E); 32.23-33.20; 34.1-31 (mixed with E); 37.1-36 (mixed with E); 38.1-39.23; 41.1-43.34 (mixed with E); 44.1-34; 45.1-48.22 (mixed with E and P); 49.1-33; 50.1-26 (mixed with E and P); Ex 1-2 (mixed with E and P); 3-5 (mixed with E); 7-11 (mixed with E and P); 14 (mixed with P); 32-34 (mixed with E); Nm 10.29-11.34 (mixed with E); 13.17b-16.35 (mixed with E and P); 20.1-24.25 (mixed with E and P); 32.1-42 (mixed with E and P). There is no universal agreement on all the attributions, and at times the conflation with other sources is such as to preclude a precise analysis.

Elohist (E). This document's careful use of the name "Elohim" for God in the pre-Sinai material is already an indication of its more exact theology. While the style is not as colorful as J's, it is more consciously didactic. E can be recognized by a preference for "Horeb" to "Sinai," for "Amorrites" to "Canaanites," etc. Its interest in the covenant is reflected in an emphasis on the ob-