

no copy of such a document that has been passed down. There is no record of anybody referring to it in ancient times. There is no specific factual evidence for such a thing having existed. Now that does not prove that it did not exist. It could have existed without leaving a copy available to us or a statement by anybody who saw it. Nevertheless, if a person says it existed when he has no such evidence, it imposes upon him the necessity of giving mighty good proof before he has a right to ask anybody to accept it.

So we have two sorts of arguments here. The claim is that these arguments prove this critical theory. These arguments are of two types: (1) the arguments for partition — the claim that you can take the Pentateuch and divide it into distinct documents, and (2) the argument as to the relation of these documents — the developmental theory.

We have noticed that the arguments for partition are of four types: (1) the argument from divine names, (2) the argument of continuous narrative, (3) the argument from parallel passages, and (4) the argument from diversity of style, diction, ideas, etc.

The argument from diversity of style, as I stated it, includes ideas as well. That is to say, if you find one document, which seems to believe in a God who simply speaks and it is done, but has no characteristics similar to those of human beings, and another which thinks of God as One who talks with people and deals with people as a human being would, there is a difference of ideas. But is it a *contradiction* of ideas? That is a question which has to be considered. If it is a contradiction of ideas then it is rather good proof of two different documents. Under this heading for partition, do you have such evidence of difference of style or difference of viewpoint as would require it to be different documents?

The second type of argument is the argument that shows development. It is sometimes called *the argument for order*: the argument that you take the statements and show how they logically fit into a certain order. Under that again, number one deals with ideas rather than words (as the previous ones do to a great extent). But