

There were ^{serious} difficulties in connection with each of these arguments as presented by Eichhorn. This is clearly evidenced by the many forms that the theory took during the years between 1800 and 1878. Since no one today holds the theory as advanced by Eichhorn, but most of the divisive critics present it substantially in the form given by Wellhausen, we shall consider these four arguments in relation to the present form of the theory, after briefly noting two very important ¹¹⁰⁷ changes that were involved.

1) In the Wellhausen theory the former unified E document is divided into two interlaced documents, the larger one being considered to have been made by priests and therefore designated as P, with the other part of the original E document retaining the name E. Twenty-five years before Wellhausen wrote this change had been suggested by H. Hupfeld, who pointed out that a substantial part of the alleged document using the name Elohim was much closer in style to J than to P. It should be obvious that this breaking up of the original E document ¹²⁰⁰ severely weakens Eichhorn's arguments.

2) The order of the documents was greatly changed. Instead of P representing the earliest material, as was held formerly, it was now considered to be the latest. At the time this change was considered so great that it was called a "Copernican revolution."

Now we shall look at the four basic arguments for division into interlaced documents. As to the first of these, the alternation of various names may seem strange to the American or English reader, because it is