Old Testament Introduction
The Bible’s Buried Secrets
Chapter 3, Documentary Hypothesis

***Overview***

*The Bible’s Buried Secrets* is yet another presentation of that warn out old hypothesis first presented by Julius Wellhausen[[1]](#endnote-1) (1844-1918) so long ago.[[2]](#endnote-2) Practically every major Old Testament theologian who has ever written has either presented a different variation of the Documentary Hypothesis or a refutation of it. I have the books of roughly a half-dozen such experts in my library. Notably, these critics do not agree with each other, which might give us an indication that the only thing widely accepted is the theory’s name. Some of these hypotheses view the Torah as segmented like an orange, while others view the Torah as shelled like an onion: this is only the tip of the iceberg. Suffice it to say that there is no Documentary Hypothesis; rather, there are several Documentary Hypotheses.

*The Bible’s Buried Secrets* states that the Documentary Hypothesis is widely accepted. This is far from true. The Documentary Hypotheses have been thoroughly defeated many times, but they seem to have a knack for rising from the dead. So, no matter how frequently or how thoroughly such theories have been discredited and refuted, they seem to maintain their adherents.[[3]](#endnote-3) Investigation of such adherents reveals that many of them reject belief in the existence of the spiritual realm out of hand, as their first presupposition. Having said this, the various Documentary Hypotheses have no special evidence; none. All the internal evidence is contained in the Old Testament with its Deuterocanon. So you can decide for yourself to either accept or reject these sorts of theories. The external archaeological evidence is being used in an attempt to reconstruct, and refute the biblical evidence. However, the major archaeological evidence in play was presented in the film; so, you are free to evaluate that for yourselves as well.[[4]](#endnote-4)

Is there any justification for any such hypothesis or method? Difficult passages do exist in the Bible. This does not justify the underlying method of *The Bible’s Buried Secrets*, that only those statements verified, scientifically, by other artifacts can possibly be true: so, for example, the dating of Moses from birth at 1486 to death at 1366,[[5]](#endnote-5) based on the best analysis of dates in Scripture, cannot possibly be true, or so the assumption goes.[[6]](#endnote-6)

***Suppression of Evidence***

After the fundamental presupposition of unbelief is exposed, perhaps the next false claim is that the Old Testament cannot be known to have been written before roughly 1000: the justification for this is the discovery of a Hebrew alphabet dated to 950 BC.[[7]](#endnote-7) A brief review of a fraction of the history of writing reveals milestones: Cuneiform (Akkadian and Sumerian), 3400 BC[[8]](#endnote-8); Egyptian, 3250 BC; Elamite, 3200 BC; Semitic, 1800 BC:[[9]](#endnote-9) all of which are in active use long before 1000 BC. We conclude that the inferences of *The Bible’s Buried Secrets* were formed only by ignoring the vast weight of other evidence: evidence that has been available in western civilization for many years. There is simply no evidence that Moses could not have written most of Torah between 1406 and 1366 BC[[10]](#endnote-10). The experts should have said, “The Old Testament cannot be known to have been written before roughly 1000” in any form of the Hebrew language; given, the present limits of our knowledge, the books called Torah, as well as a few others were most likely written in Akkadian Cuneiform.

***Suppression of Scholarly Opinion***

It is no mystery that we do not possess what Moses wrote, or even the script in which he wrote: or if we do possess it, we don’t know how to identify it. Moses may well have written in Egyptian hieroglyphs with which Moses was certainly educated. Proto-Sinaitic (1900-1700 BC)[[11]](#endnote-11) or Semitic (1400 BC) abjads[[12]](#endnote-12) are very remote possibilities, since there is no evidence that Hebrew versions of these existed until 400 years after Moses.[[13]](#endnote-13) Alternatively, Moses could have written in Akkadian Cuneiform, the regional diplomatic language of the period: thus, Akkadian bears the greatest probability at the present (2017 AD) level of human linguistic knowledge.[[14]](#endnote-14) We do not know what script Moses used; the documents were destroyed in 586 BC or previously. What this shows is that *The Bible’s Buried Secrets* is willing to avoid the opinions of related scholarship.[[15]](#endnote-15) What the 950 BC evidence[[16]](#endnote-16) establishes beyond doubt is that the Hebrew abjads are developed, possibly as early as 1100 BC,[[17]](#endnote-17) and that Hebrew developed as a literature in continual use between 1100 and 586 BC, until it was eclipsed by Aramaic around 516 BC, by Greek around 200 BC: by then Hebrew was a dead language, known only to scholars and scribes.

Supposedly, the 950 BC evidence provides a firm date for the existence of J, possibly from around 950 BC. Perhaps as a result of Shishak’s invasion (926-917 BC), E composes a separate document, dating from around 850 BC, which may or may not have been combined with J. Possibly the destruction of the Northern Kingdom in 722 BC, or even the sack of Jerusalem in 586 BC, precipitates D to write around 600, D consists primarily of the book of Deuteronomy, as far as Torah is concerned.[[18]](#endnote-18) Finally, while at Babylon or after the return from Babylon, beginning around 500 or before or later, P edits and assembles the whole thing into approximately what we know as a printed Hebrew Bible today. During the editing process, P adds a great deal of his own material to Torah. The Documentary Hypotheses are not usually concerned with much of anything outside of Torah.[[19]](#endnote-19)

***What is J?***

The fundamental assumption of J is that some ancient people or other, prior to and independent from Moses at the burning bush, knew God by His name, JHVH, and not merely by His title, Elohim. J does not exclude the use of the generic title E; it merely supposes ancient knowledge of E by His name J. We might immediately conclude that the bulk of the content of J is the book of Genesis. However, as soon as we examine the details of this hypothesis we see that the idea of J is far more complicated than just Genesis. The proponents of this theory see J as a complex interwoven thread, which must be disentangled from the modern manuscripts. In this arrangement, it is impossible for Moses to have written J at all. Moses may not even be an historical person, and all the dates in Torah are falsified insertions, because J does not emerge until after 1000,[[20]](#endnote-20) whereas the internal “falsified” dates indicate circa 1406 (LXX) 1446 (MT), as a date of origin. If these are falsifications, some of them are repeated in the New Testament.[[21]](#endnote-21)

Over against this complicated idea, and in rebuttal of J, tradition suggests that Moses actually met with a person named JHVH, at a place dubbed the burning bush, and first entered into a conversation that would continue for eight hundred twenty years and more, as the conversation extended into the lifetimes of Moses’ successors. In this conversation, Moses either learned of his people’s history for the first time, or had it refreshed to him. In either case, the idolatries of Egypt had dimmed the remembrance of the family history, and in some cases, may have deleted it entirely. In either case, whether Moses learned it, or relearned it,[[22]](#endnote-22) he wrote it down in what would eventually be the historical and theological prologue to Exodus and the rest of Torah: Genesis. During this writing of Genesis, Moses either discovered that Adam, Noah, Abraham, and all his predecessors had known God as JHVH, but his people had lost the family tradition in Egypt; or Moses, desiring to make Genesis more understandable to his contemporaries, had applied the name JHVH to Genesis at appropriate places to make Genesis clearly understandable. The purpose of writing Genesis is to provide a historical and theological prologue to Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, without which these three books are not completely understandable.

There is a principle of logic known as Occam’s Razor. The simplest solution is usually the correct one. So which is simpler? To take the record as it stands? Or to unravel pieces of it based on a preconceived scheme, and then impose an arbitrary pseudo-scientific dating system on it?

***What is E?***

The fundamental assumption of E involves the existence of a people who are barbaric,[[23]](#endnote-23) and only know God as E. They have no inherent intimacy with J and do not even know His name. Only after detailed instruction do they discover the name J, and enter into the precedent discussion with ancestors that have either been forgotten or have been fabricated for the purpose of inventing a plausible background story.

Our ordinary conclusion would be that that the bulk of the content of E is Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. Yet, once again, we learn that this is not the case: closer examination of all these theories discloses a vast complexity of interweaving.[[24]](#endnote-24)

In rebuttal…. Since E (850 BC) is commonly supposed to have emerged only after the death of Solomon (930 BC), a delay of roughly eighty years, one has difficulty understanding how J could have possibly filled Solomon’s Temple with the smoke of His Shəkinah Glory, and been called J by a people who were ignorant of His name J, and would remain ignorant of His name J for another seventy-five years or so after Shishak’s invasion in 925 BC.[[25]](#endnote-25) What compelling evidence exists for the emergence of E around 850 BC?

Furthermore, no plausible reason is provided for this people to discover the name J from their ignorance concerning E until around 850.[[26]](#endnote-26) Why should a document, for which there is no other evidence, suddenly emerge in contradiction to the evidence? Are we to believe that the person we know as Moses only emerges as a recovery from Shishak’s invasion, that Moses escapes from Shishak’s invented captivity in Egypt with, at most, a few hundred people, who accidentally stumble on the name J as they wander blindly through Midian,[[27]](#endnote-27) and finally arrive at Judea to join a divided kingdom, and witness the destruction of its northern half in 722? If this is the case, from where do the barbaric E people come? What or who brings the J people and the E people into contact and ultimate collaboration around 850? What specific historic event takes place in 850 to make such an amalgamation even possible?

Once again, Occam’s Razor urges us to embrace the simpler explanation, the traditional explanation, the one written in the Bible, as plainly read.[[28]](#endnote-28)

***What is D?***

D then emerges sometime after 722[[29]](#endnote-29) as the book of Deuteronomy, with a few additions, deletions, and corrections. D is prompted by some great disaster, but certainly not by the hardship of wandering in the desert for the 40 years between 1406 and 1366 BC. This makes D the covenant renewal document of the broken remnant of David’s kingdom;[[30]](#endnote-30) not the covenant renewal document of the corrupted multitude of Exodus, for no such Exodus can possibly have taken place, not in 722. In the process of such reanalysis the mass of the population has been reduced from around two million, to a few thousands; from a people who had witnessed JHVH crush an evil empire and lead them miraculously for forty years, to Canaanite peasants who have finally achieved a measure of freedom. The two widely differing versions are not compatible, are they?

In rebuttal…. What really did happen in 722 that the archaeology actually reveals? The reigning Israelites had so grievously sinned against JHVH in 722 that He finally removed His patient tolerant protection from them. He moved the Assyrians to destroy them, and scatter their population throughout the Assyrian empire. With their overlords removed, the common people, mixed with foreigners that the Assyrians had imported, were left to divide the land of the northern kingdom as they saw fit. Those who now occupied the land were a mixed race of Canaanites and other ethnicities; except in rare cases, they were not Israelites. Some Israelites escaped to find sanctuary in the surviving southern kingdom. The remaining mixture survived to become the Samaritans.

The only real reason for hypothesizing the invention of D around 600, is to provide a justification for Josiah’s reform. Everybody loves Josiah’s reform, so a compelling reason for its emergence is sought. Once such a compelling reason is found, then D must be hypothesized to resolve the tragedy, bringing the reform into supposed actuality. We could either find such a compelling reason in the destruction of 722 BC, or in the deportation of 586 BC. If 586 BC is hypothesized as the case, then Josiah, who lives and dies before 586, is a fabricated story designed to help the deportees to cope with their pitiful plight. Why not more readily believe that the actual incidents took place exactly as the Bible reports them: namely, Moses wrote D, as well as the rest of Torah between 1406 and 1366 BC; the destruction of the northern kingdom took place in 722 BC; Josiah lived and reigned at a time when Torah was neglected; the document(s) fished out of the temple could have been D, or all of Torah, or other parts of Torah: the biblical record does not specifically name the retrieved document(s). More likely the entire corpus was uncovered; then the Judean kingdom was deported to Babylon in 586, after Josiah’s death.

It’s a simple straightforward report: we don’t need to mess it up with complicated hypotheses, unsupported by any evidence.

***What is P?***

Ostensibly, P is the document which the returning Jews assembled either in Babylon before 516 or back in Jerusalem after 516:[[31]](#endnote-31) the document which we know in substance as the Hebrew Bible. Ostensibly, this document is the final assembly and edition of JED and P: a final assembly in which P adds a considerable amount of his own material.[[32]](#endnote-32)

In this final assembly, the existence of the other 34 Old Testament books and all of the Deuterocanon remain without explanation.

At the very least, we would expect a corresponding treatment of Psalms: since the Psalter appears to be an explication of the theological aspects of Torah drawn from the life experiences of Moses, David, Asaph, the Sons of Korah, and others.

Ostensibly, the distinction between the elements JED and P can be known from differences in grammar, handwriting style, lexicography, syntax, and the like that are observable in ancient documents. So we must ask. Which observable differences in grammar, handwriting style, lexicography, syntax, and the like are these, since no ancient documents from the period 1000 to 516 have survived? Are we to draw these conclusions from variations in the Masoretic Text, which is the scholarly work of a few Jews from 600 to 1300 AD? How can that possibly be relevant to events of one to two millennia earlier? Are we to draw these conclusions from variations in the Greek Text translation which is completed no later than 200 to 140 BC? Are we to draw these conclusions from variations in the Dead Sea scrolls, which were only recently discovered, and which have no provenance to establish relevance? Is it not apparent that no such observations in grammar, handwriting style, lexicography, syntax, and the like can possibly exist? The documents from which P is assembled are not originals, but copies that have passed through centuries of hand written reproduction, so of course variations existed, but it is impossible that such variations can be discovered from any presently extant document.

***Conclusion***

By now it should be apparent that all of the Documentary Hypotheses in any of their variations are all fabrications: all of them are a lie. The only foundational evidence that can be produced is a handful of archaeological artifacts, themselves subject to a great deal of subjective speculation, and manipulation. We can watch this manipulation and speculation of data as *The Bible’s Buried Secrets* dodge in and out of the facts they represent.

If such theories of construction can stand, we would be forced to conclude that the contradictions with what Torah itself reports are too numerous and too significant. Torah is necessarily mythology according to these hypothetical approaches. We, on the other hand, conclude that such theories of construction cannot stand; therefore, all Documentary Hypotheses are mythologies. If any of the Documentary Hypotheses could stand, serious doubt is cast upon the historic existence of Yahweh, the Shəkinah, Moses, Israel as an ethnic people, Judaism as a religious development, and even Jesus as the Son of God. There would be no realistic or historical base for Judaism, Christianity, or Islam whatsoever.

If any of the Documentary Hypotheses could possibly be correct, then Jesus would be a false prophet: a charlatan, fake, fraud, imposter, liar, quack, sham. But Jesus is the True Prophet, Who seals His veracity, not only by raising from the dead, but also by His enthronement before the Day of Pentecost in 33 AD, which is sealed by the coming of the Holy Ghost. Since Jesus is such a King, Priest, and Prophet, he affirms for us that the Old Testament is true as given and received in Greek; therefore, all of the various Documentary Hypotheses are exposed as fraudulent: doomed to failure because of a lack of evidence.[[33]](#endnote-33)

[[34]](#endnote-34)

1. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Julius_Wellhausen> [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Documentary_hypothesis> [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
3. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Documentary_hypothesis#Weakening_of_support> [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
4. Actually, there are indications that the archaeological evidence was cherry-picked to support one particular bias, conclusion, preconception, or prejudice. We are about to expose indications of such cherry-picking in our investigation into the history of writing, as well as in the refusal to credit other experts in parallel fields. [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
5. This is the conclusion drawn from the Septuagint text. MT differs by 40 years which would place the birth of Moses at 1526 and his death at 1406. In either case, we are a far cry from nothing at all prior to 1000. [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
6. We wish to be very careful here. For the purposes of this paper, as well as all our other papers, we wish to maintain a distinction between history, and pre-history. History, by our definition, is that which can be verified by cross linked external evidence. Pre-history is that which cannot be so verified at this time. Hence, the dividing line between history and pre-history is ever moving backwards in time; so that, what is pre-history today will be firmly established as history tomorrow, because of new discoveries.

The problems of pre-history still confront us. We have no reason to reject pre-history or pre-historic documents: they are, after all, actual evidence. Still, pre-history lacks the context that helps us understand the full meaning of its claims. Thus, we have the pre-historic report of Noah, the flood, and the Ark; we also have a variety of disputed meanings of this report. Until, a vast amount of external evidence is accumulated, we cannot accurately unpack the details: we know very little more than what is written in the pages of Genesis. Since, the record we have, has been translated several times, and copied manually many times more: possibly from Akkadian, or an even earlier source language, into Hebrew around the time of David (1010-970 BC), into Aramaic around 516 BC, into Greek around 200 BC, into Latin around 400 AD, into the MT between 300 and 1300 AD, and finally into English, we have lost any real grasp of the original idiom in play. Moreover, more than one of these lines of evidence still survives: they are not all in agreement about every detail. For this example, concerning Noah, there is still dispute over whether the flood was local or worldwide: while there is plenty of evidence for a worldwide catastrophic event, there is also seemingly contradictory evidence requiring a local event. We will never resolve this difficulty from the Bible by itself. We must wait patiently until new evidence is discovered that resolves all of the difficulties. In the meantime, the one thing we can never conclude is that Genesis is a falsehood, fiction, or fraud.

This brings us to the issue of maximalism and minimalism. The acceptance of evidence can be a very personal matter. Some people are naturally sceptics, or minimalists, as is the Apostle Thomas the Doubter, who have to personally verify every least detail before receiving any evidence as valid. Others tend, in the extreme, even to gullibility, accepting everything they see and hear without question. Perhaps, the middle way is indicated; wherein we do all due diligence to ferret out error, and verify every claim; yet, at the same time, we are willing to accept the professional opinions of others, when the evidence to be verified falls outside of our particular individual wheelhouse. It takes a village, it takes a Body to resolve these sorts of issues: the conclusion cannot be properly drawn until every member of the Body has submitted its evidence. Minimalists are prone to reject evidence, testing it to death before any acceptance; maximalists are prone to accept evidence, some of which, if not cross examined, proves to be false. There has to be a middle way.

Nor is this a claim that the external evidence must be used to “correct” the internal evidence. The interplay between external and internal evidence is very complex; we are not seeking to correct either: rather, we wish to understand and coordinate both. There are times when external evidence explains the internal; while there are times when internal evidence explains the external; as well as other times when both remain a mystery. Evidence is evidence; the puzzle cannot be completed until every piece is put in its proper place: it is of no value to hammer the Bible into conformity with someone’s wishes, or to pummel archaeological evidence until it says whatever we wish. Nevertheless, in the field of archaeological evidence, it is the Bible that first shows us where to dig.

Arguably, the best discussion of the technical details of such problems may be found in Kenneth Kitchen’s book, *On the Reliability of the Old Testament* (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids/Cambridge, 2003, paperback in 2006: 662 pages) [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
7. Note that the discovery of a single stone with an abjad inscription is sufficient to drive the historic credibility of the Bible back from 517 toward 950 or even beyond to 1000; and even force, at least the possibility that the David-Solomon Empire might be an historic reality. [↑](#endnote-ref-7)
8. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cuneiform_script>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sumerian_language>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Akkadian> [↑](#endnote-ref-8)
9. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_writing#Proto-writing> [↑](#endnote-ref-9)
10. Formerly, the author supported the MT dates, which are 40 years earlier: he has since become convinced of the superiority of the Septuagint (LXX) dates. [↑](#endnote-ref-10)
11. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Proto-Sinaitic_script> [↑](#endnote-ref-11)
12. Alphabets without vowels: As writing develops from speech, consonants are the dominant sounds heard and recorded first. Actually, the Semitic abjads already contain vowel-letters (א - ה - ו - י), but the idea of vowels is not fully developed. With the emergence of the predecessors of Greek, the idea of vowels will be completely developed. Phonics, as a science, will continue to develop symbols to distinguish sounds, but these phonic symbols are rarely found in ordinary writing. Alphabetic writing symbols have not developed much beyond Greek and Latin concepts. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abjad> [↑](#endnote-ref-12)
13. There is a possibility that Moses wrote in some form of Proto-Sinaitic script (1900-1700 BC), which he could have learned from his father-in-law. However, the evidence is sparse and some of it is definitely not alphabetic. There is no highly developed literature in evidence. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Proto-Sinaitic_script>

There is also a possibility that Moses wrote in Ugaritic (1400 BC); yet, how might he have learned it? There is an Ugaritic corpus of over 2000 texts and fragments. Closer inspection reveals that the symbols are not alphabetic, and are wholly unlike early Hebrew, or other similar abjads; rather, they seem to be adapted from Akkadian Cuneiform or another cuneiform, with cuneiform characters pressed into alphabetic sounds and uses. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ugaritic_alphabet>

<http://cdli.ox.ac.uk/wiki/doku.php?id=ugaritic#the_corpus>

Besides Proto-Sinaitic and Ugaritic, there is no evidence of alphabetic development before 1000 BC. Neither is there any known connection with the Israelites until around 1000. [↑](#endnote-ref-13)
14. For example: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Amarna_letters> [↑](#endnote-ref-14)
15. See note 4. [↑](#endnote-ref-15)
16. The Zayit Stone: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zayit_Stone> [↑](#endnote-ref-16)
17. This date is actually stretching the available evidence quite a bit. [↑](#endnote-ref-17)
18. The supposed separate creation and existence of Deuteronomy is necessary to explain Josiah’s reform or revival, which would not otherwise have any compelling impetus to begin. However, this presupposes that Deuteronomy does not exist as part of a five-book Torah corpus. It also presupposes that Moses did not write it: for if Moses was an actual participant in either J or E, he could not possibly have survived to also write D. [↑](#endnote-ref-18)
19. Please note that the graph, “Distribution of materials…” paints a bizarre picture. Since our first investigation this article has been completely rewritten, and the graph, “Distribution of materials…” was removed along with other things. Evidently, there was considerable dispute over the Documentary Hypothesis, enough to force a rewrite. We wish that such rewrites were compelled to keep the original claims on file. Destroying evidence is rarely a good idea.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Documentary_hypothesis#/media/File:Documentary_Hypothesis_Sources_Distribution_English.png> [↑](#endnote-ref-19)
20. J is supposed to emerge at 950, but David is dead at 970, which necessarily makes J the creation of Solomon’s court. [↑](#endnote-ref-20)
21. Acts 7:6; 13:20; Galatians 3:17 [↑](#endnote-ref-21)
22. In other words, Genesis is sourced in oral tradition, or is taught by Yahweh at the burning bush, or some combination of both. If Genesis is sourced in scraps of documents, there is no evidence that such scraps of documents ever existed among the Israelites.

On the other hand, the assumption of oral tradition is absurd; it is inconceivable that these great empires collected taxes, maintained birth and death records, livestock accounting, or other administrative necessities based on an oral tradition. Parts of Genesis read like texts copied out of the official government archives, which is exactly what we would expect in a family record. Covenants are almost always made in duplicate: one copy for the government, one copy for the citizen. Such a massive oral tradition is inconceivable. [↑](#endnote-ref-22)
23. It is the E assumption that eventually forces the false conclusion that the Israelites are really Canaanites who discover the path to monotheism all by themselves. Yahweh is not the Self-revelation of God, Who miraculously stoops to speak to His children at their level. Yahweh is the creation of a self-deified people, who seek to present themselves as messianic to the world. This is god created in the image of Man, rather than man created in the image of God. The emphasis on monotheism does not remove the blasphemy expressed by this view. Neither Israel nor Judah invented God. The Israelites are not Canaanites, which false claim Genesis anticipates: so E sources must be driven backward into Genesis to warrant all of E’s false assumptions. [↑](#endnote-ref-23)
24. Please, review the graphic “Distribution of materials…” one more time.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Documentary_hypothesis#/media/File:Documentary_Hypothesis_Sources_Distribution_English.png> [↑](#endnote-ref-24)
25. There is no reason to suppose that David and Solomon knew J, even though J may have already existed, according to this theory. If David and Solomon had known J, then there is no reason for the rediscovery, reintroduction, or reinvention of Yahweh in E: for Yahweh was already known. The hypotheses all begin to unravel under the weight of their numerous internal self-contradictions, and the absence of any evidence for source documents of any kind. [↑](#endnote-ref-25)
26. This places the theoretically supposed Shasu migration to around 850, well past the introduction of the Iron Age in the Holy Land. However, the Egyptian records date to the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shasu>

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shasu#Shasu_of_Yhw>

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Soleb>

<http://www.amarawest.org/> [↑](#endnote-ref-26)
27. It is this “accidental” discovery of J by E that provides the supposed necessary existence of J from 950, and its late discovery by E in 850. Now the dividing line cannot be the simplicity of the division between Genesis and Exodus. It must be interwoven around the presupposition of indigenous Canaanites called Israelites, who will now be joined by E Canaanite nomads who have stumbled upon the name J. The Canaanite/Israelites adopt the name J and insert it back into the mythology of the living smoke that inhabits Solomon’s temple. [↑](#endnote-ref-27)
28. BTW, how is it that J and E came to be woven together so seamlessly, without enormous conflicts in dating and other historical errors? [↑](#endnote-ref-28)
29. As late as 600 according to some: since Josiah (641-609) is already dead at this point, he is supposed to have read a book that is not yet written. [↑](#endnote-ref-29)
30. According to others, presumably at Josiah’s discovery and reading of the Law. Yet, why would Josiah discover and read a document that has just now been written? Are we to believe that a handful of temple scribes were wise enough and fast enough to miraculously invent a document out of thin air? … A document that would perfectly fit Josiah’s political and spiritual needs at that very moment? Or, are we to believe that they concocted such a document in the eighty years period since 722? There is opposing evidence to such a scheme from the numerous idols, graven images found even adjacent to the Temple that such scribes were not at all interested in reform, but were in fact involved in the apostasy: why would they even wish to write a document favoring reform. Only a handful of prophets favored reform: Isaiah, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah; these stood pretty much alone. [↑](#endnote-ref-30)
31. 500 according to Wellhausen, which is 16 years after the return. It is significant that Wellhausen saw this material as necessarily post-return. *The Bible’s Buried Secrets* has invented an entirely new idea of a pre-return Torah. [↑](#endnote-ref-31)
32. According to Friedman, approximately 50% of Torah.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Documentary_hypothesis#/media/File:Documentary_Hypothesis_Sources_Distribution_English.png>

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard_Elliott_Friedman> [↑](#endnote-ref-32)
33. Since our essay was first written, some of these “Documentary Hypotheses” have been renamed as “new” hypotheses: Supplementary or Fragmentary Hypotheses. These are nothing more than the old garbage warmed over and served up as a fresh meal. We began by stating that such hypotheses, “seem to have a knack for rising from the dead;” and so they do: this does not make them any less dead, no matter how many times they are reinvented, or shed their skin.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Documentary_hypothesis#Table:_documentary.2C_fragmentary_and_supplementary_hypotheses> [↑](#endnote-ref-33)
34. If you have been blessed or helped by any of these meditations, please repost, share, or use any of them as you wish. No rights are reserved. They are designed and intended for your free participation. They were freely received, and are freely given. No other permission is required for their use. [↑](#endnote-ref-34)