## The traditional "Documentary Hypothesis" of how the first books of the Bible came to be

The "problem": Apparent inconsistencies and contradictions of language, plot and

characterization within the text of Genesis

**The solution:** Imagine multiple authors and editors, each writing in their own times

and contexts for their own purposes. The basic hypothesis is:

OLDEST: oral traditions from unknown times.

<u>"Yaнwist" (J):</u> a supposed source from the 10<sup>th</sup> century BCE "Solomonic Enlightenment" in Jerusalem, Judah.

Characteristic elements of "J" include

- 1. The use of Hebrew, "YHWH" (often rendered "LORD" in all caps in English translation) for the name of God.
- 2. The character of YHWH is immediate, engaged, and often emotional (example: the Garden of Eden story in Gen 2-3)

<u>"ELOHIST" (E):</u> a supposed 8<sup>th</sup> century BCE source from the northern kingdom of Israel, providing local variations on the older "J" stories.

Characteristic elements of "E" include

- 1. Emphasis on "Israelite" locales and concerns (in contrast with "Judahite")
- 2. Repetition of "earlier" stories (e.g., the "wife-sister" stories in Genesis 12 and 20)

<u>"Priestly" (P):</u> a supposed  $6^{th}$  century source from former Judahite temple priests now exiled in Babylon.

Characteristic elements of "P" include

- 1. The use of Hebrew 'elohim rather than YHWH for the name of God.
- 2. The character of God is transcendent and in control (e.g., the Creation story in Gen 1.1-2.4a)

"<u>DEUTERONOMIST" (D):</u> a supposed source ranging across the time of the Jerusalem monarchy. Barely relevant for Genesis itself.