

under that, number one is very similar to a portion of number four, partition, and is called discrepancy.

a. *Discrepancy*: the argument that you have distinct differences of viewpoint between different documents that would seem to show an order of development. Are there such discrepancies? Some books will tell you that P knows nothing of any sacrifice prior to the establishment of the temple, that P knows nothing of any sacrifice by the Patriarchs. A patriarch comes through the land and never stops and makes a sacrifice anywhere. That is what they say. Does that prove that the author believes he did not?

b. *Logical progress*: the claim is that there is logical progress among the documents. We have noticed two specific points: (1) priesthood, and (2) the place of sacrifice — the altar, and others are alleged to be related to these. There are many things alleged to show that you have a logical progress from the simple to the complex.

c. *Violation of Laws as Evidence of Non-existence* (which I have not mentioned before): This is the claim that if there was a law in existence at the time of Solomon which stipulated that there was to be only one place for sacrifice, and that is Jerusalem, then Solomon would not have gone up to Gibeon and offered large numbers of sacrifices there. The fact that he does this, they say, proves that there was no Deuteronomic law at that time.

As an example of this idea of violation of law they point to the fact that Samuel offered sacrifice. If this was done by Samuel, the great and good leader of the people, they say, it proves that nobody had ever heard of such an idea: that a man has to belong to the family of Aaron to be permitted to offer sacrifice — as, they say, the P document stressed so very, very much. Violation of law and evidence of its non-existence is by far the strongest of the arguments and it is indeed a tough one.

7) *The Appropriateness of Sections to Particular Periods*