

This is another aspect of the same argument. Arguments 1 and 2 relate to the documents in themselves and how they can be arranged in a progression; 3 and 4 are their relation to history; 4 is the appropriateness of sections to particular periods. This deals particularly with the book of Deuteronomy. In Deuteronomy you have the description of a series of commands which exactly fit Josiah's reformation, and deal with all sorts of things which were then very vital problems to all. It is vital that we understand the complexity of the theory, and the difficulty of proving such a theory. It would take more than any one of these arguments to prove it, no matter how strong that one might be. The question is, just how great is the evidence? Is the evidence sufficient that any reasonable person must think it through again and see whether this is not after all the correct viewpoint, or is it a matter that is pretty hard to prove, and therefore we should stand by that which we believe for other reasons? Or is the evidence actually so weak that an intelligent person, who will honestly and fairly look at it, should be compelled to admit that there is no real strong support for the documentary developments.

We shall now very briefly look at how Solomon sacrificed at Gibeon. Deuteronomy says, "You are to sacrifice at the place where God puts His Name." Leviticus and Numbers say that only sons of Aaron are to sacrifice. Yet 1 Kings tells us that Solomon went to the great high place at Gibeon and offered thousands of sacrifices. The critics say that this contradicts both laws. It is not sacrifice at Jerusalem, but at Gibeon. It is not sacrifice by a priest, but by someone else. Of course, an incidental feature would be that if Solomon killed ten thousand animals that day his arm must have become very tired! When it says that Solomon sacrificed, does it mean that Solomon *himself* sacrificed? Or does it mean that Solomon provided the sacrifice, and it was a priest that did the sacrificing? I think that the second part of the argument, which is so stressed, is really not difficult at all.

The first part of the argument, that says it was at Gibeon and not at Jerusalem, is something which I would not wish to try to discuss in just a minute or two now. We will wait until we pick up that argument later. Here I just give it as an example to show that they have a few facts which are difficult and which need very careful study.