

extent from the simple to more complex, but it is a progress that is natural under the circumstance and does not show an evolution or progression. And when you look at the particular elements in it you find that in most cases they are quite obvious, and it is easy to see why it should be more fully given in one place than in another. When they say that a provision made here was abrogated there, you usually find there really was not a provision made at all. Although they claim that it says a person can sacrifice anywhere he wants to, or anywhere God appeared, it says nothing of the kind anywhere. It tells what kind of an altar to make, and also that God will come and bless them where He records His name. Incidentally, it does not say anywhere in the scripture that for all time there is one place where sacrifice may be done. Jerusalem is not mentioned in Deuteronomy as the place where sacrifice was to be made. Not at all. It says that God will designate a place out of their tribes which will be the place to which they are to come from all over to perform sacrifice. There is nothing in that contradictory to the idea that He might have it in one place and then later change it to another place, which is of course the way scripture represents it as having been done.

3) *The Evidence From History*

We are still dealing with this matter of development. For the argument from history, I gave you two references in which it is very clearly stated, one in Gray and one in Carpenter.

The argument from history has no relationship to most of the alleged evidences of development. As far as I know, there is no evidence from history that there were cities of refuge prior to the time of Josiah. Yet I do not think anyone advances that as proof they did not exist. Actually, we do not have enough historical material to show whether they existed or not before this time. The Old Testament is our only source for the history of ancient Israel; so the claim that the historical development corresponds to the progress of the documents is an argument which touches on the idea of development at very few points, yet on those few points that it touches rather sharply it is really the strongest argument of the critics. Yet it is an argument which,