

places that were scattered throughout the land. This had a place in his activity, but it was a comparatively small place and by no means its main feature. It is not stressed as a main feature in that chapter.

We shall look at Driver's *Commentary on Deuteronomy*. Here is what he says about chapter 27. He says that in this chapter the discourse of Moses is interrupted. He says that it is hardly possible that the chapter can form a part of the book of Deuteronomy. He says that it must be from some other source. Now that is purely imaginary. It does not fit with the theory, so take it out. But there is no evidence for taking it out! There is no reason why it should be taken out except that it does not fit their theory. As it stands the book of Deuteronomy has chapter 27 at this place where it fits very logically with the progress of the book! Moses is stressing the fact that the people should obey the law of God, and orders a procedure, as soon as they get into the land, to stress the law in the minds of the people as soon as they begin their conquest. He says they are to do it at Mr. Ebal, a good place in the center of Palestine, to which they would come in the beginning of the conquest, and he says they are to offer sacrifices there!

Addis prints the D document separately. In the book of Deuteronomy he changes his type quite frequently. He says that the additions by later writings of the Deuteronomistic school are to be printed in italics, and puts most of chapter 27 in italic type. When he comes to verses 5-7, which say that they are to build this altar and sacrifice peace-offerings there, he puts an E around it, because, according to their theory, the E document allows sacrifice anywhere that the Lord would establish His name. Therefore, he says, this passage must come from the E document. But see how unreasonable it is to make such a claim here. The critics claim that the primary purpose of the book of Deuteronomy was to do away with all the altars throughout the land and substitute centralized worship in one place. Yet they say that the writer, or some later scribe, wrote a section that contradicts that purpose. Was it interpolated by someone who disagreed with the writer of the book? When did the man live? How could such an interpolation get into the D document? It could hardly have been put there by one of the J or E writers who, according to the