

Scientific Investigation of the O.T., R.D. Wilson

32 words in the Koran to express idea of "create" and "make" p. 162
 Are we to conjure up a dozen or more authors of the Koran to account for the variations in the vocabulary?

One great writer will use a larger vocabulary and more idioms than twenty men with small ~~auxiliary~~ knowledge and less language.

The Evidence: History p. 167

The Chronology p. 167-170

The Geography p. 170

O.T. was meant to be a book for the people and not for anti-
 quarians and scholars merely. The law was to be read to the
 people (Deut. 31.11) and explained to them (Neh. 8.8) Hence,
 . . . as the designation of certain places changed, the text of
 the Bible was often changed accordingly.

Two names given to the same country or city. p. 175

Mere presence of certain geographical terms of later origin
 than the rest of the documents is not conclusive proof that
 the mass of the documents is as late as the terms so used. It
 may be simply an evidence of editing for the sake of making the
 documents intelligible to the persons for whom they were designed.

Example: "prevent" changed to "anticipate," "go before," p. 177

The Historical Data

No reasonable grounds for doubting historic character of O.T.

1. Lang. in which the diff. documents are written corresponds with the claim of the documents as to the time & place in which they were written.
2. The names, order, time of reigning of the diff. kings of the countries mentioned in the O.T. harmonizes with what we find in the documents of Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, etc.
3. Lang., grammar, and literary forms are suitable to the respective ages in which the documents claim to have been written.
4. Civil, criminal, constitutional laws both in their general character and in their literary forms, are in agreement with the times and circumstances when they are said to have been enunciated, or in use.

Dissimilarity in religious vocabulary shows that the ceremonial laws of Israel cannot have been derived from the other Semites. Hebrew religion of unique origin and internal development p. 179

5. Meaning of terms unknown to translators argues against post-captivity date for Pentateuch portions p. 180
6. Undesigned coincidences support historicity of O.T.
 Mention of the horse. Failure to mention the elephant.
7. Appropriateness of the proper names of persons with the times in which they are said to have lived. . . . p. 181
8. Infrequent ~~xxx~~ references to the laws, (H & P) found in the books of Judges, Samuel, Kings does not impinge Mosaic date and historical character of the Pent.

The testimony of a Bible writer cannot be overthrown by the opinion of anyone now living. p. 190