

Now it is largely given up in these other books, and the conservative wall is broken down, and people are accepting the Bible on which it is built and maintained. It is very solidly maintained

You will hardly find a liberal scholar anywhere who will even consider it as questionable whether these matters are true--whether we do have these styles and divisions within the Pentateuch.

We've been on D. The Consideration of the Argument from Different Style and Viewpoint.

E. Conclusion regarding Argument for Partition. There are a number of points here I want to make most of which I've looked at, but I want to put them in systematic form.

1. It is important that we keep in mind that we have no solid basis upon which to make a partition. There is no historical evidence of the existence of separate books, or various writers who wrote large sections of the Pentateuch. There is no historical evidence of these books at any time. Nor is there any historical evidence of particular separate writers who would have entered into it.

We have the story of Moses. It has been held by the Jews and by the Christians that Moses wrote the Pentateuch practically as it stands today. The idea that there are all these schools of writers is purely imaginary. There is no historical evidence or trace of any reference to it, anywhere in any ancient document.

2. Similar methods could divide almost any book into diverse documents. You could take almost any book that was ever written and by the application of exactly the same principles, you could divide it up into 4 or 5 different sources which you would assume have been put together in this way. I don't believe there was ever a book to which this could not be done just as well ~~with~~ with this one exception that within the Pentateuch we have the custom of a greater number of a certain type of repetition than you have in most modern writings though I do not ~~have~~ think any greater than you have in any modern oriental books.

This also, that you do have this feature which is rather foreign to us in America today of giving the relationship of names to a place and showing something of the fitness of a particular name in relation to something that has occurred in that place. A certain frame of mind. It is nowhere stated that God gave the names for these reasons, or anything like that. It is simply the observation of the writer and people were interested in observing the fitness of names, in those days. We do not have that particular approach. We are apt to think of these as rather the giving of the names rather than an observation of their fitness. I noticed two or three times something is alleged about Bethel Mahanaim and these other places.