

unity of Ezekiel. So the methods which were applied to all the other books of the OT were carried on to Ezekiel also, and it's interesting to see how the development is.

In 1907 in his commentary on Ezekiel, Redpath made the following statement: Scarcely any doubt has ever been cast even by the extreme critics upon the unity and authenticity of the book though a few glosses and interpretative words ~~xxx~~ or notes may have found their way into the text.

You note the attitude toward Ezekiel in 1907? "Scarcely any doubt by even the most extreme critic of the unity and authenticity of this book of Ezekiel." All the rest divided up into sections like is done with Genesis.

Then in 1914 Prof. Julcher(sp) whom Pfeiffer quotes in his Introduction to the OT -- Pfeiffer says in 1914 Julcher still maintains substantially the traditional view regarding the book of Ezekiel. But in 1924 Pfeiffer points out that Julcher ~~is~~ regarded by that time that 6/7 of Ezekiel (more than 6/7) as editorial supplement! 1103 vv. out of 1273 not actually coming from Ezekiel.

The same thing was done with Isaiah. It was proven to the satisfaction of the critics that a certain ch. did not belong to Isaiah, and another ch. Then it was said that chs. 40-66 did not belong to Isaiah. Then other sections from the early part of Isaiah.

Today the bulk of the critics would not give over 1/6th of Isaiah to the actual authorship of Isaiah, and divide the rest up into authors earlier and later until you have 40 different writers ~~would~~ who would have written the different sections of Isaiah! The process once begun goes on and on indefinitely. It is not a valid method of arriving at truth.

It is altogether conceivable that a book might have been written in exactly the way the critics say the Pentateuch was written. Altogether conceivable. But before one can say with any certainty that such a thing has occurred it is necessary to have proof of a far greater amount and far stronger in nature than the proof which we have for any kind of division in any book of the OT.

To say you can divide the OT up this way on the basis of evidence available to you establishes criteria which divide up every OT book into small sections written by many different writers and which could just as well divide up any other book that ever was written in exactly the same way. It is not to say that a book might not have conceivably been written at some time in exactly the way the critics say. It is to say that before you can have any certainty such a thing has ~~xxx~~ happened, you need proof of a different type than the proof that is alleged by them.