

2. Alleged historical discrepancies refuted

- Orr, 278 a. Method of appointing judges referred to in this "discrepancy" is allowed by Driver as "not absolutely incompatible" with Mosaic authorship. Driver, ICC, xxxvii
- Orr, 278 c. Is only the hyper-acute sense of a critic that can see in the words "for your sakes," which evidently refer to the provocation of the people that occasioned the offence of Moses . . . , a "contradiction" of the statement that he, with Aaron, personally sinned at Meribah; while the assertion that the incident is "plainly fixed" in Deut. 1.37 in the second year of the Exodus is a "plain" misreading of the text.
- Orr, 279 b. To make out these discrepancies alleged by the critics, the narrative has first of all to be torn to shreds. (Orr, 356) Only in this way can the way be cleared for declaring that JE knows nothing of such a searching of the whole land. The allegation that JE knows nothing of Joshua breaks down upon examination.

Orr, 162f. f. Ark of the Covenant. Takes some ingenuity to discover wherein the ark of the cov. differs, in structure, character, and uses, from the ark of the law in Exodus. In all the cases in the older history the words "of the covenant" are simply struck out by the critics.(Orr,162)

3. Incidental Expressions

- Orr, 282 a. "Other side Jordan" used of both the Eastern & Western side of the Jordan. See Num. 32.19 - use of phrase in both senses in single verse Generally a descriptive phrase is attached to show which side is meant...
- b. "Unto this day, at that time"