

This course which we are beginning is called The Introduction to the Pentateuch. We will begin with consideration of what the Pent. is.

I. The Pentateuch in general: It comes from the word meaning five-fold. It originally is the five-section book. This word does not occur in the Bible at all ~~which~~ neither are the books referred to as Gen, Ex. Lev., Num. or Deut. Those names are never used later on any more than the name Pent. is used. However they are often referred to throughout Scripture but they are referred to as a unit. The name Pentateuch is a better name than these other five name, because the Scripture very frequently, though it refers to this section of the Bible, it always is referred to as the Law of Moses, or the book of Moses, or the book of the law of Moses or many such terms. I looked up the word Pentateuch in Hastings Bible Ency. last night and I found that they had nothing under that but put down, "See Hexateuch". In most Bible Dictionaries published in recent years, even as recent as forty years ago, you will find that the word Pentateuch is not used but the word Hexateuch is used. It doesn't mean that they think that this portion of the Bible should be divided into six parts instead of five but they think of the first six books making a section--that is why they call it the Hex. There are still other books which prefer not to use the word Hexateuch but rather Oxeteuch. They taken the first section of the Bible and they not only take what we think of as the Pentateuch but also add Joshua, Judges and Ruth. It is always the first six or the first eight. Neither of these terms have any tradition back of the past hundred years but in very early Rabbinic writings we find references to the five _____ of the law, showing that the thought of the five parts is an early division. In all these references to the law of Moses, or some such term, we find the reference always between Genesis and Deuteronomy so there seems to be an apparent attitude in the Scriptures, and in the early writings, that this section is in mind and in all writings after the Scriptures in early times there are references to the five-fold division of the Law of Moses. We have absolutely no way to know how it came into being put into five sections. The fact that the Rabbi's said something about the five books of the law, proves nothing as to how Moses wrote it..It simply shows us that they noticed the five sections. The Jews had not dealing with the Samaritans, it would hardly be likely that they would have divided their Pent. into five sections just because the Jews--it would thus suggest to us that this five section idea was received as far back as when they received the Pent. There are those who think they received it at the return from exile, but at least it would not be much later than this time and I would suggest that around 400 B.C. perhaps they received the Pent.

Are these divisions logical. Some would say yes, but I rather doubt it. Certainly the of Deut. is a book and section by itself and is a series of orations which Moses gave at end of his life. It would be the most natural thing to make a division at that point. If one were to make another division though I would think that it would be in the middle of the book of Exodus because the first half of this book is almost entirely history. But from the middle of Ex. on it is mostly laws and ordinances with a few brief sections of history. That is the major of the division of the Pentateuch. From Gen. 1:1 to about the middle of Ex. you have that which led up to the giving of the law-- the making of the universe and the cutting out of a people for himself and putting them into a position where He was ready to give His law unto them. From Ex. 20 on we have the Law which is the foundation of that nation. The Old and New Testaments both speak of the books of Moses as the Law and we might call this first part the Preamble--about 70 chapters. That of course is not the place where our division and the way that our divisions are made it would seem that for the sake of not having too long a scroll you have all of this on one scroll. It might be difficult to make a scroll that long. Maybe at that time it was not possible to make that long a scroll but even it were possible, it certainly would not be convenient to have one that long. As you know up to the first part of the 4th century A.D. all writing was in the form of a scroll and in a scroll that winds from one stick to the opposite stick you have the disadvantage of trying to find the place. There is the great advantage in this sound-scriber over the tape-recorder or over a wire recorder, and of course there are advantages which the others have over the sound scriber but for the things that I am interested in, even though the sound scriber does not have nearly the fidelity of getting your voice like the tape or wire recorder, has at the same time a tremendous advantage and I can take one of these little recorders and say this is on this and this is on this and I can put three hundred of them in a pile and in an instant I can find almost anything you want just as you can open your Bible and find the reference. If you want to find a point on a wire-recorder you have to play the thing over and over and eventually you may find it. Now that is a pretty good illustration of what these scrolls were like. And when you would come across a long scroll with the Pent. in it and you would unwind and unwind--this would be so unwieldy that even if it would be made as big as that there would be no point to it. Also notice that the five books of Moses are about the same length more or less. You have thus five rolls of very convenient length. We have rather

natural divisions between them even though there is more a division between Ex. 19 and Ex. 20 than there is between Ex. and Gen. yet Ex. begins with Israel as a nation and before that Israel is a family. You might say that Gen. is an account of Israel as a family and Ex. begins the first events of Israel as a nation and from there on it takes Israel up as a nation. There is a break but not one that appears at first sight because the history goes right straight on and there appears no larger break there than appears at many point elsewhere throughout the Bible. Leviticus seems to be unit, but I question whether there is so much a unit between what precedes and what follows. Ex. ends with description of the making of the tabernacle and the setting apart of Aaron and his sons to be priest and in Lev. is the telling of them in office and it is pretty hard to distinguish the divisions, and so it all seems like convenient divisions into these five books and historically, traditionally and comparing all the references, it all refers to it as one book--the Book of the Law of Moses, The Torah--the book of the Instruction as to what God wanted the people to know. The word Pent. is not found and doesn't describe what it is but tells us nothing about it.

b. The Names of the Five Books: Now our names which we have in the English comes from the Greek but you will notice in your Heb. Bibles that at the top of each page you have it in Latin. so all can read it.

2. Now the Latin names are taken over almost letter for letter from the Greek, so sometimes it is a translation and sometimes simply a transcription of the Greek. The names of these five books are either taken over directly from the Greek into the Latin or they are translation. The first of them in the Heb. is called Bereshith --in ~~the~~ beginning. Now the Greek name which we have is Genesis--beginning. Now you notice that the very first word of the book is used as the name of the book. The Greek name is a discription--The Heb. name merely takes the first name of the book. You may wonder why the distinction. Now tell us what the name of the second book is--Exodus is a good descriptive name of the first half of the book of Exodus and of course the Latin takes the same. The Heb. name is --And these are names or these are names but what does that have to do with Exodus? In Ex. you have the first two Heb. words given of the book and that in a way would seem a better ending to the book of Genesis than a beginning of the book of Exodus but we have given it a descriptive name. of the first half of the book. It tells us nothing about the building of the tabernacle. Then how about your third book? The Greek name is Leviticus but what does it mean?

Levi was one of the sons of Jacob and his sons were the Levites. Just like we have ecclesiastical legislation which is legislation for the church and political legislation is that for the ~~church~~ for the state and then we have Levitical legislation, which is for the Levites. Do the Hebrews then call this their priestly book. Note the Hebrew name. It means "and he cried or called"--That is the phrase with which the book begins. Now let us for a moment skip the next book and go on to the last. The last book has a Greek name called Deuteronomy. What does this mean in Greek? It means the second presentation of the law. That is a very good name--these is a series of orations in which the man Moses urged the people to obey the law. The Hebrew name--davar is used. "These are the words" which are a good descriptive term, but the reason that it is used is because the book begins with that word. Now that leaves the 4th book, in mind keeping what they have called the first three books and that last book, you can immediately tell what you would expect the name of this book to be and it sometimes has that name but not usually.

Pent. # 3.

It means your first book is in the beginning, your second of these is ^{"these are the names"} the third is [^] "an he called" and the fourth "and he spoke". You look in your Hebrew Bible --I wish that you would bring both kinds of Bibles in the future so you can refer to them as we discuss them in class. You look in your _____ and the Lord spoke unto Moses. The Hebrew in this case may be a better description than the Greek so to call the book Numbers is about as sensible as calling the U.S. Maine to Calif.--you have only the two ends mentioned. You have a census at the beginning and at the end of the book, but it has nothing to do with what goes in between, but this book describes the events that took place in the wilderness. If we called this book, the wilderness wanderings it could give us a much better idea of what the book was about--it tells about 38 years of wilderness experience and tells about the first conquests of the land of Palestine--it describes some of the conquest that is beyond the Jordan river so the Hebrew name is much better than what we have. We have the names of these five books, but the last one is the only one which forms a unit by itself. Exodus, the last part of it and Leviticus would form a good unified section but Deut. is quite different from the rest of the books. If you read through the book of Deut. hastily not trying to get the details and then read through the rest of the Pent. hastily, or if you would open up and read at random a few verses and then a few verses in the rest of the Pent. you would know at once which was Deut. but does that suggest to you that a different man wrote Deut. What does this suggest?

Deut. is the book of orations that Moses. It is put in a different light--not just telling of incidents or describing things or simply laying out details of legislation. It is distinct in itself. Ill. here of ships and the repair or something on them. A book published by a prof. at the Un. of Chicago which is a help --it is "The Modern Reader's Guide" --no critical theory and it has a help. It is a book which takes up the Bible from a literary view point and I have found it very useful. In this book there is material about the readings of the orations of Moses. I think we miss much of it in the value of literature and oration. C is the place of the Pentateuch in the Bible. The purpose of Moses here is primarily law --showing the origin of God's view, the origin of sin, the plan of redemption. Number 2 -- a ceremony of the conquest. We are shown a history of the Bible and its credibility --the creation of the world, etc. The patriarch of history of Israel when it was too small to be a nation. We read of Abraham first mentioned and then his burial in ch. 28 and then about Isaac and his son Jacob was born in the very chapter in which Abraham died so the book could be divided quite nicely. Practically nothing original. These are only phrases from the record as so much of it is indistinct.)

4 --The story proper begins at ch. 37--his birth begins long before that but we begin to read about Joseph at ch. 37--his death is described in the chapter that his birth is. Of course you are all familiar with the story of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and Joseph and you can never cease to get value from these stories. Value for your spiritual life, value for your understanding, value for illustrations and values for proof of how God blesses His own. We could spend years on them and never exhaust them. This is the third and last section of the Historical part of Pentateuch and a section which is predominantly and this section runs from v. 1 thru ch. 19 thru v. 2 and it is a question if it shifts back to verse 1. It is rather hard to decide the parts. This part. This deliverance is divided into three parts --this chs. 1-4. The people are under this terrific oppression and then he is taken out to the wilderness--there he was called and here is one who was so willing to thrust himself in delivering the people when he was not near ready. Now that he is thoroughly trained he is practically has to be forced into the work. It is very similar to many who are training for the Lord's work. There are those who are trained at all that have a great zeal and then those who have had a good training but then they lose their zeal and then they don't feel adequately prepared for the task. I remember when I was first in Germany and knew only a few words of German and I would come up to anyone on the street and I would tell them all sorts of things and telling them all I knew--the German must have sounded

terrible but then the time came when I knew enough German, that instead of one word for one thing I knew six, and I couldn't make up my mind which was the best to use, and I used to wonder what the exact grammatical form was and I found myself speaking more haltingly and hesitantly and I had been in German two years by this time but there was this other person who knew about one-fifth of as much German as I did but he would just go ahead with it. This was the way with Moses. After years of preparation he was then afraid to go into the Lord's service though before he was prepared at all he was willing to thrust himself forward and kill one of the Egyptians and Moses now says that he can't do it and Aaron was consequently sent to be his spokesman but most of the time you find Moses doing his own speaking and of all the time Moses was far better equipped than Aaron ever was. When you are really ready to do something it is so easy for others to do instead of doing that for which you have been trained. But God had to supply Aaron here to sort of tie over the gap to give him a little confidence--when you are really ready to do something it is very easy to lose that enthusiasm and confidence and go forward/ This is taken up in ch. 1-4 and # 2:--5:1-12:36.

I would like you to take a paper and put down the various title of God as found in the book and put down the references therewith. That is the assignment for next time--that is in the book of Genesis. He might be called Lord God Almighty at one place then Lord of hosts--just go along in the book and write down where these names occur and all these terms used for God at top and underneath put down the references in their order. Do it fairly carefully and start at the beginning of Genesis and go as far as you can. We have been looking at the survey of the Pentateuch and under that we were looking at the end of the hour we saw under # 1 --C--the deliverance from Egypt under which is # 1 Preparation for deliverance. 1:1-4. # 2 is The Contest with Paroah--5:1-12:36. This section except for 28 verses is devoted entirely to the contest between Moses and Paroah though it really was contest with God and Paroah, to determine whether he would release the children of Israel and if not to what extent God would have to go to release them--to what extent God should show His great power. These chapters are rich in spiritual lessons and vital for their help in understanding spiritual doctrines.

3. The Journey to Sinai. These 28 verses that I mentioned under # 2 it is well to have in mind. They are verses 12:1-28 and though not dealing directly with Pharaoh they are directly related to it and have to do with establishment of the first great Passover and what was done at the ordinance and how the precise rules were given to carry it out and you immediately say that is law and not history. That is a regulation what Israel should do thereafter and the law begins in ch. 19 and from thereon to the end of the book--Here is law and an extremely place of law which we come right in the midst of our history. This reminds us something that is something often overlooked. It would show us that there are often parts of the Bible that don't have sharp distinction and it would often be impossible for you to show exactly where the ocean comes to an end and the land begins--to draw a hairline and it is useful for human thought to make divisions for human thought but it is rarely that one can be too sure about these divisions in either.

Pent. # 5

Exactly where the animal world ends and the vegetable begins, it is hard to say. The history of this is definite and the law is given in history and there are important historical accounts given. The account of the Passover really belongs in the Pentateuch and in a real way is not part of the contest of Pharaoh although it ends with Ch. 12, 36 and number 3, the journeys of Sinai begin and ch. 14 is something that occurs on the way to Sinai and ~~of-how-Pharaoh-freed~~ yet is the concluding chapter in the contest with Pharaoh. 14 is the crossing of the Red Sea and the end of Pharaoh and his attempt to defeat the Israelites. Number 3 is like unto no. 2 and is interesting and vital from the standpoint of spiritual truths. You will profit much from reading and rereading these chapters. Although it is not as long ~~or~~ as the preceding part, it is not read or studied one tenth as much. Some of the sections after this are used in Sunday School lessons, etc but the great bulk of the material from the ch. 19 is highly and of course that is a very definite mistake and the whole Bible is for our edification

and if you ignore any section of it you are missing some of the blessing God has for you. Our course is not a study of the contents of the Pent. but an introduction to the Pent. and we will not spend much time on this succeeding section. I have entitled Section D as the establishment of the Covenant. I wonder how many of you in reading this section singled this part out as a section, as a separate section. It is just as much a section as the Journey to Sinai or the contest with Pharaoh. The Establishment of the Covenant beginning with ch. 19, v.3 as to the arrival at Sinai and including six chapters. For the view point of God's relationship to Israel these six chapters comprise one of the most important sections. It is unfortunate in our Christian world that so few realize this fact. There is a section well known in the Christian world--that of the Ten Commandments. However, they in themselves are not an isolated fact. Up to this point we have had the history of God's creation and then of God's calling out of Israel from Egypt and then the establishment of God's Covenant with Israel is in these chapters. We'll subdivide these chapters then into divisions of which no. 1 will be preparation for the Covenant ch. 19 v. 3-25. It was not a covenant of salvation but the purpose is in v. 5 and this is the way that Israel is to become a Holy nation and a peculiar treasure above all people. It is a way not of salvation but of sanctification--it is the way Israel is to be set apart as an instrument for bringing His Word into the world and also for bringing His Son into the world and so the Covenant is very important. He makes a covenant and shows them how they are to be a holy people. God redeems us not for anything that we have done but when He has redeemed us then we are anxious to do what He wants us to do and to carry out His law and to follow the path He has for us. No. 2 is the Ten Words--which we call the Ten Commandments ch. 20, v. 1-13. They are the expression of God's will for any who are His people and for any time. No. 3 is the Ordinances. Many times we stop with the Ten Words --we teach them, etc, but we should not stop there. This section covers from ch. 20, v. 18-ch. 22, v. 33. The Ordinances follow the Ten Words it is like the Constitution and the By-laws

and the constitution give the fixed principals and it is quite difficult to change the constitution but the by-laws can easily be changed and they are the application of the principals of the constitution. I divided the material of the 2½ chapters of the ordinances into five divisions. Small a we will recall regarding idolatry and that isn't a large term but in a way more like a preamble--v. 18-23--it tells a little of the situation and then it begins with the reaffirmation of the fact that people are not to worship idols. Small b then is the law of the altar--ch. 20, 24-26. These people are God's people and they are not to make false gods. How will they worship Him? There are no priests as yet, no tabernacle and God is deciding to make a covenant together. It is just with a group of people. They are not bound in one place but they are to travel to the wilderness but at the present the altar is to be made in the different places where they are. This is a very important part of the ordinances but you can see why it is not a part of the constitution and then when there is a tabernacle built he will establish a more definite rule.

Pent. #6

civil

They continue their worship of God. The next section is ~~city~~ laws--ch. 21 to 23:9. It is important that the people have the civil law. Thus we have laws regarding slavery, marriage, fighting, restitution of that which is injured and then civil. Section D shows of certain special times for worship--23:10-19. We have the sabbaths and feasts in this section but now we have the most elementary things stated about details of the sabbath. We then have the covenant promises 20:20-33--a declaration of the blessing that He is going to bring to the people who are in the covenant relationship with him.

3--The Ordinances

4--The Ratification of the Covenant--ch. 24. It is too bad that these books weren't divided separately and put into separate rolls--it is a separate between what precedes and what follows and is quite distinct. Moses, Aaron, and two sons of Aaron with the 70 elders of Israel come before God and a ceremony is performed as we read in ch. 24.--the book of the Covenant is

read before the people--there is a ratification of the covenant and Moses and his servant go up into the mount and so we have these very important sections and for a complete understanding of the Bible, the Pentateuch etc. it is important that we get this right in our mind--this section is very vital to keep in mind. After having established the covenant, the next thing to be done after the rudiments have been laid down naturally is a system of worship.

E. The Establishment of a System of Worship--Ex. 25- Lev. 10. This is a section which belongs together. There is no break between Ex. and Lev. and this should have been on the one roll and of course we have no more warrant for divisions of the various books of the Pentateuch than we have for the divisions of the Bible into chapters. It would be a much better division, if we had the whole system of worship in one book. The rest of Lev. is closely allied to it. We shall divide this into six heads.

1. Moses is directed to build a sanctuary and consecrate priests. Ex. 25-31.

a. Directions for building a sanctuary -Ex. 25-27. Why do I say a sanctuary instead of a tabernacle. Tabernacle means--unfortunately it is an old English word which doesn't mean much to anyone today. There are six Heb. words that are translated Tabernacle--ohel--a dwelling place. It is used to mean tent more often than it is used to mean tabernacle. There is another word which is translated tabernacle 119 times--tabernacle is not a translation of any one Heb. word and it is pretty hard to tell from this what the Bible means by tabernacle. It would be much better if we used tabernacle for just one of these words and saw just how it is used. You will find one chapter where the same word is translated always tabernacle and the same word in another chapter and it is always translated tent--25-27 He told them how to build the tabernacle and in 31 He tells them how to set it up--explain 33:7. You have verbal contradictions in practically every book that ever was written. Here is a definite contradiction in the English Bible --this tent which was his tent for meeting with the people--instead of the tabernacle of the congregation it should be the tent of meeting. It is entirely distinct from what is later known as the tabernacle. #7 If you understand congregation as a coming together of people and not a tent it is all right but it is vague. We have this word translated tabernacle which simply means a dwelling place. God tells Moses how to ~~build~~ build a dwelling place--a tent that is to be used for the place God's Name will have habitation--if mishka is the word we use for tabernacle then we should not confuse this with the other Heb. word, ohel and call it also tabernacle. Sometimes in the A.V. it will be translated tabernacle in one verse and the next verse it will be translated tent. The A.V. is a wonderful translation but sometimes it is very confusing--sometimes tabernacle means simply pavilion and yet put down as meaning tabernacle. (ms)

Some parts of the Pentateuch are very familiar to you and some parts are not. Yesterday we dealt with an extremely important section --the establishment of the Covenant which I am here calling section D is of Exodus 19-24 and it has an unique position in the law. It is the very beginning of the systematic presentation of the law and separated from all that follows. One section deals with that and then you go on to another and this is the first presentation of the Law to the people stressing those things which were most vital and of those things which it was necessary that they should immediately become aware. You can't have everything was in there because it is immediately necessary and you can't say it has all the important things and the two factors enter into it. The first covenant with the people of Sinai stressing those things that it was vital they should know right then and it is the great principal of the Law. ² Begins with the Ten Commandments and then the Ordinances as we know them. Then the ratification of the Covenant in ch. 24 and then after establishing the Covenant the next natural step is the establishment of a system of worship. We have brief directions for worship in the Presentation of the Covenant and then the system of worship of the Israelites with their God and consequently this Section E has its part as no. 1--Moses directed to build a Sanctuary and consecrate priests. The directions for building a Sanctuary in ch. 25-27 and then the later section which tell how it is built and almost identical to these chapters and they give minute details. God had this Tabernacle built to impress upon the minds of the people certain great truths when they saw this building and we have all of these truths explained to us more clearly elsewhere in the Bible and in the NT and thus it is best to get your teaching from the clearest portion of the teaching. It is useful for us to see how these teachings were suggestive to the minds of the Israelites. Some of the meanings of the various parts are made clear but some are not. We have to study in order to see what is clear and what needs extra study. The building of the tabernacle is not just to have a building but to suggest certain truths and these truths were doubtless explained to them by the priests and by Moses and part of the explanation is in the OT and part comes out from the Book of Hebrews and we find the meaning of most of it in Christ and His work for us--the work which was equally done for them. I commend to you the study of the details of the Tab. and their meaning. We will not have time to go into them here. B is the direction for consecration of priests--28-29 and all of these are partly for the purpose of expressing the Will of God and impressing on them that they are to be holy to the Lord and they were to dress and behave in

a manner that would be of an example to the people and show the importance of the relationship to God which the priest typifies. Much in their manners and actions were to be representative of the truths they were to teach. The religious meaning of the direct consecration of the priests is a bit more difficult than the meaning of the Tabernacle and there are the three factors that enter into it. Very typical of God's truths of salvation as He wished to put them upon the people. C is of further details of worship --the incense alter is described and other small things that were not built into the tabernacle yet were put into the Tabernacle to be used there. Matters were given on the use of these things in regard to the cleanliness of the priests and so on. D is the designation of men to direct the construction. It was designated to Moses who was to have the leadership of the construction and who the men were to take charge in the building of the Tabernacle. God said that He had given special leaders and He said that He had given as a leader The Holy Spirit to make Moses adequate for the doing of this work. God trains men to do His tasks and God trained these men for this purpose. In connection with this direction about the building of the Tabernacle and all of that, it is interesting that God would insert right here in His directions to Moses six verses of stress on the Sabbath Law because the Sabbath was a law that stressed the people's relationship to God and no matter where they were on this day they were to keep this day and it did stress very definitely the relationship to God. God has a plan and purpose in all of history and in all of His work and this the Sabbath Law stressed repeatedly through the Pentateuch. It was stressed earlier than their going through the wilderness and it was stressed much in connection with the Law and it was means of which the Law was expressed much. It was one way that the people could remember the Law and not become indifferent. They were impressed in this way the great importance of showing forth His righteousness.

Pentateuch #8

Number 3 is the Tabernacle built and its worship established --6 chapters of the building of the Tabernacle and these chapters begin with that which these first end. After it was told to Moses how the Tabernacle should be built, He then says, "Remember the Sabbath Day" and then when Moses tells the people/^{and} the priests have been told their duties, God then says "Remember the Sabbath Day" and it comes at the end of the directions for the making of the Tabernacle. So the section begins with that which number 1 ends. After that in general it follows the course of number one. Number one is repeated in no. 3 and in fact it is practically

repeated word for word except that it will be in a different tense. It is do this, do that, do the other thing and they said they build the forces in that way. The Lord stresses the carrying out of the exact details by repeating all of this over again and by telling how He wanted it done. Here we have history coming into view and we are reminded that God did not lay down whole complete and final system for us. He dealt with the people, lead them along and gave them what they needed next. It is very wise if we take advantage of the Law and the purpose for which it is given. Ill. of Seminaries and not needing four months to recuperate. Drs. not recognized until they have had time of practice. The real purpose of the Seminary's vacation is for the purpose of students doing practical work. If a person does that in his first year he is apt to get far more from his second year of work than he might otherwise receive. If he gets internship between his 2nd and 3rd year it helps his 3rd year to be even better. God gives instruction and then He gives them the change to digest it and to work it out in practical experiences. We thus have law given and then the reaction of the people. It is done this way in order that the people may take it and understand it and know the why of it. It would be good for ministers and missionaries to realize that they should give only the truths when the people can grasp them and not try to give too much all at once. We have no. 2 for interruption and 1 is of practical application. The covenant was given to Moses in the mountain and while there it was broken so no. 2, the interruption, can be divided into 3 parts. Small a is the incident of the golden calf--the people turn away from God. Small b is Moses's intercession 32:30-33:23. It is not absolutely certain where to make the break between incident and the intercession because the two are closely tied together and the part of the intercession comes early and is really a part of the incident. It is all really a part of the break at that point. Much space is devoted to Moses's intercession for the people. I would advise a careful study for you of this section as a unit. There are certain parts here that are repeated much in Sunday Schools and then other parts that are never mentioned. The section is a unit and ch. 32 and 33 in this we have the people's hypocrisy and God's dealing with Moses and we have great spiritual lessons here. To take it as a unit and to see the relation of each part to the other cannot help but bring a blessing but we don't have much time in just the semester but I do want to stress to you the importance and may be mention one feature of it, ~~where-we-fi~~ When Moses was doing the interceding for the people and doing so much to bring the people back to God then it is necessary that Moses Himself be strengthened in His own spiritual life. He

is given a special revelation of God at this time in order that He may be strengthened and that is very vital as when you're dealing with others you yourself need new wells of spiritual strength to enable you to do what you are doing. It would be well when you see someone in a situation like that to pray for him. Many criticize because there are some features they don't like or else they will praise him as though he has no faults. We see no need of Moses's at this special time but God's. This special nearness was given to refresh him in this time. Another thing to notice briefly here is how God said he would cast the people aside and make a great nation of Moses but Moses plead for the people and God said He would send the people up there to the promised land but He would not go with them. How Moses plead! He knew of their great need. Through all of this God is testing Moses and strengthening Him so He will be able to meet the needs of the people. Yesterday I asked you to explain how Moses took the tent of the meeting and put it up outside of the camp and the reason is clear as to how he wanted to show God's displeasure on the people. He showed their hypocrisy by taking the tent out of the camp and making the people to come outside. This tent was out there and Joshua was out there doing the jobs and it was the administrative headquarters which He put out there and it had nothing whatever to do with the tabernacle but yet the ~~king-took-the-Taber--the King~~ ^{tabernacle} James version says that Moses took the ~~tent~~ and pitched it outside of the camp. It is extremely confusing. If tent is the word for tabernacle, why don't they use it always, etc. It is confusing. If tabernacle is used for dwelling place, then it should not be used for this tent, etc. King James version, in the translation introduced endless confusion and it is hard to understand this passage here. Small c is the renewal of the Covenant -- it has been broken and it now is necessary to renew the Covenant. V. 1-35 is devoted to the renewal. The covenant was made and established once and then the people turn away from it so it is necessary to devote the chapter here to the renewal of it.

We must be constantly renewing our relationship to God. We must reconsecrate ourselves every day to the Lord if our consecration amounts to anything. The acts you did years ago do absolutely no good today without a constant reconsecration today. Some think that they can give their lives and stop there without realizing that they must continually keep on. It is then easy to find greed and selfishness among Christian workers. God intends us to have true consecration. Pray that He will not allow you to slip into this condition. Pray that He will keep us --you from slipping away from Him so that outwardly you appear to be most sincere but inwardly you are looking out for just your own pleasure instead of actually seeking in the will of God in every aspect of your life. No. 3 is the tabernacle built and its worship established and it begins with that with which no. 1 ends and part of it is repeated. Ch. 40 tells of the setting up of the tabernacle. Of course they couldn't move it outside the camp until it was set ^{up} ~~out~~. No. 4-- the law of offering. It is rather unfortunate that there should be an interruption by the ending of Exodus and the beginning of Leviticus. The roll happened to come to an end at this point so they started a new roll but this is logically what comes immediately after the setting of the tabernacle. The law of the offering within the Tabernacle--ch. 1-7. They all typify Christ in His sacrifice and it is interesting and valuable to understand the great values of these offerings--they don't all typify Christ but they typify certain aspects of Him and taken all together they give a wonderful picture of the work of Christ to those who are looking to the law of offerings. No. 5 is the consecration of Aaron and his sons--Lev. 8-9. If the law of offerings had not been inserted here we might have considered 5 as part of no. 3. No. 6 is another interruption. Sin among the people. The people have turned away. Sin breaks out among the priests who have been set up by God to show how people are to come to Him. When the covenant was established originally Moses had gone with three other men to appear before God for the (formal-gation) of the covenant along with the 70 elders. The other two men sin against God that they have to be cut off and we see what a terrible thing that two men who were important in the helping of the establishing of the covenant had to be cut off for their sin. When we think we stand then is the time to take heed lest we fall. That is what happened here. One is saved he is saved for eternity but it may be as by fire if he turn away. Satan is the the god of this world and that we must remember that he creeps in to the very center of God's work if he possibly can. If you look for a perfect place here on this earth, you're going to be disillusioned all of your life. In every human group, in every human organization sin has crept

in. Sin often comes in to individual leaders and also the attitudes of the group. Aaron's two eldest sons who were chosen to go up and now they turn against God and they go in and do the sacrifice as they want instead of how God wants it done. Perhaps we should stop here and mention that there is a difference here between OT service and NT service to God. The difference is not that we have a different way of salvation in any detail but that the events have occurred and now we can look back to them and thus it is far easier for us to understand God's truths than it was for the people in the OT days. They looked forward through a glass darkly and they looked forward with signs, sacrifices and with indications but it was difficult for them to understand it and it was necessary for them to have the forms carried out just so in order that the representation be given exactly. In God's stage of dealing with the people He told them He wanted it done just a certain way and it was vital that they do it that way. When He tells of a certain way He wants a thing done then of course He means that is the way it is to be done. After Christ came and the things were performed to which they looked forward typically we now do not need these sacrifices and the signs of the tabernacles and all of that as pictures to impress upon our minds that with which our salvation lies. We don't need that. We can read the Gospels, the Epistles and we can get the teaching more clearly and more fully and there is thus a remarkable difference between the Old and the New Testaments. In the Old there is detail after detail of ceremonial law and exactly how all is to be done. In the New we are not told how we are to preach, how our church service to start, end, etc. If God had wanted the details He could have indicated it so clearly in the New Testament too. We can get the truth in a clearer way in the New than they were able to get it--now we impress it on the minds of people in every kind of way. We can work out our own methods of doing it. There is no set method although sometimes we find ones who think that they have the only right way of doing it. All different methods are ways we can adapt to different types of people or to the particular situations because God has not given us full detailed instructions. If we turn away from His teachings however we are in exactly the same position as Aaron's two sons who turned away from the law. I have called the system of worship from Ex. 25 to Lev. 10 and right here is the Law for holiness of people and priests.

Pentateuch #10

Simply know the general contents of the section--I'll not expect you to know the exact details. Foo-11, Holiness, Child birth-12, Leprosy 13-14 and other purifications in ch. 15 and then the ch. that stands out by itself in the midst of the directions is 16 and that is one ch. you ought to remember. 16 of Lev. is the great day of atonement --not one of the originals but an addition to it. Rules for purity-17,-20; holiness of priests and offerings 21-22; convocations 23; shew bread and oil 24:1-9 and then the interruption --the incident of the and his punishment 24:10-23 and it is extremely unfortunate that that and the section before's could be combined in one ch. They are two such distinct things that they should be two chapters. If some of you get the idea that I don't think the ch. divisions are inspired, it is a very good idea. The Sabbatical yr. and Jubilee in ch. 25; exhortation to obey God's law and then in 27 there is the law of vows and devoted things. It is a rather common feature in the outline of the books. G is entitled from Sinai to the plains of Moab and The first part of Numbers is preparation for departure and it is dealing with the wilderness journey and it is not a part of the laws for permanent relation for Israel to God. Numbers is an extremely unfortunate name for the book as it begins with some numbers and ends with some numbers but there are no numbers in between the beginning and the end. It begins with preparing for the wilderness journey and so on explaining all the details of it and then they describe their journey from there up to Kadish Barnea and it is a journey that did not take very long. God tells them to go up on the land and He will go with them and they refuse and God tells them they are to stay in the wilderness until that generation is gone and a new generation is raised up. God tells them it is too late to try to go now and God tells them their chance is gone now. What a lost opportunity this was for them as God had told them to go forward. When God tells you today something that is His will for you, that doesn't mean it is for tomorrow. Ill. of student who started for church in Canada and he got nervous and came back, took job and later into church and he was dominant, etc. He had the idea that he was to go back to Canada. When the Lord gives you an opportunity it is for the present time and not for some other time. Don't expect that God is going to take you back to some other place. Confess to God and make your restitution to Him and God will have a place for you from where you are and not from where you were. Ques. of grapes that the spies brought out. Not sure of the size of them.

Ch. 33 we have repeat of the journeys all the way from Egypt up to the plains of Moab and we have regards to their entrance into the land and how they were to divide it. We have no time

to go into the details of the book but only the headlines of it. I commend the book of Numbers to you to deserve much more study by Christians than it has. The moral of the Christian life is a pilgrimage through the wilderness. We have our life here and we are in Satan's territory and in a far different situation we are than if sin had not come into the world. We are in a land that is not our own really and we find much in the account of the journey of the Israelites. Much is peculiarly applicable to our spiritual lives and it does deserve great study from that standpoint. It is Moses's farewell address and the book of Deuteronomy is indeed a unit. This book is quite distinct from the rest of the Pentateuch and it is more distinct than any other book because it is different in purpose from the other books. There are sections of the Pent. that have sections the same in purpose as Deuteronomy--sometimes there are verses or even whole chapters in which the Lord urges the people to obey His law but here we have a book entirely devoted to that purpose. Deuteronomy is made up of three addresses which Moses gives to the people and in these addresses He urges upon them a recollection of the things God has done for them, stressing those things which are valuable for the people to have in mind--^{and} exhorting them to remember that the priest gets one certain section of the offering. People wouldn't remember these things anyway. These things are given in Lev. and can be looked up when the need arises. Deut. stresses those laws which are vital that all the people should know. In 27-30 we have entirely exhortation of the blessings God will give the people if they will follow on in the line of sanctification and obedience to His law and the miseries that are ahead for them if they ignore His law and depart from it. This part is just as applicable to the Christian as to the Jew. It will have to be applied in just a little different way. Mention of "swords into plowshares----"

Pentateuch #11

It would mean nothing to us if some masons took their swords and made them into plowshares but we know that when the Scripture says it it means instruments of fighting--it may mean taking of jeeps and turning them into farming equipment and so the application is not to the precise thing referred to but the idea of the sort of thing and from that viewpoint these chapters in Deut. are just as applicable to us. This could of course be misinterpreted. These people are being encouraged to continue with God and rich blessing will be theirs if they do but if they turn away it is necessary that God rebuke them and will have to show His wrath upon them in even a more extreme way than on the ones who are in the region outside of knowing of His rich blessing.

It may be that He would have us to go through suffering and misery so that the joy of it might be of a testimony to others. Usually when God brings things like that into a Christian's life it is God's way of showing His chastening or of God's means of showing that person their needs. Usually when one walks away from God He shows His mercy by chastening them in order to make this one to turn aback unto Him. So for our own spiritual life we have much to learn from these passages. The last two chapters give orders for the law of preservation for the laws--the song of Moses, the blessing of Moses upon the people and so the book of Deut. is a unified production, a definite single work and they arranged in a logical order and lead up to the account of Moses' death.

III is the authorship of the Pentateuch. Who was the author? Usually you have the author of the book right near the title of the book but in Genesis you have no statement in the beginning, the middle or the end of the book as to who the author was. It would be of interest to see if we could find elsewhere who wrote the book of Genesis. However, as we have noticed; the Pentateuch is a unit and the book of Genesis is not a unit by itself and we have no idea into the unit or we don't know if it was original at all. All of our references to the Pentateuch in the OT and in the NT refer to it as to one book and the book of Genesis is the beginning of the law of Moses. The law of Moses tells of the history of the creation right up to Sinai and then gives the law given at Sinai. Genesis is the preamble to the law and is a part of this unified thing--Genesis with the first part of Exodus so if we find out who has written the rest of the Pent. it would probably be the same one who wrote the rest of Genesis. It would be usual if someone wrote and incorporated it would be usual if he would say that he had done so. When we come into the other book we find more indication as to who has written it. As we'll take as parts claimed to be written by Moses. For this we have three places where it is stated about the laws--the first of these is in Ex. 24:4 and what is the importance of that ch.? We should recognize at once that that is a part of the law of Moses that is a definite unit by itself and I trust that all here recognize that the Book of the Covenant Ex. 19-24 and then the account of ratification of the Covenant. In Ex. 24 the account of the ratification of the covenant, we read in v. 4 "--" and this is not right after the Ten Commandments but is after the ordinances were given in addition to the Ten Commandments. The people said that all the Lord has said we will do and in v. 7 we have how Moses took the Book of the Covenant and read in the audience of the people so we have evidence here that Moses wrote laws and he wrote them in the form which they called the Book of the Covenant and they read this to the people. Deut. 31:9 causes us to ask what is the

Pentateuch #11 (cont.)

law which Moses wrote. Moses speaks of it as a law which they have been familiar with for a long time. 38 years before that the Book of the Covenant was written by him. We can't be dogmatic about this one verse and say that when it says that Moses wrote the law, it means that he wrote the whole Pentateuch. It means the book of Deuteronomy and it is reasonable to think it means the whole Pentateuch. In Deuteronomy he isn't trying to give a new law but to stress again the law that has been already given but it isn't sufficient enough for us to read the entire case upon it. In the same ch. v. 24-26 we read " " and there again we have it and it means the book of Deuteronomy but it is reasonable to think it means the entire Pentateuch. Again I would not rest the whole case on the verse but it is by far the most reasonable interpretation of the verse. Over into other books we find references to the law of Moses and to book of Moses and that with these others would make it seem almost 100% that it is a claim to Moses that he wrote the entire book. Ex. 17:14 ---there can't be too much stress put on the "the λ as it is used and it depends on the language.

Pentateuch #12

This passage along with the others does suggest that Moses was the one doing the composing but it doesn't necessarily mean it. In Numbers 33 we have another portion of the narrative that says specifically that Moses is to write --in ^{v.} ch. 2 and the record of the journeys. A then we shall call the parts of the Pentateuch claimed to be written by Moses but these parts go even beyond that and they suggest very strongly the book as a whole is the work of Moses. B is that other parts of the OT speak of it as the work of Moses. We have quite a many references in the OT. Some in Daniel and then not too many by the other prophets--quite a few in the historical books. If time permits this semester I may ask you to write a paper on the attitude of the rest of the OT to the Pentateuch--does it recognize it as the work of Moses? What is the Attitude? All of the work this term is going to be of an accumulative nature. Some courses you can take any book you wish and study it and it is a unit by itself. There are other courses where you can get no good out of Dec. work if you know nothing of the Oct. and Nov. work. Each week builds on the week before and you have to get each section in order to get then next. All that we have had so far is foundation to that which we are going to go into. Getting the matter that we consider together here in class is what is most vital. Ref. to I Kings 3:2 refers to law of Moses as being very important as David talks to his son Solomon. II Chron. 34 we read in v. 14 we have

Pentateuch #12(cont.)

the law of the Lord as given by Moses. Neh. 8:11 there is an instance in which no one doubts that it is the entire Pent. to which it refers. C --the New Testament in quite a few instances refers to the Pentateuch as the work of Moses and we can look at a few. Mark 12:26, Luke 16: so even the Lord Jesus Himself said that work of Moses and the prophets should be enough to win men to the Lord Jesus. The way of salvation is so clearly given there that the resurrection is not needed there as a proof. So Jesus refers to the Pent. as the work of Moses and as something that is of authority. Luke 24:44. These are a few of the references where Jesus refers to the Pentateuch as the Law of Moses--others could be given. Acts 3:22 gives a statement from Moses. Acts 15:21 in the Jerusalem council II Cor. 3:15. Thus we have many attitudes that this is the work of Moses. The question comes to our minds as to what difference does it make who wrote it as long as God inspired it and of course that is vital and it would be just as much God's Word no matter who wrote it but if God causes other writers to refer to it as Moses's writing, it leads us to believe very strongly that it is the Law of Moses. When Jesus speaks of it in this way we have to say that He knew what He was talking about or that He was using double talk. Christ could have simply said the Book of the Law and He could have easily avoided the reference to Moses. We could say that he was trying to keep from offending them but that certainly was not necessary at all and then too we know that He did not try to keep from offending anyone when he had to cry out against that which was not true. When you find a person referring to something incidentally so that it makes clear his position on something in which it is not at all necessary to do so you cannot escape the evidence that he very definitely believes that to be the case. There is no motive, no reason to make a statement that is false. Thus it seems the evidence is quite complete that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. I don't say we could build up a 100% case but I do think it does build up a quite strong case. When you take the authority of Christ when it is quite evident. If we don't believe what He says about the authorship of the book, what will we believe when we get into more complicated matters? There should not be a misunderstanding when we say Moses wrote the Pentateuch and I know of no reason why it would not be possible that Moses wrote every word of the Pentateuch. We have no original manuscripts today and doubtless some errors have crept in and yet the Pentateuch has been extremely well----

When we say that Moses is the author of the Pent. we mean that he wrote the great volume and it is now substantially as he wrote it and if minor changes were made later on in it they were made by inspired men and consequently the book in form as it was passed down by the Jews is a book which ~~is~~ God's truth and which is substantially from the hand of Moses. I see no difficulty in believing every word of it as the book or work of Moses but I simply say that it is not necessary to hold quite as strictly to it. Take for instance the statement of the death of Moses. There is no reason in the world if God desired him to do so when God had revealed to Moses that he was now to die and this was the end of Moses's career and at the end of this book which is the book of Moses's oration at the end of his life that he could not have put in there that which God revealed unto him and on the other hand there is absolutely no reason to be sure that he did it. There is absolutely nothing contrary to the statement that Moses is the author of the Pent. or to the belief in the Divine Inspiration of the Pentateuch if Joshua or some other man lead of God added these few verses at the end to bring a conclusion to the book which Moses wrote. If God caused Joshua or some other to put in occasionally a reference to a place to which Moses speaks of and that place is called so and so, giving the later name of the place. I ~~the~~ heard of a situation, Samuel might say it remains that way until this day and show thus how this situation continues. It is altogether possible that the Pentateuch contains a few minor alterations or additions put in by other inspired men and authoritative and inspired. It is in no way contrary to our doctrine of inspiration if it should be so but I am not saying that such is so. I don't say by any means it is necessary to believe it but if it should be it in no way interferes with Divine authorship and Divine inspiration or with the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Supposing someone says that Moses didn't write the Pent. or that he wrote only a little bit of it or none of it at all and that some other men wrote it and they put it together in their own way and the books formed and then they were attributed to Moses and people said that he did it when he didn't actually at all and then Jesus came along and spoke of Moses. We don't believe there even was a Moses and we accept the NT teaching and then is it possible to hold these two views together? There were godly men in Eng. 60 years ago who believed in the Deity of Christ, who believed in Christ as our sacrifice and who became absolutely convinced that the Pent. was in no sense written by Moses and they tried for a logical explanation and there was the most obvious--the idea of accommodation. They said that Christ accommodated himself to the common ideas of His day. They said that He didn't care who wrote it and it was God's Word and they didn't care who wrote it. They could call it Moses's law but that still didn't interfere with the truth

of God's Word and there were several who tried in this way to cling tenaciously to their beliefs of Christ in human flesh but still as God but at the same time to reject the Mosaic authorship but there are not many who have held this view for any length of time. It is really double talk and that becomes rather obvious when you think into it a little bit. If Jesus knew this was not by Moses there was no need for His saying that it was by Moses and if he accommodated Himself in this regard we don't know how many other regards He might accommodate Himself in and we know that He is not a worthy teacher and leader for us if He would take such an attitude. We must say this if this was not the work of Moses He could not have expressed Himself in the way the Gospels quote Him. This idea of accommodation which was held by many when the higher criticism began to come in, was given up more and more by them. You will find that when people of Godly Christian background begin to accept the higher criticism and begin to become to be convinced as thousands of them do every year then it is impossible to hold any longer a view which they held before and the first thing they do is try this idea of accommodation and they try to say that these historical matters make no difference and they say the facts don't matter but the truths are what matter. Who is there to separate and tell us what the truth is and what is fact? It is taken into Barthianism although in its crude form it is not an attitude held by many stronger educated people so when the person begins to accept higher criticism it is pretty apt to be his first expedient to try to reconcile it with his belief in Christ. In this first attempt a great many godly Englishmen tried to use it to hold their faith in Christ and yet at the same time trying to give up their belief in the OT, not only in Moses's authorship but in much of the fact of the OT. Phil. 2:6-7 They say that He gave up His divine knowledge when He came down to the earth and while here He was able to reveal to us great truths about God but He had emptied Himself and He didn't know if Moses had written or not so He just took the attitude of the day. He was ignorant about these things and they use the argument that no man, not even the Son of man knows when Christ is coming back and then they say that He emptied Himself of all Divine knowledge. It is not our part to go into the theory of Kenosis but we want to mention that the passage properly interpreted does not bear that interpretation in mind and there is abundant evidence elsewhere that this is not the case. If the teacher of the NT is that He is a reliable teacher. They were trying to give up the OT but that does not work. The only satisfactory solution is that Christ knew what He was talking about when He said that the OT was the work of Moses. They were simply interested in the truths and they interpreted the literary and scientific knowledge. They-He didn't come as a teacher of science but as one presenting great spiritual truths and these English ones argued

Pentateuch 13(cont.)

that the OT should be discarded and the teachings of the New accepted but it is not a satisfactory attitude and it has not survived. Those who reject the Old reject a great mass of the statements of the New as well as far as the historical accuracy is concerned. They don't care if Christ did die on the cross or not--it a'l just represents something and who are the ones to decide the important ideas?

14 Christ didn't come to teach those matters but was sent from God to give us the great truths of redemption and they will sound as though they accept the teachings about Christ and then reject the dependability of the O.T. The other attitude that was taken was Kenosis. That is that Christ emptied Himself and having done this He didn't know the facts of the O.T. You can see in Phil. 2:6,7 that such a passage doesn't warrant such a belief about Christ. He just gave up a certain amount of His divine glory and gave up the outstanding glory which He did have and limited Himself to the discomforts of this life, not that He gave up His divine knowledge or divine power. As a matter fact, if you say that He doesn't know what He was talking about you pretty soon get confused as to what He does know and what He doesn't know and soon you don't have the divine Christ at all. This view has been held by godly people and though it was rather inconsistent they still held on to it, though it is a view that doesn't stand. People soon take the next step and give up their faith in the N.T. altogether. I think that we should recognize that though it is not a major matter, to salvation at all, who wrote the Pentateuch--salvation depends entirely on the Lord Jesus Christ, nevertheless it is not all a minor matter. We may differ greatly as to what kind of communion we should use, or form of baptism or even as to our idea of what apocryphal books are inspired or not--we may differ as to how ceremony we should allow in the church--the high and the low church, and rest it on the what is the true teaching of the Word of God. Honest people have differed as to what the Word of God taught on various of particular points but when it comes to who wrote the Pent. it is clear and unambiguous that Moses is referred as the author and that is what Christ believed about it. Though it is not a matter directly connected with our salvation as to who wrote the Pent. yet if we give up Christ's authority on this, it is very hard to have Him as our Divine Lord. Therefore it is a matter of great importance. One may be a very fine Christian and still not believe that Moses wrote the Pent. and pay no attention to the Pent. but one is in the direction of that which eventually lead him infidelity and unbelief. It is a vital matter and our religion is at stake in the question.

D. The Traditional View of Jews and of Christians that Moses wrote the Entire Five Books.

The attitude of Christ is what determines it but it is helpful to know that until comparative recent years Jews and Christians have held that Moses wrote the Pent. Remember the statement of Josephus which spoke about the five books of Moses as being the beginning of the Jewish O.T. We have other statements in early Jewish books referring to this in this way and it has been the attitude of the Christian church. There has been a little bit of confusion regarding some of the early church fathers--Critics today have tried to show that questions arose about the authorship of the Pent. way back and will take a statement of Jerome and will show that he wasn't quite sure but what Jerome did was to discuss the theory that The O. T. was lost and that Ezra by divine inspiration rewrote the whole business. Now according to this myth since there is no foundation to it, but according to this myth, God dictated to Ezra all the sacred books which had been lost--that wouldn't make Ezra in any sense the author--it only was a regaining of that which already had once been written and Jerome--What is the difference does it make if Ezra did this or not--Moses is the author in any case and so it is an entirely misunderstood thing and indeed on this question whether Ezra rewrote that which was previously lost. That in no way affects belief in the Mosaic authorship of the Pent. There is really no reason that we should pay attention to this myth but there is nothing in the Scripture that even would suggest this idea but there were some in the early church that were impressed with this theory. If Ezra did rewrite them, the word inspiration should not properly be used. He did it under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit but what we mean about inspiration is keeping the writer from error--what Ezra would have done would simply be an instrument for dictating, not a new book but one which had been lost and psychologically it would not have been impossible--Ezra having been brought up with full knowledge of these books, reading them over and over again, it would not have been impossible for Ezra to have this had they been destroyed but of course we have no reason to believe that the books were lost and absolutely no evidence that he ever rewrote them. The O.T. as it was written has no vowels but simply the consonants--that being the case, it is entirely possible, when he read it to the people, read it to them the way they would talk instead of the way Moses spoke. Take the word have--contrast how they pronounced it in days of Queen Elizabeth and how we pronounce it today. There are many other words that we pronounce in an entirely different way--the e's were all sounded at the end of their words. It is entirely possible that Ezra pronounced the words as they did in his day instead of trying to imitate the talk of Moses. And we have the vowels in our Heb. Bible the way that Ezra pronounced it, but the vowels are not part of the inspired text--that doesn't mean that

words were changed in any way, but that the vowels were put down as actually pronounced and since we pronounce all the vowels differently from King James' time--I have heard it said that if Geo. Washington were here, we probably couldn't understand a word he said but we can read what he wrote because that we pronounce in a different way and they retain the same ideas. All of this idea that there was confusion is not so but the critics try to make much out of this.

What do we mean when we say Moses wrote the Pent? Do we mean that Moses wrote every single word of the Pent. as it is today. He may have and we have no proof that he didn't but that is not necessarily the case. We can believe in the Mosesic authorship of the Pent. if we believe that Moses wrote substantially the Pent. as we have it now. The overwhelming mass of it comes from the pen of Moses and there might have been the last chapter added later and some of the places might have been given later names and there might have been slight changes made at later times but made by men who were making them under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and free from error. We have convincing proof one way or the other but if there were changes they were extremely few. It is my personal view that almost all of it is as Moses wrote it down. I don't think that we have evidence one way or the other. When we say that Moses is the author, we mean that it is substantially what Moses wrote, even though there might be interpolations, brief additions and explanations but by inspired men at a later time--I said small changes and didn't all the possibility of two or three chapters. It would be natural to say that they conquered Laish, # 15 which now is called Dan, etc. We might read about New Amsterdam and then change it to New York City and little changes are very natural in a work of that type and it is altogether possible but not necessarily true and there may be such in the Pent. In the bk. of Isaiah there would be similar places but there is very little of historical nature of that type where the name of a place had changed or the name of Isaiah's children which would be natural here in the Pent.

E. Doubts of Jews and Christians regarding the Mosesic Authorship of the Pentateuch. We find that the Rabbis held that Moses wrote the Pent. but very early they came to the idea that Moses didn't write the last eight verses--the view was that Joshua added the account of his death after he died and that properly doesn't belong under this head--I wouldn't call that a doubt of Mosesic authorship but simply a question as to whether those eight last verses were from Moses' hand or not but we would say that the attitude of the Rabbis was still on the positive side. About 1150 A.D. there was a prominent Jewish writer by name-Iben Ezra. He lived in the Arabic countries and he made the statement about the insoluble mystery--"beyond Jordan" Deut. 1:1-- "the Canaanite was then in the land-Gen 12:6; Moses wrote DEut. 21:9; in the Mt. of Jehovah he

shall be seen, Gen. 22:14 and the ref. to the iron bed-stead of King Og. in Deut. 3:11. He was an orthodox Jewish writer on Biblical and Talmudic themes and he is in no sense a critic but he does say that these verses are an insoluble mystery. He picks these statements at random from various portions of the Pent. and people who read his book weren't quite sure what he meant by them but in modern times, when people began to deny to the Mosesic authorship of the Pent.--they point out that even Iben-Ezra didn't believe it in his days. How could Moses have said these statements and Moses couldn't possibly have said this. Deut. 1:1 says that Moses spoke to the people when they were beyond Jordan--Moses never was in Palestine, how could this be? That is natural enough for a later writer to say. Suppose that I were to begin a book with the statement that I did a certain thing when I was on the other side of the ocean and if you had proof that I had never been on the other side of the ocean--my statement would have been on this side and not on the other side. That is what Iben-Ezra must have meant though he didn't say what he meant. When Moses died, certainly the Canaanite was over the land of Palestine and the Israelites had to go in and conquer them. In Gen. 12:6 you read about the Canaanite still being in the land. If someone wrote that in the time of David or Solomon it would be easy enough for someone to say that, because it was important that Lot and Abimelech not have strife because then the Canaanite might come up and destroy them. I might say that 100 years ago a procession came down and marched down Market St. and then say, Market St. was then the main st. in Wilmington. Why on earth would I say that because Market St. still is the main st. in Wilmington. But I were to say they marched down French St. so many haveⁱⁿ recent years said that because it mentions this in Gen. 12:6 proves that the Canaanite was not then in the land--therefore the Pent. cannot be by Moses and there were other statements of this type. The ref. to the iron bed-stead of Og--why mention iron there? That is interesting if it occurred later on but why would Moses think that was important enough to mention. All the critical scholars today will tell you that Iben-Ezra didn't believe that Moses wrote the Pent. but he was afraid to say so and the conservative ones will say that he did believe in the Mosesic authorship but the fact of the matter is that we don't know what Iben-Ezra meant--he certainly, if he had doubts didn't think that they were worth making a fuss about them. It is even possible that he thought they were interpolations and there is no reason why there might not be a few interpolations which would not be important in relation to the context which would have been put in at a later date. After Iben-Ezra we have no other evidence of the questioning among the Jews until Stenoza, the pantheistic philosopher who heard of Iben-Ezra words and said that if Iben-Ezra had been an unbeliever that Moses had not written the Pentateuch

and Spinoza said in addition to that you read in Gen. 14:4 a reference to Dan and the name of Dan, he says, that you read in Judges was given later on and he says in Gen. 36 you read that the kings who reigned in Edom before any kings in Israel and how could Moses say that when there hadn't been any kings in Israel at all. Num. 12:3 says that Moses is the meekest man in the world and how could Moses write a thing like that about himself. Also if Moses was writing he would say I and not Moses so he says that Moses did not write the Pent. but he wrote the laws in the Pent. and someone else connected the laws which Moses had written down. I don't know just off hand what Spinoza's date is. It is not earlier than 1650 and not later than 1750. This attitude of Spinoza had little influence on the orthodox Jews then or with Christians--perhaps some with unbelievers. There were Christian writers now--Kirk and Hobbs and Simon began to write and they said Moses only wrote only part of it and he couldn't have written all of it and some of them even said that Moses didn't write at all. Christian writers took up these writings and answered them. William Henry Greed said of them that all these superficial objections were most ably answered by [redacted] and Carsell. [redacted] wrote in 1736 and Carsell in 1731 and they took up these different matters and they gave what they thought was a satisfactory answer and it seemed to the Jews and the Christian church a sufficiently good answer and they didn't bother particularly about the objections and there was no great body at the Christian church that questioned the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch until within the last century and a half. I imagine that today 90% of the educated Jews don't believe that Moses wrote it. That is a development of very recent years. I told a Jew that Moses wrote the entire Pent. and didn't believe that J.E. [redacted] were the source of it he was quite amazed and told me that I was more of a Jew than he was, etc. He was quite hurt to find a Christian who gave more honor to Moses than to this other.

#16

Witsius and Cartvov wrote. Witsius wrote in 1736 and Cartvov wrote in 1731. Modern writers may disagree as to whether they answered these arguments or not but at least these objections made no head way to speak of in the Christian church or among the Jews. There were a few writers and largely unbelieving writers who were against Christianity altogether and they were writing these statements and taking these views. An occasional Christian writer would adopt some of them but it was very seldom. We are today in a much better position to deal with these particular objectives than people at that time. Then they didn't know much about the actual situation in Palestine in the time of Moses. All we knew was what we could gather from the Bible and therefore

to decide with a matter fitted with the historical situation or not was a case in which one was not in the position to decide for they were in as good a position as we are to decide if Moses wrote of his own death and the answer to what is that we simply do not know but we do know that Moses might easily have been lead of God to put the account of his death, knowing it was just ahead. It might have happened or Joshua might have written it--it really does not matter. As to the statement of Moses's character, it was really one of the remarkable things about the Bible. Frankly and straight it speaks of individuals in it and it does not have the attitude of most writers except for the writers who wrote the Bible. Many writers gloss over the faults of the ones they like, etc. One of the remarkable things of the OT is how very objectively it speaks. David is the man after God's heart, the great hero and yet David sinned and his wickedness and meanness is presented in the simplest way. Moses is the great hero and yet his foolish action in killing the Egyptian and trying to take the arranging of God's plan into his own hands. It is clearly put forth to us and not covered up at all. When Moses sinned, no excuse is made for him. God's rebuke to Moses is quoted directly to him. Now under these circumstances, is it strange that the good points should also be given in this direct way? If you don't believe that Moses could write these good things about himself in a straightforward way, how could he write the bad things about himself? No one has questioned this that I know about. Some of these questions are historical and some of them are philological. Now one question which should not have caused difficulty is the place beyond Jordan and I am surprised that a scholar such as Iben-Ezra could not keep from being bothered by that as this phrase "beyond Jordan" is a very poor translation of the phrase. The-It occurs in Deut. 1:1 -King James, Revised, etc. The Revised goes back to most translations given to this phrase which is actually not so accurate as what the King James has here. However the King James is not accurate either. In ch. 3, 8 you find that word again but in v. 20 he is talking of a word beyond the other side of Jordan. The word beyond Jordan in this verse, v. 8 and in 11:30 means what is on the west side of the Jordan and in 1:1, 5, 3:8 it means on the east side of the Jordan and if traced through you see it does not mean beyond of this side either one. The word means at the side of Jordan and can be either side and I think it is a mistake of the King James to have it put definitely on either side and put in what they think is correct. It isn't on either special side but it is on the side of. Palestine is divided into two parts and you can speak of what happens on one side and of what happens on the other side of the Jordan. If they want to indicate the special side, they

say so specifically and so it is at the side of the Jordan and in many cases you find where it means one side and in many cases where it means the other side and when you come to the statement that the Canaanite was in the land you know that the Canaanite migrated into the land and the Canaanite was not always in the land and they came to the land just as the Israelites did only they came somewhat earlier and the Israelites in the time of Moses doubtless knew that the Canaanite had come so when Moses says that he means that they had already come and they were there as a factor even as they are today. That is a word that could look toward the back or toward the future. Of course that fact was not known 200 years ago so they could not give that answer to it except as a pure conjecture. The statement about the iron bedstead of King Bashan we know was just about the time the Israelites came into Palestine as that was the beginning of the iron age. That was not known until the last 50 years. Up to that time people used either wood or bronze and thus it was quite something for the king to have an iron bedstead and only the king could afford to have such a thing thus it was worthy of remark. People didn't know that 200 years ago either and now most of them are fairly easily explained with the knowledge we have here today -- many of them are things that are stated by themselves and many of them are interpolations and could be later inserted with no regard to the author of the Pentateuch. Like "in the mt. of the Lord it shall be seen" and it is dealing with the place where the temple was later built. You could say in the mt. you could see this plainly where Abraham took Isaac to offer him on that altar or there may have been a reason why it was called by that name even at that time. It doesn't have to be an interpolation and it may be alright to have it used in the time of Moses. If it was an interpolation, I believe it was written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and inspired of God and it is a true statement and does not affect the true authorship of the Pentateuch. You may today find people who are raising these particular arguments and it would be wise for you to be familiar with these arguments in such a case but they can be fairly easily answered. Green has a fairly good discussion of them in his book, "Higher Criticism" and any conservative book written in the last century is apt to have a very good discussion of these particular difficulties even though some of them have new evidence on them in the last few years but they are not a real problem. They did not make a great impact on the Christian church. The Christian church 150 years ago believed almost unanimously in the Mosaic authorship and these objections had been made as much as a century before that time. They are not the things we have to meet today and consequently I thought this time I would put them under the heading of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch rather than on the next. The next heading is on a unified whole and is something

quite different from these although it has taken these up and used them to some extent so the next is IV--The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch. Higher criticism means criticism, not point out flaws or errors, but rather means a study of introductory matters. You have criticism of art, literature--if you are sometime tempted to go to the movies, pick some newspaper and read the reviews thereof and you will read how much money has been wasted in making the awful production and how everything is so awful and you wonder how anybody could go and see such a thing.

17. That might be criticism but that is not what we mean. You sometimes might notice an ad on one page of a paper and see how this was the greatest picture ever filmed and right in the next column you probably would see how the critic wasted half an hour and tells how it was the poorest worthless thing that he has ever seen and the critic would simply tear the thing to pieces while right next to it they were paying good money to sponsor it. People who are hired to make an evaluation soon get so tired of it, that they tend to be old hardened critics, so criticism has naturally come to mean picking flaws, but that is not what properly the word means. To criticize properly means to evaluate and try to see what the points are ^{on} one side and the other and criticism should be constructive and higher criticism doesn't properly mean the denying of the Mosiac authorship but that which means to take up the book and look at it and examine it as to matters of date, authorship etc. and see what the evidence is. We call it higher in distinction to lower criticism because it takes the matter up of the text and fits the right word, or has there been an error in transmission --this kind of criticism simply means an attempt to try and evaluate these things but there is a movement which began about 150 years ago which has run through a very definite course and which has led to views which are very widely held and which have been one of the greatest forces in the Christian world which have as much to do with our religious situation today as any other single force and consequently it is necessary that we have an understanding as to what this movement is as to how it went from one approach to another and what effect it has had--that is why we call it higher criticism.

F. Consideration of early Objections to the Mosiac Authorship. Refer to Prof. Briggs of Union Sem.--booklet published in 1893. Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch. In ch. IV we have the rise of higher criticism. We have already mentioned Ibn-Ezra and he mentions that these certain verses are an insoluble mystery but there is no proof in whether he believed in the Mosiac authorship of the Pentateuch or not. He was an orthodox Jewish commentator. Around 1600

some other critics added a few more and Spinoza and _____ gathered these objections together adding some of their own. He, Briggs then lists 18 separate passages under four heads and I would like everyone to be familiar with these verses especially.

Historical Objections--Gen. 12:6--the Canaanite was then in the land. Briggs says that this implies that this was not the case. Other books make the statement that this statement couldn't possibly have been written until the time of Solomon because the Canaanite was in the land all of that time. Wm. H. Green points out that that doesn't mean that the Canaanite isn't now in the land. Abraham and Lot were fighting--it was necessary that settle the argument peaceably--why, because the Canaanite was then in the land but the Canaanite ~~was~~ is now in the land and the Lord has promised to drive them out--the people never have been there and they don't know the situation there and they are looking forward to the time when they can go into the land and God will give it to them and they will possess it so we would say that this doesn't imply that he was not now in the land and we know that the Canaanite was then recently in the land and there was a time before when the Canaanites weren't there. It doesn't prove anything about what the situation is right now--to say that when they were quarreling and thus not be in danger of the Canaanites. You might say there were gangsters then in Chicago--that doesn't mean that there aren't gangster there now but it does mean there was that particular time when gangsters were dangerous. It ~~was~~ is the kind of verse that could easily be interpolated but I think it is something that would be natural be natural for Moses to put in to explain but suppose that Moses didn't write this verse and that it comes at the time of Solomon or later--this wouldn't in any way prove that Moses hadn't written the Pent. It is true that there are other phrases which had no word of explanation put in so know that it wasn't a regular habit to put interpolations. You can't explain something that is an interpolation if the whole clause depends upon it.

2. Gen 14:14--Abram pursued the five kings as far as Dan. Briggs says that Dan did not receive this name until long after the time of Moses; Jud. 18:29 tells us that in that time they called this city Dan after Dan, their father--it used to be called Laish. It could be entirely possible that there might have been another city called Dan in that area--I would think it more probable that he used the original name Laish and the name might have been changed after all. One words seems to have been changed to make it intelligable to later readers but that proves nothing about the Mosesic authorship.

3. Gen. 36³¹--puts down a list of names of kings that ruled over Edom. Now what does this verse have to say about the Mosesic authorship. There is no problem in his knowledge about Edom since

Moses took the children of Israel through there. It mentions about there not being a king over Israel--before that time. That verse implies that Moses knew that Israel was going to have a king. Suppose ~~that~~ in the day of Columbus someone would say about something happening in Holland before there were ~~any~~ presidents in the U.S.--it was still 350 years before there were ~~any~~ presidents in U.S. It was all right to mention the kings of Edom and tells us how they are established and then mentions the kings which are perfectly natural. But then why would he say the next phrase when there were no kings in Israel--it wasn't until hundreds of years later that any kings came in and yet he says these are the kings of Edom before there were ~~ix~~ any kings in Israel. If that were written in the day of Solomon it would sound quite natural but not in the days of Moses. Iben-ezra thought this was an insoluble mystery and Spinoza thought that was good proof that Moses didn't write the Pent. It is easy to imagine that this chapter could have been inserted by someone at an earlier time--it isn't an organic part of the whole and you don't disrupt the chapter by taking it, and it easily could be a later interpolation; I don't think that this was the case but even if it were it wouldn't prove that Moses didn't write the Pentateuch. As a matter of fact, if you read the Pent. as a whole-- if you read Genesis as a whole you will find it possible to see why Moses made this statement. It would be perfectly reasonable why Moses should write such a statement as this. In the Pent. you already read how God told Jacob that there would be kings--Gen. 35:11 and there would be kings for his descendants and we are given these wonderful promises about Jacob and the Israelites know that they are going to have kings and yet before Israel has had any kings at all, Edom has had this long list of kings. In view of the promises to Jacob, it is a very natural thing for Moses to say--before the leader, the chosen of God, before they have had any kings at all, Edom ~~would have~~ had this long list of kings. It doesn't require that Israel already have a king in the land but it does require that the promise already be given and we have that promise already. Of course when Israel came into the land, it was a long time before the Lord gave them kings and there was this long period in which the people seemed to think it better not to have king but here was the promise right in Genesis. Here was Edom that had kings before they did.

3. Ex. 16:35 --The children ate manna forty-years before they came to a land inhabited; they did eat the manna until they did come to the borders of Canaan! He says that this implies the entrance of the Israelites into the land of Canaan after the death of Moses--cf. Josh. 5:12. This could not have been written until the time of Solomon or David according to Briggs. It would put the date only a little bit later according to the view of _____ if fulfilled in Joshua 5:12.

This could be an interpolation that was made a few weeks after the death of Moses. Do you think such is the case? I trust all of you know what precedes and what follows and the context of this verse. Let us suppose that Moses wrote down these things as they happened--is v. 35 as an interpolation? Of course God could have enabled Moses to write all about Hitler, Stalin if He had chosen to do so, but leaving that out of consideration--do you think that Moses could have written this verse? Could Moses have written this verse--No, he couldn't have. Suppose that God were to say, "I am going to give you manna* all the time for the 40 years until you get to Canaan--why couldn't He say that? Only two years after they left Egypt, the Lord told them to go up and conquer the land but the people of Israel were scared and wanted to go back to Egypt, so God told them they would stay in the wilderness until all the generation had passed on--Moses could have written this incident after Kedesh-Barnea--He certainly knew that the people were going to be there forty years--they came to the borders of the land of Canaan less than two years after they left Egypt and they didn't go in because of their unbelief and there is absolutely no evidence that God had revealed to Moses that they wouldn't go in then.

19 Moses could have put this in his account--I don't think it likely that he put it in the beginning of his ministry but as they had been going many years--and after he knew that they would be there 40 years it would be very simple for him to put down that ~~he~~ they would be there 40. It could be an interpolation that Moses put in himself and perfectly all right to put in years later in his life and has nothing to interfere with the Mosesic authorship. He couldn't have written this at the time when they first began to have manna since they nor Moses knew that they were going to be eating manna 40 years. If Moses wrote the story later on he certainly could have written this but if he wrote it at the time of the happening it could be something that he added. An argument from silence is a good argument. If someone said to me that David Jones was President of U.S. I could prove from silence that he never was president of U.S. If somebody on the other hand had been to U.S. and then he goes back to Europe and they ask him what do the people of U.S. think about their president, David Jones and he says there is no such man and they would ask how did he know and then he would say, I never heard about him, --that wouldn't prove anything because in the course of a year he might not have heard of him. Even someone in this class, if he had had not taken American History might never have heard of Miller Stillwater--it is a matter of whether silence is to be expected or not. When you find Moses and the people at the borders of the land and Moses tells them to go up and conquer the land but they are afraid and God then tells them that they will be in the wilderness forty years until all of them are dead. That

is the best argument in the world that Moses did not know of this before hand. That God gave it to them then as a result of the situation and in a case like that you would have to have mighty strong evidence that Moses had ~~any~~ idea of knowing anything about this before this time. It doesn't interfere with Mosesic authorship because Moses was living long after this could have been written--if there are statements in Gen. quoting what Abraham said, there is no reason at all why Moses couldn't have interpolated in Abraham's account statements at his time bringing things up to his time but that has nothing to do with Mosesic authorship through it would have to do with interpolations. In this case there is every reason to believe that Moses knew before they got to Sinai that they would be spending forty years in the wilderness but before this time Moses certainly didn't know that they would be there 40 years. So this story which Moses no doubt wrote in preliminary form at the time of the event described must have had this statement put in later but there is no reason that he couldn't have done that any time after Kadesh-Barnea--he knew then that they would be there at least 40 years. The purpose to give an account of the happening that took place there so people in the future would remember about God's mercy upon them--he then he could simply assume a discontinuance of the manna as soon as the end of the time for the end of it as the time predicted had been given. It is entirely possible that none of the Pent. was written until later on and consequently if Moses had sat down after Kadesh Barnea he would have know it then, but if he had written it at the time of the event he would have had to insert this later but that doesn't prove that it isn't Mosesic. If you take any book that a man writes today, if you get the 2nd edition you will find interpolations put through out to bring it up to the time of his later edition.

§. Deut. 1:1 "These be the words which Moses spake beyond Jordan"--this implies that it was an author already in Palestine beyond the Jordan. Of course "beyond Jordan" is what the R.V. The A.V. says this side of Jordan but that is an insertion that is not in the original. There is nothing in the Heb. which says "this". The evidence which I gave you a few days ago would look very strongly in the other direction. This word is used to describe one side of Jordan and the other side of Jordan, right here in the book of Deut. Sometimes it has the word, eastward or westward with it and Moses says that there is a land eastward that God is going to give them and land westward that He is going to give them and other times he doesn't use east or west but he uses the word of either side. Examination of the use of the word shows that the word doesn't mean beyond but is a mis-translation. That the author of commen. in the ICC from Union Theo. Sem. should have known that this word does not mean beyond is amazing--it is astounding ignorance.

Moses did not write beyond Jordan--he wrote a Heb. word and not an English and if you want to know what this word means look at B.D.B. own dictionary or better still look at the usages of the word in the Bible and you will find that the word does not mean beyond--it is used of both sides of the Jordan--in Deut. it is sometimes used of both sides in the very same verse. It means on the side of Jordan and can mean either side. Note Num. 32:9--this would be a very good verse for your notes. The same word is used of both sides of the Jordan--it means the area of either side--if the word were always used of the area of the eastern side we could advance the ~~the~~ theory that was was the case of Trans-Jordan but we actually find that the word is used of both sides. It means on the side of Jordan and as a rule from context which it is. You might say, "In the States" but that wouldn't say which state--look at the word throughout Scripture and see how it is used--the man couldn't be on both sides of the river at the same time.

20. It is the part of land on the side of the river and as a rule you can tell from context which side is being spoken about. It doesn't say the other side and the word doesn't ~~say~~ mean the other side--whether it means the other side or not you have to learn from context and see how it is used. Here it means when they are in the area of Jordan and Moses isn't speaking of the other side. It would be perfectly possible for the word to mean the other side and it has been assumed by people that it did mean the other side and translated the other side--even the translators of the King James' knew that much--about a third of the times they put it down as this side and the other side about two thirds of the cases. If I were to say--"these are the words which Gen. MacArthur said to his troops just before they left the Philippines" and I just made them up out my own head, it would be true that Gen. MacArthur was in the Philippines and that he left there and that he probably made a speech to them but it wouldn't be true anything that I said in the speech would be true. You wouldn't expect Gen. MacArthur to say these are words of Gen. MacArthur. I might say that these are the words that Gen. Mac. said across the ocean but he wouldn't say across the ocean if he were already over there--particularly if he had never been in America in his life and Moses had never been in Palestine. Of course all that is an assumption of the meaning of the word that it doesn't have--the word doesn't mean beyond. It means in this verse Mr. Oldham brought up that it is in the plain over against the Red Sea and he is way beyond Kadesh Barnea when he says this. It would be an altogether possible statement that Joshua could have put on this--it is not necessary to say that Moses wrote the title of the book which is part of the first verse but I see no reason why Moses couldn't have done it. Moses, knowing very well that they were going into Canaan could very well have said, beyond Jordan.

There wouldn't be any reason in the world that he couldn't have said beyond Jordan but the truth of the matter is that he didn't say that--it simply means on the side of Jordan. The question is on the meaning of this word--is the truth of the matter that Moses didn't write this but someone later on wrote and put Moses across and someone might have put the heading on later on and that would be perfectly all right and it wouldn't have interfered with Moses writing the rest of it but it isn't necessary to believe that.

Esau

6. Deut 2:12--says the children of ~~israel~~ destroyed the Horites . Briggs says that this implies the conquest of Canaan by Israel but you would have to look at that in the context to see just what it means. This is an argument built upon one word. Here Moses is speaking to the people and he tells them how Esau will take over the land as Israel will take over the land of Canaan. There we have an argument that Moses not only could have written it but that he couldn't have said it because this part of the original which Moses gave. Could Moses have written it or could he even have said such a thing? This is rather hard to figure out by putting in an interpolation. Someone could later put in a time or place and something like that could easily be put, but here is something in a speech of Moses. It would be as though you had a speech of Gen. MacArthur in which he said before he left the Phillipines, "Just as the Americans have flooded over Japan so the we will flood over the Philippines--they did it later but not at that time. You might say this has a prophetic element therein--just as Israel is going to conquer Canaan later on. Some critics say that this verse couldn't have been written until the time of David when all of Canaan had been conquered. But it doesn't say until all of the land of Canaan had been conquered. It certainly would be possible for Moses to say this just exactly as it stands before his death. It seems a very important and significant statement--in Num. it tells us how they conquered about a third of Palestine--all of TransJordan, the land of the Og, king of Bashan--all the territory that belonged to 2½ of the tribes and therefore why couldn't Moses say, just as Israel conquered this ~~the~~ land so Edom had conquered that land which God had given them. Israel had conquered some land already and there is reason for Moses to refer to something they had already done. This was the land of their possession though it wasn't all their land. Deut. 3:11, 14; 34:10; Gen. 22:14; Num. 21:14; Deut. 27:2 and Num. 12:3. Write a brief statement why you think that these verses might raise a question as to whether Moses wrote the Pent. or not. See what you think is the problem and think of an answer for it.

7. Deut. 3:11. Ref. to Og, king of Bashan who had an iron bed-stead. The mention of iron is the problem there. Moses is reminding these people. It sounds to many that it is something that happened away back. Geo. Washington has a great army at Valley Forge--his headquarters are still up there. You wouldn't say that Gen. Eishenour lead an army into France and the one who directed them can still be seen but I don't think that it necessarily means here a long time. The leader Moses is simply reminding the people that they defeated the king Og--here is the bed-stead of his that has been preserved and there it is to remind us all but it is reminding them of something that is up there right now as a visible evidence of something that is there right now. The verse is in parenthesis in the R.V. and it sounds very much like an interjectory statement. He says in the previous verse that at that time they took the land out of the hand of the two kings of the Amorites--is not Moses there reminding ~~them~~ of the goodness of God; this man who was a giant has been overcome and the people were here fearing going into the land because of the giants there but isn't that wonderful proof of the goodness of God. Look how big he was with his bed-stead of iron. It seems to me that Moses would have a purpose in saying it right there to the people and yet the verse could be something which a later writer inserted as an explanation of this fact which would not interfere at all with our idea of Moses writing it and simply this insertion by an inspired man of God could have been put in later but I don't think that it is necessary to believe this. It is clear that they had iron in that day but it was rather an oddity and didn't have a great deal of it.

8. Deut. 3:14 "Jair the son of Manasseh took all the country of Argob unto the coasts of Geshuri and Maachathi; and called them after his own name, Bashan-havoth-jair unto this day." What is the problem here about the Mosesic authorship? It is the reference "unto this day"--it seems very strongly against Mosesic authorship at first sight. Supposing that I were to say last year Gen. Eishenhour came to Wilmington and they changed Rodney Square to Eishenhour Square and it has remained that name until this day. Suppose that happened about six months ago. I might very well say that to you here but to go and say that it remains that name unto this day--I might say that 40 or 50 years from now but if it happened only six months ago it would be very unnatural for me to do that. Immediately it raises the question to what day--it seems that it would refer to a time long after. How could be it be that Moses could have written it. It means that it has continued until the very present. It is not the sort of thing that one would naturally expect about an event that has happened just recently--it might be a later writer that put this down when it happened--that is that it continued even to his day but I don't feel that

is necessary--this is not merely someone describing something that had happened but is a man exhorting the people not to fear; the people are wondering whether they can conquer that land which has so many more people and Moses tells them to remember how they conquered these people on the one side of Jordan already--why six months ago we had this battle and we conquered that place and called the place by that name which is still standing today. It wasn't simply a raid but you have the evidence right in front of you. The conquest had stuck. The American armies ran over Belgium and headed for western Germany and then the time of the bulge battle--someone might have said look how you said you conquered this section but now it is all gone and the Germans are back there again. But here is a conquest that stayed so why should you be afraid. It was a sign of the goodness of God that not only enabled you to make a raid but to conquer and establish the place which you took and to keep it. It might be an interpolation and if it were it would disrupt the unity of the book but it very well could have been said by Moses in that time. (This record is interspersed with a good deal of student participation which could not be heard.)

Joshua

22 If the whole book were not written by Moses but by ~~Moses~~ or Aaron, that wouldn't prove it to be either false or true. We hold to it because the rest of the Bible holds to it being the work of Moses. It is the teaching of Moses and of Christ that these five books are by Moses. That doesn't necessarily mean that Moses wrote every word of it. It is sufficient to hold for that premise that Moses wrote the great bulk of it, even though certain changes might have been made later by inspired men and consequently is true. I don't feel that it is necessary in any case that I know, that anything was written by ~~a~~ another ~~man~~ under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Even if all these were interpolations it doesn't effect the authorship of Moses as the writer. We are in a different situation regarding Mark from the situation here in the Pent. because our earliest MSS go back to about the 3rd century. Before that we only about two centuries and our evidence is sufficient to say that this is probably not in the original even though it is in a great bulk of the MSS which we have. Now in the case of the book of Moses, we have 2000 years away from the autographs and therefore it might be possible that we have such a problem but we have no record of it. But we don't have the same amount of evidence for the O.T. We have to have other evidences on which to build our premise. So this ref. Deut. 3:14 could be a real objection if it weren't for the two facts--that Moses spoke these oration and the situation surrounding them and also that it could be an interpolation without ~~disrupting~~ ^{disrupting} the context. He is the inspired man who wrote most, and if there were a few insertions here and there, it wouldn't interfere with the Mosesic authorship.

like

9. Deut. 34:10--There has not risen a prophet in Israel since ^{like} unto Moses. Briggs says that this implies to a long time after the time of Moses. If Moses wrote that himself, it would seem from our English translation, a long period in between but one thing to note is that the Heb. perfect is used--There hath not arisen. The Heb. perf. does not have that stress on time. It has more the idea of certainty of it rather than the time. I do not feel that from the verb form you can necessarily get the idea but from the context. Read the following verses. There are a great many things connected with the exodus from Egypt which naturally aren't repeated--it would be very much like anyone to mention these things as not likely to happen again in the very near future and unlikely that it ever would happen. It would be altogether possible that Moses under the inspiration of the Spirit make the statement in v. 8. How could he know that they wept for him thirty days while he was still living. The Lord might have lead him to put down what was going to happen and I see no difficulty in believing this and yet many think that Joshua added these words afterwards--that these are like an epitaph added for Moses and there is no reason why it couldn't be. In that case there has not arisen a prophet in Israel like unto Moses would be an impossible statement at all to make shortly after his death. There would hardly be a situation comparable to it for a very long time. This might be a little hard to think of Moses as writing than anything else that we have looked at--it is not impossible that he wrote out it certainly would be possible and probable that Joshua added this soon after his death but that in no sense detracts from the Mosesic authorship of the Pent. Briggs says all these nine statements are inconsistent with Mosesic authorship. Two other tests he says have not altogether stood the test of criticism--he is giving the 18 instances which Spinoza which were given 200 years ago. Here are two which haven't stood the test.

10. Gen. 22:14. He says that this implies that the Israelites were long in the land. They were a long time in the land before they went down in Egypt--plenty of time for such a usage to become established.

11. Deut. 2:5--not so much as a foot breadth. Briggs says when compared with I Chron. 18 where David conquers Edom--it implies when Israel was friendly with Edom but not a later time than Moses.

Indications of special authorship--12. Num. 21:14--"Wherefore it is said in the book of the wars of Jehovah". Briggs says that this implies another author than Moses. It would be entirely possible for me in a book that I wrote to refer to another book. It reminds me of the time when I was at Princeton Seminary as a student--said that Dr. Henry Van Dyke was going to read

selections of poetry at certain time and at a certain place. It so happened that about half of the people there were from the Seminary and there were few from the University itself. He read some poems with great feeling and other poems he didn't like and into his voice he would put such a feeling of disgust that pretty soon the listeners would decide that the poem was no good. He then, after reading from quite a few then said, now I will read from the God of the Open Air-- now who would you think was the author and one fellow asked who had written the poem and with quite a bit of pride he said that he himself was the author and the fellow then told him, "Oh, Congratulations!" How happy Dr. Van Dyke must have felt. Why couldn't Moses have said, Now I'll read a statement from this certain book and this book might have been written by Moses but certainly it didn't have to be. It could have been written by someone else in the camp and just an account of the events that the people had gone through, not an inspired book but how does all this imply that the book was written a long time before?

23. 13. Deut. 27:2 ff. cf. with Josh. 8:30 ff. (Min. 0-3 is student speaking which can't be heard) I think that it would be possible for a man to say before he died that he wanted his son Henry to have the best horse and his daughter to have the cow; now they might or might not do it but there certainly is no reason why he shouldn't say it. In this case Moses said, when you come into the land, this is what you are to do and in Josh. it says they did it. The day you pass over Jordan, do this. Joshua passed over Jordan and then sometime later he did it. That throws light on what day means but does that have anything to do with the authorship of the book. Moses might have said that he wanted Henry to have his black cow and Mary to have my white cow and they might have each preferred the other one and twisted later--that wouldn't have anything to do with Moses having said it. But if they disobeyed Moses it wouldn't be an objection as to Moses being the author. (Much of the record is taken up with asking various students about what is the real problem here in these two passages.) Now the problem that was raised here by Spinoza and by others--here he put some stone together and reared an altar and wrote upon it a copy of the law of Moses. You certainly couldn't write the five books of Moses on an altar. Briggs says this implies a law much less extensive than the Pent. How big a law could you write? It says that they wrote on these stones a copy of the law of Moses--is that just the ten commandments or the whole Pent? The Law of Moses would sound like the whole Pent. would it not? How big would an altar have to be to write this? My father could write the Lord's Prayer on a dime but there wouldn't be much point to writing it that small since no one could read it if it were that small. If the Law of Moses was written on stone and then the Law of Moses is referred to

as these five books--actually it seems like a later idea that the law of Moses would be referred to as the five books. I think that here you would get some evidence that wasn't known during the time of Spinoza from the fact that Hammurabi put up this law code in Babylon in the central square and it was read by all and it was inscribed on a large stone and it is written in cuneiform writing and the code is about as long as one of the books of Moses--with that writing which has such small characters it would have been entirely possible to write the whole law. Of course we don't know what they wrote it in. In Hebrew as ordinarily written it takes much more room and as we have it, it would take a great many stones to write it on and another verse we should notice, another question that is. Note v. 4. He tells them to put up stones and put the law on them and then he tells them to build an altar of stone. To imply that these are the same stones on which they write the law is reading into the text. He mentions the stones first and the writing of the law next and then build an altar of stones. It would be entirely possible to have a series of large stones and then to have the altar next to them. It is an inference that is unwarranted that it is necessarily limited to the stones of the altar. In Joshua 8 it is much stronger there--the inference that those are the stones of the altar, it would be difficult, if Josh. 8 was all alone, to suggest that there other stones but Josh. 8 doesn't stand alone. He fulfilled the command of Moses. On what stones did he write. You have the command--to put up these stones and make an altar. Later on you have given by Joshua what they did and that which most impressed the people was given first--the putting up of the altar. That may very well be that there were extra stones Critics claim that Deuteronomy is the only book of Moses and not the whole thing, but it would seem much more like that he would have written the whole Pentateuch if the other were written ahead of Deuteronomy. And the whole thing is commanded to be kept together and when Joshua is told that this book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth--does that mean just the book of Deut. or does it mean the whole Pentateuch? I don't know if we are in a position to prove whether he wrote only Deut. or not but there seems to me that there is no difficulty in holding that he wrote the whole book in view of the fact that it doesn't limit it to that.

24 ---I wonder how many of you noticed the real problem here--as to whether the stones were really large enough to hold the whole Pent.

The next group Briggs entitles Inconsistencies and I don't think that these need delay us much. If there are these that wouldn't necessarily prove that Moses didn't write the book. Very seldom does anyone write a book that doesn't have some inconsistency therein.

There is very much that many of us do that appears inconsistent unless you know the whole picture and we can't write all the detail in any book.

14. Deut. 10:8 "At that time the Lord separated the tribe of Levi, to bear the ark of the covenant of the Lord, to stand before the Lord "etc. It is a very superficial criticism because it is very easy for something like this to happen twice. It could happen for one situation and then happen for another situation and they don't have to be identical either. Different details can happen and we might go into full details of it but I don't think that it is necessary.

15. Ex. 4:20 is inconsistent with Ex. 18:2 ff. One place says that he took his family down to Egypt and then it says that he stayed in Midian. Does Ex. 18:2 say that they remained in Midian. It says that ~~they~~ sent her back. Very often objections are raised and problems raised but they haven't even read what it says and haven't examined just what the text says. There is too much argument on all sorts of questions instead of looking to see exactly what it says. In the first case it tells us how Moses started for Egypt and then how the Lord tried to kill Moses on the way and how Sipporah intervened and ~~it~~ and saved Moses' life. Now Dr. Robert Dick Wilson's theory was that after that event occurred which almost cost Moses' life due to Zipporah's attitude though she did now give in when it was necessary to save his life that Moses sent her back to her father from there. That may be so and there is no reason to know whether this is right or not. But after that there is no mention in the account in Egypt and a period of a year or two was required with all the plagues and the controversy with Pharaoh and the situation was getting all more and more intense and it would not be strange at all if Moses took Zipporah all the way to Egypt to have sent her back to her father. This doesn't say that she remained with her father. It mentions right there, after Moses sent her back. We do not have all the facts given to us in the Scripture. We have the facts which are important. She is with him on the way to Egypt and a few years later she ~~is~~ is with her father and he is sent her back-- there is no ~~it~~ contradiction there at all if you look at the exact words and see what they say. Briggs points out how inconsistent the view is.

17.

16. Ex. 13:11--Jehovah spoke to Moses face to face--Num 12:3 Moses was very meek above all the men that were on the face of the earth. 18. Deut. 31:9. Moses wrote this law. Why should he not say the Lord spoke face to face with him if he did. Why should he not point out that he was very meek above all the men of the face of the earth when he also pointed out the faults which he did. He gave a true picture which uninspired men don't give. He gave the faults and why should not then the virtues be given in a fair way. These objections Briggs goes on to

point out that all these have either been forstalled or proved to show later editors have come in and most of them though have maintained their validity. I don't think that we have to accept his conclusions. Hume in His Essay on Miracles tells what wonderful things he has done. Prof. Olmstead of U. of Chicago wrote a book of the Life of Jesus a few years ago and in the beginning of the book he says that the Life of Jesus had never been studied by a real historian before and now he says that he has written it in the full light of history. You will find plenty of statements that are often quite absurd which go far beyond that which Moses wrote in the Pentateuch. These particular objections we have looked at and though I don't think they are important intrinsically but they are important because they are the very things that people will often bring up to you.

Of course you all understand by this time how we are studying this course. We are putting all the references of that certain name--you can see at a glance--there is Deut. 1, the first five verses and you might notice that Jehovah is used three times and the name of God three times etc. For next time is to clearly review the lessons for today and also go on with Gen. 27 and go on as far as you can in your time listing the various names of God. We had not finished last time the authorship of the Pentateuch but we were learning some of the alleged problems in connection with it and we noticed these various early objections, most of which are entirely superficial. They are all such that could be explained as interpolations without questioning the authorship of the Pent. so I see no need even to consider them interpolations--in past years I haven't spent much time on them but it is good to know what the actual situation is in each case.

4. Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch. We have already mentioned what we mean by higher criticism. It has come to mean, often at least, destructive criticism. We speak of the errors of higher criticism and held by those who hold such views--as held by those who hold destructive theories of criticism. Higher criticism is taken up any time you ask who the author is and at what time was the book written. Even a book of fiction written 60 years ago will have quite a different background of a book of fiction written today and it is very interesting to study this. Higher criticism is used by anybody that is interested in studying any certain subject. Higher criticism of the Bible, per se is a necessary thing--when was it written and who was the author of the various books is all valuable information. There is however a movement that has taken a certain attitude towards criticism of the Pentateuch and this movement is one of the most important forces in world in the last century and a half.

If you would take the Christian world about 100 years ago you would find those who lived and went on living paying no attention to the claims of Christ and you would find those who were devoted to Christ and following Him, and you would find, regardless of their own personal attitude toward the Bible, believed that the Bible was true and they knew that they ought to follow it and knew that they ought to receive Christ and they knew that they were going on in their own way and not following God's Word. There were comparatively few who would say there is no reason that I should follow the Bible since it is not ~~xxxx~~ true. They knew that it was true and they either accepted it or rejected it. I have ^{heard it} said the Dwight L. Moody said at the end of his life--the tremendous difference in the attitude of the people toward the Word of God during his life. In the beginning of his life people would admit that the Bible was right but they would be frank that they enjoyed the world too much and I am not strong enough to stand--most everybody would admit it that the Bible was true but towards the end of his life people would argue and say how do we know that this is true. Isn't this Bible just put together by man. One of the greatest forces in causing a change of the people toward the Bible is higher criticism. The condition in America and Europe which produced these two world wars ~~xxxx~~ cannot be understood apart from the decrease in faith in this land which was to a large extent, the result of the higher criticism. Therefore anyone who is going to understand religious conditions and understand how to serve the Lord effectively, it is very vital that you know something about the higher criticism. There is one very easy way to deal with higher criticism. That is the way the Presbyterian Church, USA is the way they dealt with Mr. McIntire and said he was a bad man--he has horns and hoofs and you must let him in here and above all don't let him mention the world council nor the condition of the Presbyterian Church USA and as long as people are devoted in you and have such confidence in you that they know whatever you say is right and if you say that person is bad he must be--that method will work and there are cases where, rather than enter into a big argument with some cult or group--it is sufficient to say that is bad and just keep away from it. That is, in some instances a far better way of handling it rather than enter into long and detailed discussions about it but when a movement is out to win as many fine Christian people with fine Christian background and with zeal for the Word of God, has been lead by the higher criticism to change their idea about the Bible, you have to take a different attitude--when it is accepted in the majority of our pulpits and theological seminaries--at least the old ones and in most colleges and universities where anything about the Bible is taught, we are not going to make much progress in the world as a whole if we simply say that it is bad and tell people to keep away from it.

That is not the effective way to deal with a thing like this. We must recognize that there are fine people who have been presented with the arguments and couldn't answer them so have taken the wrong attitude and have thought that they could cling to their Christian faith and still accept the entire higher criticism. They have adopted ideas like the Kenosis theory but the next generation gives up their faith entirely and it doesn't work. But people have sincerely believed that these arguments are simply unanswerable and it is necessary for us to frankly examine them and see what they are. Anything that is as widespread and effective as this one must study and just to call it bad is ~~an~~ an attitude that I don't think anyone in Christian work or as a leader should have in his mind. I think that there are cases when a movement comes in and the attitude is that it is bad and that may be the necessary attitude for your congregation but if it becomes strong and a force to be reckoned with and it is would be fine to see what is good in it and what is bad. It is my personal belief that one of the reasons why cults and isms are so widespread today is because the Christian church has neglected a large portion of the teaching of the Bible. We pour our stress on a few great fundamental truths and we should put our stress on them but we at the same time neglect other ~~xxx~~ truths. So Mary Baker Eddy or some Theosophist or Adventist takes a hold of a blessing which the Christian has available and yet most Christians don't know about it and hence along some some who present such and such with an emphasis on this that has been neglected--they are giving them a certain amount of good but the Christian doesn't realize it. These cults should be dealt with but the way not to do it is to call everything therein bad. If you build up an institution or organization or an idea that is entirely bad it will fall of its own weight. It is impossible for anything entirely bad to prosper for any time. There must be a certain amount of good in anything to go forward and strength to go forward. The bad may be so bad that it will over shadow the good and yet good in it to give it strength and we as leaders we should not take that attitude that all of it is bad but study it out and keep people out of its bad points and see what the good things in it are and see what portion of the things are really good--In Christian Science there is a great emphasis on peace of mind and freedom on a calm contented attitude. I don't think they really produce it but they do make a good counterfeit of it in many cases and the sad thing about it all is that in the Christian world you will find many earnest Christians who don't have peace of mind and don't have freedom of worry and don't have trust because they don't realize they have the right to have it through Christ and the fact that they should have it. The attitude that all of a thing is bad is not one that will accomplish anything in the long run. That movement might

lead to tendencies which are vicious and wrong but we can say that we are dead against the movement but at the same time point out some of the good points and it is our business to find out how we can adopt those good elements into our teaching from the Word of God. It is simply absurd to take the attitude that everything is absurd in any movement and anything that is _____ that is essential that is as strong as it is today and it has a good amount of good solid amount of reasoning and filled with facts and there are points where the observation has gone astray and places where the argument would be true and not false and the thing is to find where those points are and be able to admit everything that is true and show where the error is. That is the way we as Christian leaders can help others. I heard a fellow 15 years ago go out full of zeal and fervour for the Gospel and the people to whom he ministered out in the country had no use for criticism and these people never had heard of higher criticism but all they wanted to hear was the word of God. In about a year I was called back and asked to give some arguments against Higher Criticism because the young folks had come back from University and the parents couldn't answer the questions of their children. It is a thing that one will meet in all kinds of places and of course one thing that you are very apt to do is to run up ~~against~~ individuals who probably don't know a great deal about it, but if you instead of saying it all is just a bunch of junk and on the other hand you show them that you know as much or more about the subject than they do and you can show them where there is a weakness in the thing or where their ideas don't fit, you can very likely win their confidence. I feel that it is very important that we don't take the idea that all this is a lot of foolishness but really study into the matter and see where the higher critics get off.

26 They have a background just the same as ours--it is a viewpoint which has had a very wide influence and therefore we should try to sincerely and earnestly try to understand a little bit of what it is and what its viewpoints are and what are the particular places in it where they have gotten off the track. This section # IV is not saying what is wrong with Higher Criticism but rather what is it--that is the movement that has come to be associated? Through what viewpoint has it passed and how did it begin and who are the men that have contributed greatly to it and what phases of it are they absolutely sure of and have been sure of or have they taken a certain change in their attack. We are interested in criticizing these viewpoint here especially unless it is rather obvious but the our interest right now--What is it? What have the leaders held and what is their argument for holding it. The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch is not like having Einstein coming up with a theory of relativity works either 100% for it or if off

even the slightest bit that makes one 100% against it--that is not like Higher Criticism. It is a movement that has gone through a history of about 200 years and in this history it has assumed different forms and gone different directions and if you get ahold of it in any one point you do not properly understand it. If you are trying to deal with someone that believes it, you can deal much better with that person if you understand the background. We wish now to get a sympathetic understanding of the stages through which it has gone and some of the reasons.

b. Astruc's Clue: This has been greatly exaggerated in recent years. Looking back on it, this man Astruc is given a position in Higher Criticism which he does not deserve. You will find many a book which says that Higher Criticism began when a profligate physician in France presented the astounding theory that the book of Gen. could be divided into two documents on the basis of the proper names of God. Now when making a statement like that, it is not a fair way of reasoning. Whether he was a man of profligate life is an interesting question ~~but~~ ^{and} it is one worth looking into but it does not in itself prove whether his ideas were correct or incorrect on this matter. To call a thing an astounding theory is absurd. To hear that men were flying through the ~~air~~ air was an astounding theory and when the Wright brothers were managing to fly half a mile in the air, the people just refused to believe it--it was so astounding. A thing may be astounding but that doesn't prove it true or false. Astruc as a matter of fact I have found not to be any more profligate than any other Frenchmen of the time. He lived in the middle of the 18th cent. The Huguenots had been driven out of the country and their activities had been suppressed by the licentious king, Louis XIV and France sunk into a condition from which it never has emerged--a condition in which R.Cath. based everything upon its forms and ceremonies but didn't affect the life and was struggling with an atheism ^{and} the atheism has largely won in recent decades. The character of the French as a result has degenerated. I did find that he was a very learned physician and that he wrote the treatise on venereal disease which was the standard work for nearly a century and was a researcher. Astruc never denied the Mosesic authorship of the Pent. He stated it very positively that he believed Moses wrote the Pent. and Astruc did not discover anything new. He noticed that in the book of Gen. in the 1:1-4--God is always called Elohim and then he noticed that in ch. 2 that He is called Jehovah God and that after that for a couple of chapters He is always called Jehovah and then ~~for~~ some times for a few verses He is called God and then LORD and this is the clue. Augustine had noticed this and commented upon it. Many people had noticed this strange and interesting fact about the book of Genesis--Ex. 1 and 2 are the same way but after that it is not that way. The same is true in Numbers and Deuteronomy. The term God is comparative,

little used and Jehovah is usually used. But in Gen. you have one name used for a while and then the other name is used for a while--you have long sections of one use and then you have long sections with other name used. Now many men have noticed this before and this was nothing new. Astruc developed a theory on this. He tied it up with another idea that was already known. It is amazing how many steps forward are taken by simply tying two simple things that are already known and put together. In Astruc's day there were people who were saying that Moses couldn't have been the author and then there were some who said that Abraham lived long before Moses, the flood, creation etc. were long before Moses and then they would say--do you think that Moses went up in the mount and God simply dictated the whole book of Genesis to Him. There were orthodox commentators around 1700 A.D. who in their answer told the people that was not what they believed--we don't think that God dictated the whole Pent. to Moses--these things were written down at the time and he simply put them together and God by His Holy Spirit kept Moses from error in order that He might give a correct story of these events, by which he had learned through records that had come down to him from earlier time. That certainly is a reasonable view and this was what the most orthodox commentators were giving for an answer to these who were attacking the authorship of Moses and it is exactly what I believe about the matter. But how often you can take an orthodox view and the devil will take it around and twist it--Astruc took this idea that Moses had MSS and took this other thing about the peculiar use of name of God and Astruc took these two together and developed a theory and it is a good thing when people's minds are active and the more theories we get the better but we must test the theories and to our surprise we will find that some of the theories will help us get more truth but we must test them very carefully and not take it unless we have real evidence that it is true. Astruc worked up this theory and as a hobby he would study the book of Genesis and he would try and figure out the different documents that Moses used. The first one was from Gen. 1:1 to 2:4. Then at 2:5 he starts to say Jehovah God and then later he says another name but this Jehovah God he doesn't use again. Jehovah is used to identify God that was spoken about before and God is tacked on just to connect the idea up. Astruc then conjectured that Moses had one document that had all about the flood and etc. and that there was another one that used the Name Jehovah--so he went through and took all the passages that had God in it and then all those that had Jehovah and he thought separately he could get two separate stories which were complete. And then he found about ten other passages which he tried to fit in though not very long. He had two main long documents--one using God and the other using Jehovah. He put these into parallel columns like

Origen's Hexaplar and he called one column a and the other b. He wasn't so much interested in where he ~~got them~~ or how Moses tied the two documents together but where he got them rather. I know people who can preach the Gospel and who want to preach and yet they spend weeks and months pounding up the number of letters in the Scripture in a certain verse thinking that might give a bit of inspiration and if that doesn't fit their theory, they will twist it around and get a new theory and they get the most complicated mathematical formula in the attempt to show a bit of inspiration and they could do the same thing with any book ever written. Ill. of friend who wrote saying how many letters, numbers divisible by 7, etc, in the NT and the idea of it all was that it was a wonderful proof of inspiration but the main trouble was that the fellow did not ^{know} any Greek because I took the first paragraph in the Greek Testament and counted the number, the verbs divisible by 7, etc and here and there I found paragraphs divisible by 7. There was a theory that had nothing to it and yet I know people who spend much time puzzling over the books and try to prove a lot of trash like that. Compared with that Astruc's theory was intelligence itself-- he had a theory that had a lot of evidence in it and he studied it and then after he had worked it out he had the idea that he would like to publish it but he thought he had not better as people would think that he was unorthodox and that I don't believe that Moses is the author of the Pentateuch and he talked with a friend about it. The friend encouraged him to publish it as he said there were Protestant writers and Roman Catholic. He was still hesitant to publish it as he was afraid most would misunderstand his attitude as I am afraid most people do today due to the way they throw dirt at him as though he was responsible for the whole business. He was afraid of casting aspersions on the Mosaic authorship and he didn't want to do any such thing. He did publish it and it was published in 1753 which is a date which has been considered a memorable date in history of higher criticism because Astruc wrote his book at that time. It is of little importance in history because little attention was paid to his book and Voltaire 20 or 30 years later spoke of the ridiculous theories of Astruc and that is one of the few references that we have and Voltaire thought it was rather absurd and hardly anyone paid any attention to it. The only reason it is important now is that the same line was taken later and then people say that the original theory began with Astruc. He was the pioneer and the pioneer's work in this case was buried away and forgotten and it accomplished nothing as far as any effect was concerned, at least if we can take the next man's word for it, it accomplished nothing and I don't see why we shouldn't take his word. So by the opinions contributed by both conservatives and liberals today it is necessary that you know when he wrote his book and that you know what his theory was

and the next man had five times the importance Asterec had although he is only about one tenth known and he has just about the same theory so there is no use to explain it all over again. He only dealt with Genesis and from this book he was able to figure out what he called the A document. The A Document in which the word God is used for God and which tells the story from Creation up to the end of the life of Joseph and that he was able to figure from it the B Document which tells ~~of~~ ⁱⁿ it ^{of} the Creation up until the End of ~~Moses~~ Joseph which uses the word Jehovah and 8 or 10 other sections varying and don't fit into either of these documents and some of the other little documents that Moses used and he believed that Moses used them in order to write the book of Genesis. The theory has in it what seems reasonable and what there is about which a question might be raised. The idea that Moses used documents is nothing that any intelligent person can attack. You don't have to believe in Moses's documents as it is possible if God chose that He dictated to Moses the entire book of Genesis. It is entirely possible that He may have had the events passed on by word of mouth and then he took what was passed on by mouth. Either of these is possible but it is equally possible and in my opinion far more probable that these events were written up and the records passed down and that Moses had the records. That impresses me as far more probable as we know that writing was common in those days; in fact, more common than in this day even. It was common in Mesopotamia, in Egypt, in Palestine and why shouldn't Abraham have written? We don't know that he did or that he didn't so the idea that Moses used documents may be true and it may not. This theory assumed that there were the two documents which expressed the story right from creation up to the end of Joseph's life. That is something that you might hesitate about. Someone might have said that they wanted to write up the whole story just as Moses did in his day. They might have and they might not but we have no proof. It would be just as probable that Noah would have the record that he passed on of the events before his time and that Abraham would have Noah's record and he would write up the story of his life and Jacob would write up the story of his life and that could be just as probable and the same story could be written up then in two different ways. Another big assumption is as to whether or not Moses read all the documents through or did he just take it and put a section of this in and a section of that in and then put into the story of the Gospel writers's words arranged another. We know that was done with the Gospels as you can get the story in the Gospel writers words and then he would pick out the parallel and the different accounts were compiled to make one from all four Gospels and you can tell where they are from because you can say Matthew speaks of the Kingdom of Heaven, Luke and the Kingdom of God. It might be possible that Moses

did this but we can't simply assume that it is true and so it is worthwhile to look at the evidence to see if the evidence is one way or the other but don't be too sure that you can prove it one way or the other as we may be able to prove it and we may not. Twelve years ago I received a book from the Sunday School Times and wanted a review written --I wrote it and they wanted at first only 700 words but then I made it 1000 words long and they wrote back about wanting it 1500 words. It was published on the front page of the paper as an editorial but unsigned. Norman Jerome recognized it as he recognized the style as mine. If Mr. Eppard and I had written it together he would not have been able to pick out the paragraphs I wrote and the ones Mr. Eppard did but what is even more if the reader had never seen or written read either of our writings, then to try to pick out the individual paragraphs would be impossible. To tell what his style is and what my style is is going quite a bit farther and it is merely pointing out something that you can't take for granted. Asterec's idea is that we have evidence of the styles here in the fact of the names.

Pent. #28

Asterec took the names as a clue and then he figured from that what other clues might be and he figured that God took things in a very systematic way and he thought he noticed a sort of style that went ahead in a 1, 2, 3 order and when he came to the next chapter he thought it just went along like a story. Asterec, if was the only man in the higher criticism, we would not even need to discuss the higher criticism but there was a German named ~~Jeorn~~ Eithorn who born just about the time Asterec wrote his book and this German wrote a book in which he presented substantially this same view --Eithorn and you will find among people who know little about the higher criticism Asterec will be mentioned a dozen times to Eithorn mentioned once and if studied very much they are apt to mention them about equally. Actually noone noticed Asterec's book but Eithorn's book was just like setting a fire to dry grass. It spread so rapidly. Eithorn said that he had never seen Asterec's book or heard anything about it until after his own book came out--Asterec's book was 30 years before, few people had said anything about it; Asterec's book was in French, Eithorn's in German and so there is no reason in the world to think that Eithorn is telling a lie. Eithorn may have easily done it on his own initiative and if so 1782 is the real date of the beginning of the higher criticism instead of 1753 but it is important that you remember 1753 and I don't care if you remember 1782 or not. 1753 is considered the date for the beginning. 1782 Eithorn wrote his first ^{edit} introduction to the OT and it went like wild fire. Ques. of student.

Answered with French answer. Conjectures about the original memoirs which Moses used in composing the book of Genesis and this is a rough English translation of the title which he used. It is not too important to remember the title but the date is important. Eithorn had a brilliant style but many thought he was not a brilliant scholar and the reason for that was that he wrote too interestingly. That is probably one of the big reasons it carried so interestingly and the books which he wrote had wide spread interest. Eithorn is the ideal one to get credit for it, I think, although Asterec had an idea of it. It lead to wêdespread interest all over and he is considered great in the writing of it. It is important to consider Asterec's date. There was little attention paid to Asterec's book and you can readily believe it might disappear with out much affect on the world if Eithorn presented about the same ideas about 30 years later and so then we asume they began with Asterec. The name of Asterec is today probably a dozen times better known in connection with the higher criticism than the name of Eithorn-- he gets the credit or the blame for all development of the higher criticism which has affected all the religious world and thus it is important to realize that we notice that Asterec did not decide the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

Eihorn is the next one we will deal with completely. Here we have a very strange thing--quite opposite to the usual course of events--usually the Germans write in heavy letters but Eithorn's style aroused interest all over Germany and Eithorn was a very brilliant German professor in a German Un. Gottingen, the province of Hanover and the story that leads to that is interesting. The duke of Hanover at one time was made king of England and for over a century the Duke also reigned as king of England and it was during this period that he wrote--in fact, in 1782 when his introduction came out ~~the king was~~ the Duke of Hanpver was George the third and the US had just won its independence that year from England. In that year 1782, Eichhorn published a book, Intro. to the O.T. He had a brilliant mind, a great student of the Bible and Oriental languages, a student of literature and of history. He used to lecture 24 hours a week covering various oriental languages, many different types of Biblical languages and the history of literature and general history and a tremendous field he covered and a man covering all of that of course could not possibly do a thorough exact detailed work and therefore there are those who speak slightly of Eichhorn and though his work wasn't as exact as it might have been, it was by no means a superficial type of work and he was quite an energetic sort of fellow and he claimed to have worked out these ideas himself. Of course it is so similar to Astruc's idea that it might make a person wonder. The important thing is that he wrote these ideas in a manner that

would draw attention from all of Germany; everybody was reading it and everyone was either for it or against. One who was tremendously interested in it was the philosopher Goethe and he accepted the whole theory and was all in favor of it and within 20 years a man made the statement that all would accept the idea--that Genesis was made up of the two documents--The one that uses the name of Elohim and the one that uses the name--Jehovah. His ideas were very similar to Astruc's--he believed that Moses wrote the Pent. and Astruc in his early writings never even suggested anything else but that Astruc wrote the Pent. and to the end of his day he never came out with any other position. Before the last edition of his Introduction was published, there were others who had denied that Moses was the writer of the Pent. And in this last edition he didn't speak as positively on this as the first. He did modify his view a little and admitted the possibility of someone else having written the book. Eichhorn only applied his method to Genesis and didn't go on into the rest of the Pent. He considered that Moses compiled the book from these different sources and thus that the book is made up of these two early sources with a certain amount of extra material made up of other sources.

29 He pointed out that one that uses Jehovah could be taken out and looked at as a complete story and there was a complete story in the other except that there were a few places where it was a little rough but on the whole they both made a tolerably good story. Of course if there were just a few interpolations--this documentary theory of the origin of the book of Gen. was or came to be a very important factor in German scholarship through Eichhorn's work. Of course we must recognize that it was not merely through his excellent writing that Eichhorn gained such a great reputation. The theory was not quite as novel as ~~it was~~ in Astruc's day and the book came to people that were more interested in theories of that type because by this time scholarship in Germany was trying to analyze the sources. They were trying to tell about all the ancient classics--as to how much did Cicero write and what parts did he actually copy and what parts did someone else add. They were dividing up the Illiad of Homer and said how this part came from this period and this ~~the~~ part from another period. It was quite the the thing at that time to try and find out in various writings all the documents and how they were put together. That being the case, it seemed quite natural to do the same thing to the Bible and so they took up this book of Eichhorn with great interest. Now today that is not a common method of studying ancient writings. If that sort of method were advanced today, people would say that is was an interesting idea but do you have proof enough to tell if these sources are all right. If you took one of the addresses of President ~~of~~ Roosevelt gave, you would find in that address which he

gave, there might be subjects written by five different people. He had different men working out these speeches and another would take these separate speeches and fit them together and then Roosevelt himself would go over it and the result was a composite work of many men and not simply the work of one individual but for anyone to think that they could go into that work and could recognize what the various divisions were and who wrote this or that, would display a tremendous amount of knowledge. Someone who knows Roosevelt's advisers well might be in a position to do a pretty good job on it. If you had heard Judge Rosenman make a good many speeches, you would take a sentence of his and say that sounds exactly like Roosevelt and here is a phrase etc. and you thus could take out phrases and sentences which would remind you of Roosevelt but if you have not heard them, ~~but~~ if you weren't living with them, you would not be in a very strong position to do this and of course that is the position that we are in regarding all these ancient documents. Many of them no doubt are composites but when it comes to adding them up and telling what comes from this or that source, we have those sources to compare with and it would take a tremendous amount of knowledge and of guesswork and modern scholars do not feel very qualified to do this. In that day it was the general feeling that they could do that and therefore the theory of Eichhorn was very readily accepted.

d. Arguments for Partition: Now I want to mention the arguments that Eichhorn mentioned that he tried to prove that he could make these divisions and show the basis on which he made it. These arguments are of great importance, not only to show us what Eichhorn did but because they are the standard arguments used today by those who hold to the higher criticism. It is very important that we get what these arguments are since we will be studying them the rest of the semester.

1. Argument for divine names. Though this was changed somewhat later we will see what Eichhorn argued. The feeling that God says this and God says that and the other thing and you find the name of God all the way through and from Gen. 1:1-2:4, you have a continuous document which speaks of God in this way. But after that you have Jehovah God for a way. And the reason that Jehovah-God is used is simply to tie the two sections together but then you will find Jehovah a ways and God for a ways and this is a clue to what the two documents were. Now in Eichhorn's view this was of far greater importance than today. It was extremely important in that day and has been right down through in the development of the higher critical view. So it is a valid question--can we divide it up this way? Does this give us a solid basis for making a division? There were people in days of Eichhorn that refused to accept it and they said that name of God

was used to mean a great force and God as the great Creator and when Jehovah is used it was used in reference to the relation of God with His people and so they said you have a different reason why one name is used and then another and that explanation works out very well in ch. 1 and ch. 2 and 3 because that is the way it is used but does this explanation work for the rest of the book? We will look at that later on. There are many phases of it and it is important for us now to realize what the claim is--Divine names are used.

2. Continuous narrative--You can read the passages in Gen. which use the name God and go right straight through and get the whole story. You can have a story that is connected and you don't have any great gaps and you go right straight through and you can do the same thing where the name Jehovah is used. It isn't as though you just had a section that used the Name God and just as though just in a certain part. He thought the story of Abraham and Isaac came from the Jehovah writer and the story of Jacob and Joseph came for the God writer. They thought that both these stories were given a good bit in both the documents. Now this argument from continuous narrative is a very interesting one and a very important argument. If you could go through Roosevelt's speech and you could pick out sentences that you thought were characteristic of Judge Rosenman and then arrange those sentences and it showed a continuation--you could say that Rosenman wrote a speech but if you found Rosenman's style only in the first paragraph and not in the last part, your argument would be tremendously lessened.

3. Parallel Passages (There is nobody today that holds the view of Eichhorn today and so there is no use our spending a month on something that no one holds today but we have to know what he believed so we can properly evaluate his evidence. We have to get his strength and weakness.) This is an argument that requires a great deal of study to make a fair judgment thereon. You take these various stories and both seem to tell the same thing in different words. You have the story of creation of man in both--it isn't only that they are told in parallel and continuous but that they tell the same thing.

30 There is the story of Abraham that lied about his wife and another tells about going to land of the Philistines and there he told a ~~wife~~ ^{lie} about his wife and through God's marvelous intervention he got her back. Did one story tell it this way and other and once you get that attitude you are getting beyond what Astruc said. He held that Moses had written it all, but that the same story is written twice by two different authors --one story says that he went to Philistia and another to Egypt etc. you pretty soon have a contradiction if it is the same event. You are not getting to the place where a parallelism is a mistake--we have to examine this with extreme care. You could have two accounts. Cf. Paul's account of his conversion in Acts--no proof of parallel documents--aren't they simply details which are stressed for the occasion.

We could go on and give you the history of higher criticism under about 20 main heads but I think that it will be a little clearer to you to divided these heads into other heads and keep the these larger ones in mind. IV--The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch. A. The Importance of this period--Change B. (Astruc's Clue) make that 1. B--the early Documentary Theory. Under that 1--Astruc's Clue. 2. Eichhorn. 3. ~~For~~ Arguments for Partition. A. Divine Names--that in itself would not prove different documents. The arrangement of names may be a clue and an interesting thing and an unusual thing to use a certain Name for quite a period and then another name for quite a period--that in itself does not prove different documents. I was preparing some S. S. Lesson Topics recently--I said the birth of Jesus, Jesus being His Ministry, the temptation of Jesus, Christ explains the Sabbath, Christ does this and that--when I got through about a dozen lessons I noticed that I had four or five using the Name Jesus and then four or five using the Name Christ and then maybe four or five using Jesus again and it is easy to see how one would come to do that. Either Name is all right to use of Him and you might have a special reason for doing so. You might be more like to speak of the baptism of Jesus than the baptism of Christ but then when you think of Him in that position of the Anointed One of God and whe He has done for us, we naturally call Him Christ. In many cases it doesn't occur to you to call Him one of the other--either name is a good handle and one fits as well as another. Once you have used One Name for even perhaps an unconcious reason, you are much more apt to go on using that Name for a while unles you have a particular reason to change to the other. In Russia I understand that they will use may be six names and mix them all up--they think it is good to have variety but to me it is confusing. ~~When~~ they have four people in a room and each name has about six parts and they use anyone of the six names for the four people--in English we are more apt to use one name ofr a while and then switch to another name for a while. It would be very natural to hear in my home to hear my wife speaking to me in two or three different ways in five minutes but it might be that she was speaking about me to different people. She might speak to me and call me by my first name and then answer the phone ans say Dr. MacRae but it would be apt to be to different occasions. She wouldn't ordinarily switch. This use of divine Names is not unusual--we all do it and it is not at all unnatural to use one name for a while and then switch to another name for a while--the use of the names in themselves do not prove different documents but it is a suggestion and it is worth seeing if one could consistently work out something that would give evidence as to the various scources from which the material had been taken. There is never anything wrong in following up any such truth and finding out

but it is only a clue and not a proof unless it is buttressed by other evidence. It is just like the way that many people divide the books of the Bible. They would say look here--Here is the book of Micah--Hear O Israel, then it says, ^{Hear ye Priests} Hear Ye People--out of the seven chapters three of them begin that way. Now they say--the book of Micah is divided into three parts and each part begins with Hear ye--there is no proof for this at all on this basis but when you look into the divisions further and see the unity in each there is a section of two chapters, then three chapters and then two chapters and that each of these has a certain unity within and then you can say that here is a natural division of the book into three parts and that here is a clue and that suggests it. On the other hand there are people that divide the book ~~into~~ of Isaiah because of a certain phrase and yet when you look into them, you will find that there is no basis. The divine name is at best only a clue and perhaps worthy of consideration.

31 The use of these names is not a proof but a good clue. It needs further evidence but it is by no means a proof. No. 2 is the evidence of continuance ~~documents~~ narratives. The reason I'm glad to have this as no. 2 instead of no. 3 is because it fits with no. 1. It is in other words a subsidiary evidence which may be of importance but is not a proof. If no. 3 can be proven it is a proof --no. 1 is merely a clue but a valuable one. You cannot say that if he uses documents it must make a continuous narrative. That cannot be said. If it does make a ^{narrative} continuous evidence that is very interesting additional evidence. You may have the same story told twice and then the evidence only told once. You might take one of Roosevelt's speeches and by taking out sentences here and there you could get almost all that he said practically. Then you could take another speech and do the same but then you couldn't put the two together. There is apt to be repetition for anything that is facts but trying instead to drive them home. You can about pick out enough to provide a continuous repetition and from it you can get a continuous narrative. We need to examine it to see if it works out exactly as they say it does. If it does work as they say it doesn't seem that it proves the point necessarily. If it doesn't work it does not mean it does not prove the point. It is an interesting point but it seems by far the weakest of the four. There are some striking evidences that it might work out but we're not saying it will work out. It was said that the Elohim sections form a regularly constructed and continuous narrative without any apparent conflicts or caps. In the Jehovah section it was affirmed even less so as they were not sure if it would make a whole story or not. The third argument is from parallel passages and this argument is in connection with something which Moses is supposed to have written. It is used with the theory in connection with the unknown writer

and the argument says this thing is repeated twice here. It is easy to say a thing once and then say it over again to drive it home. A parallel passage that says about the same thing in other words and you find about the same thing in anything that anyone ever says in a speech. If you have a parallel passage in the sense that you have the same thing told twice then there is no sense in telling it twice. Then it goes beyond proving simply the kind of documents that Moses would use. It could be a lack of understanding on the part of whoever combined them. IN the NT we have three stories of the temptation of Jesus and in these three stories the order of the Temptation is different. If someone was writing a ~~Life~~ Life of Christ and felt that he should put all three in and then you read each one and they are each in a different order and then you could say that that man believed he was tempted in three different ways and of course we could say that such a thing might have occurred but I don't think that many think that way about it. If you have parallel passages which differ with each other and which are inconsistent and yet the same story it would make you think that the person who put them together did not know much about it. It is not merely the case of using evidences--it is the case of using them in an incorrect way. This goes beyond Eithorn and says there are actual mistakes in the material. The view that is held to day that Gen. 1:1 and 2:3 gives the Elohist's idea of the creation and that 2:4 following gives the Jehovist's idea of the creation implies that there are two different contradictory stories here and if that is the case you can already say that we have the contradictory idea of how Moses arranged it. The argument from parallel passages is much more vital an argument than any others we have looked at. Now we ask if we have two stories of Creation. There may be a reason for giving repetition and different aspects of the same passage. If it could be done in an ordinary talk it could be done in a book which Moses wrote. If you have different parallel passages it would in some way seem that these are in some way inconsistent with each other. I find that many places I go I have many ask if there are contradictory stories of creation. If you don't have two contradictory stories and it is just the telling of the story twice with the different aspects you might to stress. When you come to the Flood you might find in ch. 6, v. 8 we have a passage in which the name of Jehovah is used and in this passage in which the name of Moses is used we have an account of the increasing of wickedness in the world. Then the rest of the ch. uses the name God instead of Jehovah. Look in your Bible at Genesis 6. Is the name Jehovah always used in Ch. 6, v. 1-8? It is not a mixed passage. Is that an argument against God being Jehovah? We would say it is not. It is descriptive of certain individuals and these individuals are not well spoken of in the ch. Speaking of the Sons of God would certa

certainly mean that it would be the same--the Sons of Jehovah. The next instance in the next verses wher we have any other name than God. Jehovah is not the correct pronounciation and you can look in your Hebrew Bible and tell from that. Something about Lord in capitals--LORD.

32

When you find the letters in capital like this it is in the Hebrew and Jehovah is one way to pronounce it. Is this a section that always uses the word Jehovah for God? We found in v. 2 the case of God used in that word. It is speaking fo this class of people rather than of something that God does and so. What is the next instance for the use of some other name after v. 2 other than Jehovah? Is v. 4 an argument against its being a Jehovah passage? Is it the same as 2--the Sons of God? Look and you will see it is about the same as in v. 3. It is Jehovah again. In your Authorized Version the representation is Jehovah--they put either Lord in capitals or God in capitals and it does seem that it would be better if they would be consistent and use either one or the other all the time. They have it here Lord instead of God but that is purely the whim of the translators. The Hebrew has Jehovah exactly as the other. There is an apparent case in the English Bible where it doesn't fit as being a Jehovah passage but due to the whim of the translators it is an inconsistency on their part. Capital God is the same as LORD and whenever you read it you should say caps so anyone will know. We can say v. 1-8 use the word Jehovah consistently for God and in v. 9 we read that Noah walked with God and that is not in caps--that is God in relation to an individual and to one of the leaders and it has the word Elohim and it is not either God or Jehovah written in Caps. Then you have again in v. 11 again in v. 12 and in v. 13. Here is a ch. in which the first 8 verses and the name Jehovah is used consistently for God and the next ones use the name of Elohim for God and consistently. You find the document tells about the wickedness in the earth and Jehovah's willing purpose to destroy and then you look at the next part. Verses 11-13 you repeat what you have in 1-7. There is a repetition--is such a repetition impossible? He told the story at length here--he told it fully and then leads up to Noah, he introduces Noah and then he tells of the things that happen in the formation of the ark. It is common in any literature to tell a thing at length and then to tell it briefly or the other way around. This does not prove they are two different documents but the fact that you have the change is definitely the argument in favor of the other. It is the argument of which if you get enough of them and they stand the test, they will stand. It is by no means a conclusive proof but an indication. There is no statement that the writer using the word Jehovah did not know the name of God. Our English just turns it around and Elohim

is a term for a sort of being--just like a man or a dog. Sometimes it says the God and has the article in it. We use that term when we refer to the gods of the heathen and we refer to someone when we say that he makes something his god. We use it referring to anything that we put up in a supreme place. The word god is a term then for a class of things rather than an individual but the Lord Jehovah is a proper name. It is the specific proper name of this individual and that is the reason in favor of the Revised Version calling it Jehovah instead of calling it the Lord and Jehovah, even in the way it is pronounced, it is a proper name. In our AV we say God and we don't use any article with it and we speak of it as a proper name, God. When we say, the Lord, putting an article before it it sounds as though we're describing a class of being. Ill. of students many in Faith Seminary but you wouldn't say there are Mr. Eppard's many as it is a proper name. Apply it to Prof. and it applies to anyone in that category but you apply it to one certain one and it means ~~any-of-them~~ one special one. The name Jehovah is the personal name. They didn't think the name of Jehovah had been revealed yet at that time but the one who used the name of Jehovah--they know that He is a God. It would not be unnatural for them to ~~tell~~ call Him God at times then. For them to speak of some people as the Sons of God and that is an entirely different thing. Now you notice in what I said I have repeated the same thing about four times and in any book there is repetition. If you have a book you can divide up and take this section, and this section, etc. and they all use the name Jehovah consistently, and then in another section they all use the name of God consistently and then you put the name of God over here, the name of Jehovah over here and then with one group there is a series of incidents told and then you say they are told again over here and it is not the continuous narrative that each agree to the unit but you have the thing told here, and here, etc. Then consistently you have two accounts of everything. Now if it worked out that way that would be a mighty strong argument for two documents but we want to see if it does but we must get busy and see just what the argument is so we notice that here there is a repetition and here is a passage using the name of Jehovah which tells at length of the wickedness of man and God's determination to destroy the earth. Then we have three verses, 11, 12, 13 in a passage using the word Elohim which tells us that the earth became corrupt and God decided to destroy it so there is a repetition--not such a repetition that necessarily proves different documents. If there are enough of them they will form an argument that must be very carefully looked at to see how much it does or does not prove. In ch. 9 we have given to us in brief form in repetition what we already have here in the early part of the ch. From v. 14 on we have an account of God's command to Noah to

build the ark and to go into it and take his family with him. Notice 14 describes the ark and tells him what the ark is to be like and in 17 he tells how the flood is going to come upon the earth and all in the earth will die and he makes the Covenant with Noah and in 19 and 20 he is told how he is to bring some of every kind of animal into the ark. Then in ch. 7 you have the word Jehovah used again and in v. 1 and v. 5 and there Noah is told to go into the Ark and take his family and every variety of animal with him. You notice that the passage of how to make the ark is not repeated and thus there is not a complete repetition and it does not repeat about the covenant being made with Noah so it is not a complete repetition there either but it does repeat the command to bring animals in and it is easy to see the same thought and command.

Pent. #33

In ch. 6, v. 21 he was told to take food into the ark and there is nothing about that in ch. 7. So then everything is not repeated by any means but there are parallels to some extent so the argument ~~ordinance~~ of parallel passages if they were absolutely the same in Matthew is for absolute repetition but it can't be that. A certain amount of paralleling you can find in anything and you won't find absolute word for word repetition and the question is if it is enough to prove different documents. I mentioned yesterday about Abraham--one is an Elohim passage, one a Jehovah passage and are the same stories told twice? Are there two different events or just what, we ask. What you decide on that will determine what you think about that special evidence. The 4th argument is the least tangible of the four and yet the most important of the book. This one is argued from the differences in style. You might say style, diction, ideals and aims. This fourth argument really includes the first argument after all. Different names for God is an evidence but it is not a sufficient evidence. The question is along with other arguments do we have other evidences? Is there evidence of the diversity of style? Take Gen. 1 and you read it and you find that He did certain things in the morning, and the evening and it was one day, etc. You have a sort of table there and so on 1, 2, 3 & in ch. 2 and 4 on you don't have that method of tabular. If you find every time that the name of Elohim is used there is a tabular method of presentation. If you had the different presentation, you would probably say that here is a different style, a different approach, a different method of speaking. In ch. 1 it speaks of "beasts in the field," and in ch. 2 it speaks of "Beasts in the air." If everywhere you have Elohim you have beasts of the field spoken of and everywhere you have Jehovah you have Beasts of the air, that would seem to show several peculiarities of the style of that writer, would it not? In the

3rd Ch. you repeatedly have the word create used and in the second one you have the formed one used and then you have created man and ~~woman~~^{wife} in one place and then in another you have male and female and use the different expressions and different ways of saying the things. I could use certain terminology one minute and the next use some other and that still would not prove anything so the question is if you can take all the Jehovah passages through and find the style to be similar to that of this section and then take the Elohim passage through and find a style similar to that passage and if you find that the one who says Elohim always says male and female and then if you find the names of the expressions that are consistently used along with the names and their change and then you would have a basis for your argument. The argument from the view of the diction and view point of style and so on. That is the most important of the four but it is probably the hardest to take hold of. You cannot discuss the evidences pro and con if you don't know what it is and therefore we want to get exactly what the higher criticism is and how it developed. You take a man in the government and you ask what you think of that man--you can measure him and you can make certain judgments by just looking at him but it is most important for the government to know what his background is and what his history and experience has been. ~~xxx~~ I have known when one man saw another man and did what he thought of as a joke to the other man and the other man was absolutely unmoved by it and thought what sort of mean and sour fellow is that and finally he called him names and then proceeds to tell how sour he is on the world. Then another fellow tells him, Did you know that his little boy was killed in an auto-accident last month and only then could he understand why the other fellow wasn't in a mood for laughter and of course he felt very much ashamed of himself for having taken the attitude which he did. His attitude might have been entirely justified if there had not been this cause behind it to explain why the other man was that way. That might not excuse the other man's attitude, but it will be better understood and so in connection with this higher criticism. It is something that has moved along and shows upon it the marks through which it has gone and if a person is going to understand it in order to be able to deal with it reasonably, he must have some idea of the progress through which it has gone and to know what it is like today. So it is important that we get an idea of how it came to be what it is and what stages it passed through and not so interested now so much is this thing true or false but this is based upon these arguments and this viewpoint and insofar as these arguments are valid or not, they will stand or fall. That is very important if we are to understand the subsequent phases of it and see how it developed into a force which,

is a force, which I believe has done more than any other force to destroy the faith in the Bible in the world today. It is the basic reason for turning away the people of God. The first step that you make to turn away from the Scripture and to take what is good and what is bad, the step leads logically to unbelief and knocks the very foundation of any successful attempt to be a witness for Christ. This force is one of the greatest forces in the last two centuries that has caused apostasy in this day and any surrender that we make in any detail is extremely dangerous and it is taught today in nearly all of our great seminaries like Princeton, Yale, Drew, Colgate-Rochester and taught as definite and true and a person is just beside himself if he doesn't accept it. One cannot take oppose this without knowing something about it and how it came to be what it is. Just to know how strong and weak these arguments are that have produced this strong crisis in the world today and so at this point I am not trying to give evidence proving that Eichhorn was right or wrong. I am trying to show you what Eichhorn believed and what arguments he used. He believed, at least to the last edition of his book that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch, but it is rather hard to find a copy of that last edition, because in general he held that Moses was the author and compiled the book out of documents and I believe that Moses had documents which he used but to say that he just took a section of this and a section of that which requires a good deal of proof before anyone has the right to dogmatically to say is true. To say that these documents which he took this way and which he arranged this way, we cannot tell what is in this document and that, it would take a tremendous part of ability to recognize the fact as to what belongs in each. So

34 we don't have any objections to saying that Moses used documents but I would be skeptical about anyone being able to say this came from this document and this other came from that one-- if that were being presented today, we would say, he doesn't know. He wasn't there and is there sufficient proof--maybe he is right and maybe is wrong but it doesn't make a great deal difference anyway, but it did make a great deal of difference because it was the foundation and in order to understand that thing it is vital that we know the sort of arguments that are used. Can you be sure that whenever you come across a different name, it is one document and when you come across another name it means another document. That in itself would not prove anything though it might be a clue and you could take the separate sections and put them together and see what you have and if you find that they give you a connected story with no bad breaks, you may say that it looks likely that you have complete documents and if you find that the same stories are told, that would be a further proof. If you found that in this section he uses a

a certain style and this ~~xxx~~ ~~xxxx~~ section another sort of a style, we would have pretty good evidence that Eichhorn could divide the books up into various documents and divide it up into the two main sources that Moses used. If that was the view that was taken today, we would take a long time studying that view but nobody today believes Eichhorn's view and his is only the foundation. And we want to see why they don't accept Eichhorn's view. Of course the reason was, at least one of the reasons is that it didn't work out nearly as simply as it sounds. These evidences from styles correspond somewhat with the use of the names but not exactly and you find pretty soon, can we make the division here or here? Here is a phrase that is used in Gen. 1 and it should be up here and this other phrase should be down there and pretty soon you have all these divisions being moved around in order to take care of all this and then we find in continuous document, we will find E document says that the God that everything was good and then we see that everything was evil; how did that come about? All that is told about is found in the J document and how do you now find a good world that God made all of a sudden filled with wickedness. There must be something missing here and so you find questions about your continuous document theory and then you look at the parallel passages and see about Abraham in Egypt lies about his wife and with the Philistines he tells about a lie--why couldn't the thing happen twice. We certainly make a mistake more than once. ILL. of having an account of the first world-war and the second world-war and someone might look at these two accounts and say this is actually one war and somehow it is gotten divided up into two world wars. In both of them England, France, America and Russia on one side and Germany on the other and the President of the U.S. takes a lead as to the final say in both wars. There are various countries on the other side but the head of the German nation is picked out as the leading target to represent the evil of the other side--that was Emperor Wilhelm in the last war and Hitler in the past war. Different names but the same authority and same situation. Then you find in 1915 at the beginning of the first world war you find that a German named Graf Spee was off the coast of S.M. and the British fought them there and ~~the~~ Graf Spee went down to the bottom with the ships and now at the beginning of the second world war you find the battle of German ships against British and there is only one principal difference. In the first war Graf Spee was the Captain of the fleet and in the past war Graf Spee was the name of the principal ship. In the first World War the British sunk the ships of the Germans and in the second world war the Germans scuttled their ships. These minor differences actually show you have the same authority--two different versions of the same authority. That would be a

pretty good proof that there was only one war with just two different accounts and it is remarkable the number of similarities that one can find in different things and this argument of parallel passages is well worthy of consideration but which is not necessarily a proof.

4. Further Development of the Documentary Theory--we mean that development which came immediately thereafter.

a. Its Extension through the Pentateuch. Eichhorn thought this related only to the book of Genesis and the first two chapters of Exodus but others continued the method right on through the Pentateuch. They said the divine names do not serve as a division anymore after the beginning of Exodus because it is nearly always Jehovah and God is rarely used but as you get on into the Pent. you will come across passages which sound very much like the first ch. of Gen. He did this and that and he saw that it was good and it was evening and morning, the third day--it was a statistical enumeration it would sound like. In the E document we have the list of the kings of Edom and how long they lived and we get to Lev. and you find that you are to take the animal and this with the gall, this with the tail, and you take another animal and you sacrifice this with a tail, caul, and it sounds like the same sort of style as we found in the first part of Genesis. So they said that this probably fits together with the other. Naturally when you start doing this through the Pentateuch, you begin to wonder whether Moses was the author. Moses might have taken documents to tell you what happened centuries before his time and put them together and compiled them, but did he take that which happened in his own day and put them together--these must have been done later if it can be taken on throughout the Pent. Yes, the people said that Moses could have had different scribes writing and then he put them together but no one held to that very long. They soon said that it came later than his day. So there came a weakening of the faith of Mosesic authorship.

b. Ex. 6:3--a denial of Mosesic authorship. I have looked at various books recently which present the higher criticism and they give you Astruc and Eichhorn's view and then they will present Ex. 6:3 as an argument and I have not yet located who started building an argument on that reference. It is an argument used by all the higher critics and came soon after Eichhorn to be of considerable importance. "And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac and unto Jacob as El Shaddai. but by my name Jehovah I was not known to them." By this name I was not know to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. It plainly contradicts it doesn't it. I am Jehovah and by that name I wasn't known to them. The name God is used all the way through Gen. How about

the Jehovahistic document that called Him Jehovah right from the very beginning. Here is a flat contradiction is it not. Certainly this is two different writers that had two different ideas and thought the name Jehovah began at the very beginning--not only does this seem to show that Moses might not have written it but they both contradict each other and here the argument is not the habit of whether you like to use the name God or Jehovah. If that is the meaning of this verse why couldn't the man that put these two documents together see that these two would contradict each other?

35 That is one big difficulty is this very thing and other interpretations have been suggested for this verse by conservatives who explain how it can be that this can have been said to Moses and how the name Jehovah wasn't said before to Moses. We will look into that later on. It is one of the arguments held most tenaciously to this day. If I were to say to you that I met Mrs. Field over in Europe one time and I said to her, what do you think of so and so and she said I went to the post-office to ask for the mail and they said there was no mail down there for Mrs. Field--suppose that I were to tell a story like that. Now maybe someone were to ask me if Mrs. Field was married yet and I would say no, but she met her husband a couple of years later --that would be a flat contradiction. Here I addressed her by that name and yet she wasn't married and didn't even know her husband and you would come to the conclusion that that wasn't her name at the time. In this this case, if God says to Moses, Abraham and Jacob did not know the name Jehovah and yet if Moses writes in the town where Abraham says I worship Jehovah, you certainly would be flatly contradicting yourself. If you interpret the verse the way the critics interpret the verse, you have a flat contradiction and shows the man who wrote it as an utter false if one story or if in documents; therefore conservatives feel that the verse should be interpreted in a different way--not that they didn't know the name but they don't know that characteristic which is highly stressed in that name of Jehovah but knew that characteristic which is stressed in El Shaddai. There are four or five suggestions that are made for the interpretation of this verse but it is very difficult to see how the critical interpretation is right--not only does it make out that Moses was an utter fool, but whoever put the documents together is made out as an utter fool. On the direct interpretation it makes Moses an utter fool but also anyone that combined the documents as a fool also. It is not a conclusive argument by any means but it is important to know that it is an argument that was accepted by critics a century ago and today the argument is accepted by 60 to 70% of the theological students of the world and by liberal men--I would say accept it 95% as true.

Of course that is not true of Eichhorn and Astruc's view, because theirs have been developed and modified greatly but this particular argument is held on tenaciously. So it is important to mention at this point but now we mentioned

c. Ilgen -- It is just a little bit difficult to know whether to put Ilgen here or in the next division. He is a figure which is rather a transition character so I mention him here. This man had less influence than ^{Astruc} ~~Ilgen~~ had or Eichhorn and it is very important that you be familiar with both of these men. If you forget the name of Ilgen I will not feel so badly because his importance at the time was not great and his book ~~was~~ was not considered great but it does show how his theory was developed. Ilgen was a prof. at Univ. of _____ in Germany and wrote a book in 1798 which he called The Documents of the Archives of the Temple of Jerusalem in their Original Form was a Contribution to the Corroboration of History and Religion and Thought--they used long titles in that day. This book of his is almost impossible to find anywhere and the book had very very little influence. Critics look back and say what a wonderful mind Ilgen and the thing that makes him wonderful is the way he went in the direction of the higher critical view. He said that this matter of Eichhorn is very good but he went on to say that he figured that it wasn't a unit--he said the first section made up the E and then there were five sections which made up the E and the first J is two sections. He didn't say anything about a 2nd J so he probably thought they would get a 2nd J so you have more than one writer. It begins to confuse the clear simplicity of Eichhorn and Astruc's view and when Ilgen came to ch. 2 he said he didn't think that part was J at all but that Jehovah had been stuck in there later and written later in but should have really been God and so he changed it around a great deal from the arrangement which Eichhorn and instead of having two main documents, he had three main ones and a number of subsidiary ones. It is simply an indication of the facts that when you start this method of dividing up into documents you have the right to divide it up into more documents and that is an argument which is greatly weakened. If you prove that here are two documents that are combined it is pretty strong argument but if you find the same evidence to break up the first into smaller ones, you begin to wonder just how sure one could be and how far one could ~~split~~ go. Ilgen took a step in this complexity. He saw the same arguments that Eichhorn used could be used to break the documents into smaller portions and that is why I questioned whether to put Ilgen here or not.

C. This I will call From Eichhorn to Graf.

This is a long period of criticism in the field because there were a number of important developments during this time but Eichhorn laid the foundation and Graf laid the foundation of the theory as held today by nearly all scholars.

1. The Fragment Hypothesis: Now you might think that Igen was making it a good deal of a business of fragments. There were other scholars at this time who set forth various forms of Eichhorn's view. Of course conservatives were denying Eichhorn's view and the great mass of the English speaking world was not much affected by it at that time--nor a great part of the German church though the universities were greatly affected. Now the founder of the theory was a Scotsman--a Rom. Cath. priest--Alexander DeBdes. Actually he says, there are a lot of documents and a great many small sections which were gathered together by the compiler and he not only took the Pentateuch but also added Joshua to it and made it the Hexateuch but the Pentateuch is a word that is given up by the unbeliever. Your liberal dictionaries under Pent. simply tell you to look under Hexateuch and all this was divided up into these small sections and it was supposedly in the time of Solomon that it was put together. Some of the sections might go back to the time of Moses and we can't be sure of just two main documents. This reduced it to argument to absurdum and now he was followed by a German called Vatcher. He wrote a book in 1805 in which he went paragraph by paragraph and he divided up sometimes the sections in as small as half verses, and sometimes a whole chapter and made all these various documents.

36 He said that all of these different fragments and that a compiler perhaps in the time of Solomon put all these things together and made up the Pentateuch and he includes Joshua therein. He says that Gen. has 38 fragments and other books of the Pent. he divided up similarly though perhaps he went to extreme. Hartman in 1831 presented the same idea. In this period from 1800 to 1835 it came to be quite generally held by critical scholarship, this fragmentary idea that it was a lot of different small writings that were compiled together. There is a unity to it and a plan and a definite arrangement and there are references in one part to another part and fits together into a logical complete unit and it is much easier to believe that one man wrote that, since it all fits together into a unit, than to believe there were a lot of separate documents and so today, there is no scholar but who would consider the fragmentary theory as ridiculous but it is the development that originally came from the documentary theory and it is strange that the view held today is more similar to the fragmentary

theory than the holders realize. The fragmentary theory, Wm. H. Greene calls the Document Theory Hypothesis of one man. It was the taking of these arguments and taking them on further. It is the same sort of thing that someone has presented in relation to the history of the U.S. in the middle of the last century. Southern states said they entered the union voluntarily and have a right to withdraw from it voluntarily. The north said, No, the union once formed is a permanent thing and they have no right to secede from it and so a bunch of them seceded and made a confederacy but before the war was anywhere ~~any~~ near over, the states began to become dissatisfied with the Confederate govt. and they began to secede from them and so the principal carries on and you have no permanent coordination at all. There is nothing dependable or unified and it is a principal that helped in the end of the war as it did. There would be no fighting strength ~~if~~ if they didn't stand together. In this case, the Documentary theory figures that you can divide it up, and it is one thing to have evidence to show that there is reason to make a division but it must also show that there is reason for stop making a division. You have to show that there is a reason to stop at that point and that these are the documents and are not to be divided up into a whole lot of little documents. You just don't get a unit by getting a whole lot of little documents. A man may read a lot of different documents. There are a few books written that way but it is easy to recognize when ~~this~~ is done. There was a great reaction against the hypothesis theory but before we go on to no. 3 I want to insert a different line of logic--# 2. De Wette--he was a brilliant German scholar born in 1780. He read and wrote a great deal on higher criticism and had a very great influence but something that had the greatest influence was something he did while only 25. He wrote a book at that age which was entirely novel and yet which is accepted by all critics today. That theory was that the documents that Josiah found in the temple was the book of Deuteronomy--at least the main section of the book. Of course some had said that this was all put together by the time of Hezekiah. _____ said that by the time of Solomon. Josiah was much later than Solomon, ~~even~~ being later than Hezekiah and so here is a section of the Pent. which comes at end of the history way at the time of Josiah according to DE Wette and he bases it not upon literary ~~arguments~~ arguments but upon historical arguments. It is the beginning of the application of historical arguments. This argument and theory is spoken of by all critics as the great master stroke in the understanding of the Pentateuch. He made out that the book of Deuteronomy is the book which was found in the temple by Josiah and was written at that time and not before.

Review--the outstanding difference is that the first chapter reads like a stastical statement while the 2nd, 3rd and 4th reads like a story. Just look at the repetitions in the first chapter and it is like a table. Cf. v. 3, v. 5, v6, v. 8, 9, 11, 13 and so on. You have six days and God said, tells what he said, how the thing happened--it is a table and enumeration--it is like a stastical arrangement. Is that a difference of style and does that necessarily show a different author. Why couldn't the same person write a stastical table. I could say in 1940 we had so many students from the South, so many from the northeast; the next year and so forth and repeat the same phrase and give a statistical enumeration and then I could describe some experiences that I had and it would be all an entirely different style. There is a marked difference in style between Gen. 1 and Gen. 2-4 and no one should think of denying that. The question is, is it so different that it would indicate a different author and that is a question which cannot be answered immediately. If you find evidence that the author always writes in a certain way and that the author always deals in another way, you could point out that is one always speaks in this stastical way and this other always talks in this more interesting narrative way but ordinarily you might think that both styles could be used by the same man depending upon the subject matter. We have to go on and look at further material before we can be certain of our answer whether this difference in style would indicate a different author or not. There are one or two things that perhaps I should stress a little more about this fragmentary hypothesis before we go on to notice particularly DeWette. This hypothesis is quite a natural development of the documentary theory. The arguments used for the doc. theory, the last two of them naturally went on to produce the fragmentary theory. It is exactly the same argument that is used. Now the documents if they prove that there should be divisions, should prove where to stop at the point of division. If they go too far they destroy the proof and validity. ILL. of what the man once said about Daniel in the lion's den. He said that those dens there in Babylonia were big caves in the earth--the entrance was sealed up with an airtight seal, so it is perfectly silly to say that Daniel was able to live all night there because even if the lions didn't get him he would have perished because of the lack of air. That proves that Daniel couldn't live as well as the lions. Often you will find that an argument proves too much. People will base arguments on doctrinal matters and often they will prove ~~with~~ ~~in~~ much too much and the argument becomes absurd. Our first two arguments did not do that. We have the names of God and that might prove two documents though not necessarily

That might be a clue as to two documents but it wouldn't prove it necessarily and has to be combined with other arguments. Now the second argument about parallel passages might prove something. If you find the same thing told twice you might say that there are two documents but of course this is not proved conclusively simply from that. I am sure that any of you could take my lectures and pick out and find that the whole thing could be put into some 20 minutes--I repeat practically everything ~~and~~ I say two or three times because it is necessary to get it across to get them over. Very often I will repeat within five or ten minutes something that I have already said--that doesn't prove a different author and there is a purpose in repeating the same thing and then I might say things that are similar but aren't quite the same--they are parallel. You have to use this argument with care. Now they take this document and Ilgen had two E and one is called the first J and he made it out as though he expected another document but this was taken on. You have to have a definite stopping place and the same thing is true about style. You must have sufficient other evidence that would show that this would prove another author. Wm. Hen. Green--Let every word be compared with each other, grammatical construction and so forth and let it be compared and noted as difference in diction and style and let the parallel be paraded as showing different authorship and let this all go on and it would not be difficult at all to show that each page came from a different author. The question is--does it go to that extreme and it is easy to go to that extreme and those who used this hypothesis did ~~use~~ ^{go to} this extreme and they divided Genesis up as well as the other books of the Pent. into a great many small fragments and combined them or said they were combined at the time of Solomon or Josiah or some later time of the Israelite kingdom. This theory was not long accepted and it never was widely accepted outside of the scholars but it is so unnatural and unreal. It is based upon the assumption that there was a great body of writings about the Mosesic and anti-Mosesic writings of which we have no more evidence. We have no reason to think there were fifty different writers writing about Moses and about Abraham and so on. We would think that some other of these documents would be remaining or references thereto. It would be easy to take Macbeth and Hamlet and look at the differences--one deals with Scotland and the other deals with Denmark and note the difference in background--the characters are quite different and you might say that two different authors must have written these two different plays but when you got through I don't think that you would find anybody that thought two different authors wrote them though there

are some who would say that Sakespeare didn't write either one of them. Why don't they say one man wrote Hamlet and the other was written by someone else. Both are such a tremendous work of art that it is enough to give one man undyng credit--why not spread the credit out a little and give it to two men. The fact of the matter is that we don't have that many men who are capable of writing such material. It is far easier to believe that one man like Shakespeare wrote a dozen great classics than it is to believe that a dozen men worked on these 12 classics of whom we have never heard anything and we don't have any evidence for such a large number of writers writing all these different things and of course if we did, all these different fragments put together would not produce this orderly work but just a body of disconnected anecdotes or a heterogeneous miscellany. If you took three stories of Sherlock Holmes, I am sure that you would recognize all the stories by Conan Doyle--there is a similarity of approach and then there are differences and someone might try to make out different authors but the unity is far greater than the differences. In the Pent. there is a great unity of structure and a similarity of different parts such as has resulted in a very strong reaction against this fragmentary hypothesis. That doesn't mean that the method is wrong but the method might be used to extreme and still be right and yet it raises a great question about the validity about the fact when it is carried to such a terrific extreme as this fragmentary hypothesis.

2. This does not effect the main body of the study of Genesis because no. 2 doesn't deal with Genesis. DeWette did but only to a small extent. It comes chronologically at this time so I think we should consider DeWette somemore. He was a very precocious scholar, and at the age of 25 he was able to write books that influenced scholarship up to the present day. Then writers say that in years later he didn't come up to the promise of his earlier years. Later on he went on writing and doing important studies, many of them on the N.T. but the thing for which he is most remembered is the very first thing he ever wrote--in 1805 he presented a strong case for the book of Deut. was written at the time of King Josiah and was found in the temple as described in II Kings 22. Is there any objection to finding the book of Deut. in the temple at the time of Josiah? Not only is there no objection but I think that we must say that it is undoubtedly the case, that it was found at that time. Was it just the book of Deut. that was found or the whole Pent? He said that they found it there and read it through twice in one day and therefore it could not have been the Pent. Some people could read very rapidly and I am not sure just how much evidence that we have for having read the book through one day. We can't be so sure as to how long this was--they read enough of it to see what it

was undoubtedly so I don't think that his evidence that only Deut. was found is at all conclusive at all. I would say that Deut. was definitely included in what was found but whether the whole Pent. was found there that day or just the book of Deut. and they proceeded to carry it out and later on they found the rest of the Pent. where it had been forgotten during the wicked reign of Manasseh--so they found the official copy there in the temple. That doesn't say that there might not have been many other copies with the people and the king did not know about it, and when they found the official copy there in the temple the king was so impressed over it that it caused a revival in the land. Perhaps the whole Pent. was found and maybe Deut. only but why did he insist on just the book of Deut. In the revival which Josiah proceeded to bring about, there are things specifically mentioned in Deut. and connects right up with things that he did. So there is no question as to Deut. being included in that which he found and I don't think anyone before DeWette's time had questioned but that Deut. was included. The new step of DeWette was to say that Deut. was written at that time and for that purpose--especially the 12th chapter because there because there Moses commands that they should not worship in every place in the land where they take a notion to out are to worship in one place and to offer their burnt offerings in the one place where the Lord shall choose. The outstanding thing which Josiah did, among many other things, was to get rid of the high places where the people were sacrificing upon the hills in various places. There was Gebea where Solomon had had a great sacrifice and the Lord appeared there to offer him wisdom and that was after Solomon had sacrificed in this high place here a few miles from Jerusalem. Josiah destroyed these high places and caused all to worship in the temple after that. Josiah put an end to the worship of the hosts of heaven and this is commanded in Deut. 12. DeWette says that this priests in the temple didn't like the idea that people were offering sacrifices elsewhere and taking away their tithes and so they would make it against the law to worship any place else so they made out that they found this great ancient book. When they did that, the king tried to do away with all these other places and that meant that all the sacrifices would be brought to one place and so it was a mighty good thing for the priests and so historically you can see why such a book was gotten up and thus he thought he proved his point for the priest's sake.

38

The book was found in the temple and Josiah adopted the book and carried it on and they say that they know when Deuteronomy was written but any thing that is written but it must come later on

than the book of Josiah and that is the great suggestion which is made by _____ and has been accepted by practically all British scholars ever since. There is a difficulty in it as you immediately see for the believing man to say that Deut. was written just at that time. That would be true especially if the priest wrote it and pretended he found it and Deut. has so much in it about doing good, it would then make the man out to be a terrible hypocrite. It would then be a great moral difficulty to think that the priest wrote it and then if you try to get around that by saying someone else wrote it and the man who found it did not realize it. Then they would say it was not just for the purpose of getting more tithes for the priest but they knew it would be a good thing for the land and so it was just a white lie, just a pious front to tell the king it was an old book when actually it had just been written. If you think this of a book that is as good a book as Deut. is just written, then you can see wrong in most all things and become a real cynic on life. People have tried to say that someone wrote the book and it got in there in some way and it was just written then but the priest did not know it. The big problem is the moral problem--could a man who committed a fraud write such a good book as the book of Deut.? If not, just how did it work out? It is a difficulty but one which the critical scholars think can be worked out in some way. Ques. about why it should be a moral problem at all. Then a book such as Deut. and to obey the Lord and all the terrible things that will happen if you don't would be hard to write and have it be just a fraud. Ques. We shall study the moral problem later on but at present we want to know just what its development was in the higher criticism. In 1805 it was presented and it was one of the few things held by the higher critics then. There are some critics who are altering the view on this point now though. Some say that Deut. is much later than that, and then some say the book was written at a much earlier time. Ques. The one specific command about the worship in one place you do not find stressed in Exodus, Lev. and Numbers. The other things are stressed about equally. 1807 he thought the whole Pentateuch was unhistorical. Some critics say that you don't learn anything about Abraham, Noah, etc, but you learn a lot about the people who made up these stories in their own times. Not all the stories critics have gone to such an extreme but some of them have. Number 3 is the strong reaction against number 1 and this is a reaction which carried for 50 years and in 1823 a brilliant young German scholar wrote a book against the --- hypotheses. This man was named Hymen Ewald. He was one of the outstanding Biblical scholars of the 19th century. He wrote many works which had a great influence. Some people thought that he had such an influence that it went to his head and he got the word that he could say what the fact was

on anything. He expected the people to take just what he said and that would lead to the tendency of having him say things without thinking them through as much as he should. He did make many statements which were carefully thought through and carefully studied and the great influence he had was based upon his great ability and his tremendous amount of work. This work he wrote in 1823 was very unusual in that it had a short name -- "The Composition of Genesis, Critically Investigated." This was very remarkable for those days. He attacked the fragment theory very strongly. A book like Genesis with such a marked unity in it would hardly have come into existence simply through a great many writings having been put together in the way the fragment hypotheses suggests. He opposed strongly the dividing up into little sections all these various parts. He gave some illustrations from Arabic literature in which you find repetitions in a greater way. He felt Genesis as a whole was a unit. His book was one then used greatly to put an end to the fragment hypothesis. Some scholars had held this theory but it had never held any control outside of the ranks of the leading scholars. We are interested now in looking at the development from the criticism. Ewald is a man who was a critic and he was not convinced the whole book was written by Genesis-Moses, it was an old book but he did think it had a marked unity and this fragment hypotheses was impossible. In the next seven years Ewald was influenced by others to take up the view that Genesis had a great amount of unity in it but there were a great many sections in it that were added later and so there began what was called the supplement hypotheses was the established view of scholarship among the critics regarding the Pent. for 50 years. The supplement hypotheses gives an idea of exactly what it is. The document hypotheses was here at the E document which has the name Elohim and here is the J document which has the name Jehovah for God and these two documents, they took a part of this and a part of this and that and so they got then two original complete stories and the E document gives a complete story and the J documents gives a fairly complete story but not as much so as the E document. Some came to hold this view in England and some in America and by many in Germany. The E document here is the foundation--they call it the . It is of Genesis --the God section and then in Ex. 6:3 it says that His name Jehovah was not known before this time. So we have the original document supplemented ^{by an} ~~in-the~~ individual writer who spoke of God as Jehovah. This view was held for about 50 years--there was a Biblical scholar named Blake who was one of the main writers on this--an evangelical Christian who was greatly impressed with the advantage of this view over the view of the frag. hypotheses and he adopted this view to a great extent while holding the great Biblical doctrine. There were some who

did not adopt any of the views--Hentzenberg, for instance, who was a great writer in the middle of the century and who insisted on the Mosaic authorship of the entire Pentateuch and who took a conservative view point and Keil was another great conservative writer. Beak was an evangelical Christian who thought as much as he could of the critical theory and then went on from there

Pentateuch #39

This was held by many critical scholars but then we can go on from there. In 1823 Ewald strongly attacked the frag. hypotheses and then we noticed later on that he gives his approval in general. Any book that gives an account, historical, of the rites of the higher criticism gives much to say the supp. hypotheses but recently they have little to say about it--having almost ignored it. They take the original document and they take sections of various things and put them all together and make them all close. Whether Moses did it or whether someone else did it, it is done. In your supp. hyp. you have one story you may call E if you want to and it is the story which uses the name Elohim --the Gron? is perhaps better. Then the Jehovist or the more recent critics call him the Jahwist. This man took this Elohim and he inserted stories here and here and here and so you get that which has a different style from the original Elohist because the Jehovist inserted it. The Elohist makes a continuous document and gives the whole history and Jehovists insertions are extra and you don't have to say the Jehovist theory makes a complete one. That was the trouble with the original document theory--it was easy to see how the God sections made a complete story but there is the next with no explanation in between. Some say the writer took the Jehovist theory and put it all in and others say that only parts were put in. There were many scholars that wrote various variations of this theory. 1823 until exactly 1878 this great majority of critical scholars held the supp. hypotheses. It was established as explanation which scholarship saw to be the true answer to the problem--how did the Pentateuch come into existence? There was a story of it written in the days of Solomon, perhaps even as early as the time of Saul. Whether earlier or later there was the E story---a story which made a complete narrative and a story which has a unified style and uses the name God all through until it comes to Gen. 6:3 and from then on uses the name of Jehovah. This complete story is a unit and then the Jehovist makes an insertion. It is a beautiful simple theory of how it came into existence and it gains the acceptance of the scholarly world. For 50 years it was held by most of the scholars. Of course along with it at that time there were conservative scholars who said there was nothing to it. Keil, Hentzenberg, and vari-

ious other writers who said there was nothing to it. Kourtz wrote one of the fullest reputation of it--one that is pointed to today as being a very excellent reputation of it all. Some do not mention it all and others mention it occasionally. After he had written it he later gave up this view. It is not as bad as it sounds. He abandoned the idea that Moses wrote it but he thought it was put together in the next generation. That is not such a great difference--far different than the view that some have that it was in the days of David or Saul. I think Kourtz is condemned far beyond what he deserves. We are not going into the history of the conservative opposers of this. We have mentioned that there were very few in America who knew much about this theory --a few of the unitarians and some of that type who were much interested but that is all. The rank and file of the American church knew little about it and had little connection with it. Princeton Sem. was strongly opposing it all through this time. In England the Church of England was dead against it and it was not taught in any school. Any person would not be ordained in the Church of England who believed any such theory. The Ch. of Eng. unitedly believed in the Mosaic authorship of it. ~~But~~ Some of the men were quite radical and did not believe at all in supernatural religion. They said the book had come into being through this natural process. Blake was an evangelical Christian who tried to take a mediating view and he felt he could not defend the view against the great onslaught that faced him in the criticism and so he would give in on some points and maintain others. He was considered a mediating theologian and though considered an evangelical man was ~~being~~ taking this supplementary view and took it that someone else wrote the E document and the other editions were put in later on and so hence Blake was pretty well accepted by the critics and his books were accepted by them and so these theories received easy acceptance into conservative circles. And doubtless if Blake's works had been translated into English they would have won great recognition if it were not for the church of England which forbade such theories and insisting that Moses was the author of the Pent. Some of the more radical scholars wouldn't even ^{be} looked at during that time. Blake would be more the type that would make it easy for the theory to come in since he was so evangelical--the book was translated but since there was so much opposition to it, it didn't get very far. The first real sign of interest in this came from a bishop in the church of England name Calenso--he is not particularly important in the story of the criticism but his story is worth noting. He was an English mathematician and his books were textbooks in high schools and colleges for years. Calenso went into the church of England and became a missionary

to Natal in South Africa. Now how much he knew about the Gospel I don't know but he went down there to be a missionary and doubtless was very sincere to present the views of the church of England and when he got down there he started telling the Zulus that Adam did so and so, and when they asked him if that were true he didn't know and began to wonder. Instead of the bishop converting the Zulus the Zulus converted the bishop. When I was at the 18 International Congress of Orientalists in 1931 I met a man who told me that as a young boy he heard a missionary sermon and decided that he would like to be a missionary and he trained towards that end and took everything that would be useful for working in India and when he got through the university he went over to India and when he got over there he began talking about ~~eternal~~ eternal life and when people there asked him if he were sure and he wasn't sure about it and then he wasn't sure about the deity of Christ and then he decided there was nothing to these old fashioned views so he left them and gave up his work as a missionary and took up teaching in one of the colleges at Oxford and he told me that practically every American ~~that~~ came to take extra work took it under him and he was training the next generation of missionaries--this was 1931 and he told me he was getting a little tired of teaching there and wondered if I could help in America but I haven't as yet. Bishop Calenso was a very charming man and would be the type to attract you--he stayed in Natal and helped out in the humanitarian ways. He knew if you really wanted to get the facts on anything you went to German books--if you want to study French, German books are the best. The Germans are most of the founders in these sciences and so it was natural that he should go to the German sources for the Pentateuch and he studied the supplement theory and he saw what was forbidden in England and saw how the Pent. came into existence and being a man of very inquiring mind, he wrote a series of books on the Pent. in order to show that the E material was late and undependable. He tried to prove what the German scholars had said was earliest, he said contained inconsistencies and absurdities and has parallels within themselves and it raised the ire of the Church of England and he was tried and his books condemned and not to be allowed in England. But under the peculiar constitution of the Church of England he was allowed to continue as bishop.

40. There was a bishop 20 years ago over here in America that denied the truth of the Bible but there was nothing that one could do about. The Bishop of Birmingham now denies the very foundations of the Bible and the Arch-bishop of Canterbury fumes against him and tells him how wicked it is, but the Church of England today has more freedom practically than any other church in the world. You can hold almost any view you want and they can't do anything to ^{you.}

So you have a great combination of views today. In that day you had a control that kept these views from coming into the church and from being ordained but once ordained they couldn't do much about Calenso except send another bishop that taught differently. What he said didn't seem to do much to the people of England except to get the people angry with him but in Germany the people began question the supplementary documents and they accepted what he said about the E document and of course there weren't many in Germany that could read his writing and it was very difficult to show how much influence it really had but now days it is quite customary to point back to Calenso as one of the big leaders in the higher critical field. The early writers said that the J document was a lot of stories which could have easily been drawn up later but the E gives you detailed documents and tells how they travelled from place to place and lists the kings and it would sound like detailed information and therefore must be early while the other sounds as though it were drawn up later. He went into Gen. 1 and said that it sounded detailed at first but it says light and then sun and how could you have light without the sun. He says this sounds quite late. His arguments weren't particularly important but his attitude of not criticizing the J document but the original--it was this that had a certain effect and this was very important--it was the result that scholarship had reached after quite some times. Ewald, who had much to do with starting it began to see difficulties.

4. The Crystalization Hypothesis--this is not nearly as important as the Supplement Hypothesis because only a few held it, comparatively. It was advanced by Ewald in 1843. Ewald had never directly advanced the supplement theory but had given his approval to it and had stood for a far greater unity of Genesis than the the fragment theory and he said that it can't just be a mass of fragments. He says you take the E documents and you have all these gaps and you speak of man being good and then suddenly being bad so he says that it presupposes gaps and things which have not been said. He said you have four basic accounts. Then you have a supplementer who drew those as the large part of the E documents and inserted them here and here, etc. Then a century or two later the J writer comes in and put certain insertions into this and then another E writer puts insertions in to this and later on Deut. is written and united with the rest so instead of one simple supplementation you have sort of the idea of an oyster getting different additions to it. That is to get around the statements that seem to presuppose statements that are already in. It is a clever way of trying to get around the difficulties but was not accepted very widely so we do not spend a great deal of time on it.

5. The Modified Document Hypothesis which is far more important than the Crystalization Hypothesis though at the time the latter seemed the more important. It is very important that we get in mind the man that presented this. Hupfeld published his book in 1853 and this book which he published in 1853--this supplementation business doesn't work at all. He said, if you take the J material which is said to be supplemented into the E material and the E material has the name God and the J has Jehovah and E is tabular--so he says you don't have supplementary material at all but two documents so he called this E^2 which he took out of E^1 so now you have three documents. E is the original document, then there is the second E which is mostly Gen. 20 to the end and then there is the J and of course the fourth is Deut. He goes back to the old document theory and he didn't get too much attention since the Supp. Theory was already too well established and yet today all the critics believe that Hupfeld was right so he is very important.

You have these various Theories and some of them seem easy to adopt but there are great difficulties so that they didn't work though Ewald tried to make it work. He made a series of supplements and there were some that followed Ewald (Min. 11-end is quite indistinct.)

41 --You originally had two main documents according to the theory and now you have four main documents. Hupfeld presented his idea in 1853--this gives you progress of the idea--He came along with the modified document hypothesis which was very complicated and not so many accepted it though of course there were some. Hupfeld made great use of the redactor-- He would constantly say that the redactor when he put these documents together made a change. He said that when this redactor put these various documents together he would put some smooth sentence in which would make the transition--when you are joining the J document to E--you don't just say Jehovah and then God but Jehovah*God and that is quite reasonable in that particular place because the name Jehovah-God is not used much in the Bible outside the 2nd or 3rd ch. of Genesis. In the beginning of the ~~xxx~~ documents you find the two combined he pointed out--he says you put the two names together at that point. That is what a man would naturally do in these documents. He then said that redactor would sometimes ~~had~~ add some word or sentence--like in one place he might put down male and female and in another place he might put man and woman--He might change the Name of God to Jehovah. (3)

He could easily change the name from God to Jehovah or vice versa to make it go more smoothly. Also we need to recognize that the redactor who combined these documents naturally made changes in them and thus you cannot say it is just exactly the way it was written. You can't say this is part of the E document and that part of the J document and so on like that. Then if the redactor made such changes then it obscures the proof that there ever were any such documents. It makes it harder to prove where one ends and the other begins. Ques. about the supplementary theory. As to the exact order in which they were combined I am not sure if ^{Hupfeld} ~~Huxley~~ was positive on that as there were others later who advanced various views about it. There were others later who advanced their views about the documents. ^{Hupfeld} ~~Huxley~~ pointed out that the J and E documents were not too much alike and either one or the other was combined and so they would say there was a redactor who would combine them and so there was a redactor that combined them. Then another redactor combined that with this and later still another redactor combined this with Deut. So you have a different group of redactors that combined that which was written quite late but the important to notice now is that the first document is still the E document but a large portion of the E, which all critics before had said was part of the E document, Hupfeld had pulled out of it and made a second E document--that makes you wonder right away why others didn't do this long before. Another thing about it is that another element which he took, including practically all the portions of Genesis, after Gen. 20, so you have the first E document running up to Gen. 20 and then from there on we have the second E document. In the first you might have Isaac grow up and married and then he died and then all the rest of the story of Isaac might be found in another document. So your E. document right through the last two-thirds of Genesis is just an occasional sentence, except for the one chapter with the list of the kings of Edom, and the chapter of the burial of Sarah. But you see now what the effect this all has on our original four arguments. You say we have two big documents-- E and J --You then say that E tells the whole story without interruption and you don't need J--if you can say that, you can't say it as fully anymore when you take it out of the E section and makes it the whole thing very fragmentary and your second E doesn't even begin with Creation but starts in the middle of the story of Abraham, so you can say that J is a complete story but it always was recognized as a continuous. So the argument of complete documents is cut to a great extent by making it into more document--the more documents you have the less evidence you have. Now with the first argument about Divine Names, you say when one name appears that is one document and when another Name appears it is another, but if you find that the names overlap you will find it much more

difficult to prove. The effectiveness of your argument is cut down by applying the Hupfeld theory. The argument of parallel passages would be one to perhaps lead one to think in different documents--if you say this story and this story are the same thing and then you find another version, you figure you have three copies of the same thing. Then you have the argument of style and you have perhaps a long enough section which you can compare and see if it all hangs together--but when you divide up into two sections you have a more difficult time to prove your case. If I give you a book here to compare with another you might do pretty well in proving the same or a different author wrote, but if just have a few sections--because the smaller the section the more difficult to prove anything from style, unless you are sure you have a book that he wrote in the first place but we don't have anything like that for Moses. So Hupfeld's ideas seemed to weaken the argument. But then came along a very important change.

6. The Rise of the Developmental Hypothesis: Except for the one fact that Deut. was a historical argument alleged to come from the time of Josiah --all the arguments up to this time of the critics have been based upon literary matter--it has been divided up into documents but on the literary basis it is said that the E document was the earliest. There were some # 42 scholars, mostly followers of Haegel's philosophy who tried to explain things that have happened largely on philosophical principals. So they figured out that the simple was first and then the complex came afterwards so they proceeded to study the Pent. on the ideas of the simple laws and then the more complex so they said when you look at the laws of the E document you will find that they are simple in form--thou shalt not do this etc. Do not seethe a goat in his mother's milk and a lot of little simple things--they said that was more primitive type of law but as you go on you get more involved but as you get along you get more involved and you have a development of the law so they studied the law to get the development of it. One of the earliest to advance a theory along this line was Reuss of the Univ. of Stroudsburg. He gave his lectures in 1833 but didn't publish them until 1879. He told how 40 years before he had been telling the same thing that were brought out as supposedly new, but at least it was the beginning of the movement. Now one of his followers in 1835, Vacke, gave similar theories and they received a little more attention and then in 1861, Prof. Kunen, prof. of Univ. of Liden told about the development of the Pent. He was studying through the law and trying to locate, what he thought was different developments of the law and now there came along one whose name is of great importance and his name was Graf in 1865 which he published a book of great importance. Prof. Graf said that the idea that you have the E document with all the elaborate laws of the priests

and all the elaborate details of ordinances--you have these simple forms of law--he made out--this was written first and so he said that everybody agreed that E was the first document and then the second E. might be next but Deut. was the last one--No he says, they are not the last laws but the first ones. People said that this sounded very reasonable to say that these complicated laws of the tabernacle and the law of Moses and the complicated law is that of the exile--you cannot separate these laws from the E. document because E¹ has the same sort of style in it--this man lived so long and so and so-1,2,3,4, and all that goes with this little minutia of the tabernacle--You can't take that apart from that since they are all one document. It is impossible to say that this is the last thing and Kunen in 1869--I was at Liden and saw his picture--it was the same town where Mr. John Robinson stayed when bidding the Pilgrims good bye. In that great University there Abraham Kunen wrote a book in which he said Graf is right and so he said how opposite this was, and so it reversed the whole line of the critical world up to this time. For a 100 years everybody had agreed that the E document was the foundation and so there comes a place in personalities and so all this that was so minutely written and detailed, they thought they would call the P document after after the duties of the priest mentioned there. The E¹ is now called P. One time at the end of a year I asked an examination about the J and I got an answer that was very fine in explaining the P. (Min. 10-15 are very difficult to understand.)

43

Now we have P, E, J and D and now the order is J, E, P, D. P is now near the time of the exile rather than back at the time of Moses. P is at the time of Jehosaphat and ~~xxx~~ D at the time of Josiah and that is the way that it is accepted by practically all scholars today except Prof. Phiffer today of Harvard. (Something must be wrong with the transcriber again--record Min. 1-12 and quite indistinct.). Phiffere separates some of P and puts it as earlier but I don't know of any others that do that--he makes an S document. and Astruc After Ex. 6:3 they call it all of J. You remember that Eichhorn confined themselves to the first part of the Pent. You remember in Ex. 6:3 he says that by the name of Jehovah He was not known up to that time. Only in the first part of Genesis will you find the argument of divine names holding up even in a small way. After Ex. 6:3 the name of Jehovah is used almost entirely.

Soone after this time along came a very brilliant man called Wellhausen.

He was a man like Eichhorn, who was brilliant but he had an unusual way of getting things over to the people. He didn't write in that long tedious style that you have to read over so much before you get anything--he had a great style that was easy to read and in the year 1878 he wrote a book of the history of higher criticism, and this book that he wrote spread all over Germany and it was read very widely indeed, not only in Germany but in England and the U.S. It is still called the Graf-Wellhausen theory--Graf began the idea of putting these documents late but few people could grasp what he was getting at, but Wellhausen succeeded in popularizing the theories. He was a brilliant man with a brilliant mind, the theory is still very tenaciously held though of course there are modifications of it. Barton, the great prof. of _____ in Penna. made the statement that there was no doubt about the existence of the great documents, J, E, P and D and Dr. Albright of the Univ. of John Hopkins in the review of Allis's book on the Books of Moses, said there was no question about the existence of these great documents. (Min. 7-12 are quite indistinct).

44 I had to rush a good deal last time we met so we would come to a stopping place for the higher criticism and recent developments we will leave until later because that which we have been looking proceeded to a certain stage and then has remained quite static. Wellhausen's view since 1870 has remained about the same with very few modifications. There are a lot more modifications in the last 30 years than there was in the previous 40 but the modifications have remained individual and consequently it is one of the greatest forces in our civilization today and it would be impossible to say how much harm it has done even to this day. It has affected people's attitude towards the New and Old Testaments and affected their attitude towards the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ and towards Christian ethics. That is why it is so important that we understand exactly what it is and it is possible for a person to go out and expose the liquor traffic and say how bad it is, and amongst ignorant people you get a long way in this type of tirade but if you are going to deal with intelligent people you would have to show them why it is bad to use alcoholic drinks and we might even point out some of the outstanding men that used alcohol temperately and today and out and out stand with ignorant people, you would get much further than if you would try to reason such a thing out, but such an attitude is likely to boomerang on us.

In the end usually people find that your attitude in certain respects is unreasonable and then in the end they figure that you are wrong in everything--and particularly this is true in this field because of the men that believe it, and think they have proved it as much so as though saying the world were π round. And someone who doubts it is just as much out of date as one who believes that the world is flat and hence is necessary for anyone going into Christian service to know what is wrong and what is right about it--what its strong and weak points are and it is only in this way that any effective testimony can be set up against it. And so I am very anxious that we have a reasonable attitude towards how it began and what is the best method of withstanding it and to know it came that many intelligent people withstood it for a while and then came to the conclusion that it was the only correct attitude to have towards it and how the whole approach was fundamentally wrong. We were looking at # 5 and # 6 and I want to review what that is.

5. The Modified Document Hypothesis--the original had two documents and then the writer fixed it up so it would make a continuous narrative, but if it does make a continuous narrative it is pretty good evidence that you have two distinct narratives and then you compare them both. Now the minute you follow Hupfeld and divide one of these up, your documents are all smaller and the amount and material you have to work on, of course is far smaller and therefore much harder to prove what the contention is. Hupfeld put forth his theory in 1853. The people thought that the Supplement Theory was much better and they thought that any more than two documents was too complicated. But Hupfeld is important because of the way in which his theory fits in with the Developmental Hypothesis. Here then we have the case where two different theories have come together and we noticed how some scholars argued for their theory on the basis of style etc., while another group at this same time tried to show the development of the law and how it got more and more complicated, especially with the law and how it began with real simple laws and gradually got more complex. It was the application of the theory of evolution to the theory of the Pentateuch. We noticed Giese and _____ Kuenen, and then Graf in 1865 made the first big step in this direction and we noticed how in 1865 that he took these laws and switched them right around to fit this idea. All these previous scholars had held that the E document came first but then he put the E last. Of course they were not holding all this as separate documents but as supplementation. Now Hupfeld had divided E into two parts, of which E¹

would be the first, then comes E² then comes J and then comes D. And now Graf says that the laws in this E¹ are the most complicated and go with the detailed accounts of the tabernacle and the genealogies and here was the most complex form being put first by scholars who were interested in the literary style and here along comes Graf and cuts the theory right in half. He made E² as the latest writings and of course anything that was stastical would naturally go together such as Gen 1-3 with Lev. 1-3. When Graf presented this, the people thought this was rather fantastic. Along came Kunen and wrote a book proving that all of E¹ was late and completely reversed what was thought before this. Of course this was quite a change in mind, and the older scholars simply couldn't see it; made it out as simply fantastic. But the younger scholars under the influence of evolution which was coming more and more to the fore and they thought that it was very reasonable. Then in 1878 Wellhausen wrote his great History of Israel, and in this he wrote not only all these facts but in a very enjoyable German style. One of our greatest commentators of the N.T. was the late Prof. Zahn and was called one of the greatest scholars by Harnack but sometimes you will begin a sentence at the top of the page and find then the end at the bottom. I have often had to break one of his sentences up into five or six English ones to get any sanse out of it at all. It is a struggle to figure out just what it means. And a scholar thinks it is worth the trouble to get the material by laboring though such writing but Wellhausen didn't write that way, but he wrote it so well and so forceful so that all could read it and in 1878 his work spread like wilfire as Eichhorn's had done before and just as in this case Graf work wasn't popular, nor was Astruc's work popular in the day of Eichhorn.

45 Wellhausen didn't present something that was any different from what already had been presented but he put it into such popular language that all except the very old scholars accepted it--it was very widely accepted by practicly all and then he was invited to write the article for Israel in the Ency. Brit. in England and his influence extended not only all over the British Isles but over the United States and so the theory is often called the Wellhausen Theory since he popularized it. He was a great Arabic scholar and N.T. scholar--it would be more accurate to call it the Graf-Wellhausen theory since it really was Graf that made the important discovery, but it would still be more accurate if it were called the Hupfeld-Eunen-Graf-Wellhausen theory and the influence of

it has been very great up to this time--so great that I am going to put in another heading.

D. The Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis: summarizing the material of this we will mention. Astruc had an A and B document and various names were given but in the course of years systematic names were applied to them and are held to this day. I remember once I asked in an examination--Give the characteristics of the P document and I got back a very excellent description of the J document--such an answer is not worth anything--it was a case where his knowledge was all confused and of course of very little use to him. If you began discussing the matter with someone who was studying it and you used the wrong terminology, he would conclude that you knew absolutely nothing about the matter. You have to use the accepted terminology and so I think that it is very important that all of you know what is the E, J, P, and D documents and what makes them distinct, etc. If we are talking about the earlier ones, E document covers something entirely different from what Hupfeld thought of as E¹--the 2nd E we know what you mean, and then from Wellhausen's day on we know that the 2nd E is referred to as E and the longer E--Gen. 1-19 and most of the portions of Exodus--we are used to call it not E but P. Then there was a slight change in time and now the order is J, E, D, and P. The big change is taking what used to be E and putting it last and making it P; this is established and certain and some say to this day that by simply reading P, you can pick out what a late and corrupt style it uses and it is obvious that it was written a long time after the other documents and noting how complex everything was; but they forget that over sixty years or longer they use to have this very same material as early. This terminology is very useful because it has different ways in which it can be interpreted. This letter P stands for Priestly and is the document that tells about the tabernacle and what the priest had to do. D is the Deuteronomic material. J represents Jehovah or _____ is the characteristic divine name of this document and that is why we call it the J document. Elohim is the characteristic of the second as well as the P document but in addition, the J document is thought to have developed in Judea and the E document to have developed in Ephraim, in the northern kingdom. That is the general idea of how these documents developed. Now all of this is accepted in most universities that teach anything about the Bible today--accepted just the same way that they accept that the world is round and practically all seminaries that are over 20 years old teach it. Practically all agree what is in P--the statistics and precise details compose this document and is quite distinct from the narrative portion. Is this sufficiently

different to suggest a different writer or is it simply different because of the style of material that is being used. That there is a difference in style, there is no question. If you should go through the Pent. and pick out the stastical portions you probably would come out with 3/4 of what the P. document but couldn't the same wñter have used both kinds of style when dealing with different material? The D document is exhortation and to do what God wants you to do, and why you should be true to God and thus they will live. Ill. of when I use to meet over in our house and when we would come across something that was important I would put it on the dictaphone and though my wife wasn't there she could always tell when I would put it on the dictaphone--the style and tone was different, because here was something that I wanted to keep in more permanent form. Exhortation is always going to be different when getting someone to do something, and quite distinct from telling a story, and you occasionally find in the first eight books of the Bible and so it isn't very difficult to tell what is the D material. But when you come to J and E there is not quite the distinction. They both are narration and both tell what occurred. One used the name Jehovah and the other Elohim but there are places where neither name is used. You will find critics differing as to what belongs in J and what belongs in E but it is recognized that the style is so similar, that without the names it is extremely difficult to tell the difference. Here these two are so close together that you can hardly tell what is J and what is E and is utterly different from the P document. It used to be that they thought there was a good deal of difference between J and E, but in the last sixty years, scholarship has come to the conclusion that you can't tell the difference between J and E --it simply shows that just because scholars should agree on a thing doesn't prove that it is necessarily right. I was greatly impressed when I was taking some work in botany and geology--though all the profs would agree that evolution was true and you would ask them just what work they had done--they might say that they specialized in the circulation of a leaf and there are a thousand different specialities they could and did work in, but they had never worked on the whole and therefore could speak from only a limited experience.

46 All they knew was what someone else had said in a class or what they had read in a book and the great sweeping statements that they make rests upon actually just what two or three people have said, so that the consensus of opinion really doesn't mean so much as just how much has a person really worked in the field and found out for himself the

premise. And here you have two or three people writing and everyone else is convinced by their writings. There is one exception--Dr. Phieffer of Harvard --he takes the J document and cuts out a portion of it which he makes it the S document and it is another small modification which is part of the great theory that is accepted by most scholars.

1. The Rise of the Theory. This we have already discussed.

2. The Spread of the Theory--in 1878 is the vital date of the spread of the Wellhausen theory. After that it was taken up by scholars all over the world. We might note W. Robertson Smith, a brilliant young Scotsman who was raised in fine Christian home; he went over to Germany and there little by little he had been changed in his viewpoint and in 1881 in Aberdeen, Scotland he gave a series of lectures on the rise of the religion of ~~Israel~~ Israel, in which he presented the Wellhausen theory and people thought that this was the answer to it all and though there were some that didn't like and brought charges against him--they expelled him from his professorship there in Aberdeen--he was then taken up by Cambridge University and later he became editor of the Ency. Britt. and his influence was many times what it had been before and he was one of the great forces that caused the belief to be accepted widely. Today in most Scotch universities the higher critical view is presented as that which is certain and definite. I remember in Germany meeting a man from Scotland that was over there and he mentioned that that in Scotland when they got the Wellhausen theory they preached it the rest of their lives--here in Germany was a sad condition because the students would hear it all and then they would go out and preach the old fashioned evangelical teachings. The result is that though Germany was the birth of the higher criticism, it has not had the influence that it had in the English speaking world and there has been a larger body of evangelical Christians in Germany than there has been in Great Britain, and I think that one of the big reasons is that it has been taken over bodily by the English Speaking World and it has come to be almost a mark of intelligence here by accepting this. Various leaders in Oxford, Cambridge, Union and other places took up the theory and it was very widely taught and though there have been a few valiant opposers of it, the majority of the scholarly world has been won over by it and the majority have accepted the theory. The reason is that it has united three different things. It broke the shackles of the older belief of the Supernatural in the Bible--it seemed to give a good reason for not holding to this authority. (2) The whole theory was presented in a very

reasonable way and the (3)--it is united the early partitions with the idea of evolution. It became an integral part in the theory of evolution and so we go to no. 3.

3. The development of the Laws: According to the theory it is that the laws developed from the ~~the~~ most simple to the most complex and so in the end you don't have something that God has given and we must accept it. Note the development of the priesthood. In the J and E documents we have no mention of the priesthood--that is of the separate priesthood. When you get into your separate narratives, it gets a good deal harder, because there seem to be references to different priests but they are isolated references and might be the work of a redactor that came later on. In the D. document you have exhortation and people are exhorted to do what the priests have commanded, so in Deut. you have a Levitical priesthood. Now any ~~priest~~ Levite could be a priest but that is only an inference. You don't have detailed instructions for the priest but why should you. ILL. of a U.S. Senator and the details that would be important in a certain connection, and the fact is that much is mentioned concerning the priesthood, but not the details, but when you get into the P document you find details mentioned and what particular duties etc. Is this all a development in history or is it an evolution, or is it because of the particular sections of the Pent. In J and E there is not much mentioned about the priesthood but in D there is a lot of reference to the priesthood but in P is where the details are given. Then there is the matter of the offerings--in J and E offerings are spoken about in a very general way, but then when you get into Deut. you find certain offerings specified. There is a certain detail about the offerings but not very much mentioned, but when you get into the P documents, it goes into minute detail and should be done with each and they try to show the definite development there--now is there this development and how are we going to explain it.

47 Now comes the question of sacrifice. At first Abraham could offer it here and there and in J and E you can sacrifice just anywhere but in P there was a central place and so you proceed from the general to the specific--it assumes the central place, they claim about the D document--is the explanation that at first God was rather lax and let them meet wherever they pleased and then He became strict when they had their own land or is the explanation that it is an evolutionary aspect--you see that the problem is a little more complex than the other two stages and there are many other stages that might

be mentioned but these three are the most outstanding and it is very important that you should be familiar with them.

4. Summary of the arguments--what is the situation today. You pick up Phiffer, and he just takes it for granted that this is the way it is with no questions asked. Today they just for granted that all scholars believe in the higher critical theory and simply assume it all. The older books will often give the argument for believing it. We might distinguish between the arguments for partition from the arguments --do we have different documents? You can't argue for earlier and later documents until you have proved that we have them. We might mention the arguments--divine names, parallel passages, continuous narrative and diversity of style and then if you have the partition and you have the idea that here are four different documents.

B. Arguments for order--Discrepancies. We find the law given to Moses on Mt. Sinai and then we have it given at another time and so that might prove that someone else wrote another portion of the law. Discrepancies are a strong proof that there are these various arguments.

2. Laws of Progress--if they have logical progress--priests, offerings and altars.

3. Violation of laws that had no proof of existence. Abraham may do something against a law and then God blesses him; is the reason that the law was unknown at that day? ILL. of driving on the right side and the left-hand side of the road.

4. Laws that apply to a particular period and this applies particularly to the book of Deuteronomy.

Discrepancies certainly are an argument for development and naturally it came up as to when these things came into existence. We have mentioned the laws of progress. When you get you E document it is slightly more spiritual, not so much anthropomorphism --there is supposed to be a rise in the concept of the attitude towards God.

(This whole record is rather indistinct and difficult to understand.)

Here we see how in one place the sacrifices were to be done in one place and then we see how Solomon went up to Gibeah and God rebuked him for it--when he went up there, God instead rebuking him commended ~~for~~ him and gave him his choice of what he wanted; if the law of Deut. had already been given at this earlier time and not at the time of Josiah, how did this come about? I am just simply presenting the argument and a few of the examples--I trust that all of you realize what the answer is to this simple question. When the Bible says that Solomon sacrificed a 100,000 sheep, that he didn't take a knife himself and slay all those sheep himself, but it means that he gave the sacrifice and demanded that it be given and doubtless there were individuals that did the work and it doesn't say who they were and there is no contradiction here in this particular case, as to who was to do the actual sacrificing. Now in that particular case it simply doesn't stand to reason that he should do all of that; it would have to have been done by others and we have no right to say that Solomon disobeyed in that particular case. You see the argument is not that the law was broken--bad people break laws, but when you find a good person who is praised doing things that are strongly condemned in the law, it is a pretty good argument that that particular law has not yet been given--that it is something that comes later. So this argument of violation of laws because of non-existence is one of the very strongest of the arguments of the Higher criticism of the Pent. and is one which we will examine at length in due season.

4. The Appropriate sections for a particular period, I have already mentioned, how this applies specifically to the book of Deut. It is not nearly so easy to say of J, E, D and P that this particular passage fits with a particular time but in Deut. in ch. 12 they are specifically told not to sacrifice just anywhere but are to bring their sacrifices to Jerusalem, or to the place where God selects to put His name there--you read about Josiah after he found the book that was in the temple went out and destroyed the high places and ordered them all to sacrifice in Jerusalem and in Deut. you have many false and evil practices condemned and in II Kings you have many of these very same specific things mentioned as what Josiah put down. So Josiah's reform and Deut. fit closely together--there is no question about that. Does that mean that Deut. was written at that time or does it mean that it have a peculiar fitness for that time, though written long before that time? That cannot be answered categorically without looking into the evidence but there are other things in the

book which fit much better for things that happened long before the time of Josiah and these things that fit the time of Josiah could very well have fitted an earlier time and so various details of this have to be looked into. The thing that I want to be sure about now is that you know what the critical theory is. There are a great many people talking about it who don't know what it is and most of the theological students simply take the whole theory for granted, just the same way as they take it that the earth is round and most institutions that teach anything about the Bible teach this the same as saying Washington was the first president of the U.S. Consequently the great bulk of students simply take it all as facts and your ministry is apt to be inclined towards the most ignorant people and whatever country of the world you are in, you are going to find people going back to these views and if you immediately show them that you have no idea what it is, you might have a very fine argument against some phase of it, but in the course of show to the person that you thought it was utter nonsense, you naturally would have no influence on the man. It is vital that we know exactly what the theory is and know something of how it developed. If you get everything from this point on in the course, and yet you don't know what is the J, E or P document, I would say that your time is utterly wasted and in such a case I would have to give you a grade less than 65. That is why we have spent so much time discussing what the theory is and how it came to be and there are a 1000 other details that might be learned about it, but if you know exactly where we have come so far and know exactly how the theory developed, and what the principal arguments are--if you know that, then you are in a position to investigate and see whether they are valid or not. To distinguish between J and E is very difficult but the other documents are very easy to distinguish between. What do we mean when we mention the P document. Is it that which tells about the fall of Man--people may differ as to where J ends and E begins but there is not a critical scholar anywhere that would have any question about the difference between J and P. There is very little question in their sight where P ends or begins. You might pick a book that differs radically with another book as to where J and E begin or end but then on P you probably would find all agreeing as to where it ended and began. It is an important thing to know that J and E are easily distinguished but it doesn't have nearly the weight unless you brought in the argument about P having been written late. We will hope and trust that everyone has the material up to this date, because it is essential if wish to understand the material that is still to be given

We will now proceed with the second part of our course.

V. The examination of the arguments for the Partition of the Pentateuch. (1) Those that are connected with the partition of the Pentateuch and those (2) connected with development of the Pentateuch. There are four main arguments for partition.

a. The Divine Names.

1. The Priority of the Criteria. The Divine Names is not simply one of a whole different uses of style, though some may tell you that it is. That is an easy refuge. The argument is liable to be that of style, but that is merely one of a whole lot of criteria of style--that is apt to be stated and there are apt to be some who would try and state it on that basis, but it is important to realize that the theory began on this criterion of Divine Names and it is on that basis that the first argument was made. That in the early writers there are many dogmatic statements about the dependability of this argument and that in the latest books it is treated as quite dependable. It is given a great deal of prominence and it has a place in the history of the development of the theory--that is where the Jehovistic document and Elohist documents derived their names also. So you have one with God and another with Jehovah and then see how they compare.

2. The Graf-Wellhausen theory breaks up this argument and criterion. Of course it was their theory that broke it up--Hupfeld wrote his book in 1853. As taught before that it was on the basis of style and the use of Divine Names that it was divided up.

49 --We have noticed that through the P document the name of God is used throughout and in the E document which constitutes a considerable portion of the J*E material so that the argument about Divine Names is terrifically complicated; the fact of the argument is that the argument is not between the J and E document but between J*E and the P document and that too has been pretty well broken up.

3. This Criteria is almost entirely confined to the book of Genesis. Now the E document is almost all of it in Gen. and that uses the name Elohim but the P document is said to use Elohim up to Ex. 6:3 and Jehovah thereafter. That means all the way after that you have Jehovah used, and consequently it is only in Gen. that this criteria has much effect. Another thing to notice about it and it is quite important, is that in Gen. and early Exodus, this criterion cannot always be followed. It is not used consistently throughout. By that we mean right in Gen and early Ex. can you take all of the passages that have Jehovah

in them and say this belongs to the J document, and then take all of the passages that have Elohim and take that as being either from the E or P document. You can do it to a very large extent but you cannot do it consistently--if you do that, then some of your other arguments fall through. For instance in the story of the flood--of course there is no E document before Gen. 20 but in the story of the flood you have the J document and you have the P document and you separate the sections that have Jehovah and Elohim in them and each has a complete story paralleling the other story--if that is the case, you should have one name used in one story and the other name used in the other and then you find that when you get all this done, you will find that the names don't work out just right. In Gen. 7:9 in the J story of the flood you find Elohim used and therefore one critic says that this originally was Jehovah and it has been changed to Elohim. Another says a redactor put this in because vs. 7-9 have to be in J to parallel the E account. In vs. 16 of the ch. 7 you are in the middle of the P story and there you find the name Jehovah. In 7:13-16 is the story of P, are to be parallel to the J accounts. In the selfsame day Noah and his family entered into the ark with the animals after their kind. Note the statistical nature of this passage--they that went in went male and female; in Gen. 2 it says man and his wife. It uses Elohim and then it uses Jehovah, and so the critics claim that this has been inserted by someone else--now you see that is not carrying the theory through consistently. If you can change a word where you want to or change this phrase, it makes it pretty difficult to say that this is a solid criterion to base any theory on. Cf. ch. 14:22--you have another instance of this. Also in ch. 17 we have Elohim used repeatedly and so we would say that this was in the P section, and yet at the beginning of it we read the Name of Jehovah and says that He appeared to them. It would seem that Jehovah must be a mistake here--you don't make the change here at the beginning of the story but after you have introduced your story. Now in ch. 20 you have the story of Abraham and Abimelech, the name of God, Elohim is used right through, until you get to v. 18 and then Jehovah is used. If it had changed in ch. 21, there is a different story and another incident told, but here is part of the story that you just had--it uses the name of Jehovah all of a sudden. We might explain it this way--we are talking with an outsider who doesn't know the covenant relationship and it was quite natural to use the name of God but when you come to the last verse, you come across the close care of God over Abraham and what He had done for Abraham and it is very natural

that the covenant name should be used. Here a redactor came in they probably would say and it. We have a book in the library on the Hexateuch and then all the inconsistencies he just has a redactor come in and change it to fit. It is interesting to note how often these changes are made--now there are quite a few changes where J and E are not used consistently, they simply have this redactor dress it up. Cf. Wm. H. Greene on p. 221 and his discussion of the Divine Names.

50 -- I do not think that this is a good book to put into the hands of someone that doesn't know anything about the arguments. It often will discuss individual points and do them very well, but I think that someone that has well in mind the material that we have covered thus far would get a great deal out of the study of this book. There is not a great deal of shifting between J and E, and there are individuals that have different theories but the arguments remain about the same as the Graf-Wellhausen theory was put forth. I don't think that you would find much change in the theory even in the last fifty years. In Gen. and the early part of Exodus I think we can dogmatically say that a redactor, if the theory is true, that a redactor has had to change it at many points, but when you get down to such arguments how can you be certain of anything.

5. That within the documents you find other names used. You will have a long section of just one name used and then another--why on earth would the names be used in this way--it is because the redactor took different passages from different documents, but that statement doesn't necessarily follow, because there are other names that are sometimes used. The J document always spoke of Jacob and the P document always spoke of Israel; you might call that the characteristic feature. You have the story of the Jacob and as he comes back from Padanaram we find that God appeared to Jacob and that God told Jacob that his name would no longer be Jacob but Israel and after that sometimes he is called Israel and sometimes he is called Jacob, and after that change of 32:23--from there on you have Jacob used and also Israel; in fact Jacob is used a good deal more than Israel, even though before this time he is told that he would be no longer known as Jacob but as Israel. In ch. 37:1 we read Jacob but in v. 3 Israel is used; in v. 13 the name Israel is used and then in v. 34 it mentions that Jacob rent his clothes and put his sack-cloth upon him. You have both Jacob and Israel is used--sometimes one name is used and sometimes the other.

You have Jacob used before and afterwards. There are other proper names of God used in a similar fashion and an attempt has been made to divide up into documents the use of the name of Israel and Jacob and the P and J documents do not use this consistently. You find the alteration in these different documents. In America we are perhaps more accustomed to using one name and using it steadily instead of switching back and forth with the use of names but in many other cultures you will find that they will use one name for a while and then use another name for awhile. Dr. Buswell gives the example of people referring to him as Dr. Buswell; his wife always calls him Oliver but when talking with children they might refer to him as Uncle Bus--Mrs. Buswell might say to me that Oliver will be here tomorrow and then she may answer the phone and say Dr. Buswell is not in town today and then might turn to a great nephew and say Uncle Buz is not in today and the same person might use three different names, and depending upon the circumstances, it would be perfectly silly to use another name in that certain connection; yet there might be other times when all the names could have been used with perfect reason and you don't have to prove that there has to be a reason for the use of the name in every case, but sometimes it is used simply as a handle--and once you are used to using one name, you are likely to keep on using that name until you have a definite reason for changing it. ILL. of a certain faculty member calling me Allan for a while and then changing to Dr. MacRae after awhile--they simply make the shift and then stick to the change. In certain other cultures it is different. ILL. of reading _____ novels. They will use maybe six names and then it goes on to say Alexdrina says to Ivan and Iovich answers--and perhaps in a one page three or four different names might be used to describe the same person. They seem to have the feeling about not repeating words just as I don't like use common words many times. We have a feeling against using common adjectives repeatedly and they seem to rather jar us, but in speaking of an individual we will usually ~~the~~ use the same name; but the Russians seem to feel that way about names. It has a great deal to do with the particular culture that is being spoken about. The Hebrew is near to us than to the Russian but farther away from us to lead to the idea that it represents different documents. It is a very interesting matter--this matter of the use of names.

6. A Similar use of Divine Names in the Koran--now anyone who knows the history of religions in a small way--is an alleged revelation of Mohammed, and is the writing of one

writer and these sermons are written down and were written on separate sheets of paper and after his death these various sheets were gathered up and put into notes and they arranged them according to length and the order is not very chronological or logical order.

51--And it is interesting to note that Mohammed uses different names for God, Lord, etc. but no one says that you can divide the Koran up into documents. ILL. of once talking with a missionary from India and if was right after Lord Halifax had been made ambassador to the United States and we were speaking about what Halifax had done, and he pointed out that he wasn't considered a man of any special ability; yet he is considered to be one of the outstanding viceroys that India ever had. He said he had never heard of that, even though I pointed out that he was the one that made Ghandi back down on his word--he used another name to refer to the same man, and as board of education he still had another name, and the odd thing about it was that most of the British seemed to forget that this was the same man--the brilliant viceroy of India--he was then promoted to Lord Halifax and lost a good deal of his prestige. Shortly before the Revolutionary War you might read about Lord Kitten and he was such a great leader and then his name was changed to Lord Chaplain--he opposed the idea of overcoming the colonies over by force--it is quite confusing these changes, and I think it is done over in China somewhat also. In the Bible I feel that the changes in names cannot be totally explained on our use of names here and isn't sufficient criteria on which to build up an argument. of division of the Bible.

The documents of the Hexateuch is in two volumes. The second is Dryver from the book of Genesis and that is in the Westminster Commentary series. The third is Skinner. That is in the Inter. Critical Comm. series. The next is Dryver's Lit. of the OT. William Henry Green--Unity of the Book of Genesis. Any of these verses will tell you which document is from J. and which is from P and so the first thing is to get them in mind and have them before you on paper so you know where they are. Make a list of the matters described. List the verses under the title of each. Note matters given in only one of the two. (Most of the record 8-10 is assignment.) Note the arguments found in these books in connection with the different views of each. Note the points of strength or weakness as to document theory. Use Adais as this is the easiest way to deal with the last part of it. You will need the books for the first references to see which verses are in each and you will need the second one to see the arguments which they will give. You can get the ex

which are only similar and we have of course today, coincidences--different events occurring that are quite similar and I gave you a number of instances of that. Then we noticed in the story of the flood which is said that it is two parallel accounts put together, interwoven, that you have a good many parallels that are put there for literary expression and in certain portions of it you don't have simply two parallels but six or seven and other portions you don't have any at all. Consequently when you separate them you don't have two complete documents but you have vital and important gaps and you will have two or three times told over some event. Incidentally in our examination of this, we noticed that that arguments for ~~division~~ division --that a place where it says God, according to them though it really would belong in another document, yet they say that a redactor has changed it and therefore and then in places where it is said that it is characteristic of one writer and some of the verses are so mixed with the criteria that they have to say that a redactor wrote these verses. To give the story of the division of the flood, it sounds at first very formidable but when you look at the minute points, even though differing ~~it~~ in its purpose --that this story parallels the story that is in the Bible and not only just the J or P story--that is the Babylonian account. It takes both to make the parallel to the Babylonian story. The copies which we have of it come from around 600 B.C. but they come from a long epic, and portions of it have been found as early as 2000 B.C. and so it is quite definitely accepted by scholars that our story of the flood is part of an epic which was written around 2000 B.C. This would be about the time of Abraham and it would be entirely possible for the events of the flood to be remembered up to the time, even though they would have become quite confused in the Babylonian epic and the main events are common but J and E must to be taken together. The matter of naming things is something else I should mention. It is a misunderstanding if we say that the reason that it is called Babel is because there the tongues were confounded--makes

Now here was a fellow that didn't care anything about it, but he thought that was the the thing to do. Mrs. Robert D Wilson used to get so disgusted while at Princeton. She came from rather an aristocratic family in the south and when Woodrow Wilson came there as a teacher first, she sort of introduced Mrs. Wilson to the town and helped in her in a great many things--then Mrs. W. Wilson moved to the White House and then there came to town the widow of Grover Cleveland. It would seem from then on that at least 50 salesman would come to the house and always their big argument would be that Mrs. Cleveland bought one of these or Mrs. Wilson, and that was the big thing--.

You come to a class and if the teacher can prove that scholarship believes this about the Pent. it certainly is more acceptable to the average student. At Wellsey College every student has to take Bible in which the higher criticism is presented and put down very dogmatically as if it were absolutely so and final--there is no intimation that there is even another view some of the students told me last summer--this is simply what scholars have discovered. It is just as certain to them as that the world is ~~bound~~ or 2 plus 2 make 4, or that the theory of evolution is true. --that J, E, P, and D existed as separate entities before they were combined by the various redactors. This alleged concensus of scholarship is not a valid argument. All the world may believe something and it may be utterly wrong. I found in connection with evolution, while in college, that all the professors of botany, geology, biology--they were convinced that these were the facts and they would lay it down so dogmatically--so I would ask them just what phase they had done their graduate work in--what was their partiucular field of sceintific study and I would find that the botanist was interested in the life-system of the leaf and how the different products in the leaf worked together to form the green matter in it, or where certain plants grew--and I found that practically everyone of the scientists with whom I came in contact was working in some field of science that had absolutely nothing to do with the matter of evolution, whether it was true or false so the majority by far were basing all their work on an alleged conception of scholarship, which was the conclusion of a very very few men and these had simply taken what was given to them from books and statements given them. The number of men that have actually done firsthand work in evolution is very very small, and it is very easy for other to simply take over what someone else says into their field. In

the U. of Penn. sometime ago I noticed a good ill. of how easy this is to do. There was a prof. there who was highly noted in studies related to the O.T. He used to give courses in some particular book of the O.T. each year and it would stimulate to hearing--he would take up the archeological, or linguistic evidence and various ways of finding out what this book meant, he would turn to the critical theory and turn to J, P etc. and show there was nothing to it and he would simply ridicule these theories and he would show that these theories didn't hold up with the particular book he was taking up. But when he would refer to other books in which he wasn't doing first hand study, he would turn to the standard critical books and see what they said about the situation. He would simply say what does Driver, or Phiffer say and that was the last word--but the particular book in which he was working, he would tear into the criticism and he could easily see that the theory didn't work out with the facts they were trying to present.

a. This agreement was never perfect--all through the 19th century some held to the supplementary theory and at the end of the century--there has never been a question of J and P but there are tremendous differences in mind where J and E begin or end. There is no exact consensus of opinion on that--some have even written that E never existed and in the last 50 years there have been quite a number of critical ~~and~~ scholars who have advanced individual theories for the arrangements of the books--theories which have not found acceptance by others but which have adopted the same general method.

b. This consensus shows not the truth of the hypothesis but a most defensible form--given that there are such documents--that there are two main ones, P and JE and then the attempt was made--are there more evidences to put in it in P or in JE and do such evidences make a unified document and are they divided in such a way that they are two parallels? It shows not the truth of the hypothesis and that is the best way you can think of it. The name God is changed to Lord and the name of the Lord is changed to God, etc. He has made this alteration or that is what happened. This division varied widely until 1878 and then the theory came into development and it is interesting that among the many definite view points

#83 It then disappeared after a few years and you get a few here and there that fit in with the theory and it was accurately adapted and they had ^{no} great influence on the developing

of the theory and their viewpoint was adopted as final.

d. is one which I wish we could spend some minutes on but I think we can barely mention it. Archeological studies have had changes to disrupt the form of unity. Prof. Spisser gave a lecture in Crosser Sem. and the one introducing him said ----- and then about 15 of our students went into the auditorium and he gave one illustration, and then another, and another, etc, and he went right thru that way and then he ended up with the words about the freedom from error in the OT and then the one or two alleged errors in the OT and it seems to our students to be fairly easily answered and that is how he finished his message. This idea was done by one of the foremost Palestian archeologists. He was asked to present the present attitude of archeology and he began with talking a little about the development of the Pentateuch and he told much of their understanding of the OT and there was the great intelligence of these men mentioned. After telling about their great intelligence and their wonderful brains, he went on to say that he thought the higher criticism had been attacked and it was the type that had not shown many brains and the attack had been very weak and it was rather minimized and as though it did not amount to much and then he went on to say that in recent years there had come to light a great deal of archeological material. Then he went ahead and spent a long time giving archeological evidences and of the statements of accuracy in the OT and sections which had been greatly doubted and then he ended up with 'What is our conclusion regarding this?' What about this great debt we owe to these great minds that originated this? You must not be thought to differ from it. Ill. of talking with a man in Jerusalem some years ago and he mentioned something about holding to the theory and he knew there had come great changes in the view point regarding it and it was the effect of archeological evidence upon it and the attempt is to hold to the theory of evidence to the contrary. They could change the particular points where it is affected but the places ~~eh2~~ where there is no archeological change then that interferes and it is twisted with the thread of archeological evidence and they are twisting it in many different ways so the consensus of criticism has been very greatly broken up and they have tried to maintain that theory and at all changes there is the specific evidence to show that there is such a theory to be had at this point and at this point there is such unanimity to discard this theory. Mention of the Philosophical Society in Phila. in 1929 and in this address he spoke of archeology growing in statement after statement based on this theme here. Some of it would come after the J document, many centuries after the Genesis and you would wonder if the author of J

would have any correct way to get information. There was even evidence of accuracy in the P document. He concluded the evidence of the accuracy of these statements. He said these stories must have been handed down by the word of mouth until the time when there were the different documents taken together. They look at the theory and they put them together. Consequently they come to us from the very events described and they seem to make the contradictions in the different documents and actually they are not alike and they are actually not reliable and there are books on the definitions of Bible history and it is by Prof. and he has done much archeological work in Palestine and in this book he goes through Joshua and Judges and this shows the statement of it. It is in the book of Joshua and Judges and that is the document of JE and it is the JE material from Joshua and Judges and it shows how Palestine is going to stay at the different places and it goes back to the accuracy and he says I don't pay any attention to it and he says that is the real reason and it is the archeological evidence from the accuracy of the statements and the P document, he says, is so late that it is pure accident. Your archeological evidence pays no attention to the fact if it is P and JE and it is a statement of the OT and the statement and the arch. evidence fits together. So there were two types of archeologists. There is something which contradicts and then causes the answer to be no but there is this attitude of skepticism and that is what took possession years ago of our great universities and our theological seminaries. They try to show evidence if they are accurate in one point or another and that is in the process of the different documents and it is after the time of the events alleged to the time and they are topnotch in our universities and they are given forth as something that is most true and the scholars have caused the questions to take place and they put what agrees with the Bible in a footnote and if there is something they don't quite see how it fits then they take it as an evidence of inaccuracy although examination shows there is no real contradiction between the arguments of the archeological evidence and the Biblical discoveries.

It has nothing to do with the statements they jumped at and believed to be true. There were a great many statements made by archeologists and they still did not relate to them and they are consequently from the view point and they add to it expecting to find the evidence to fit in with it. You find it is different and there is difference there but as for finding evidence against it is finding the evidence which is there. No. 6 is the opinion that we have now examined each of the four arguments --we can say there is a combination of all of the arguments which existed separately and there is material added to prove the hypotheses but not all the arguments together prove the hypotheses. The various documents are part of a wide spread movement and on the part of the OT it has persisted in its union and so you have the wide advantages and it is important as to what the last one is and next in 36 we have what they take care of. It goes from one stage to another and thus we see how the ideas come to pass. They go from one idea to another until they reach the case which they suggest. There will be different ideas in the next stage and they are durable documents and they do very much stand and they are what God said of them. We ask then if it is a natural development. Every few years people go through different stages and they have different ones for president, etc. ~~It is rather a study of history.~~ We have the two hypothesis and then Graf and Wellhausen combined the two and it is very important to see how they combined and what is the importance of each.

VI. The Developmental Hypothesis. In the different documents we see a development going from one stage to another stage and thus we see how these ideas came into existence. Do we believe in one God and Maintainer of the Universe, because He revealed himself in that way and He told us in His Revelation that is what He is, or do we believe in that because men have gone ~~through~~ through a gradual time of development until they have reached this idea. Of course if that be the case then we might as well go on. Do the alleged documents as they stand present an explanation on natural grounds for the existence of the Bible and for the religion of Bible. Did all this come into existence because God said this was the truth and these are the facts or did it come into existence because men did this and that, and different ones held different views and they came into a clash of ideas and out of it emerged a synthesis of various viewpoints? Is it a natural development as to how it came about. You can easily show how the Constitution of the U.S. came about through a

process and development--you can show how people got the idea of getting together about every four years from all the different states and they go through a form of casting their electoral ballots, but everyone knows before how they are going to vote--you can see that was the result of the founders of this republic who thought the ordinary man didn't know enough to pick the president of the U.S. and so they said let the people get together and people from every district get together and elect one in whom they have confidence and these will get together and they will decide who should be president--so we have the electoral college. The thing had not been going four years before it lost its validity. They were voting for men, not because of their skill in knowing who to vote for, but for those who had promised to vote for John Adams, or Thomas Jefferson as President of the U.S. Some people thought that it was so ridiculous in Calif. 1916 -the candidate for President lost out largely because they didn't vote for the ~~man~~ republican electors and people there didn't like the men who were running for electors --it is a natural development but has been continued as an empty form for 150 years. That is true of all institutions--they develop this form and that form, and naturally there are many things in religion which are purely a development but is the whole Bible such a development? Did the teachings of the Bible come into existence that way? or was it not revealed of God? How could such a development occur and give us the wonderful results that we have in the Bible? The Graf-Wellhausen theory gives an explanation of how it may have occurred and satisfied many that it was only a purely human development and that it wasn't a divine revelation at all. If the argument of partition is absolutely invalid, then you might say that it was a waste of time to look into the argument for development at all. On the other hand there is sufficient material in connection with the argument for partition to have led many infallible people to lead people in that direction and consequently we cannot say that their argument is invalid, because there is a great deal of material that is valid, but we do say that the evidence is not sufficient that we can take the Pent. and divide it up into documents, and say that this existed in such and such a year and that we know the limits of each one--I say that we do not have evidence enough to do that. However, if someone is able to come and show you evidence that there has been this document, and this one--which one would be the earliest--J. The critics say there are all these documents.

If they said that there was great probability of it--then for us to say that there is not probability of it is a much harder thing to do--you have not proved your case--suppose they should say that and then that they would say that these documents looked as though they would fit into the developmental theory--it would be a pretty strong argument. ILL. of someone showing you a book that were descriptions of the state of Penna. and there are two distinct ones which were a combination ~~of the~~ and made two books and say that you didn't believe it so he would begin to show you that one gave the situation around 1840 and the second was the situation around 1940--here is a statement about an airfield--you would know that wasn't written in 1840 .

85 **And then in the other one you might read that at this road walk 20 steps and turn left and you will find the under-ground railroad, you would say that today nobody would be looking for the under-ground railroad station--thus slaves escaped from the south, going from one home to another and kept in hiding during the day since they did this at night--today that would just be a mention of a historic site, but it doesn't say that about it that couldn't have happened in 1840. About 1840-1850 slaves were kept there in hiding but if going out there to the station today someone would just say it is a little historic sight and it does not say that this is where there used to be a phase of the under-ground r.r. and it does not say that you turn to the right at that marker but at the house. The situation was at the time of the underground rr and it was different from the time of airplanes. To examine the evidence you look at the details and if you had evidence of that type and if the evidence is correct then it shows the type. It looks like an evidence that could greatly strengthen but you could divide it up into two documents and that is the claim that they have here and the claim is that the documents as divided show a progress from early ideas to later ideas. They reflect an early period and they reflect a more advanced period. That idea is not made as much of in the books as you might expect but in popular presentation it is dwelt on a good bit and as regards institutions it is made much of in the books. So here you see the relation to the partition theory and it is interesting to see what the development is --if it is fairly well provable and fits in with the development, then it strengthens the idea and then it is known there is actually such a partition and so after the critics divide these up, do they then have documents which show a progression from the

primitive to the advanced. Do they show the evolution of religion? In my opinion it is the idea of combination with the idea of development which caused the preservation of the higher criticism and brought out the result that in the last 60 years this has been tenaciously held to with other classical books and it is an approach given up and here the question is if it is God's revelation and does He reveal His will to us or is it a natural development? It is that part most popular in presentation but is not most stressed in the scholarly books and that we will take up as b. Arguments in the development as regards religious ideas. The one has primitive ideas, the next less so, etc. The next is of the most advanced ideas. It is a very common idea about the OT and the OT teaches of the God of wrath and spoken of as the Thunder God of Sinai and that is the God of the OT and the NT has the God of love. Many say they are interested in the God of the NT and not the Thunder God of the OT and it is very easy to show the difference. All can be taken to fit with the ones in the NT and ignore the ones of the OT and take just the ones that fit with that, etc. You can then show a perfect development from the one or the other. He is a wonderful God whose mercy and kindness endures forever. There is a God who does not desert His people even though they sin against Him but He follows them with loving care. God is just as tender in the OT as in the NT and in the NT there is an abundance of statements also that tell of the wrath of God and tells of the terrible fate for those who reject God and it is stronger than anything contained in the OT and proportionately there are just as many of them. It is very commonly taught and all modernists may educate them to this and they try to get across this evolution of the OT to the high in the NT. There was no such thing if you look at the facts and both of them present a God of love and mercy and both present a God of justice and wrath also. IN the case of these documents--is it a question of taking out in the OT the statements that present a God of wrath and putting them in the early documents and not of love? No, that is not the particular view point which is taken but the claim is that in this document we have anthropomorphism and we have God followed on very human terms--He walks in the Garden, He forms man out of the dust of the earth, etc. He does all of these things using very human like terminology in all of the things we read about Him. Then comes the P document, and God speaks and there is light; God creates and the high, lofty idea is given but nothing of this gross, physical approach. So there is the advance in this and that is the idea widely believed. It is not so much stressed in the scholarly books as you might expect but they stress the argument from religious institution. Driver's intro.

speaks of it as a wonderfully clear intro. on the books of the OT and it is 50 years old. Eifer is only 10 years old and why not a book 50 years old instead of 10? The one written 50 years ago has more in mind the answering of conservative objections and the one written 10 yrs. ago has little change in its view point. It simply thinks the conservatives are out of consideration and consequently we don't come head on in dealing with them so much. It assumes that everything is correct as they take the view and that is harder to reach as there is no place to take hold of it. It is easier to study the criticism in the early stages of it--the beginning. After it has become so certain of its supremacy then it does not need to try to prove it to anyone. Driver says in p. 9 where he is not yet telling us there is a J document and an E document but he is simply trying to show there is a very different attitude in the two sections--ch. 1 and 2 and so he says in ch. 2 instead of speaking or creating as in ch. 1 God fashions and gives the man the breath of life. He sets and closes up--closed up the flesh. All of these are taken from ch. 2 and in ch. 3 He walks in the Garden in the cool of the day and so we have these statements in the flood story and in the J story He shut them in. Driver takes up the argument again in Driver on p. 120 but there is a peculiarity that his argumentations are highly anthropomorphic and he takes Jehovah not only as the prophets generally as expressing human resolutions and swayed by human emotions but as performing sensible acts--he means acts of a physical type and some illustrations in J's narrative from Gen. 2-3 and 7-8 were taken about. There are the different expressions. All human like terms used of God. These instances are not confined to the childhood of the world but we find that He comes down to see the tower built by men. He goes from visible to invisible form and He meets Moses and He takes off the chariot wheels of the Egyptian and does that mean that J thinks God came along and pulled off the wheels one by one. Is that J's concept? He is grieved, He repents, He is angry, etc. All of these terms are used of God in the J document. P. 128 tells of the P document and no angels or dreams are mentioned by him but he does speak of God as appearing to men and of going up from them but he gives no further description of His appearance. Usually his revelation takes the form of God simply speaking to man and only in the supreme revelation at Sinai and at the tent meeting is He described here as being manifest in the form of light and fire. He is speaking there to Moses as man to man and that the people may recognize Him. Wrath also proceeds forth from Him. The anthropomorphic expressions show God to be grieved and they

are not given entirely to J or any one definite one. Anthropomorphic expressions are rare. So the purpose is unmistakable--it may be he can speak of God more circumspectly than other writers and that is interesting that He cannot use all of these primitive terms and they say they can speak of God more strictly and they ask how can they show the development. A prophet might be that way and a priest that way, etc.

Pentateuch 86

He was using what you might say was very ^{primitive} firmative language. However, I did not think he meant that there was a little thing ^{up} in my head reaching out for this thing or for that thing but he got the ideas across to me perhaps better than a psychologist would who might have expressed ordiliness and knowledge in the words of five syllables. One might have given it in abstract psychological language as he doubtless would before a group of learned men. The other presented the idea in a popular way and in popular lectures--one used one terminology and the other used another sort. Taking them alone you could say the one talking about the little kink has a primitive idea and that comes back from the childhood of the race. The other one comes from the 20th century. That is the general idea of these documents--J is the early primitive view point about God and P is the advanced. That is not just what P said. Being a priest he may speak more circumspectly than others and that gives away the whole argument for development. We are not interested so much at the moment if it was a prophet or a priest that wrote the certain section but as to what was its development. Does it show any sort of development? Does it grow from primitive ideas to more advanced ideas? P material consists mostly of geneological material, statistically material, notation of precise regulations for performance of sacrifice. This sort of material makes up at least 9/10th of the material the critics give to the P document. In that material would you expect anthropomorphic terms about God? Where would that sort of language come out about God? Driver says P contains some anthropomorphic material. P does deal with a certain amount of narrative material which is put in the P document. To make it connected throughout they put in the documents here and there. In them you have a few anthropomorphisms. He does not say they are lacking all together but they are there. You would expect them to be there under the circumstances. If you are going to use this sort of language about God, it is natural to use it in a story and that is what the JE material is. It is almost entirely accounts of events. In the P material it would be unnatural to have that sort of material. What is the division of P and JE actually? There is not much reason for that sort of material in

this. The same thing applies to some extent to J and when God exhorts they people to obey the law and when they do what God has given them as their law and you don't expect much anthropomorphic material in that sort of talk. Not unless the exhorter stops to tell a story or an incident and in that case it would be natural to tell how God determined to do this or that. It is part of the J or E document and so naturally you cannot expect in what is considered to be the E document to have that sort of material. In that connection it is interesting to read a bit further as to what Driver says about the P document's attitude. P is advanced and abstract and you would think in these advanced days they would think through the problems of theology but that would be when they would be interested in understanding the problems of the universe. P would be when they would be interested in the development of their own little group perhaps. It is justified by the fact that man was made in the image of God and where do you find that statement in the P document? The statements in Gen. 1 are of God saw and God said and they are quite as anthropomorphic as the statements in Gen. 2. The language of the Psalms is largely anthropomorphic and the hands, feet, etc. of God are referred to. We understand these expressions as figurative and he says you will find the great blessing of No. 6:24 as He will make His face to shine upon thee and lift up His face upon thee and this is surely anthropomorphic to refer to the face of God as well as to a part of His hand, foot, etc. Yet that is given to P by the critics and it is true that the J document said that Moses was to let God's face be seen and the Hebrew word is not far back in this particular case and where it speaks of God and to put your sins behind His back and it is a specific word used for back and in that case it is the Lord (of horror) what means after. It is that which is behind and it may be described in the afterglow of the glory of the Divine presence. It is the way it would be interpreted if it contained enough of the P phrases and then it would be necessary to put it in the P document. I think our Eng. translation of that passage is a little crude and the Hebrew certainly does not require it. Carpenter also gives these arguments on p. 95-96. Driver does not put the stress that is apt to be made in a college class on this point of going from the primitive to the modern. He does not put the stress on it because the facts do not clearly work out that way. They all put their stress on the argument from religious institutions which is a much more involved argument than this idea that you have a development idea of God from the primitive to the advanced. Carpenter says on p. 95 that the action of _____ and mankind according to

J is marked by definite human characteristics and according to J the formation of man is accomplished by making him out of mounds of dirt--plods of the ground. " That is reading into the phrases to say the least and it is much more than the version requires and "blow in his nostrils living breath." It makes it sound much more primitive this way. We are similarly prepared to visit Sodom and Gomorah and inspect the guilty cities and see if they are really as wicked as they seem. They are apprehensive lest the man who has become as one of us should gain the power to live forever and He made man on the earth. He condescends to prove himself in the right and there is a more advanced stage to be made by the angel of the Lord ~~or~~ Elohim and the angel of the Lord usually fits the E document as they say the word Jehovah there is a mistake and substituted for the original word of God. That is in the E and not in the P but God sends the angel of God and the more advanced stage is conceived by the angel of . Then he goes on to say that none of these representations occur in P and it is full of Hebrew for generations. With the D Manner in which it opens the Creative utterance comes forth of itself and the external facts match the inner thoughts. Elohim said "Let there be light" and light was. ~~Man rises in obedience to the Lord--~~ rightly did the Psalmist seize on this mark of the Divine activity and it was done. Accordingly in his part with man, Elohim is in His inter course with man and P gives it different stages and it evades J and to some extent E. In modern language it may be said that his representation may be more abstract and then he goes on to say that it is natural to look for parallel phenomenon and there are certain .

#87

In P He only speaks but there are many, many cases where it says "God spoke" and "God said" and we ask what does this mean? As the critics divide up the story they start with the P document and they have the list of the sons of Israel and then they jump to ch. 6, v. 2 "And God spoke to Moses and said to him, I am . " He merely spoke and He did not appear. That is the J document. The next verse says, "I am and I appear to Abraham, Issac, and Jacob." It makes you wonder if Carpenter read one verse further before he wrote that sentence. He just speaks and He does not appear. I thought I would get a hasty view of this statement Carpenter said and he refers to the fact that where the critics begin the P document, it begins with "And God said," and so he says He does not even appear. In J He speaks out of the burning bush and in Young's concordance I looked up the word "appear."

This is the English word, Appear, and in the Hebrew it represents that He was seen but there may be other cases that I did not look for at this particular time and I found it is often used, "Your men shall appear before God", your tribe before God, etc. I noticed a few of them. In Ex., Lev. and Numbers the word is used altogether about 20 times of God. In Ex. 3:2 in the J document, Ex. 3:16 "appeared to his fathers"; Ex. 4:1; 4:5 and they all said he appeared. In Ch. 8 v. 3 we see He says that He appeared. In ch. 16v, v.10 and it is still the P document. In 9:4 God appeared and it is still P. Lev. 9:6; 9:23 16:22 and Num. 14:10 (J doc.) and 16:19 has Him in P again. Num. 16:42; 20:6 in P. He appears more often in the P than in the J although it occurs in both of them and one starts with God appearing out of the burning bush and as the critics divide it it is just "And God said" so He says in the one case there is the much loftier conception. Narrative material is put in the one and the one that seems to have the anthropomorphic representation usually goes in narrative material anyway. It often grabs a statement out of P this way. Dr. Ellis in his teaching of this matter used to say that he had two aims in his study of the Pent. criticism -- the first was to lead students to trust the Bible and the second was to lead them to distrust the critics. You find that when these arguments are presented the man is looking for evidence and he is apt to do what anyone would do and that is to go into a subject with a presupposition. He is apt to twist things around to fit. The facts often given in support of the critical argument often have to be twisted around and in case after case this is true and when they are taken out you reduce the number of vital arguments that have to be dealt with -- the view of the P is that it is not anthropomorphic and it is not based on the fact that out of the Bible is taken the narrative material and what is left includes very little narrative material and it might seem to be anthropomorphic. Ques. He tells how He appeared in the burning bush. Ques. about how reader s will know that He is anth. It says He does not even appear but there is no validity of that statement as He does appear more often in P than in J. In P there are statements of their seeing the glory of God and there is more in J however as there is far more narrative in J. The argument for development in the form it is most commonly known would relate to religious ideas as most people would know nothing of the argument as it regards religious institution and as it regards the ideas it is that we have primitive ideas in the documents and advanced ideas in the later documents. As we noticed yesterday the only difference between the documents in this regard is the claim

that they are anth. in expression and in descriptions of God in the early documents and they are lacking in B and E. There is no difference alleged between E and P in this regard but the stress is laid on the difference between JE and P and J and E have the anth. description God takes off the chariot wheel, overwhelms the Egyptians in the sea, walks in the Garden, etc. In P no such expressions. In P God simply speaks and it is done. There is a much loftier idea of God in P and P is mostly genealogy, etc, and comparatively little narrative and we don't expect to find anth. but occasionally we do find in P what is as much anth. as anywhere else. (8-9 is repetition.) P is actually relating to the material and there is no evidence as is claimed. This is not the thing stressed in the scholarly arguments on this point and the argument stressing the religious and secular institutions is what is stressed here. Religious ideas are not discussed principally. P and E discuss the great religious concepts and there is no discussion of them in P. P has the list of Kings. If you proceed from the simple and rudimentary you expect the more advanced man with a loftier idea would think that. It just hangs together that the document with most of the narrative material given has laid down most of the specific material. We must look at the argument that is really stressed--the one from religious institutions and from the particular laws given and in these laws you see a development and an evolution which shows it goes from the simplest to the more complex and in these laws we will make c--the argument as developed as the place for sacrifice and there is nothing stressed more in the argument for the development than the claim relating the place of sacrifice. It goes from the primitive to the more advanced. Samll(1)--situation as regarding Mosaic sacrifice and it deals naturally with matters of law and it is comparison of codes of law in which we are interested. The question regarding the attitude of the documents of the law before Sinai is asked. In J and E you sacrifice here, there and everywhere. In P it is restricted strictly to the place God selects. The temple is mentioned especially as the place that God chooses. P has all the complex rules of the priest, etc. It is the question of what happened before Moses. Deut. does not say what did and so they deal with J and E. On p. 82 you have quite a bit of discussion of this subject and what is the view regarding pre-mosaic sacrifice?

#88 According to the J document Cain and Abel offered their offerings to God and we find these various sacrifices in J and in E and not in P and what about P--does he give them in the different places? In P eh he says there are no offerings made and there we can see the

difference. In that section of the flood three are given to J. P makes no offering on the section when the flood are over. It is interesting that when you take the accounts of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, you will find that if you leave out a few geneologies and list the kings and you will find that about 90% of the material is given to either J or E and there is practically nothing else given. Fully 90% is material given to J and E. That includes the altars they built and the sacrifices and consequently there is none in P. In the story of the flood we have repetition in all the incidents of the flood and the bringing up of the structure to give a vivid picture of it as the waters descend upon the earth and the waters dry up and Noah comes down and he makes a sacrifice. God makes His promise and the covenant is made. You give one to J and the other to P and so you have a development there and even though Jacob, Isaac, etc, move through the land, they do not make an offering there. No sacrifice was legitimate that was made at the Divine command. The sacrifice of P is not the spontaneous offering of man to his maker but the express ordanance of God himself. Not until the tab. was built was there a place actually prepared where sacrifice could be made. Not until Aaron and his sons were consecrated could sacrifices be properly given. No where in the P document does it say there was any before. There is no such statement but it is only a case where you put all the sacrifices in J. There is a progress in the pre-mosaic picture in J and E and they had sacrifices in various places while P did not. Then others say that according to P there could not have been any sacrifices until all of these things were done but still there is no such statement. (2)--the law of J and E. In J and E there could be sacrifice most anywhere. Abraham did it here, and here and here. Noah did it way over there in Arat and they all did at different places. Ex. 20-24 is permitted to sacrifice anywhere it does not have to be restricted to one place and here they are at Sinai. The Lord says to Moses, "Thus shall ye say that ye have seen I have talked with you from Heaven. Ye shall not make gods of silver and neither shall ye make gods of gold and an altar of earth shalt thou make unto me and thou shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offering ^{& thy peace off.} and thy sheep and thy ox shalt thou offer to ~~me~~ ^{whom I record my name} and in any place I shall come unto thee and I shall bless thee and if thou wilt make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not make it of hewn stone for if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou shalt ~~plute~~ ^{plute} it." There is the law of the altar in J and E and it is the only law of the altar. They sacrifice then any place. It is not resticted to one place. What was the command given to Moses right after the Ten

Commandments. The Lord said to Moses, "Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel--" same quot. "In all places where ^I ~~thou shalt~~ record my name, and I will come unto thee and I will bless thee" and they say they can sacrifice any place where ^{He} ~~they records~~ His name and it is not restricted to any one place. Is that what it says here? "I will not Restrict ions are to be given and the altar is to be built of earth and if of stone, of unhewn stone. "In all places where I record my name, I will come unto thee and I will bless thee." As you read on you see how Moses went up into the mt. and God gave him specific instructions about making a building, etc. and this was not an altar of human work but a brazen altar and what a contradiction. Can they be the same document? Is it possible that you can have a book in which one time He says to build an altar of earth and another time He says to build an altar of bronze--is that not possible? As we have it, we have the Israelites coming to Sinai and God giving them the 10 commandments, then Moses goes up into the mountain, it takes a long time to build the tabernacle and of course they are progressing and of course they wouldn't keep returning to Sinai every month to sacrifice--they are traveling here and there--it would seem that it would be only natural to at first for God to give a restrictive idea about the sacrifices, but that the full details would be given later--it stands perfectly reasonable as it stands. When you get over to Deut. you find there in the 12th ch. he is discussing there what they are to do after they get in the promised land and he tells them to destroy to all the places where the nations serve their gods, and they are to go where God shall choose, there they shall go. He is saying there must be a sharp break between idol sacrifice and that to God--they are not to do as the R.C. do where they take over the heathen temples and take over many of the heathen rites and ceremonies by simply changing the name and they make as slight a change as possible and they they bring them into the fold of the church. He is telling them here not to do that. He is telling them to have something distinct but they are to serve God in the place that He shall choose. The whole emphasis in Deut. 12 is not to take over the Canaanite places of worship but to make a clean break. The view of the critics is of course is that the book of Deut. was written at the time of Josiah, when all the priests in the land wanted the altars to be destroyed in the land so they could get more income--therefore they wrote the book of Deut. and therefore also pawned off the book for the people, and thus all the income would come into the priests. They say that

this conflicts with JE --but the only law that conflicts with this is Ex. 20:24 and it is given at the beginning of the wilderness journey at Sinai, where naturally they would not have one place and they are there moving about. In principle there is no difference between it, and the command given by Moses does not contradict, because of the circumstances in which the people of Israel find themselves.

89 **The law of these detailed regulations would refer to the people as stationed in one place. Right here there is another interesting point that comes in this connection which easily can be considered under the matter of having one place to dwell and that is the matter of asylum. According to the reconstruction of critics, the law was given there at the time of Josiah to do away with the altars scattered around the land. That would make certain dislocations--what was to happen to all these who were to care for these altars--were they to go on relief. Deut. says that the Levites could come into the one central place--they don't have to stay scattered about. So they say that is an attempt to alleviate the condition of these people, whose altars were destroyed. They also say that as long as there were altars scattered throughout the land, during that period, there was a possibility that when a person was in danger of his life on account of accidentally killing someone else the other person, relative might try and kill him naturally, and he needed a place where he could be safe from the blood vengeance, they say that in this situation he could go to the altar and he would be safe. There at the altar he could not be injured. However, once these altars are done away with, then people who got into difficulty, there would be nothing for them to do for safety and therefore it is now necessary for something to be done for protection for them. So it is necessary to establish cities of refuge for these people. A new matter is introduced, which are cities of refuge at this time; then they say in D and P you have the cities of refuge mentioned--don't you see the development there. This is the claim of the asylum.

The law relating to is--that of Deut. is clear enough. Deut. 19:1-13--read from Addison's D document. (Min. 4-6) Now you see the law in Deut. According to the critical reconstruction, this is given here in D to make up for the loss of an asylum because of the altars that are to be destroyed and only one place left for sacrifice. That is the critical theory of it of course.

As the Israelites are preparing to go into the land of Palestine, Moses in his final address to them, is laying down before them their situation regarding the establishment of these cities of refuge and showing them what they are for. That seems reasonable from the Biblical point of view. --that you would have cities of refuge described and ~~mentioned~~ mentioned in Deut. and not mentioned in Exodus. How could they get along in the wilderness without any cities of refuge or Sinai? Weren't they necessary to be told about this so that 40 years later they would know all about it. after all that generation had died and new one had been raised up? There is no reason as the Bible stands why they should even be mentioned. There is no reason for it but when they conquered Trans-Jordan then Moses established these cities of refuge there. They are not even all named by Moses but are named in latter part of Joshua. That is the way it stands in the Bible and that is the logical but the critics add that this is an evidence that Deut. was written at the time of Josiah--when you do away with the altars scattered throughout the land and make the people come to Jerusalem, then you have to have cities of refuge, but before that there were no cities of refuge--no JE material mentions this but they must flee to the altar and let us now look at JE and see how explicitly it tells us that these altars are the asylum to which they can flee and be safe. Cf. Ex. 21:13,14--He that smiteth a man so that he die shall surely be put to death and God will appoint a place whither he shall flee--see how it contradicts. He doesn't even mention the cities of refuge. The law that the critics tell us--that in the time of Josiah they were safe if they fled to the altar. After Josiah they appointed these places of refuge, and there they would be safe until the high priest and then they go back and a long period of time elapses--they have been allowed to live a period of time--but if they have intended to kill, then they can't stay in the cities of refuge but they are cast out and killed. But before that, of course you have a situation where you have a man who murders another --you can take care of him but here is another man that doesn't murder anyone, so he can go and cling to the altar and he will be perfectly safe, because no one would dare touch him while he is hanging on the altar. So he hangs on there for the next 20 years and so is safe--that doesn't make sense. But then he says that a place will be set apart where he can flee and be safe, but when he goes on and says, that if they should come presumptuously upon his neighbor,

he shall be put to death. The most natural interpretation of the story would be that if a person who has accidentally killed someone, he will be protected but if you find out that it was ^{not} an accident they are to kill him even if clinging to the altar. It is not saying that the altars are the place of the asylum, but rather that a place will be appointed whither he shall flee. Was it not important that they tell us where the place is--are they going to have to wait forty years to find out what is going to happen to those who accidentally killed someone during those forty years--why don't you get those cities of refuge appointed right there since all the people were there.

90 -- He may make some special plan for those to be protected but there was no point to telling them 40 years ahead of time as to where the place was that He wanted for cities of refuge. It is not reasonable inference at all that they would stay clinging on to the altar, and not get any sleep or eat at all, but that is assumed in all critical books.--that the law of JE is that the altar is the asylum for the person who has committed murder accidentally and when the altars are done away with then are the cities of refuge done ~~xx~~ given. If there was a sacred altar you would think, that the murderer would naturally run there for protection, because he surely would think that he was safe there, but that would put a responsibility on the ones in charge of the altar to see if they are guilty or not. In a country behind the iron curtain they to run to the U.S. consulate since they are a lot safer there than in a church. To say this proves that the altar was set aside as an asylum as long as you had the altar, you would have no need for the cities of refuge. In the Middle Ages, the churches tried to protect the innocent at any time, but that doesn't mean that it was the law of the Middle Ages, that the innocent would stay in the church and thus be safe while the one who was guilty would be cast out and punished. Even when you had cities of refuge, I can well imagine, if there was some sacred place in the neighborhood, and here was a man in danger of his life,--the ax had slipped and the other person was about to kill him, I think that he would run to the nearest sacred thing and grab on to it--maybe he wouldn't even know where the cities of refuge were but the first thing that would enter his mind would be some sacred place, even here from the altar a murderer was to be taken away and be killed. He couldn't claim any safety, just because of some sacredness.

There is nothing that can protect him, but to say to take him from that altar, and say that is the same thing as appointing a place--that is inference is it not? This is just one of their many arguments. The allegation is gotten from this--there is not any such statement that the altar is the appointed place. When they get near Canaan He does appoint a place and it is perfectly reasonable as it stands. ^{Joab} Adonijah? wouldn't have had any right to go to a city of refuge--he saw that his life was in danger and went to this sacred place. Solomon had Joab taken away from the altar and killed. He didn't think of him as perfectly safe and not able to touch him. If you went to the mountains and they pursued you they would kill you if they caught you but if there was something that was near that everyone considered very very sacred, many people would not even have the strength to run to the mountains--they would take the first thing that came in their mind. Many wouldn't know how to live in them if they got there. The argument is one strictly one of inference. It is not specific. As these stand, ~~they~~ they are perfectly reasonable. Here in Sinai one could run off and die. Perhaps some did commit a murder and escape clear back to Egypt, but most people couldn't do that. There in the camp--he would grab the most sacred thing that he could find, even if it was the altar--that was not to protect him even if he was a murderer. Does that mean that he is going to appoint a place immediately or does it not mean that this is a general law that he is setting down for the future when they get scattered out over an area. In Num. 35:9-14 you have the law of P in this matter. (Min. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ -10) You have the law given here in Num. and in Deut. you have Moses telling the people and the language of the two differs from when the Lord tells Moses and when ~~he~~ he tells the people. Carpenter says here that a modification is given in case of homicide. Ex. 21:14 --the old law is dropped without reserve he says--God will appoint a place where people can flee if they kill someone unawares. That is not dropped. And if a murderer is caught, he is to be killed--he is not dropped. Is this all a contradiction--it would hardly seem so as it stands. I have given you your assignment in Dr. Allis' book--the first three chapters.

The assignment is already assigned. It is in the 5 books of Moses by Ellis and the first ch. and the third ch. is included. For Thur. is to get thoroughly the other half of the 3rd ch. fairly well and look over the last half and then get a good idea of ch. 2. The last time we were discussing still the argument for development as related to the place of sacrifice and we notice that the claim of the critics is that the JE code permits sacrifice anywhere. The JE quotes say nothing about where we can sacrifice. The initiative is with God as to where they can sacrifice and it does not say just where. It would mean that sacrifice is not restricted to just one place then but there is no teaching anywhere in the scripture that out of all the places no where is said that just there can it be done. This does not mean that this is something that is required by God's holiness but it means that it is something that God wished to have done when they entered into the land of Palestine. When you go in there, He said, after the Lord has given you peace from the war, then you are to sacrifice only the place which He chooses out of all the tribes. The command is something that is given for a particular time and a particular place. It is true that the Jews have taken the command and carried it on and acted as though there is no place where you could sacrifice except in Jerusalem and thus they discontinued sacrifice when Jerusalem was destroyed. This was not stated in the Scripture and it is clearly taught they sacrificed in other places except when the Jew came into Palestine. The Bible teaching as it stands is that the patriarchs sacrificed to God as they felt called upon to do here and there and earlier had they done this also. When they came into the land of Palestine, God commanded that there they should have all their sacrifices done in one place and it is easy to see the reason for it would be to keep them from dividing up into sections and to breaking up into little units each with its own devotion to separate sacrifice and it was to stress the unit of the nation and their unity before God. There are many reasons why this would have to be and we can see why God would desire this great nation to observe this sign of unity. This is after they have come into the land and after God has given them peace around about. It is different from saying that the teaching of the Bible says that only at one place is it permissible. This is the command of E--Deut. the command of Moses to the people as they are going into the land. You look at the Lev. legislation given prior to this time and it no where says you must sacrifice in just one place and there is no such command in P at all. It is of the legislation given before that time but it assumes that the sacrifice is a unified institution and the general attitude and spirit of the general legislation is that it is something which is done under direction

and appointed for and that speaks of one thing and thus the Bible stands. They are in the wilderness and all together and camped about and everything has its head quarters in its one place and the commands given for the wilderness journey would rather naturally assume that situation and the legislation is not given simply for the wilderness journey but it is given to outline the way they are to worship God and the way they are to serve him in the wilderness and also in succeeding years and in succeeding years it is God's will that there should be the sacrifice in the one place. There is no need to stress it in the wilderness as they are all gathered together in the one community and its when they get scattered in the land of Palestine and the wars are over and then they have peace and there is the tendency then for little isolated communities to develop and without much connection with the rest and then it is important that it be stressed to the individuals who are to have the religious life centered in one place. God will select out of all your places so as it stands it is most reasonable. It can be done by taking this out and changing them and saying this comes from the J document but this comes from the JE document--621 BC; this from the P about 200 years later and from that arrangement it does or does not say it is from the specific places God selects and that is by no means a worship form but it is with all these different high places over the land where they were having little separate places and where people came together to perform little groups and to to their sacrifices and to disregard the temple in Jerusalem and then the P document comes to the critics 200 yrs. and serves the situation which P has already ascribed. It is not an evolution from rudimentary things up to more ~~el~~ cultivated and lofty things--not at all. It is simply the claim of a historical development and the historical situation as the Bible stands is at least as reasonable and with that connected is the claim of asylum and the claim is made that as long as all over the land there was an altar there for an asylum. It does not say that a man who is unjustly accused is (it fades out from 9-10). The assumption that a matter with an asylum is connected with a construction of altars in the time of Josiah is to a large extent something that is read into the text and a few words may fit into this assumption but it is nowhere stated. We go on to --the argument for development as regarding the priest. The claim of the critic is regarding the JE document, the heads of the families may sacrifice and when it came to the time of Josiah, they introduced an innovation and they restricted sacrifice then to the Levites--they were the sacrificers--they were the priests and they tell you in the books of the critics that in JE there is no place for sacrifice and the one who does

it is the head of the family. When you get on to 6:21 there is the innovation as a strict sacrifice to the one particular group and it is the type of the Levites and Deut., they say, shows no distinction between specific priests and Levites and there is no difference in 621 BC. All the critical books will tell you this. When you get on 200 yrs. later to the time for the P document, they have gone farther and established an organization for the high priests and they say the high priest is of the sons of Aaron and all priests must only be the ones to make the sacrifice and sacrifice is strictly forbidden to the rest of the Levites. Some said they had as much right to sacrifice as the sons of Aaron and they were all smitten dead as a result of it. It is made up nearly a thousand years later in the P document in order to show they want to restrict it to the sons of Aaron and that is the critical view regarding the sons of Aaron and we ask if the Scriptural references support all that they have? It is true in the time of Abraham sacrifice was not restricted to the sons of Aaron or even to the tribe of Levi in the time of Noah also. The idea of restricting it this way is something ^{that} had to be introduced as a specific thing and we ask if it is reasonable to think that when it was introduced to see if it was restricted to just these ones or was it in general? Sacrifice was a custom we find--

Pentateuch #92. They say that is the view of the P document--According to the JE the sacrifice could be performed at any place, just so it was in his name. They say that P gives no sacrifice until it is done at the one place and it is done by the Levites. P knows no sacrifice until it is done by the sons of Aaron--that is their statement. It is very easy to get that view. All you have to do is to take the passages that tell about sacrifices and put them into the JE document in the early history--that is easy because in the beginning P consists almost all of statistics and enumerations, lists of things that happened in 1, 2, 3, order so as they divide it up, it is natural that P has nothing about sacrifice--Read from Carpenter, p. 83--the view of P is entirely different. In P in Gen. account Noah makes no thank-offering when the peril of the flood is past. The place where it says that he did is put in the J document. P tells about a covenant--the Babylonian story tells about both the sacrifice and the covenant. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob go through the land but they never commemorate where El Shaddai met them--they never do because all the statements that tell they do are in the J document, instead of being allocated to the P document. Do you notice how much he reads into the text. There is absolutely nothing to prove his statements here at all. If you take the passages of sacrifice and put them in the J document. You take your statistics etc. and

a very little amount of narrative material--you have nothing about sacrifice in P and then you say that P doesn't believe in sacrifice. That is connected with the argument of silence. The fact that a book has no reference to something, doesn't mean that the book doesn't believe that it exists. The argument from silence is one which can be very wrongly used. The matter of silence in a book is one which you would expect the book to tell about. If we had a P document, a complete one as originally written, and it told about all this as he says, and no where did it tell about Abraham sacrificing in the land--but it does tell about his elaborate relations with God, you would wonder why there was no mention about sacrifice. In this instance the argument from silence is a good argument, if you are sure that you have the whole P document--but the critics themselves at point after point will say that the document doubtless told about this or that but the redactor took it out. At point after point they assume that the documents are not preserved in completeness. You will doubtless find many places where they will say that such and such was lost from the original, and then to simply assume that sacrifice isn't mentioned at all, after they admit it is not complete is a pretty big assumption. It is also a pretty big assumption when they say that no one was allowed to sacrifice any other place--this argument from silence used wrongly enters into the whole argument of higher criticism at point after point. The argument from silence if rightly used, is a very important form of argument. It is a difficult argument to use and you must be sure that you have all of the evidence. Then according to the JE argument you have that no head of the family can sacrifice. There are no priests--just anybody sacrifices--it doesn't say. Just because it says that thou shalt sacrifice, doesn't mean all are to sacrifice. He is talking to Israel as a whole and may refer to it as a nation rather than individuals; in addition to that a person may sacrifice something without he himself performing the sacrifice. Commands are given in the P document--that the sacrifices are restricted to the sons of Aaron, and yet individuals are told to sacrifice in another connection. The priest performs the sacrifices but the individual brings the sacrifice--that is brings the animal--so to say that anybody can sacrifice from this passage, is using the argument from silence in a way that is not valid. It is assumed, because it doesn't say here, that the priests are the ones to do the actual sacrificing, then anybody can do it, and that is not stated here at all. There is an interesting thing--in order to get the different document, JE as the earlier, J in the

middle and P later--to get the different codes of law that way, you have to give the book of the covenant either to J or E. The earlier critics mostly gave it to J but soon after the Wellhausen theory became well-established, they became pretty well agreed that it was from E-- and the Book of the Covenant--Ex. 19-24 is most of it allocated to E--that still isn't JE. Right here in JE you find in 19:21 ff. , v. 24--right here in the E document, that which contains the earliest primitive law--you have two mentions of Priests here. It is so definitely allocated to E, but the critics say that though priests are mentioned here we have no idea what they did. They don't notice I guess, that it says the priests that come near unto the Lord--they are definitely a religious organization that have reason to come near to the Lord. It is clearly shown that there are priests before the time of the Levitical priesthood or the priest of Aaron. To say that these priests were not set apart is a pretty big assumption. It would suggest that even among the Israelites in Egypt, there were individuals who were priest among them, and as they came up through the wilderness there were priest, though they might not have been particularly well selected--the matter of sacrifice seems somewhat restricted even there. God says to Moses there in the wilderness that He was going to regularize it so that the family of Aaron --they were to be set apart to offer sacrifices but this was not a new thing--it is even mentioned in JE as the critics recognize it to be. The argument then that anybody could sacrifice is an argument from silence, and it is an illegitimate argument from silence--JE doesn't say that anybody could sacrifice--there is no certainty about it. There is no reason why God couldn't set down strict laws as to who could sacrifice afterwards. He gives those commands later to Moses in the mount and those are the P documents. When you come to the D document--what Moses says just before they go into the land of Palestine, according to the Bible as it stands, you have a great difference between the D docu. and the P--the Levitic legislation. It is what God gives to Moses and that which is written out for the priests for the oversight of the religious life of the people--to be able to read the precise details and to apply it properly while they were in control of the people. Deut. is the orations that Moses gives to the people as they draw near to the land of Palestine to prepare them for specific changes which naturally take place when they cease to be a wondering people-- and become a people spread over a wide area in Palestine, and to impress upon their minds matters which every

individual should know, and not matters which are written down which should be looked up by the priests. There is a big difference between the purpose and the outlook of Levitical legislation and that of Deut. There naturally wouldn't be the repetition that there are in other portions--a difference in selection: according to the critical point of view, Deut. comes at the time of Josiah, and at that time it is now laid down that priesthood is restricted to the Levites.

#93 --- Deut. never enters into that particular question. It does enter into where sacrifice is to be offered and of course if you are not to sacrifice anywhere except where God chooses, then the question as to who sacrifices, is more or less an academic question--as far as the people are concerned. You might say that here is a man who wants to make a sacrifice--and he goes back of his house to make a sacrifice--the idea of Deut. is to stop that--it is very important that they know to sacrifice at the temple--it would be perfectly obvious that you couldn't just walk into the temple and make a sacrifice--you would have to do under the regulations that were there. The restriction of the place automatically restricts the person. --there is no restriction in Deut. as to who was to sacrifice--there is much therein as to where --it isn't necessary that every individual in the land but as long as it is restricted to one place, you just have to know where that place is and who it is is only vital to those who are in charge of that place and that is exactly what we find. He makes it definite--the Lord proved what He meant when he killed the sons of Korah who thought they could sacrifice just any place--it is very reasonable that it should be given just as it has been. It shows why it is not necessary to give it in the orations of Deut. It always speaks of the priestly Levities--all Levites are equal and are on the same standing--It is not possible to make a thorough unmistakeable study of everything that you are interested in, though it is very good to make a general study of a great many subjects and a thorough study of a few; consequently for our present purpose it is sufficient to look into Young's concordance and to see how these words, Levite and priest are used in Deut. I read them there in their context and I found that priest-Levites are used only four times--17:9; 18:1; 24:8, 27:9--and the critics say that in Deut. there is no difference--so it means the Levitical priests each time and there are two additional places where it says the sons of Levi--but I found that priest is used also

17:12, 18; 18:3, 19:17; 20:2; 26:3,4--You have eight times in Deut. where it speaks of the priest. Then the priest is used a little more often than it is used with Levi and so it is not a proper statement to say that Deut. always uses the Levitical priest and to him they are all the same--at least not on the basis of philology. All the Levites which are priests and the matter comes up as to what do we mean by priest. No where in the Bible does it tell us that a priest is a man who sacrifices. That is the great outstanding work of the priest--you might say that about a secretary who writes notes down--sends letters and yet you will find a distinction in business houses between a stenographer and secretary--a secretary has some extra responsibilities. A general secretary of an organization doesn't just write letters--some to be some specialized and hardly writes letters at all. Then you will have traveling secretaries--it has quite a broad phase of meaning. A priest--that word can apply properly to anyone that has a religious position. It is used of ~~if~~ one who does various priestly tasks and it nowhere says in the Bible that no body can be a priest who works for the Lord, but ~~it~~ it does say that no one should ~~be~~ sacrifice to the Lord unless they are a priest--the sons of Aaron are the priesthood in that sense and so it is quite natural to see that priest is used in a special sense, though he had many other duties than just to offer sacrifice. The book of Deut. nowhere says that only a Levitical--there is no mention whatever with the priests and connection with sacrifice. You must perform your sacrifices where the Lord shall choose--it never speaks of the Levites as sacrificing--the book of Deut. is not dealing with who should sacrifice, but rather with the question of what should the people know that are going into the land of promise. The people are told very specifically that they are to bring their sacrifice to the place where the Lord God shall choose for them, and naturally if you bring it to that place, you will find that place fits it, but it is not necessary to go into that. In the Levitical laws of course it is very vital to go into this which is very definitely stressed. So the critics say that priesthood is limited to the priests of Levi, and sacrifice to the sons of Aaron, but they rearrange it out of the order in which they are, even with no evidence for so doing, and when you get through, it is an argument from silence--a legitimate argument. It is dogmatically stated that Deut. does teach that--that all the Levites can sacrifice--Carpenter goes into this a good deal. He insists that the Levites are all

equal in the book of Deut. He says that according to Deut. 10--all the Levites can sacrifice. They say that it specifically recognizes Aaron and Eleazer as in the priest's office. Deut. 10:6-- Tells about Eleazer taking Aaron's place when he died. At that time the Lord separated the tribe of Levi--notice how equal they were. Don't you see how all the Levites can sacrifice, but it doesn't say a thing about sacrificing. All the sons of Aaron are Levites, but to separate some from the tribe of Aaron to sacrifice, that doesn't mean that all in the tribe could sacrifice. It doesn't even mention sacrifice and three verses apart, we have the mention of Aaron the priest and Eleazer succeeding him. So to say that Deut here teaches that all Levites can sacrifice, is to read into the text which is something it doesn't say at all. That is a very important thing to recognize here.

94 The critical argument as presented sounds extremely strong but when you examine the instances which they give you find a great many are not at all as represented. You find that there really is no argument in a great many ~~of~~ of them. The claim is made, eg. that they could not be the laws to sacrifice in one place because Saul and his army sacrificed the cattle out in the field of battle but the word which they translate sacrifice, which the A.V. translates kill--it is used even in Deut. 12. Even in that ch. it is used to mean to kill at home--Deut. 12:21 if it is too far away to go to the sanctuary--the word may be used at a banquet or a feast, and that is not a case in point at all. We have noticed in a good many cases in which men are not _____ in any sense and naturally what they do doesn't prove whether it was in accordance with the law or not--then we noticed there were commands of God given under exceptional circumstances. They say how do you think Moses could give the law to sacrifice in one place and then right in the book of Judges, you find Manoah sacrificing right out there in the field near his home--the angel brought the message and told him to make the sacrifice. That was a specific command of God and an exceptional case. Naturally it would take precedence over any general principle. We know after the the removal of all these there still remaind some definite difficulties, and when you take out 3/4 of the cases which the critics give as proof--that there was no such law until the time of Josiah, there still remain cases where this law doesn't seem to have been obeyed by godly men and it is vital to have an answer. You do have a long period of history --a history in which there are many emergency circumstances and you have an exceptional situation in which other matters

which were more important--that there be sacrifice rather than that the sacrifice be observed at a ~~special time~~ regular place. We will read about this man and that man whose heart was perfect and yet the high places were not taken away--you read about that until you come to Josiah and you find that he did take away the high places, and of course they say this proves there was no such law and the writer of Deut. inserted all these statements later on, to make it look like there was such a law but the fact of it is that the kings did not obey the law. The fact of it is the these services were kept up during this long period and a strong attempt was put up to put them down, but it is easy to see how that situation could have developed. It was not stressed a great deal and there were ~~the~~ other things that seemed more vital to those kings--and the fact that a person knows the law doesn't mean that he is always going to follow it. It doesn't say in Deut. that you are to worship only in Jerusalem but to sacrifice in the place that the Lord shall choose, and the place which over the centuries they did worship was at Shiloh, but from there the sons of Eli took it to battle and the Philistines took it--there is no further mention of Shiloh and it would seem that during that next period of 40 or 50 years, the land was so over-run by the Philistines, there was no particular place where they could worship, and Samuel would go from place to place giving this and that little group the Word of God. That was an unusual situation and after that, they didn't get established in one place until the time of Solomon--the temple was built in the days of Solomon. The argument is that we don't find existence of this law until the time of Josiah, and not before that time. On the assumption that Moses gave the Law it would be natural that people would obey the Law. When you find instances where the leaders of the people disobeyed the law and acted as though it didn't exist, that is a strong argument that this law did not as yet exist and wasn't given until the time of Josiah. The P document comes from the time of the exile according to their argument. We have been discussing whether or not there is development in the putting together of the law. You don't find evidence from history that there was such a law. If we were discussing whether or not the electoral college was a good thing for the U.S. or not--evidence on the history of the U.S. from 1780 ff. would be very pertinent but in the colonial days it would not make any difference because U.S. as a country did not even exist before that time.

And the argument as to whether the laws of Deut. were used after the time of Moses--naturally that doesn't hold because you wouldn't be expected to obey the laws for Palestine before they got to Palestine. Our present argument is about the Israelites entering the Promised Land, as given in their history of Judges, Ruth, Samuel and Kings--do we find evidence of this law being in existence. The critic's claim is that this was not a law until a 1000 years after the time of Moses and therefore in this period before you find the leaders of the people ignoring and if the leaders were good, they wouldn't have ignored the law.

2. Who performed the sacrifices. I have not take the time of going into these arguments in full to present ~~the~~ the higher criticism. This is a very important argument, and is fully taken up in Carpenter's book. You remember that he says that you actually don't have the priesthood of the sons of Aaron during the time of Israelite history. You have it in the P document given at the time of the exile and during the period before that just anybody could sacrifice but it was not kept to the priests. They say the priesthood was open to anybody and from 621 B.C. on you have it restricted to the tribe of Levi and they had secured for themselves the priestly functions. We notice that zavah doesn't necessarily mean sacrifice in the technical sense but it may refer to the killing of animals. We notice also the word--cohen not used in the narrowest sense. That does not necessarily show one who performs a sacrifice, though that is specifically what a cohen is. A secretary is one who writes, but you have general secretaries of organizations that never wrote any short-hand at all or used a typewriter but dictate all their letters and conduct business and manage things and they are not secretaries in the technical sense. These words often have one specific meaning and then they broaden out into a broader field.

" Priests"

95 --~~Sacrifices~~ is used for people who had other functions and it is even used of certain official in the government sometimes. That is entirely natural because they were leaders and had the say on various matters. If a person had leprosy he had to go to the priest. He had authority over sanitation, health laws, whether a man ~~had~~ a right to be in the city of refuge or not--had authority over quite a number of legal matters. There were a lot things that were connected up with the priest's office and the word priest would quite naturally come to be used of men who didn't have this specific function and consequently we sometimes find the word cohen is used in a broader sense and doesn't mean that he was

one officially in charge of the sacrifice. ^(b) Another thing we should remember--Priesthood of Aaron and Eleazer is recognized in the book of Deut--Deut. 10:6. It is said to be all about Levites and intended to come from 621 B.C., right there we have them recognized as high-priests. You might say that is something that the P writer inserted later--but the critics say that it comes from JE--how it got into Deut. is an interesting problem.

(c) All the persons that are said to be giving the sacrifice are said to be performing it. Here they say you have the law that all sacrifice is to be done by the sons of Aaron and yet you read in I Kings that Solomon went to Gibeon and there he performed sacrifices. It was not in Jerusalem or the selected place and Solomon himself performed the sacrifices. We read in I Kings 3:3--you have an excuse given for Solomon in this regard. In this time there the people sacrificed because there was no house built unto the Name of the Lord. He did love the Lord but sacrificed in high places. There is a recognition that was not the right thing to do. In all situations you find people with their particular faults and short-comings; the temple is not yet built anyway. Cf. v. 4--what could be more specific than the breaking of the law of P than this. Here are sacrifices performed by the sons of Aaron and here it says that Solomon himself went--can D and P have been in existence if he offered a 1000 burnt-offerings upon the altar. The critics tell you there couldn't have been any such law at that time, because you have here your history and shows Solomon utterly ignoring the law, but of course when you read it a little more closely and you try to picture Solomon offering 1000 burntofferings--that in the course of that afternoon he personally killed a thousand cows, put them on the altar, and offered the sacrifice and set the fire under-neath them --if he did all that in one afternoon, he was a might strong fellow and a very rapid worker. It is hardly sensible to think that Solomon did that to a 1000 cows and in fact there is no reason to believe that he did it to one--that means that Solomon gave the burnt-offerings and presented the animals. It means that he told the ones that were to sacrifice here were the animals he would give fore his offering. So the person giving the sacrifice is often spoken of as the person performing it and when you read that so and so sacrificed, does that mean that the priests didn't perform their function of sacrificing. It means that a person did as he should do--he made an offering and a person that gives the offering is properly spoken of as offering a sacrific~~ing~~ even though someone else does

the sacrifice but it doesn't necessarily have to mention the fact as to who did the particular service of sacrificing. You might say that you paid your income tax yesterday. You wouldn't ordinarily explain that an official of the government received it from you etc.--those details would not be mentioned. It would simply stand to reason with those thousands of sacrifices--that there would have to be officials to do it, or there wouldn't be any regularity about--in general it would stand to reason. It occurs to me there would be one case in point--ILL. of describing the sin of Eli's sons --in I Sam.2:12--when any man offered sacrifice, the priest would take part of the meat, but it doesn't enter into the question whether a priest or anyone could come into the place to sacrifice. I don't think that you would find any place where people could come in and make their own sacrifices but it is natural terminology--certainly no one would say that Solomon offered all these animals individually. There is no reason to assume that he offered any of the animals personally. I Sam. 2:19--it doesn't say if Elkanah did the sacrificing there or not but it does tell us that Eli was right there. This takes care of a good many of the instances.

(d)--In the case of the altar, there are instances of godly leaders that did not take a special effort to see that they had a priest of the house of Aaron to offer the sacrifice. It wouldn't be necessary to mention--it is possible that Samuel had a priest going around with him in his circuit who did the outward sacrificing. But the impression you get is that Samuel at least officiated. This was in the time of the Philistine supremacy and under the circumstances it would be more important to have sacrifices than to be so worried about performing them in the right place. Man was ~~made~~ not made for the Sabbath but the Sabbath for man--the thing that is vital in both Old and New Testaments is the presenting of God's truth that is vital and the particular matters of form and ceremony are under normal circumstances to be preserved because they carry out the figure and present the idea but they are not the vital thing. In the days of Samuel there is no evidence that this particular law was stressed and when you don't have a law stressed for a time, it would be quite natural that it would be forgotten and not have much attention paid to it.

FINAL EXAMINATION IN PENTATEUCH

May 13, 1955, 2:00 p.m.

Time: Two hours. Plan your time so as to finish.

1. Tell the nationality, approximate date, and contribution to the development of the critical theory of each of the following:
 - a. Astruc
 - b. Colenso
 - c. DeWette
 - d. Eichorn
 - e. Ewald
 - f. Geddes
 - g. Graf
 - h. Hupfeld
 - i. 'Ibn Ezra
 - j. Kuenen
 - k. Wellhausen
2. Describe each of the main documents in the Critical Theory of the Old Testament as generally held about 1900, pointing out some specific passages it includes, describing its style, and alleged viewpoints.
3. What is meant by the argument from history? Discuss fully.
4. Fully discuss the argument from parallel passages.
5. Discuss the dating of the book of Deuteronomy.

.....difficulty, but a very interesting book that was thrilling to many who read it, in the way in which it seemed to them to take the naturalistic attitude, evolutionary approach, and everything we have as a result of natural, ordinary, human development, and my ~~own~~ means of it, to explain how the Pentateuch came into existence. And Wellhausen and some of these German scholars who advance this theory were very thorough-going rationalists, and they thought everything comes into existence by purely natural circumstances. Now here is a book which all the Jews and Christians have believed for centuries to be the very foundation of their ~~religion~~ religion. How did it come into existence? Well, by natural processes of human historical ...1½.... And it sounds so interesting, so easy. It is like when Darwin's theory broke on England. And people, instead of thinking that a thousand or a million ~~were~~ different things were depended each one by a separate2.... of the almighty God, could imagine that from one little tiny cell there had developed by a perfectly natural process, all this great variety and incidental features could show how everything came into existence along the way, it just seemed to them to be the answer to the problem. And there was no need of a God to establish, create, or direct it, because it was just a natural process. Now of course, the question is, where does this natural process come from? Where do any of us get our existence? There are great arguments for the existence of God which need to be faced even apart from these theories, but it is one of the greatest forces in the world for a belief in God and God's plan, the existence of this wonderful Bible, the Bible is here, where did it come from? And if you can account for it on a purely naturalistic basis, and natural development, why that is very satisfactory. Well take the matter of, take our alphabet. Suppose somebody were to say to you, look at this wonderful Latin alphabet we use. Isn't it wonderful! A divine gift to us. God invented it and gave it to us. It came right from His hands. Well somebody else would come along and say, Oh, is that so? Do you think our Latin alphabet is invented by God and written by Him, and handed to us? No, it is just a natural development. He ~~it~~ would say, Here, look at the Greek alphabet. Look at our alphabet. See how similar it is. The Greek is earlier. Ours is based on the Greek. The Greeks brought it over to the Latins. The have alpha, beta, gamma, delta, we

have a b c d e f g. How do we ~~max~~ come to have a 'c' where they have a gamma? How do we come to have a 'g' later on? Well, it came overland through the Etruscans. And the Etruscans didn't have a 'g' sound, they just had a 'c' sound. So when they took the alphabet instead of saying alpha, beta, gamma, they said, alpha, beta, camma. And so they wrote the development from gamma, and they pronounced it 'c', and then when the Latins took that over from them, they took over the 'c', ^{and} ~~when~~ they had a 'g' sound, and they ~~max~~ was no 'g' left in the letters, and it was like the 'c', so they took the 'c' and put a line across the lower part and made a 'g'. And I believe all scholars believe that's how our alphabet got established. The Latin alphabet came from the Greek alphabet. Well, where did the Greek alphabet come from? Well, it came from the Hebrew ~~alphabet~~, Phoenician traders ~~brought~~ ^{bröht} it overland, brought it over sea, and they ~~brough~~ brought it to the Greeks. Well, the Hebrew alphabet does not have any vowels in it. But the Greek and the Latin have vowels. How did they get vowels? Well, because the Hebrew alphabet has the aleph sound which is a guttural which doesn't exist in Greek's/ their letters, aleph, beth, gimmel, when they said aleph, they ^{meant} took the first sound in the aleph which is that guttural 5.....open the throat and say the 'a' and we don't have in our language. The Greeks didn't have it, and the first thing they heard was the 'a' and so they thought, This stands for a vowel. And they way through a misunderstanding of the Semitic ~~alphabet~~ ~~which~~ which had only consonants, they got some vowels, and so you have letters for vowels, which the Hebrews didn't have. And you can trace it through like a natural developmental process. Now somebody comes along ~~mx~~ and says, this Latin alphabet is a divine gift to us, God gave it exactly as it is. It would be wicked to change it in any way, because it is a divine gift to us. We would say that's preposterous. We know how it came into existence. We have seen its development. We understand it. Now in Mesopotamia they didn't have stones so the Babylonians built their temples out of brick. They could make the brick out of clay, they had no ~~stones~~. Well, then they decided that's the way to worship Marduk, you have to have ~~xxxxx~~ something made with brick. So they'd go to a country where there was good building material and they'd ¹/₂ say, Oh ~~my~~, it would be awful to worship Marduk with ~~xxx~~ stones, you have to use brick. That's what they were accustomed to using. And that way in every religion there have

sprung up all kinds of customs which are based on purely accidental circumstances. There are all sorts of them. In every one of our denominations. In our habits of religious life, there ~~xxx~~ are custom~~s~~ which have developed from purely accidental circumstances. We adapt to a certain situation. And then when the situation changes, we are used to that method and we keep on doing it ~~the~~ and we get the idea some way that that is the way that things have to be. Like the missionary~~s~~ ~~xxx~~ daughter I heard of who came home on furlough~~s~~ and they were visiting on a farm, and they said, Oh, we'll bring you some of the milk we got from the cow this morning. She didn't want any milk from a cow, she wanted milk ~~xxx~~ from a can. That's what she was used to was milk from a can. She didn't want milk from a cow. That was the accustomed way. She didn't want to change it. Well, is the Bible in that category? A great part of what we have in life is, but is the Bible in that category? There are things about it that are. The titles of the books. It is ridiculous that we call the fourth book of the Bible, Numbers. Moses never called it Numbers. The Hebrews never called it Numbers. It is perfectly silly for us to call it numbers. Just because it happens to have two or three chapters that have a lot of Numbers in them. Many people fail to get the Treasures and the value of this very interesting book because we call it Numbers, and they think it is just a bunch of statistics. And how perfectly silly it is that we take the first, second, third, and fifth books, and we take their Greek words and transliterate them, and the average person has no idea what you are talking about. And they are good titles, if only we translate them. And then we get to this one where they have a terrible title in the Greek, and we translate it, so they ~~do~~ know what it means. It is about the most absurd thing you could do. It is much better to call it, Arithmoi, like the Greeks do, and then call Genesis, Beginnings, and Exodus, Going Out, Leviticus, Priestly Legislation, and Deuteronomy, Second Law. Why keep those words in the Greek that have some meaning and then take the one that doesn't and translate it into English and deceive people by it. We do all kinds of foolish things in our religion, and we do them in connection with our Bible. We do many of them. But the basis, the solid foundation, the book itself, as it originated, did that come about by a natural human process of development, or is there something which God has given us, given it in the circumstances, given it under

human conditions, and many things given in a certain way in relation to the events of the time, but nevertheless so given as to give us his meaning, His truth to us, to fit the circumstances that shall come in all times, which is it? Well, the criticism, prior to Graf, was a matter of considerable interest to a small group of people who were greatly interested in this idea of literary partition, and sources, very fascinating after you get into it. But the rank and file of people, it didn't mean much to them. But not that Graf and Kuenen of Leiden, and Wellhausen, ~~xxxx~~ presenting this theory, you took the old source development ~~ix~~ idea, the old idea of dividing into sources on a literary bases, and you combine it with the evolutionary theory so that you have an explanation on perfectly natural circumstances of how this comes to be, and you rule out everything supernatural about it. And that was very very attractive to a great many of the radicals in Germany and in Holland, and in France. Probably the conservatives of Great Britain and America would have indignantly repudiated what was advanced by these radicals were it not for the fact that a few conservatives from these countries went over to Germany and studied under those great radical scholars, and adopted many of their views, and tried to combine these views with a thoroughly Christian view on certain points, and then came back and they said, Well, after all, we believe in Christ, we believe in the Gospel, we believe in the Virgin Birth. Professor Briggs of Union Seminary, ~~was~~ a strong believer in the Virgin Birth, was one of the protagonists of the Graf Wellhausen theory, unforcked by the Presbyterian Church in the USA, and their students were ordered not to go to Union Seminary because of his views on the Old Testament, and yet he was a strong protagonist of his belief in the Virgin Birth. Well, it was men like that who adopted some features of the higher criticism who brought it in and led others to accept it, and resulted in its gradual introduction into Great Britain and into this country, and more and more it spread, and more and more those who accepted it went on to use the same methods in larger and larger sections and until the end it did away with the supernatural altogether, as far as having any books that God has given from which we could take statements, until you get the Neo-Orthodox view in which statements doesn't matter. You can take the whole book, and it is the most wonderful spiritual source of knowledge you've got, but you don't get any propositional truth from it. You don't get any statements you can say,

this is a fact, because in ~~the~~ the religious world there are no facts. It is the other side and we know nothing about it, except that it breaks through something into our lives. Well, that is the way in which this has had this ~~the~~ tremendous influence, and there is nothing gained by our just passing it aside and saying, Oh, we don't believe that, we believe in God. I think all that is true and good, but I think there is a value for us to understand how this developed, and see its bases, and see how strong some of its arguments can be made to appear, so that there are people who have very sincerely been convinced that this is so reasonable that it must be true. Then I think we want to see ~~what~~ how reasonable ^{part} of it can be made to appear, and then see that they are not actually reasonable at all, that it is again the same old theory of the ...12.... of a beautiful theory by a gang of ...12. It is a beautiful theory. But let's get the facts and see where they fit in. Well, now before we get the facts I want you to understand the theory and know what it is. Mr Rivi?.....

AAM: Well, now, at that time, quite as early as that, to how great an extent it was guarded, and as to how great an extent he gave it....12 $\frac{1}{2}$, but it was the idea of development by natural processes, that idea very definitely, and certainly the idea of going ~~from~~ from the simple to the complex. I mean, there is so much in it that is in common with the evolutionary theory, and the evolutionary theory ~~is~~ has been so big a feature through most of its history that my inclination would be to guess that it was right from the start, but I just don't know. But we have spoken then about ~~the~~ Wellhausen's great book. Well, now that leads us, this was C I believe we were talking about, wasn't it? From Eichorn to Graf. ~~We~~

We'll go very briefly on ~~the~~ D, The Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis. We'll speak of D very briefly for this reason. We won't take as long under D as on the others, because we've already come up to ~~the~~ D and given you a brief idea of it, but of course I have only given you the bare outline yet. We want to see what the main features are. Now under that for logical completion, we'll call number, The Rise, The rise of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis, but that we've already discussed. I won't repeat it. Number 2 is its spread. And under that Wellhausen' book is mentioned ~~again~~ again because it was a ..14 $\frac{1}{2}$..., his book published in 1878. Question:.....

....Well, this great book of Wellhausen had a tremendous effect on the spread of brilliant it in Europe and Germany and in France, I believe, and a ~~Christian~~ Englishman named, William Robertson Smith, studied in Germany. Smith was a very great scholar a brilliant man, he was raised in a most orthodox and conservative Scottish background. He went over to Germany and studied there. And he was at first greatly shocked at the attitude of the radical scholars ~~with~~ with whom he came in contact. Gradually he ~~came~~ ^{came} to know them as persons and found them very fine people, got to know them well, adopted their views, and went back to Scotland speaking very piously about many things, but strongly advocating the Graf-Wellhausen theory. And his influence did a tremendous lot to carry these views in Great Britain. I believe he was professor in Aberdeen University, and he was brought to trial for views, and they had a great church trial, convicted him of heresy, expelled him from the University, and so either Oxford, or Cambridge, I forget which, came to take him on, and made him their professor, and he had twice the influence he had had before. He was editor of two or three of the editions of the Encyclopedia Britannica. He was a very brilliant man. Dr. Allbright told the story he heard about him, he said, that Robertson Smith had an almost encyclopedic knowledge of manuscripts and texts and all that sort of thing. He was interested in all these details of scholarship, and he said, one time he was at a party somewhere, and they saw him get over on the sides and there was an English squire, one of these men ~~that~~ that was interested in fox-hunting and horse racing, and he ~~was~~ saw Robertson Smith over in the corner with this fellow, and some of them said, Oh, poor Smith, they said, Here he'd love to talk with people about the pedigree of N. T. manuscripts, or the development of the critical theory and so on, and here he is talking with this squire that knows nothing but fox-hunting and horse racing, and is interested, not in the pedigree of manuscripts, ~~the~~ but the pedigree of race horses, and how bored Smith will be. And then they looked over and they saw the two men talking very excitedly, and Smith was talking, and was so interested, and the other fellow had such an interested look on his face, that they were quite surprised, and after a little when the party broke up they overheard the squire and he said, You know, I've met a man that knows more about horse racing than I know. (laughter). The first time I ~~never~~ ever have. And he gave it as an instance of the wide knowledge of this man, brilliant man, brilliant

scholar, but a pernicious influence in the history of the world, because it was his influence that introduced and widely spread/ that which the British world was ready indignantly to reject, but it was his brilliant mind that advanced it and caused it to become widely accepted, and then of course there have been younger men in Great Britain and some in this country, who have advanced it very strongly, the older scholars, the critical scholars were holding to the supplement theory, some of them gave it up, and came over, others of them held to it to the end of their lives, but no younger fellows/. All the young men from that time adopted the Graf-Wellhausen theory. In 1900 you could say that all scholars, and by that you meant all critical scholars, all scholars agreed that ~~these~~ these chapters are P and these are J and these are E and these are D, and that J is the earliest and then E and then D and the P, the main essentials of the theory, and thousands of the details, you could say in 1900, all critical scholars in the world agree upon it. That was held very very widely, and ~~taught~~ taught as the established results of modern scholars. Well, now, there are people today who will tell you the G-W theory is completely out of date, other things have taken its place, but don't you believe it5¹... Professor Albright told me in Jerusalem in 1929, he said, there are only two orthodox Wellhausenists in Germany, and they're not orthodox. That's what he said. But that means that there is no longer any scholar of standing who will take everything in the G-W theory and say, all this is absolutely so. Everyone will change this or will change that, or change that. But they don't agree on what they change. And I think it is safe to say that 90 % of critical ~~scholars~~ scholars today accept at least 80 % of the teaching of the G-W theory. There has ~~been~~ rarely in the history of the world been a theory as extensive or as complex as this which has been accepted by so many people for so long a time. And it is accepted today in the main. Dr. Albright will write a book which has very conservative statements in it, and he'll take this feature of the higher criticism and he'll kind of knock it, and this feature ~~is~~ and slam it, and you'll read along, and you begin to think, my my, he certainly doesn't hold it at all, and then he'll come to the conclusion and ~~he~~ he'll say, however, of the facts of the existence of the independent existence of the great document, J, E, D, and P, nobody could ever doubt that. That's the theory, that's the basis of the theory. And he will make a statement like that.

Dr. Albright wrote a most amusing article, I thought, in The American Scholar about twenty years ago. In this article he told about Graf, Kuenen, Wellhausen, these great scholars, and the wonderful theories they advanced. And he told ~~xxx~~ about the conservatives who tried to answer them, he ridiculed them. Their answers were silly ...7..... And then he said, However, it is strange that new discoveries ~~xxxxx~~ make it look as if in many regards, the great scholars were wrong, and the conserva/tives whom he poured such contempt upon, they were right after/ all in many of their views. And then he goes ahead and for about twenty pages he gives you one archaeological evidence after another showing the dependability and veracity and the truth of the story I've told you. And then when he gets through with it he says, what are the conclusions? The great conclusion is that we must never forget the debt we owe to those great masters of scholarship, Kuenen and Graf and Wellhausen. (laughter). And that is the attitude of the critical world today, that they laid the foundation, and you can change a little here, and you can change the color of one of the8.... here, you can move the chimney over three inches this way or that, but the main basis of the building remains solid/ and established. Of course, the average student today in a theological seminary, a liberal theological seminary, or in a class in a university, will not have the evidences of it presented to him to a great extent, because it is just taken for granted it is true. And there will be discussion of whether a certain chapter belongs in J or P, but the basis of it is just taken for true. The person would be just as silly to doubt this as to doubt the theory of evolution. I happen to run on to a man/ in the university of Pennsylvania a couple days ago and he was given a test in a course he was taking there by one of their leading scholars in the University, and the course was in the history of ancient Israel, and they gave a list of questions for the undergraduates, and then here's a question for the few graduate students who are in the class. Here was one of the questions. "What was the language which was used in the original manuscripts which were used by the author of the J document/ in preparing this material?" What was the language of the material which he used? And he wanted a scholarly discussion of whether it was Amorite, or ...9...., or what the language was. Which was used by the writer of the J document? But that there was a J document, you see, that is just as plain as that

theory of evolution is true. They just don't question that. Well, now, that's the general attitude, and it is not necessary. It is foolish for you to preach alot of sermons on it. It is foolish for you to go to alot of people that don't know anything about it, and try to inform them. There'd be no sense in it. But ~~for~~ for a man who is going to serve the Lord to have an understanding of it, to know what its strong ~~points~~ points are, and what its weahnesses are so that when the occasion comes and it will come, if you are used to any extant in the Lord's service when you come in contact with people who have been tremendously influenced by the ~~theory~~ theory, and yet who are open and influenced by the gospel, to know a little of its weak~~ness~~ness and strength, and be able to point out a feature here, and a feature there and ~~it~~ they may shake their faith in the evidence, and lead them to look into it and be led to see the truth. Mr. Wilson?.....

AAM: Well, Dr. Speiser at the U. of Pennsylvania happens to be the man who gave the question about the J document I just referred to. He gave that last week. My observation of him has been that he gives courses in Biblical books and he will take the critical theory and he will show how all the details are utterly fantastic and are wrong and the archaeological~~e~~ evidence show that it is absolutely wrong as far as that book is concerned. But you ask a question about any other book, and he looks at the latest critical work to see whether it is ~~the~~ the J document of the E document, exactly what it is, and accepts that as the final authority on the matter. unless hell..... Now that's unless ~~he~~ he gets into a book like Genesis, which is the basis of this theory, and there he's pretty apt to hold pretty tenaciouly to the theory. I mean, he will occasionally make a statement about this weak point or that weak point in ~~the~~ the theory, and if you put them all together, you get alot, but he'll make up for that by every now and then making a strong ~~and~~ declaration of belief in the main essentials of the ~~theory~~ theory. That is almost necessary if a man is going to maintain his intellectual respectability today ~~inxxx~~ among critical scholars. It is just like in the evolutionary theory. Dr. Albright wrote a great book on From Stone Age to Christianity with alot of fine material in it which made the liberals very very angry. Out at the university of Chicage, they couldn't say a decent word. I had a friend who was on the staff there, and he was at a meeting there where the book was reviewed, and Oh, he said, It was awful to

hear the way those fellows just tore into Albright because he was so awfully con-
servative. That's their attitude, a lot of those people, toward Albright. But
somebody came out in a review of the book and said that Albright rejects the theory
of evolution, and Albright, he was hurt. He wrote an answer to that. He said,
How utterly preposterous. Why anybody that looked in my book on page so and so,
he named about twenty pages, would see very clearly the force I put in the theory
of evolution. After all a man's got to maintain his intellectual respectability.
Dr. Robert Dick Wilson was much impressed by an article in ...12 3/4.... on
being willing to be a fool for Christ's sake, and it is a fact that in every field
of science and thought certain shibolles get established which you have to hold
to be considered respectable, and a Christian, if these things are unChristian,
is considered as rather foolish just because he doesn't believe by people who don't
know anything about them much, but who accept them because they are the accepted
thing. As Dr. Speiser himself said, The academic mind is very greatly overrated.
He said that when he was trying to park his car one day. (laughter) He saw where
the others had parked their cars. But it is a fact that there are prejudices and
attitudes among scholars which are just part of human nature. There is many a man
who becomes pastor of a church, and he has the impression, I'll go in that church
and I'll present them the truth, and they will just welcome it and rejoice in it,
and immediately he stepped on the toes of somebody's little prejudice on some point
and they get angry. And he's in difficulty. And he thinks, Oh my, this little
point. They believe this way. I am going to give them the truth. And then they
will accept it immediately. And pretty soon he gets thrown out on his ear, having
wild radical ideas. And if he would learn to know a little about human nature,
he would learn that ~~xxx~~ people's prejudices cannot be removed by simply a presen-
tation of truth. You are wise to take the big things and stand on them, and on
little unimportant things on which you will find people with silly prejudices in
this direction, and this, and this, and this, and all kinds of directions, don't
step on their toes. Try to ignore the things that are minor, but gradually lead
people on the minor things to the truth, but don't think that people are just if
you give them the facts are going to accept them. People are just not that way.
People are filled with prejudices, and that applies to great ~~xx~~ scholars as well as

to ignorant people. Mr. Blakely?.....

AAM: That is exactly the impression which many many people have gotten from reading articles by ~~him~~ Albright for the last thrity ~~years~~.....

Well, if I heard this precise statement, I might say that's fine, but I might...

...end of P 2

P 3

.....sombody have a question?.....Yes, that's a good questgion. Hupfeld followed the view which all previously had accepted, and continued to hold it for a while. The scholars through the pre~~vious~~ hundred years, all who accept the critical theory at all, that is, who ~~at~~ took the supplementary theory, not..... the supplementary, or perhaps even the original document the~~ory~~, thought of P as the longest, the fullest, the most detailed, and it was the foundation, and the other were additions to it. Well, you see, that is opposite to the evolutionary idea that you start with the simple and go on to the complex. And once that was pointed out, it was very easy for these scholars~~z~~ to say, No we were wrong, the first was last. It was very easy. But the fact that P was universally regarded as the first for all those years, I think shows that the evidences for it being last aren't so strong as people are trying to make out. But in line with the evolution-ary ~~threx~~ theory, P would naturally be last, because it is the most complex, and th more advanced.....2..... Well, now, I am very anxious to understand if you know what the theory is, because there are many details that we haven't yet looked ~~inxx~~ into, and I am not so anxious that you see the flaws in alot of its little details and superficial points as I am that you get an understanding of its main features which after all are2 $\frac{1}{2}$, Yes?.....

AAM: Yes, well, suppose we leave that for a little because that is a portion of what I want to go into this hour. A very important question was raised, but I'd rather go into it in just a few minutes3.....Mr. ?.....

AAM: That is something I would like you all to get well in ~~xxxx~~ mind. As originally held,3 $\frac{1}{2}$ for E and J of course. That's no longer the case. Now the old E is divided into P and D, and ther's J. Now of course there is xxxx E as a separate one. Now Hupfeld siad, The style of E is so much like J that it is very difficult to tell which is whcih. About all you could go by is the divine.

There is very little else. Well, now to tell what is E and what is J, there
 4...., than there are differences there. You take two chapters in which the name
 of God appears once, and it is Jehovah, well, somebody says, The Redactor changed it
 there. It was originally Elohim. After all, if there are only one or two occur-
 ances, you can't go by it. And when it comes to the evidences, J is narrative, and
 E is narrative. So it is very hard to know which is J or E. Well, now the atti-
 tude which was originally take was that P was the first and E was later, and E is
 the first and J is later. So naturally E was thought to be before J. Now just
 when and how it came about that there was a shift in the idea on that in deciding
 that E is later rather than earlier. I couldn't say. My guess is somebody sug-
 gested it, somebody else put it down for a fact. It is not a vital thing. It is
 very small. P is a big thing. J is a big thing, D is a big thing. E is so much
 like J that as a matter of fact, ~~by~~ most scholars speak of JE. And, of course,
 that was the original...5... dividing it according to divine names, to call it
 JE. And the idea is, J was originally written, then E was written, then a redac-
 tor combined J and E and5¹....., and the redactor combined it into one book,
 JE. Well, now to tell which part was originally J and which was E, there are all
 kinds of ~~diff~~ different ideas. And so how it came about to decide E was later than
 J, probably very soon, because J had the greater part of the anthropomorphic mater-
 ial. And anthropomorphic naturally seemed more primitive than statements that are
 not anthropomorphic, that are really anthropopathic. Well, this ~~spread~~ spread of
 the theory, then, I have spoken of. How/ widely it spread. That's what I was
 dealing with when these various questions came up. But number 3, The developmental
 aspect of the theory, or the evolutionary aspect. Let's call it the evolutionary
 aspect. That, of course, is the great strength of the theory. Other books were
 divided into sources, mostly given up. This continues, because the source idea
 had been combined with the evolutionary idea which has been a vital force in our
 civilizati~~on~~ for the past seventy-five years. Well, now, just how does/this evo-
 lutionary idea come into this. Let's think of that for a little. In the first
 place it comes into it because you have your shorter6¹..... things first, and
 your longer things later. But that's a very superficial aspect. The book of the
 covenant, of which Mr. Bentley asked a minute ago, The book of the cov~~en~~ant,

in Exodus 21 to 23, is a set of three chapters/which gives you a basic law , the ten commandments, then ordinances, and judgements, related to it. It is prefaced with the question, Will you follow God's Law as He gives it to you? The people say, We will. Then the law is given, then they had a meal with the elders and nobles, at which they formally ratified the covenant. It is a unit by itself. There is no question of it, The book of the covenant. Well, here is a short book of laws, a brief presentation of the law. Well, then, Oh, you go on to about 35 or 36, and the chapter of the breaking of the ten commandments, you have a new statement of quite a few of these laws, which some think is the very first primitive statement by J. And7 3/4... advanced the theory that that was the original ten commandments, Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk. That was one of the original ten commandments.....J.....8..... But that's not a vital part of the critical theory, a good many don't hold it. But that J had some very primitive laws, but that the simple book of the covenant is JE, and8..... of JE, that is the first law. Well, then, you have the law of Deuteronomy. It is more extensive. It is fuller than this. And then you have the priestly law which is far more extensive, and far more complicated. Well, this isn't evolution. That's a natural order for the evolution to have taken place. Well, now they say, The idea is contained in these. They say, J has primitive ideas of God. God comes down to see what the men are doing. Let us go down and see what they are doing. God walked in the garden in the cool of the day. God smelled the odor of the sacrifice. All these anthropomorphic statements about God, that is J, the most primitive document. Then people advanced a little to a little higher level of religion, and they used just anthropopathic statements. They don't any longer speak of God as having a hand or a face, or an arm, or like that, ~~that~~ those anthropomorphoses, but they take, God was grieved. It ~~changed~~ pained God. They used anthropopathic statements in which he is spoken of as having feelings like a human being. That's E. Well, then you get up to P, and in P you have this lofty, spiritual ideal of God. God said, Let there be light, and there was light. God said, just the divine words. The lofty spiritual concept of God without personality, ~~that's that's that's~~ you might say, just a word, just a faith. Well, then they say, this evolution applies in religious customs. Now

this is perhaps the very center of the evolutionary theory. Or at ~~it~~ least of the Hegelian aspect of it. The religious customs which are followed in these different documents. You take the question, where are you going to sacrifice? Well, in the book of the covenant you can sacrifice anywhere you want. You build an altar, you're given certain directions how to build an altar. After you build the altar, then you sacrifice on it, ~~anywhere~~. Then you come down to Deuteronomy, and Deuteronomy says in Deut. 12, You shall come to the place the Lord your God ~~shall~~ shall select, ~~and~~ out of all your tribes and there shall you sacrifice. It is limited to one place. And then you go on to the priestly legislation, and that just doesn't say, but it takes for granted that it is limited to one place. The priestly legislation with all its complexity requires one temple, one place of sacrifice. Now who is to do the sacrificing. Well, in the book of the covenant, any head of the family can do the sacrificing. And then you go on to the Deut, and it says, the priests, the Levites, levitical ~~priests~~ priests, the tribe of Levi, the sacrifice. And then you come on to the priestly legislation, and it is the family of Aaron. It is not anybody. It is not even a whole tribe, it is just one family. It is restricted. You see the evolution. You see the development. And so in many cases like this, there is an alleged evolution or development from the simple to the complex, or from the primitive to the advance. There are hundreds of cases where such a development is alleged. And then they say, You take the narrative, and it fits in with it. You read about Abraham, and he sacrificed up here, and down there, and different places in the J document. Abraham sacrifices many places. But not in the D or P document. According to them, Abraham never sacrificed in any other place than in Jerusalem, because after all, the teaching of the D document and the P document is that only at Jerusalem can there be sacrifices. So that in all the accounts where Abraham sacrificed in other places than in Jerusalem are in the J document. It goes, you see, from the simple to the complex. Now the J tells us about a flood, and he tells, God said, take two of every animal into the ark. Well, P tells us about a flood, but he has a complicated idea with clean animals and unclean animals, you take two of every unclean animal, and seven of every clean. It is complicated. It is more advanced.

It is a higher stage, less primitive in development, and ~~so~~ you have your evolution your ~~evolution~~ development, your going from the simple to the complex which is shown here, and not only that, but they say it fits with the ~~history~~ history. Look at the history, they say. You find Joshua, you find Samuel, Samuel sacrificed here and there and there and there. He doesn't just sacrifice in Jerusalem. Now if the Deuteronomic law had been there in Samuel's time, how could he sacrifice at Mizpah and all these other places. How could he do it? I mean, he was a good man. He wasn't just disregarding the law, he was the sort of man that would have obeyed the law. Well, then, ~~when~~ when he pays no attention to it, it is pretty good proof it wasn't written yet. So it must have been much later. And he didn't look for any Levites to sacrifice. He did the sacrifices. Look at Solomon! Solomon went out and he killed ten thousand cows, with his own hands, in order to sacrifice to the Lord. He didn't look for any Levites, and any priests. Of course, right there, I think it is a little difficult. I think his arm must have gotten pretty tired. My guess is that he did have Levites do it for him. But that's what they say. Mr. Fritz, do you have a question?

AAM: That's what our course is about. I expect everybody here to be quite ignorant about it, but I am trying to present the question and to present the problem to show the view they take, and then to ~~show~~ show the answer, and some of the views they take are very very easy to answer, and some of them are very difficult. And I am trying first to give an idea of what the view is. And the view is not just some silly foolish thing that some crazy infidel thought of. It is not that. It is a very ~~well~~ brilliantly conceived evolutionary scheme. That's what it is. And when you look at it, there are many many reasons why I am convinced that it is not a reasonable interpretation of the Bible, that it does not stand up. But in order to see the reasons it doesn't stand up,14½....., you have to have an understanding of the strength of the arguments advanced for it, and what are the points which are difficult to answer, until you get ~~into~~ into a thorough examination of it. And what are, on the other hand, the claims made for it, that rest on no foundation and are very easily answered. Now someone else had a question, Yes?end of P 3

.....is an argument which I believe can be completely and satisfactorily answered I think it is the logical order, tho, to take up the other arguments first before it. Rather than, the history I'd rather not take up until along toward the end of our semester, but I want you to be aware of the problem, to be aware that the argument from history is that if you take the historical books, they say, and read what they tell you that happened in the earlier days, it follows ~~along in~~ ^{the law of} JE, and not the law of D or of P. That's what they say. Well, now, you can present the argument from history, and I just did, in such a way that it sounds very very strong. But when you look into its ~~data~~ details, you find all kinds of loopholes, and weak points in it, and consequently it is an argument which I believe is fully answerable but it is an argument which can be made to appear very very strong, and so I want you to be aware of it at this point. Yes?.....

AAM: Explain what they say it means? Yes, I'd like you all to have that in mind. That what they say it is, they say that JE document, Oh, say! A point I never thought of before. A very good point. According to the, let's say, according to the supplementary theory, according to the supplementary theory the first document written, the old Elohist document, describes God as appearing to the patriarchs under the name of El Shaddei, and he was called God, Elhchim, or he was called El Shaddei, and that is the ~~te~~ teaching up until Exodus 6 where Moses says to God, What is your name~~s~~, and God says, My name is Jehovah. That is my name, and you can tell that to the ~~peo~~ple, and from there on they used the name, but the name~~s~~ according to the believers in the supplementary theory, it was revealed for the first time in Exodus 6:3. Then, however, the people became accustomed to using the name, Jehovah, and they used it exclusively after that, practically, and when the J book was written the author of J forgot that that was the previous idea that that name hadn't come into existence until the time of Moses, and he wrote his book, and he happened to use the name, ~~He~~hovah right from the very beginning. And so when the two are put together, you have a contradiction between the P document that only used the name, Elhchim, up until Ex. 6:3, and the Jehovist document uses it from the very beginning. That is their theory. And it is an interesting one to consider the answer, but just at the moment Mr. Brown asked this, the thought occurred to me, with the G-W theory, with the P document put later, it surely be-

comes a much weaker theory. Because if ~~xxxxxx~~ everybody knew the J document already and according ~~it~~ to the J document the name Jehovah is used right from the beginning how would the P document get the idea that it never was known until Ex. 6:3.. You see what I mean? It changes the order around, and kind of wrecks that argument immediately, it seems to me. By the way, Professor Garstang has written the book on the foundations of the Bibles, is it? The Archaeology of the books of Joshua and Judges, and he's got some very interesting archaeological evidence on the accuracy of statements in the book of Judges, excellent material, but he says in the front of the book, he says, I have been greatly interested,4 3/4.... says, in finding in Palestine archaeological ~~and~~ evidences, and evidences from the places, of the accuracy of statements in the JE document of Judges, and so that's what I am giving here. Now, he says, I have occasionally found evidence of accuracies in the P document. Now, you'd never expect that anything as late as the P document would have anything accurate in it. And yet I ~~xxx~~ have found a few, but, he says, we are not going to bother with those in this book. My point in this book is to show that the JE document is a ~~xxxx~~ reliable source of history. And so, you see, that's the attitude. The P document, that's just a late thing with a lot of imagination. That doesn't count. But the JE document used to be thought to be imagination, too, now we are beginning to find there is a good deal of true history in it. But, to his surprise, he found there was some in the P document too. Well, ~~no~~, you see, in Ex. 6:3 from the ~~Wellhausen~~ Wellhausen view with the P document the last, to my mind it knocks half the weight out of that argument you see, from Ex. 6:3. But you see what the argument is now5 3/4.....Mr. Brown. Did I make it clear?

Well, then I fear we'll have to leave that until next Monday

.....end of class, Feb. 17, 1955, end of P 4

P 5

Feb. 21, 1955

....Question.....AAM: Yes, you put them together so you have one manuscript that you call JE, and which they all admit is very difficult to tell what is J and what is E. There is very little1..... of divine names. which was J and which was E by divine names. Now last week we discussed a few of the basic things in the last hour, of the critical theory, and we discussed a

few points about it which are not so basic, a bit more involved perhaps, some considerably more, and some not quite so much. After class several of the very best student, I believe stayed around and asked me some questions, and from the questions I saw that they did not have a clear understanding of some of the basic factors in the theory. If that's the case with them, it probably is the case with others also. Now there would be not much point in our spending the rest of the term discussing weaknesses in the theory until I am sure that you all know what the theory is of which we will be discussing the weaknesses. You have to have a pretty definite idea of it, or else it doesn't mean a great deal to you. And, in fact, I think you should have a better idea of what the theory really is than the students who are trained in liberal schools, for they simply take it and accept the conclusions and that's that. But if you are going to deal with people who feel that this is definitely proven, and you will, every one of you, before your life is over, have many such occasions to do that, it is important that you know exactly what it is that they are talking about even if they don't know. Because, when you get into discussion, if you start giving an argument, and then they say that that argument has no meaning, and ~~are~~ ^{start} giving you a reason for it, if their reason is not a valid reason, you should be able to demonstrate it, and it is most vital that you be able to show them that you truly understand what the theory is they are talking about, and if they think you are not, when they look it up they will find you were right on it. And so to get the basic principles of it thoroughly understood is extremely vital in this point in our discussion. I believe personally that the arguments and evidence for it are not sufficient to maintain it. I believe that it has many very great weaknesses. But it is not just a lot of nonsense. It is a theory which can be made to look very very strong and very very impractical, and it is a theory which has been accepted by a great many very brilliant people, and it is important that we have real understanding of exactly what it is. So I think it would be wise for us to take a little while now going over the history of it again, now not bothering with the question of what someone believed or when it was taken and so on, but to find out exactly what the views were. Take the first thing, the original document theory, the early document theory. According to that view, the view that Eichorn advanced, and

then others after him, there are how many main documents, Mr. Melton?.....

AAM: Two main documents. There may be other~~s~~ small sections inserted here and there, but there are two main documents, According to that theory, which of these documents was written first, ?.....

AAM: Yes, that's the correct answer. There is so far as I know, no reason why it makes any ~~great~~ difference to them which of the two was written first. Here are two different documents. And each of ~~these~~ these documents gives an account of the history from the creation of the world up to the time of the coming of the Israelites to Canaan. Now, there are two different documents, then, and somebody has combined these two, and there is no rason in the world why such a thing might not happen. But, the thing about it is they ~~say~~ claim to be able to recognize the fact that there are two different documents, and to separate them out and tell what belongs in each one. Now what are the bases on which they~~say~~ claim to be able to prove that there are two documents, Mr. Wilson?

AAM: Yes, but their claim is that you have more or less alternating sections. That you will have a section which uses the name Jehovah, another in which God is called Elohim, another section in which he is called Jehovah, and more less alternat~~e~~, and you can separate them out, according to this, that this is a very strange and unusual thing to use two different names for God, use one of them for a while and then another one, and that you can separate them out, and thus tell what the documents are. The argument on the basis of divine names has proved that there were two different sources, and as a means of separating the two sources one from the other. Now, of course you get a little more into detail and you notice that in ch.2 and 3 where it uses Jehovah, it uses Elbhim with it, as if to say, This Jehovah is the Elbhim spoken of in the first chapter, and that of course was added by the redactor. The document ~~originally~~ originally just had Jehovah. But the redactor in putting it together would put Elohim after Jehovah in Ch. 2 and 3 to show this is the same ~~one~~ one he's talking about. Then when, that is the first argument, the first bases on which they claim to be able to prove that there were two distinct documents. Now, Mr. Pankerton, what is the second basis on which they claim to show there are two distinct main documents?.....

AAM: Yes, They say you take each one of them by itself, and you read it through, you've got the whole story, and that's pretty good proof that you have two distinct complete stories originally. You have the two complete stories, add you put them together, and have more detail about different phases of it, but that neither one of them needs the other. They are complete stories by themselves. That is what they maintain. That is their argument. We are not saying it is true that any of these are true, we are noticing facts that on the complete arguments we are trying to get an idea of what they are, and then we'll look into them and see whether they stand the test of examination. What is the third basis which is advanced on which they establish this theory? Mr. Bentley.....

AAM: They claim that there are confusions of the same story, and that would be an evidence of parallel passages. Now that is not the only type of parallel passage. You have in Genesis 1, it says, God created man, male and female created he them. In Gen. 2, you read the God made man of the dust of the earth and breathed into his nostrils the breath of his life, the story of the creation of man told twice. Man's creation is described in Genesis 1, about v.20, it is described in Gen. 2, about v.10, and so you have the story of the creation of man told twice. That is a parallel passage in that case. There is no question. This case of Abraham and Sarah, we can argue whether it is a parallel or not, but here we do have a parallel, we have the story of the creation of man told twice. Now you have the story of the making of the tabernacle told twice. One of them is represented as being, God said to Moses, God and do this, do this, do this, do this. And it says, Moses came and he did this, did this, did this, did this. And you have it told twice. This is a parallel. But as it stands there is a reason for the parallel. One is the command, the other is the fulfillment of the command, but it is a parallel. So you see there are all kinds of parallels possible, there are parallels possible which are purely, perfectly natural, perfectly proper, there is no reason in the world they shouldn't be. I may say, I want you to write such and such in this roll call, thirty seconds later I may describe them all over again. There may have been a dozen more people came in the room, and I may have decided it is still rather early in the hour, and have given it over. That would have been a parallel, but there would be a reason for the parallel.

When I used to teach beginning Hebrew I would explain a point. I would explain it a second time. I would explain it a third time. It would be three parallels. Usually then somebody would raise their hand, Would you please explain so and so, and I would explain it a fourth time. So there would be four parallels, but there's a reason for it. There's much that I give you today that parallels that given in other days. There's a reason. So when you find parallels, the question is, Are they natural parallels, which you would normally expect to find, or are they not. Are they such parallels that would not ordinarily occur, and therefore have to be explained in some unusual way. And there are those who will say, they will say you can take the two documents through Genesis, and you will find the ~~theory~~ ~~theory~~ series, this event, this event, this event, this event, right straight through, describing one, describing the other, a whole long series of parallels. Well, we want to look into that, and see whether it is quite as long as it is said it is. But that is the argument, and there is considerable material on which to base a very reasonable argument. Well, now is there any ~~other~~ other basis for the theory, Mr. Brown? Mr. Tentarelli, what is the fourth?

AAM: Differences of style. And exactly what is meant by that?.....

AAM: Yes, that is to say, that one uses one type of style, and another another. The difference might be a difference of wording, one uses a certain phrase, another uses a certain phrase. It might be a difference of type of syntax. One might use prepositional phrases, the other might use clauses more, there might be different types of differences of style. Well, now, isn't the first argument simply a part of argument four, wouldn't you say, Mr. Tentarelli? Argument one is actually only a part of argument four. And some of the critics today will say it is just one thing in four. It is ~~not~~ not a main argument at all, that is, it is just one of many differences of style. But we give it as a separate distinct argument for two reasons. First because that's the way the criticism began, and we noticed that they based it on that. Second, because in their discussion they actually do give tremendous emphasis to the matter of the divine names when it seems to be a good argument, and when they find difficulty with the argument in certain places, they say, Oh, that's just one of a hundred stylistic features, not particularly important. But the fact is that they give great stress to it, and so

~~that~~ it is not out of place to consider it as one of the four basic arguments. Well, now, on these four basic arguments, Eichorn claims to divide Genesis into two main documents, ~~an~~ which have been interlaced by a redactor. He would say, by ~~Moses~~ Moses, but later men carried it clear through the Pentateuch and then that did away with Mosaic authorship, because Moses wouldn't have taken two different somewhat contradictory stories of events he was connected with and interlace them. They are from a much later time according to this phase of the theory....end of P 5

P 6

.....The other document, the E document would be Genesis 1 and various sections through the book. What ~~sections~~ portions particularly of the rest of the Pentateuch would they put in the E document? Mr. Harding.....

AAM: Well, no, there are sections from Genesis 20 - 50 here and there that would be put in, though there are many sections that would be put in J. But what about the rest of the Pentateuch, ~~sections~~ after Genesis? They would put sections all through the book of Genesis, from Gen. 1-20 and Gen. 20 -50, sections of all1 $\frac{1}{2}$, this E document. But what section particularly of the rest of the Pentateuch?.....

What in particular would go in E, Mr. Perez?....., outside of Genesis? What is particular? This is extremely important to the whole ~~the~~ development of the G-W theory, so I am a bit disappointed that anybody hesitates on this particular question. Mr. Delancy? The book of Leviticus.

AAM: The book of Leviticus, the priestly legislation, the legislation that goes into minute details of ~~the~~ formulas of sacrifice, that sort of material goes with Genesis 1, where you have enumerations, a list, precise legal details, not to be remembered, but to be looked up. That is very very important. You cannot understand the origin of the G-W theory if ~~that~~ you don't have that solidly in mind.....3.....AAM: No, No, I don't know the exact proportion. But I would say this. There is a book where I can see how the3 $\frac{1}{2}$ has arisen. But say this. As originally held, the J document was Gen 2,3, and 4, and would be sections like this.....to Gen 50. That was the J document. And the E document, as originally held would be sections the same way more or less.....4..... But Hupfeld said, What we have con-

sidered as the E document is really two documents. And he said, In this E document this section here, and this here, except for the last little part of it, and this here, except for the first part of it, and this here, except for the middle part of it, and then this here, and the first part of this, and the last two-thirds of that, and this and this, these, he says, are the second Elohist. And then, of course, he goes on to Exodus and the same thing applies. In Exodus there is your J document, and here is your E document, and he said, in the E document, this part and this part, and then, they are second Elohist too. Now you see, what he did was to take most of those sections of the E document which are from Gen. 20 and Gen 50, and say they are the second Elohist, but there remains other sections of the E document between Gen 20 and 50 which he considers the first Elohist, only the striking thing about this, that while he leaves ^{all} practically of the E document up to Genesis 20 of the first Elohist, but from there on to ch50 he leaves only tiny little sections with one or two exceptions, one or two pieces are long sections, but in most cases, just a sentence or two are there is all he leaves for the first Elohist, and puts the rest ~~into~~ the second. That's very important.....5½.... I hope I've been clear on it. Because I would like everyone to understand that precisely. ~~Question~~ Question.....

AAM: Yes, that's it precisely, and we now call, what he called the first Elohist, what we call it. What he called the first Elohist we call P, and what he called the ~~first~~ second Elohist, what do we call that, Mr. Goertzen? We call that E. Question.....What I crossed out are the second Elohist. The first Elohist would be P, P is the part of E that I didn't block out. That's the first Elohist. The first Elohist includes all the E sections between Gen.1 and 20, no not all of them, but most of them. And it includes very few of them between Gen.20 and 50. And then after Gen 50 it includes the greater part of the E sections. That is the levitical priestly law and all that, but there are some sections after that given to E also. Well, I hope we've made that clear, because that is very important to understand just what the theory is. Yes?

AAAM: The original E, the first Elohist is P now, that's right. We are still talking about the early documentary theory, when there are just two documents, and these questions look forward to Hupfeld which I have been dealing with about the

2nd Elohist. But we've been talking about the original documentary theory ~~win~~ which were only included two documents. Now this is ~~called~~ followed by the fragmentary theory which broke it up ~~into~~ into a lot of little fragments. And that's very unsatisfactory. Who would be the writer of all ~~the~~ these different fragments. How did they come to be so many, how did anybody ever come to make a marvelous unity like this out of them all. It was held by quite a number, but real scholars came to see more and more its great difficulties, and gave it up, and there were substituted for it the supplementary theory. Now how did the supplementary theory differ from the original document theory? Mr.....

AAM: The documentary ~~theory~~ theory has two ~~original~~ original documents. The supplementary theory has one document to which somebody adds supplementation here and there throughout. There is only one document. That document is enlarged by adding new material.9..... Mr. Steltzer?.....

AAM: No, where it came from, different stories he heard around, different places, different things, but he put them in his own style which is ~~is~~ different from the style of the original document. And he did the word Jehovah, the original document used the word, Elohim. And the original writer used the word Elohim up till Ex.6.3, then in Ex.6.3, he said, God ~~is~~ said, My name is Jehovah, but your ancestors didn't know me as Jehovah, they knew me as El Shaddei, but I am telling you ~~now~~ now my name's Jehovah, so from there on he calls him Jehovah. That's the original document. But then the J writer didn't realize that, he overlooked Exodus 6.3 some way, and consequently he knew God as Jehovah, the name that was used always after Exodus 6.3, and then he inserted these sentences, he just called him Jehovah, and so that contradicted what was already there, but he didn't realize it. He added these supplementations all through. Now, according to this supplementary theory, would the first argument, the first basis still be valid for the supplementary theory, if it was valid for the document theory? Would the first argument, the first basis be valid for the supplementary theory, if it was valid for the document theory? Would it? Why not? Does anybody have any reason why it wouldn't? Do you recognize the basic document by its use of the term, Elohim? The supplementations you recognize by the use of the term Jehovah? The same argument would be just as valid, wouldn't it, for one as for the other. Would be just

as valid. Yes?.....Student: It seems to me that if J is to be added to E, it would make E not a complete document, and therefore.....11½....

AAM: Well, now, that's getting on to the second ~~th~~ bases. The first basis is the matter of the divine names as an evidence. That would still be the evidence. Now as to the....Mr. Harding?.....

AAM: That could ~~n~~ only be used up to Ex. 6.3. That's a very important thing to keep in mind. In any event it can only lead up to ~~xx~~ Ex. 6.3. What about the third argument? Parallel passages? Is that argument as valid for the supplement theory as for the document theory?.....Well, let's take the second if you want. What about the second one? Is that aNo, but would there be one there? Yes, well then your second argument would be valid for your E document, wouldn't it? According to the supplement theory, the E document alone gives you a complete story, it is a complete narrative, and continuous document. You don't need J, J is certainly not. So that it would work for E, but it wouldn't have to work for J anymore, because J being just supplementations, they don't have to be complete. But E would have to be complete. Yes?.....

Now the supplement theory was the result of the feeling that the continuous document theory didn't work fully with the J document. The documentary theory originally says, You have two complete stories. And you say, Yes, but J doesn't seem quite so complete. Well, J isn't quite so complete as E, No. But it is pretty complete. You have got two complete stories. You don't need the other. Each of them is complete in itself, but somebody fitted them together, interlaced them. So your continuous documents, your complete narrative stories, arguments, is an argument that you had two documents each of them complete in itself, which have been combined. Now, the supplementary theory doesn't have to argue that way anymore. They say, one of them is complete, the E doc. But the J. doc, you say it isn't complete, well, it doesn't have to be, because it is not a separate document, it is supplementation put in here and there, and they don't have to be complete. So the second argument would have to apply to the original beginning, but it wouldn't have to apply to the supplementation according to that. Then the, what about the third argument.....end of P 6

.....You might say, the two documents, ~~that~~ they'd each of them have parallels and the redactor was rather stupid and put all of the parallels on. In the supplementation view you would expect him to have more sense. But if you find, nevertheless, that he has put parallels in, it would seem to be an argument they weren't there originally, they were part of ~~the~~ their supplementation. I would think it would apply just as well, or about as well as in the other case. Mr?

.....

AAM: They would have to be two parallels that occurred in the same document which can happen, as we notice. Like there can be two perfectly natural reasonable parallels, or else maybe one of the divine names has gotten twisted around in the hands of the redactor. Mr. Rupprecht?.....

AAM: Well, but it is the claim to be part of the evidence that there are, that there is more than one document. There is one document plus supplementation. The fact that you have parallels. You may not see them until you divide it, but when you divide it, you see them, and then it is proof according to this that you are right to divide them. Mr. Steltzer?

AAM: Well, that would not be a division point of the story, but it might be a section which deals with foreign nations where you wouldn't use the personal name of Jehovah you'd ~~use~~ use with Israel, or it might be a stress on him as the creator of all the world, the God of Israel, or some reason like that, but it wouldn't be valid for a basis for division. Well, now what about the fourth argument. Does the fourth argument apply to the supplementary theory? It would apply just the same, wouldn't it?

Well, now there was Ewald's crystallization theory. We don't need to spend so much time on that. But we should have a definite understanding of what is meant by it. The Crystallization theory is based upon this matter of the completeness of the narrative. The reason for having a supplement in the first place was the J document was not complete, so it didn't seem that it would stand as an independent document. It was supplementation. That is to say, You take your J document, and you read along about something, and then you read about something else. And things that have happened inbetween are referred to and no ~~mention~~ mention of them in the J document. You must take it for granted. So there must be an

account of them somewhere already, and so the supplement, for that reason it was a supplementation rather than a separate document. Now the crystallization theory you have first a section and then additions, and then another and another. You have about three supplementations, instead of just one supplementary fragment.

Mr. Melton, you had a question?.....

AAM: Well, he would get the different sections from different stories that he'd heard around, different ideas.....4½.....Yes, in other words you think that the parallel passages look more in favor of a document theory than of a supplementation.4½.....Mr. ?.....

AAM: In other words, you think the use of the names would fit better with the document theory than with the supplementation. Well, most scholars today feel that documentation is much better than the supplementation, and Mr. Hall agrees with them. (laughter). But now the crystallization theory, you see the point that there were gaps and to fill them in properly would seem to be more reasonable to Ewald if there was a series of supplementations than just one. But this did not win acceptance. Now we come to Hupfeld's modified ~~document~~ document theory. Hupfeld goes back to the old idea of a document theory, which would seem to people to be a retrograde5½..... turning away from the beautiful simplicity of the supplement theory that has been held for nearly fifty years by nearly all critical ~~the~~ scholars. It seemed to them to be a backward step ~~that~~ that Hupfeld took. We discussed a few minutes ago what Hupfeld's modified document theory was, does everybody understand clearly now what Hupfeld's modified document theory was?

Question:.....

AAM: It was E according to the original terminology of Eichorn which just had ~~two~~ two documents, E and J, according to that it was E, but what Hupfeld calls the 1st E and that they call P. Question:.....

AAM: Simply that the style is one day, two days, three days, this thing, that thing, it is an enumeration, a tabulation style and the priestly laws are naturally in a tabulation style ~~was~~ too, so they say, that is the tabulation type of style, is the style of P, the dry statistical sort of a style, P, and that ^{is the} same style you find both places, so they must belong to the same document. Well, I hope that everybody understands what Hupfeld's view is. We will have at least three

of four chances to find out before the end of the semester whether you do understand what it is, because it is basic to everything else. Yes?

AAM: D becomes very important under the development theory, but up to this point it is not particularly important. D, of course, was advanced early in the twenties by DeVelde that the Deuteronomy, most of Deut. was the document which was found in the tent, and he gave different arguments which we have glanced at to show that it was that. Well, ~~now~~ now they all felt that that was after all this happened. That is, Hupfeld would say, first the first Elohist was written, then the second Elohist being combined with it, then the J was written or was combined with it, it might have been written or have been combined with it, and then D was added. Well, now, that's Hupfeld's theory. Now Hupfeld's theory, how about the four bases of Eichorn's theory. How do they fit Hupfeld's theory. How did the first basis apply to Hupfeld's theory? as ~~xx~~ compared to the way it applied to Eichorn's theory. What would you say about that Mr. Hall?

AAM: It would still apply. Would it apply as well as to Eichorn?....9..... I think each of you has gone a little too far. It is in between, but a little nearer to what Mr. Ribí said, than to Mr. Hall. That is to say, originally Eichorn said, Look here, take the section, take J and make one document, and one style. Take the ones that have Elohim and make another document and you have another style. There is a simple basis of division on the basis of divine names. But now Hupfeld says there are three documents. He says that that has J in it is one document, but then he says there are two other documents, both of which have Elohim in, and he says one of them is so much like J it is indistinguishable from it. Well, doesn't that cast doubt on how good a division this was anyway? Divine names. Here are two distinct styles, the style of J and the style of ~~Ex~~ E. And these two styles are easily distinguished by the fact that the one uses Jehovah, and the other uses Elohim. They have many other differences of style. Now Hupfeld says in this E there are a lot of sections which actually, except for the divine names, are more like the style of J than they are of E. It is a complete reversal as far as the style of both sections is concerned, and according to it, you have only two divine names on which to divide into three documents. It is much harder to divide into three documents with two divine names. And in the JE

stuff that you can hardly tell what's J and what is E, some of it uses Jehovah, and some Elohim, so that the Hupfeld theory seems to take the beautiful simplicity of the division on divine ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ names, Eichorn's view, and break it up 11 $\frac{1}{2}$... It still applies to quite an extent. It is still based on it to quite an extent, but not nearly as much. It is broken up to quite a large extent. What about the second argument. The argument from continuous narrative. Does that apply as well to Hupfeld's theory as it does to Eichorn's theory? What would you say about that Mr. Jantzen?.....

AAM: Well, even more so, because the continuous document, originally they'd say, here's E with a continuous story, here's J with a continuous story. Now they take E and they divided it up into two sections, and each of them running through, if you had a hard job to prove that J was a complete document, aren't you going to have a still harder one ~~xx~~ with the second Elohist. And with your first Elohist your job is going to be harder to prove it is a complete document, because you have taken out all these 2nd E sections. It makes it much ~~xx~~ harder to apply the continuous Elohist argument. As far as parallel passages are concerned, perhaps it makes it easier, because you might have two parallels, before both of which were in the E document. Now one of them can be in E and one in the 2nd Elohist, so it makes it easier as far as parallel passages are concerned. And as far as a style is concerned, it makes it a bit harder. I just pointed out how they said here are two styles. Now they say you take out all the second Elohist and it is nearer the style of J than it is the style of E at all. So that actually your style arguments you have less material of each style and you ~~xxx~~ claim to have three different styles instead of two styles, so it makes that argument a good bit harder to apply. If I give you two books, and I say, here is book written by A, and here is a book written by B, now here's a little sections, I want you to tell me which style it is. You would take A and B and study them, and find out what their style is. This one uses this word so many times, this one uses this word so many times. This one has so many prepositional ~~phrases~~ phrases, this one has so many participial phrases, and so on. Then you look at your little sections and you see which is nearest to it in style. But, if instead of giving you two books I give you two little bits of stories, each in a separate style, you'd have much less ground on

which to make a differentiation of style, much less material on which to establish it, and Hupfeld cuts it down to where you have much less material on which to ... 13½...., so that those arguments apply in a somewhat different way now than they did to Eichorn, quite different. Now we go on from there to Graf and Wellhausen, and I want to review that tomorrow. I want you ~~to~~ to have the idea of exactly what the theory is very thoroughly in mind, and then....end of P 7, end of class, 2/21/55

P 8

2/22/55?

.....We spent quite a bit of time on it last time. If there is any question on it, please ask me right now. Mr. Meznar?.....

AAM: Yes, we are going to go much more in detail on those matters as we take up the ~~the~~ theory as it is today. In connection with Hupfeld what I wanted to do was simply to put out that dividing it up into four documents gives less material on which to establish a definite style. It is true it eliminates progress. If you would divide up into fifty sections of half a page each, you might say you have less problems, but you'd also have less emphasis. What I meant was, if you have two documents, each of which is many chapters in ~~the~~ length, and you can show a definite difference of style, you have a strong argument. Now, if you divide it up into smaller sections, you have less evidence on which to claim to have proof of style. And the other point about the style argument of Hupfeld that I think is very important is that beginning with Eichorn, on the document theory, and then through the supplementary theory that was universally held for nearly fifty years, before the rise of the Wellhausen theory, it was claimed by all scholars, all Christian scholars, that the whole E document had one style which was distinguishable from the style of the J document. Now Hupfeld took out perhaps a third out of the E document and made it the 2nd Elohist which is the E of today, and he said the style of ~~the~~ that is actually nearer the style of J than it is the rest of the E document, and it seems to me that that casts some doubt on the whole ~~the~~ method of thinking that you can recognize these ~~the~~ documents by style, to have forty years of scholarship to hold that this was one unified style, and then to have everybody ever since believe that this which is taken out ~~it~~ is much more like the style of the other than it is. We'll look at that more in detail later. Mr. Steltzer?....

AAM: That's a good question. Hupfeld's view applies largely to Genesis because there's more E material there than anywhere else, that is, 2nd Elohist E, but there is material given which, $\frac{1}{2}$ there is material which they give to E in all the other books of the Pentateuch and also in Joshua, but far less than in Genesis. Well, now, Hupfeld's view which was advanced in 1853 was just 100 years after Astruc advanced his original suggestion of the clue on the basis of the divine names, did not receive much acceptance immediately. It seemed to most people to be just a move in a different direction altogether and a move away from the supplement hypothesis which was the established view. Then we have, however, the rise of the developmental hypothesis, which we've already stressed, but which we wanted to review so you have it well in mind, the rise of the developmental hypothesis which holds the view which has been accepted practically ever since, and I think this is very important to understand. Dr. Allis wrote a book on the Five Books of Moses, in which he took up the arguments for the higher criticism and dealt with them at length and gave a great deal of excellent material about them about ten years ago. And Dr. Albright of Johns Hopkins University wrote a review of it in which he criticises Allis very very strongly for dealing with material from around 1900 almost entirely, and for not paying much attention to the later material. Now Dr. Albright's criticism there was in my opinion entirely unjustified. Since 1900 there have been four or five leading scholars who have advanced suggestions regarding the criticism which would change the Wellhausen theory quite materially in certain regards. But no one of them that has secured any great following would make a drastic change. They will perhaps divide one of the documents into two again. They will perhaps touch on the actual existence of one of the ~~documents~~ particular documents, and say it was a supplementation instead. There's occasionally been a man who change the origin of the documents, but that is rare. But the fact is that the higher criticism of the pentateuch as taught today in practically every theological seminary that is over thirty years old, and in practically every University in the world where there is any ~~the~~ teaching about the Old Testament, it is substantially the same as the view which Wellhausen advanced in 1877. It is substantially the same. Now, Pfeiffer in Harvard advances a new document, an S document which he takes out of the J document. He keeps the P document, exactly

the same, the E is the same, he divides the J into two parts. Otherwise it is just the same. He keeps the order in exactly the same except for this new S document. Eisfeld of Halle has an L document which he takes up and thinks is separate. Otherwise his view is practically the same. There is a professor in the Hebrew U. in Jerusalem who has a theory of a change of the order of the documents, which very few others have followed him in. But he keeps the documents substantially the same. The theory is a complete change from the theories which were held a hundred years before, and that's the very important thing to see the great, almost Copernican revolution that was made in taking what was the very earliest document and making it the very latest there in 1877, but since that time the document theory with comparatively little change it has been taught in practically every school in the world, and so these little changes that are suggested are comparatively unimportant. Now it is true that we do not have the same exact agreement that we had from 1875 to say 1915 and 1920. During that period there was said to be an absolute consensus of all critical scholars about the Wellhausen theory and they agreed on the little tiny details of it. Since that time archaeology has led many of them to see a great weaknesses in the theory and to attack it at different points, but they attack it at different points. They don't agree in any one change in the statement. One man makes one change, another man makes another change, another one makes another change, but on the main points they hold to the same general principle, and that is why it is in my opinion far more important to have a ~~thing~~ thorough understanding of this view which was accepted in 1877 and which is the basis of the views held in all critical schools today, than it is to know the details of the comparatively small alterations that Eisfeld or Pfeiffer or some other has suggested, but been followed by comparatively few during the years since 1920. This is the basic view. Now I would like everyone in this class to have a better understanding of what the view really is than any except the very best students will have when they graduate from one of these critical schools. Because they don't go into it to try to prove the view, or to try to give a thorough understanding of what it really is. They take it for granted so definitely that most of the students there simply accept it as something that all scholars believe in and then they have a very good understanding of certain aspects, but of its basic underlying principles,

and of how it truly fits together, and of the view that its great proponents have really held, the mass of the students from these schools don't have a ~~thorough~~ thorough understanding. Now if you do have that understanding, then you are in a position in discussion with them, and everyone of you will find times in the rest of your life when it will be very helpful to be able to discuss this theory intelligently, if you do have that understanding, it will be easy for you to put your fire against the basic things and not get into wasting time on little non-essentials. And it will be easy for you when they flatly contradict you on something, to know whether it is some minor thing that it is foolish to waste time arguing about, or that it is some major point on which you can be absolutely ~~xx~~ certain, and when they look it up, they will find you are right, and of course that will strengthen your influence on every aspect if they find you are right on some basic aspect which they had forgotten, even tho they had been definitely taught. Mr.

AAM: Yes, yes, in Princeton today, I would say, that in Princeton the O. T. dept. the probabilities are that any teacher in the department there is ~~thorough~~ thoroughly convinced of the main essentials of the Wellhausen theory. Now I don't know whether it would be stressed quite as much there as it would be in a school like Union. But it certainly would underlie the viewpoint a greater part of the10 $\frac{1}{2}$ It is my impression that Dr. Gamon who edited the new edition of the Davis Bible dictionary, in that dictionary in the article on the Pentateuch, rather definitely leans toward the theory, though he doesn't come strongly in favor of any critical theory in that book, he leans toward the basic critical points such as this and the matter of Isaiah and the matter of Daniel, and all those points he leans very much in that direction. Yes?.....

AAM: You mean he teaches this. You've heard that from student there? Yes, that is the view which a person has to take today, if he is to be considered as intellectually respectable among11 $\frac{1}{2}$... in the O. T. It is the evolutionary view. You get in the field of biology, and you may find some biologists who will criticize this and that and the other aspect of evolution, but nearly all of them will say, of course, I believe in evolution, because they wouldn't be as much respected if they didn't. That's the way with the higher criticism. The basic essentials. On the other hand there is a strange development from 1875 to 1920

if you were to be considered as well-trained in the O. T., of course, you believed in the Wellhausen theory in all of its details. Since about 1920, it has been quite the thing to say, now of course we don't hold to Wellhausen's views anymore. Of course there are many points in which we know he was wrong. But that's the general attitude in sort of running down the name of the Wellhausen view. But its essentials are still held and held very strongly. Dr. Barton of the U. of Penn. about 20 years in an article in Archaeology and the Bible said in it that one of the great effects of archaeology has been to prove the once separate existence of the great documents, J, E, D, and P. He made that statement categorically, and I don't know what evidence he had on it, because his article in which the statement was given there was no evidence for it whatever. The evidence he gave would look in the other direction. And Dr. Albright of Johns Hopkins will attack this little feature and that little feature and the other little feature of the Wellhausen view, and he'll give page after page to doing it, and then he'll say, However, the basic feature of it, the existence of these great documents there can be no doubt. Now I don't know whether in the depths of their hearts these men really believe that particular thing or not, because it is so contrary to the evidence they find in archaeology. But I think they have to throw in a few sentences like that once in a while to be ~~some~~ considered intellectually respectable. Maybe some of you know about the experience I had about 8 years ago when I was elected president of the Oriental Club, here in Philadelphia, a club which includes professors of Oriental study from U. of Penn., and Swarthmore, Bryn Mawr, Princeton Seminary, and other institutions like that around, and as President I had to give a presidential address, and I thought it was a wonderful opportunity for a testimony, so I took for my subject the scientific approach to the Old Testament. And in the view I spoke briefly of the history of the criticism, and then spoke of archaeological evidence disproving the Wellhausen view, and of course the usually have a major and a minor communication, but when you have the presidential address you don't have but one communication, you have the whole evening. So I presented this material as strongly as I could, and when I finished it was thrown open for discussion, and I found there that these men who were not in the O. T. field were quite convinced by my presentation, and tremendously impressed. The men who were in the O. T. field

I was amazed how mild they were in their..., hardly one of them came out with a strong attack, but they....end of P 8

P 9

.....Only these two man who had been formely Orthodox Jews, but after a long discussion in which they pecked a little here and there on me, and it wasn't particularly hard to answer the points that were raised, after a long discussion, the man who had originally nominated me for president, who was one of the most respected oriental scholars in the group, gave the concluding remarks, and to me it was the most humorous thing to see how he did it. Very very cleverly done. He did it in ~~xxx~~ such a way as to speak so favorably of the archaeological material which was given, and the excellent presentation, and all the men there who weren't in the technical Old Testament field were nodding their heads, agreeing and feeling that he'd done a good thing in nominating me for president, ~~xxx~~ and on the other hand he said that there were three or four things ~~thxxxx~~ that ought to be emphasized. He said, One one, of course I had said about the great minds of these men who originally developed the theory, but, he said, I ought to have stressed a little more than I had, and he talked about the great minds of Wellhausen and Graf and so on, and then you could see the O. T. scholars nodding their heads. (laughter) And then he took up two or three points which he stressed, and in each case he said, I had mentioned this, so that he didn't seem to be objecting or differ~~ing~~ with me in the least, and ~~xxxxxx~~ ^{the men} there who were not in the Old Testament field were all of them2 $\frac{1}{4}$ But they were things which the men in the technical field would feel were strongly upholding the Wellhausen theory, and he presented those in a very very nice way, ~~though~~ ^{how} I had mentioned or admitted these points, and they needed a little more stress on them. And he dissociated himself very vitally from any disagreement with the Wellhausen theory in the course of it. It was very very cleverly done, and to me a very interesting indication of just how the feeling is among those who are working in this area. It is established, like the evolutionary theory is established in the biological sciences, and in philosophy, and that is one thing we want to stress in connection with this theory. is that ^{it is} its connection with evolution which has preserved ~~xxxxxx~~ it. The documentary basis of it is something which was common throughout the early part of the last century. They divided

Homer up, they even divided $3\frac{1}{2}$ They divided up all ancient documents practically and many modern ones into alleged sources, and of course there are sources of documents, in most cases there are sources. It is not the same, there are sources, but saying we are able to recognize ~~them~~ and separate the sources, that is $3\frac{1}{2}$ Today very few people would think that you take a document and divide it into sources unless they had another separate document clearly established which was plainly to be seen to be one of its sources, and we have no such evidence for the O. T. We simply have the Pentateuch itself. But during those years scholars were dividing up every ancient document into alleged sources of documental sections, and scholarship came to the feeling that this thing was after all not very practical and they'd given up practically everything, and almost entirely given up even with Homer by this time, though it held on with Homer than with most other works, except the Bible. And regarding the Bible, my guess is that the whole method would have been given up by 1900 or shortly after if it were not for ~~the~~ the fact that the work of Graf and Wellhausen did something which was never contemplated by the early students of the documentary theory. It combined the documentary theory with the theory of evolution in such a way that not only did it say that you knew the source which the unknown redactors of the Pentateuch used, but that you were able to see in these sources how the ideas of ~~the~~ Israelite religion developed, and thus to see a natural development from very simple primitive ideas up to the advanced ~~the~~ ideas which you find taught in the O. T., and of course if you can show that these ideas are just a natural development, you've ~~done~~ come ~~so~~ a long way toward explaining it away altogether. And was its union ~~of~~ with the theory of evolution which gave it ~~its~~ its strength, and which made it hold in a crystallized form until today it is taught text books ~~which~~ on religion by men who know nothing about the O. T., but just take it over from the O. T. scholars, and take over these/basic things ~~which~~ and ~~which~~ include them, and it is taught in philosophy of religion in the universities all over the world today, that the religion of Israel, the idea of one God, one great God, is a gradual development, and can be traced to ^{the} these different documents. Well, the developmental hypothesis came then when a group of scholars who had been not paying particular attention to the O. T., most of them,

but thinking along the lines of evolution and of philosophical development, and making theories about the O. T. along that line, which the technical O. T. scholars were paying practically no attention to. When their views became united with these views of the criticism, and formed this Graf-Wellhausen theory which had been the dominant theory now for seventy-five years, in fact almost the exclusive theory among those who do not hold the Mosaic authorship, and Graf was the one who first tried to combine the two, and so it was Graf in 1865 who wrote his work in which he dealt not much with Genesis, but with the laws of the Pentateuch, and Graf took the laws of the Pentateuch, and tried to show that you had an evolutionary development. You have the book of the Covenant, the first set of laws, and then you had Deuteronomy, the more advanced set, and then you had the priestly code, the very detailed complex code with lofty7..... ideas, which would have come much later, and Graf presented this, but originally Graf simply held to the supplementary hypothesis and according to the supplementary hypotheses, of course, the material that later came to be called P was the very earliest, the foundation document, and then the J material was supplementation inserted into it. Graf dealt with that, he presented it, but it was a minor thing. The major thing he stressed was the development of laws, and immediately after this book was published, it was strongly attacked, because, people said, you cannot separate the priestly legislation from the material later called P in the book of Genesis. You can't do it, and they said, it is ridiculous to say that the ~~the~~ original foundation writing, the E document, that comes after the supplements added to it. Of course, that would be fantastic. You couldn't hold the supplementary theory which for forty years had been universally accepted among critical scholars, you couldn't hold that, and show any evolution in the laws of the Pentateuch. And so Graf, under these criticisms and attacks, switched from the supplementary theory to Hupfeld's theory, and he adopted Hupfeld's modified document hypotheses, and doing that, he was able then not to ~~to~~ have the supplementation, and to say the earliest supplement ...8... the earliest foundation we switch to the basic point, but we switch to say they were distinct separate documents. And then among these separate documents he took the one that later came to be called P, which formerly had been considered by all to be the very earli-

est document, and he made it the very latest, because it was the one which must go with the priestly legislation, and in order to get his evolution in, in the laws, he switched around Genesis completely from the view which all had held formerly. Well, he did that, and Kuenen presented substantially the same views in Leiden and in Halle, and it was Wellhausen in 1876-78 who wrote it up in beautiful German a brilliant scholar, and a man with an unusually fine style, and once he presented it, it took the scholarly world by storm, and it spread rapidly to Germany, France, England, and came over here, and became the established critical view. Well, it is such a complete change from views before. It is very interesting to see how completely they were changed and how very10..... were the judgments on literary problems of these people before if this view was correct. That's very interesting to see, and yet this is the view which has been tenaciously held ever since, because it fits in so beautifully with the theory of evolution. Now the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis, we have seen, we called it D, and ~~now~~ we've spoken of 1, its Rise, 2, Its' Spread, 3, The evolutionary Feature of it, but number 4 ~~Under~~ that head is a review of arguments, and here the things I want to stress, (we'll take up each of the arguments separately and look at them,) is that there are two different types of arguments. We dealt with one through the history of ~~the~~ higher criticism from 1753 up to 1878. We dealt almost entirely with one which we may call the arguments for partition. There were four arguments under that, four main ones, and then there are the arguments for development, and there are two different sets of arguments. But the two fit together in maintaining the Wellhausen view, as held today. Now I think it is very good to have the two sets of arguments well in mind, as distinct lines of approach which must fit together if the Wellhausen view is to be maintained. You will find people who take one argument or another or they ~~may~~ jump from one to the other, and they ~~sometimes~~ try to present something on this or on this. You can take any one of these arguments and you can present in such a way that it sounds tremendously strong. You can present it in such a way, that it sounds as if there's just no answer to it. I think that if you examine it carefully you would find that each one of them has many weak points. There is no one of them which is nearly as strong when you examine it carefully as it can be made to appear. But the thing I want to stress now is that it is not enough to

prove ~~that~~ the theory to show great strength in one of these arguments, that the argument have to fit together to prove the theory. For instance, if you ~~are~~ are to say, Look here, in the Bible here is a verse which says, and God came down and he talked to man in the garden in the cool of the day. Well, you could say, That's a very early view. That's primitive. That's anthropomorphic. Now here's another one that says the God was grieved in His heart at what man had done. Well that's just anthropopathic, that's a little bit less primitive. Well, then, here's another view, which says God is exalted in heaven. He sends his messengers to do His will. You might say that's more lofty, more spiritual. Then here's one, and God said, Let there be light, still more spiritual, just God speaking speaking. Nothing of a ~~man~~ hadn, of a foot, of a face, nothing anthropomorphic, nothing assuming elements of personality. See the evolution. Well, anybody can say that doesn't show an evolution, because you can pick a sentence out of any book and another sentence, and arrange them in a certain order, and say, this brings out certain aspects, and this doesn't bring out certain aspects. You can do that. That doesn't show an evolution. In order for it to show an evolution, these statements have to be taken from different documents, and they have to be documents in which there is more than one sentence, there's a whole lot of material that has a general uniformity of type, and which you have some evidence that they come at ~~the~~ different periods. It has to be that. I mean you could pick four people in Philadelphia, and you could take one who has a very very primitive superstitious idea, another one, he never went to ~~school~~ school in his life, you can find another one who went through 8th grade, and you can take his ideas, a little less superstitious, ~~then~~ you can take another man's ideas who went through high school, and then you can take a man who's highly educated, and you could quote from the four of them, and you could show ~~four~~ four different stages of culture, by ~~just~~ quoting the views of these four men. You would have to have some reason to think that these men lived at different times, that they weren't just different individuals. You'd have to have some reason to explain that this shows an evolution to show that they were really distinct things. Now the evolutionary theory in connection with the higher criticism, depends upon the arguments for partition.

If you pick sections of the Bible, and claim to show an evolution, because...end of P 9....

.....clear evolutionary progress from one to the other. It doesn't prove you just can take a sentence from one or the other. You have to prove that the whole thing is basically unified in its attitude and it stand on these matters. So you see there are the two different types of argument, both of which have to stand solidly in order to prove the Wellhausen view. It is the development idea, the evolutionary idea which has caused it to last and to be strong, because the partition attitude is given up for all other ancient works. But the evolutionary approach causes people to be very ready to be easily convinced by the partition argument, and the partition argument, if presented strongly cause people to be very ready to be convinced of the evolutionary argument. It is reasonable to take each of them by itself and examine it carefully and say, Do we have substantial evidence that there once were four distinct main documents? Do we have evidence? Or is such evidence actually lacking? That has to be examined fairly. And then we have to take the other and we say, Assuming that the documents are such as literary criticism claims established, is there truly an evolutionary development between them?, Or is there not? It is very easy on any four things to take a couple of sentences here, a couple here, and couple here, and claim to show a development, but it is that correct interpretation of these particular phrases. Or is something being read into them? And is it typical of the document as a whole? You see we want to look at each section separately. Now the four main arguments that we've noted four partition are the same arguments which Eichorn originally advanced back in 1800. I don't know whether you will find them presented this way in all critical books. I would like to take a good recent critical book and assign it to you to read to get a presentation of the criticism, but by those who believe in it for you all to study, but I have not found one that was satisfactory for this purpose because from their viewpoint the battle was fought sixty years ago. From their viewpoint it is won today, and every recent critical book that I have seen takes up the discussion of whether certain chapters belong in P or D or E, rather than a discussion of the basic question, Is there any such thing as P or D or E? That is just about taking for granted. It is thought to have been proven fifty years ago. Well, we want to see whether it was actually proven or what the evidence is of it, and to see what their weaknesses are so that you can deal fairly and effectively with

those who hold it. And those four main arguments, I think everyone ~~kk~~ knows those well now. We had them under Eichorn. We have repeated them and examined them. I am anxious that you see how these four arguments which Eichorn presented, how they apply to the Hupfeld view which is the Wellhausen view, how some of them are greatly weakened by it. The view of divine ~~names~~ names, we noticed, as long as you have two main documents, one said, God, one says, Jehovah, that means a very simple argument, just to put the God sections together, the Jehovah sections together, you have got two documents. Well, we notice very soon that after Exodus 6 that criterion is no longer present. So for three fourths of your Pentateuch, because all the documents use Jehovah after that time. And then we noticed that in the early part, Genesis and the first ~~two~~ two chapters of Exodus, as originally presented it was very simple. Here is the document that says God, the Elohist document. Here is the document that says, Jehovah, the ~~Jx~~ Jehovistic document, very simple. But Hupfeld said, the document that ~~says~~ says God, you take out about the material here and there, that's the 2nd Elohist, and in style that's more like the Jehovah document than like the first Elohist, and now the first Elohist, which they call P now, the priestly document is switched to the very end. So you have the name God used in one of the earliest documents and in the very latest documents. Two documents which are so utterly different from each other that the second Elohist, or E, can in most places hardly be distinguished from J. The style is almost identical. It is only the divine ~~names~~ names that makes any difference. And the set of Addis which we are going to use a good bit, the Documents of the Hexateuch, he has two volumes, one of which he calls The Earliest Book of Hebrew History, and that book deals with JE together, and he marks some things as J, some as E, and about a third of it he says, either J or E, we don't know which. But he puts P in a separate volume, the priestly documents. So you see that in your main distinction your divine names breaks down almost entirely. I doubt if it even would have been thought of as a criterion if it was not that it is so striking just at the one particular point of the first few chapters of Genesis. There is more striking than anywhere else, and therefore it is made a foundation to start the whole theory. Then the second argument, the argument of continuous narrative, we've got to examine that rather carefully. How much evidence do you have that from it being a continuous, com-

complete narrative, that each of these documents once stood alone as an independent document? Well, you read the P document. God created the world, and he saw everything that He had made and it was good, a wonderful world He made, and then you read that the earth was filled with violence, and God decided to destroy it. Well, what happened all of a sudden to this good world that God made? How did it get filled with violence? so that God had to decide to send a flood in to destroy it? There's no explanation. The chapters inbetween tell about the fall of man, but they're J they're from the other document. The P document is then not complete, is it? It assumes things which J tells, and it is a weakness in the theory. How can you believe that P once was a complete document that just takes things for granted, which are necessary for the understanding of what comes next, and you find many such points, but right at this point the important thing we want to stress is that the Dupfeld view which is basic to the Wellhausen view, breaks up this continuous narrative argument. It already had its difficulties as applied to Eichorn's view of just two documents, but now that you have your three documents aside from Deuteronomy, it breaks it way up, because most of the material from the E document in Gen. 20 to Gen. 50 ~~is given~~ from the original, ~~is~~ E is given to the 2nd Elohist, which they call E now. And that means that the whole story of the Patriarchs is practically unrepresented in P. They try to make that up by picking a sentence here and half a sentence there, and a paragraph here, and just a very very little material between Genesis 20 and Gen. 50 is given to P, which is so extensive before Gen. 20, and is by far the largest document in the rest of the Pentateuch, it just is half a sentence here, and a sentence there through it, and it is a very artificial thing, trying to show a completeness there by the taking out of the 2nd Elohist. Then the third argument from parallel passages, of course, that is an argument which ~~is~~ if carried through can lead you to the fragmentary theory. We will go into that rather fully. It is very interesting in the story of the flood. The story of the flood, the claim is made, that you can take the story of the flood, and you can pick out the material and pick out the P material, and you have a complete story of the flood, because practically everything that is said about the preparation for the flood, and the beginning of the flood, is in both the J documents and the P documents. That is you will find a statement, The waters came down upon the earth, and the waters

multiplied and increased and covered the earth. Well, the waters came down upon the earth, can be one document. The waters spreading and increasing and multiplied on the earth, can be another document. You've got the thing told twice, you see. So there's parallel, and you have these parallels in the story of the flood, so that you can easily get the first two thirds of the flood story, two complete stories. There's no difficulty at all. But when you come to the end of the flood, you don't have that. There the stories are not very complete, because there you're flood builds up with this tremendous tremendous thing, and then it stops. It comes to an end. And when it comes to an end, you have everything told only once. You have no parallels, and so your stories are not very complete, and at the end of the flood. But not you take the first two third of the flood story, and you take each of the documents and it is very easy to find parallels again. You could divide each of them into two documents again, and you could perhaps divide each of them again. The fact of the matter is that it is a literary device to increase the impressiveness of the thing to say it more than once, to stress it, to repeat it, to dwell upon it. And so you have parallels in the early part of the flood story, so that as you read about the waters coming down from heaven, and coming up from the deep and sweeping over the earth, and covering the tops of the mountains, and spreading over the world it just builds up the tremendous intensity, and the thing is told you about eight times in order to stress it. Well, if you are going to say from that you get to parallels, you might as well say you have eight parallels, and you have where a thing is stressed that way you have it repeated in any literature, and the result is you can get parallels, but when you get to the end where it just stops, you don't have any parallels, you have only the one, so you have great difficulty in proving two documents at the end of the flood story. But in the beginning part, as far as parallels are concerned, you could easily prove seven or eight different stories. And so in anything that is ever written, you have lots of parallels. You have things repeated. They may be repeated for emphasis, or they may be repeated as when God told Moses how to build the tabernacle in full detail, and then it tells how Moses built it, it is repeated. Well, it is easy to say, well, here's a parallel. One belongs in one document, and one in the other, but there is a reason for the parallels. So your argument from parallel passages is not enough to

just show there's a parallel. You must ~~show~~ show a whole series of parallels, enough to really prove that there are two or more different documents, and you must show that the parallels are not simply such as would naturally occur. And then, of course, you have the type of alleged parallels which are supposed to have been misunderstood by the writer. As ~~when~~ they say that Abraham went to Egypt and he lied about his wife. Isaac went to the Phillistine land and he lied about his wife. These are so similar, they must be the same story. Therefore there's been a misunderstanding, one document has the story of Abraham, and the other says it was Isaac. One said he went to Egypt the other said he went to the Phillistine land, but the stories are substantially the same, it must be the same story. Well, in connection with that we have to examine these stories and see whether they are the same ~~one~~ story or not, and we'll have ~~to~~ to see in life whether there are incidents which are so similar, and yet are distinct. Mr. Wilson? Did you say that that one that combines E and J put the entirety of ~~the~~ material in both E and J into this other, ...13 ...that there was a selection going on?

AAM: Yes. Now that is a very very good question. And an ~~easy~~ question to ask but a very ~~very~~ difficult question to answer, because you have no specific authoritative statement of the critical view as to whether the redactor put in everything he found in the manuscripts, or whether he only made selections, and you have to go by the arguments presented, and you find an inconsistency in that regard. One of the basic claims ~~for~~ to prove that there are these documents, is to say, Look at here, how this thing is repeated. Look at here how it is given twice. Look at these contradictions that are here, they must come from separate documents, and then much is said of this. Look at the evolutionary development. P knows nothing of any sacrifice in Patriarchal times. There was no sacrifice then. J has sacrifice. Well, now that sounds as if the whole material is here. There are a tremendous number of arguments given in all the critical books which have no validity whatever if you can say, Well, it may have been in the original documents. They merely made a selection. On the other hand, where you find difficulty, where you find that one document simply doesn't have it, you will very often have the critics saying, Well, of course, that must have been in the original document, but it was not selected. ~~There~~ is no specific thing on this particular point, but ~~the~~ the general assumption

is that all, or practically all of the material what was in the original documents has been retained. That is the general assumption which is followed.

Mr. Wilson..... end of P 10

P 11

.....If I were to say, for instance, the students of Faith Seminary, there is exactly the same number of students whose names begin with each letter of the alphabet. We have five beginning with A, five B, five C, five D, and so on. Well, you would say, Well, look here, in this class you've got four beginning with D and only one beginning with A. And I could say, Oh yes, but the other A folks aren't in this class. Well, if you have no way of finding out about the ~~xx~~ other students, you can't say, I'm wrong, but neither can I prove I'm right. And then you are going to say, Here were were original documents which are completely lost. We know nothing about them. What we have is only a selection. Well, 9/10ths of the arguments for the original documents $1\frac{1}{2}$ You couldn't say there weren't two but nobody could say there were two, ~~xx~~ they simply wouldn't have ... $1\frac{1}{2}$ The assumption behind it is that practically all the material in the original documents has been retained. That is why these parallels, we have these repetitions, we have these contradictory statements, we have these disagreements. One man, according to the J documents there were two of every animal that were taken into the ark. Now the P document sharply contradicts it, because it says there were two of unclean animals, and there were seven of clean animals. So it sharply contradicts it. The J document knows nothing of any distinction of clean or unclean animals. The P document has that distinction taught. Now that is what all the books will say. Now if you are to assume there $\frac{1}{2}$ may have been alot of other..... $2\frac{1}{2}$ that haven't been included, you can very well assume that J had that distinction, but it simply isn't mentioned. 9/10ths of your argument would fall to the ground, if you are not able to assume that practically all the material has been presented, but it is true, there is no definite consistent view on the matter, and that is one of the weaknesses/of the theory at which we will look. Well, now that is true of this argument on the parallel passages, then that this is an argument which you can carry on and get more and more separate documents, so that the divison into more documents of the Hupfeld view, does not increase the difficulty of the view of parallel passages

but for the teaching on parallel passages to be really effective it has to be combined with the second argument of complete documents. That is, you have to have not only a couple of parallels, but a whole series of them to show, now here's what you will read in some books. They will say, The J document give you an account of events in the times of the patriarchs of the naming of all the different towns and all that, and the E document gives you a different story of the naming of all the towns. Well, you read how Jacob, for instance, was ~~runningxxxxxxx~~ coming toward to the Ja....? $3\frac{1}{2}$, the night before he met the angel $3\frac{1}{2}$, and you will read that Jacob divided his camp into two groups, and he ~~sxxx~~ sent one group ahead, and he took the other group with him, and there were two camps, and so they called the name of the place, Mahanaim, two camps. And then a little further on you will read And Jacob looked up and he saw a host of angels for his protection. And he said, Here are the angels, and here are my people, and here are two camps and so they called the name of the place, Mahanaim. Well, you read that, and you say, That's funny, they give two reasons for naming it Mahanaim, very queer. It certainly is a good arguments for two documents. One document said it was named for this reason, the other for the other reason. You find a few cases exactly like that in Genesis, where there are seemingly two different reasons given for naming the same place. Well, does that show two different documents? Well, it looks in that direction. We have to examine it ~~fair~~ fairly and carefully. But a very vital question about it is Not merely that this one point looks in that direction, but how big is your series. And you will find many a statement in critical books that would lead you to think that you have a series of about thirty of these, and about thirty parallels. Well, now, you've got to look at them, and see whether you actually have, or whether there are just a comparatively few that are real arguments, and alot that ~~re~~ sort of forced and5..... Then the ~~xxxx~~ fourth argument, of course, is the argument from style, and on that argument Mr. Meznar asked in the beginning of the hour, I won't take time now to go further on it. By the way your paper is due today....

end of class, 2/22/55

4/18/55

....really there. It would be very easy for me to say, A couple of weeks ago I was walking in the mountains, and then for me a little later to say, I spoke about inspiration to the seniors at Wheaton College. And somebody would say there's a sharp contradiction. Once he says a couple of weeks ago he was in the mountains, the other he says he was in Wheaton College. Now anybody who's ever been to Wheaton knows it is in the flat plains, it is not in the mountains at all, there is a sharp contradiction between these two statements. Actually, of course, in this case, both statements would be ~~xxxxxxx~~ true, but in one meeting I might be speaking about one subject, and in the other about the ~~xxxx~~ other subject, and the two statements would be absolutely true, but given in a different context, they would seem to contradict one another. In one case, for instance, I might be summarizing the year's events to someone who was particularly interested in Wheaton College, and I would give the main events of the year, and when I came to this point I would mention my visit to Wheaton. Talking to someone else who didn't know anything about Wheaton College, but was much interested in the mountains, I might summarize the main events of the year here to them and not mention Wheaton, but mention about at that point in the ~~xxxxxxx~~ account, and so you would have the two accounts agreeing in other things, but at this one point, one having a trip to the mountains, the other a trip to Wheaton College. Well, now, that may seem far fetched to you, but I have within the past month heard people accused of telling lies on no bigger ground than that. It is very easy once you ~~ix~~ get the idea that somebody does not have integrity, that they are not dependable, it is very very easy to convince yourself of it further and further by noting apparent discrepancies in things they say. Now there are many people who are not dependable at all, and on whose statements you cannot rely, but if you are going to take someone and prove they are not reliable, be very very slow and careful about your proof, because it is so easy to get proof that just isn't proof at all, so very very easy. Now alleged contradictions, you find the critical books full of them, but a tremendous amount of them are exactly like what I have just mentioned. Another sort of contradiction that you find, well, ~~xxxx~~ of course, if you had just what I just said, and then you had

a third place where it is describing my experiences during the year, and mentions both things, it would be easy to say, here is the earliest document which describes the trip to Wheaton, here's a later document which substitutes ^{for} a trip to Wheaton a trip to the mountains, now here's a third one which combines the two and puts them both $3\frac{1}{2}$, a combining document, a synchronising sort of a thing, a synthetic sort of a thing, and all three are therefore false and contradictory. Well, that's exactly what the critics do, time after time. Now another thing the critics do time after time is to allege a contradiction where one has something given that the other does not give. For instance I might give somebody an account of the trip to Wheaton, and knowing that the person to whom I was giving it was one who had been a former student at Wheaton, and knew how easy it used to be to get there by taking the Chicago, Aurora and Elgin train out, I might mention the fact that when I got to Chicago, I looked in the phone book to see if the ~~xxxx~~ C A & E was running, and when I found the only address given for it was one out, way out in the country ~~some~~ somewhere, I decided it was not running, and so I went out on the Northwestern, which was not nearly as convenient as the Aurora used to be, but an awful lot more convenient than the Aurora is today. Well, I would mention that in talking to someone who had been there and knew the circumstances, and was particularly interested in that problem. Someone who had never been there, I would not bother to mention that particular fact. But the critics, time and again, point out, something is mentioned here, it is not mentioned there, there is a contradiction. They list these, they list hundreds of alleged contradictions. Now the fact then, there can be two different things given, which if you knew the circumstances, they are both true, or they can be the same thing given with an added circumstance which is just not mentioned in the ~~the~~ other. There can even be two opposite statements given which are both absolutely true. Somebody might remark some day that at 8:57 in the morning they saw me coming out of the other building, so they concluded that I had a class at 9, they concluded that I had a class, because at 8:57 they saw me coming out of the door of the other building. Somebody else would say, Well, at 8:58 I was him going in the door of the other building, so you are completely wrong, the class was 8 to 9. He got out at 8:50 and went over there after class. The fact of the matter would be, as frequently happens ^{with me}, I would come ^{out} at one moment,

and start over here, get a hundred feet and remember something I'd forgotten that was vital, turn around and go back for it. ~~One~~ person sees me come out at 8:57, another see me go in there at 8:58, and antoher sees me come out again at 8:59. There are three different reports, two of them coming this way, and one going the other way. The two coming this way contradict each other as to the time, though they agree in general ~~circumstances~~. The ~~one~~ is sharply ~~opposite~~ to them because it has me going in the exact opposite direction, and yet all three of them would be ~~absolutely~~ true. There are false statements in the world, there are all sorts of them, and it is the proper attitude of the careful think~~er~~ to investigate and not to accept something as true unless you have evidence of it. When I have a statement about ~~his~~ history, anybody's statement, there may be errors in it, I ~~shank~~ check it with someone else, I try to find ~~me~~ definite evidence for being sure on a detail of history. But when you are to say there is deliberate contradiction or there is definite disagreement between ~~these~~ things, particularly between what claims to be first hand sources, you must recognize that there is always the possibility that there is some circumstance there, which, if you knew it, would explain the matter. It is my impression, I'd have to look up the facts on it lately, but it is my impression that back about 1850 there was a big dispute between the north and the south. The north wanted, I believe, to set taxes in proportion to the number of living people, and to give representation in Congress in proportion to the people who had a right to vote. The South wanted to set the representation in Congress according to the number of ~~ixix~~ living people, but to fix taxes according to the number of people that had a right to vote, and since about half of the population of the south was slaves at the time, it meant that your figures, you have the southern figures, and the northern figures as to the population of the southern states, in these regards, it would flayly and sharply contradict each other, and yet there was an explanation for ~~it~~ an easy understanding of exactly why the situation was/. Even more recently before women had the vote, you would have one statement of population which would relate to voters, and others which relate to all ~~p~~ people and would be two or more times as big. You could have those ~~xxxx~~ two statements as to what the population was in an ~~area~~, it would ~~sem~~ to be a flat, sharp, contradiction, and yet if you got into it, you would see they were both absolutely

true, and there was no contradiction. We have to go slow and easy about finding contradictions that show lack of integrity or show a development and a long period in between. We must go slow on that. If we find an apparent contradiction, we of course must redognize there is something that deserves study, there's a ~~sktax~~ situation there that needs to be looked into to understand it. It doesnot mean that we have to throw one of them aside. Now at this particular point as regards religious institutions, I have quite a number of them listed here, which I took from Carpenter's book, the composition of the Hexateuch. I think probably we won't look at all of them, but we'll try to get a few of the most important pretty well in mind. And yesterday I was looking, we looked at 1, The premosiac sacrifice, and we noticed the fact that J and E described sacrifice before there was an Aaronic priesthood, and P has no sacrifice they say at all, so they say it is a contradic- tion, but actually in the laws of P there is so very little narrative there is no ~~particular~~ particular reason any sacrifice should be mentioned.

Now we were looking at number 2, the place of sacrifice, and this is one of the big main key point on the whole main critical theory, this one. J~~e~~ and E permit sacrifice anywhere that God appears, they say. Well, the ~~na~~ law of J and E shows sacrifice, the narritive, I mean, shows sacrifice at many different places. There was sacrifice at many different places in the time of the Patriarchs. Of course, there was no central sanctuary, nothing of the kind. There is no contradiction in a teaching of the Bible that there was sacrifice at many places, and then that God declares that the nation should restrict it to one place. There's no contra- diction in that. But is the law of JE contradictory to the law of D and P. Well, we notice that the place that the law of JE permits sacrifice anywhere that God appears, is ~~ahxxx~~ based upon Exodus 20:24. And we noticed yesterday, that what it says there/ is, An altar of earth/ thou/ shalt make unto me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offer/ings and thy peace offerings, and thy sheep and thine oxen, in all places where I record my name, I will come unto thee and I will bless thee, and if thou wilt make me up an altar of stone, thou/ shalt not build it up of hewn stone. As this stands in this law, as it stands in the Bible, it is given at Sinai, and the people are begining their/ progress through the wilderness, and they will haturally have sacrificed ~~ah~~ half the sacrifice in many different places

because they are moving forward. And it would be perfectly silly to have a law here sacrifice shall only be in Jerusalem. There'd be no point in it, forty years before they get into the land, and 240 years before they conquered Jerusalem. There'd be no point whatever in such a law being given. But even the critical statement that this permits sacrifice wherever God appears, you notice, is not stated here, at all. There is nothing ~~xxx~~ stated whether there is to be one place of sacrifice or many given. It is just not stated. It stands to reason in the situation, as the Pentateuch stands that they sacrificed at many places as they go forward toward the land, and after their beginning, conquest before they are finally settled, they sacrificed in many places. There is no point in a law of confining sacrifice to one place at this time. But an express provision that they are to sacrifice at many places is not even given here at all, it just says, in all places where I record my name, it says, I will come unto ~~there~~ and will bless thee. It is not saying, Wherever I record my name, there you will sacrifice. Just what the tie-up is between places where He records His name, and how they are to build an altar where there are13... few stones, is a matter which might be subject to various interpretations, but to restrict it, to sacrifice, is certainly going beyond the text. Well, now, that they say then is the law of JE which permits sacrifice everywhere. Now in Deuteronomy, especially Deut. 12:5, but other verses later in the book also, particularly in that chapter, they say, the law is changed in the time of Josiah, the priests in Jerusalem get this book of Deuteronomy hidden in the temple where they can find it, and pretend it is an old book, in order to make everybody sacrifice at Jerusalem, and therefore they'll get a bigger income. That is what the earlier critical books all said of the origin of the book of Deuteronomy. Now later on many critics reacted against this idea of Deuteronomy being a book put in there for the purpose of increasing the income of the ~~priests~~ priests. The high moral form of the book is such that it is very difficult to reconcile with such a low selfish purpose, the purpose of the book, and they have been greatly attacked on that, on the moral differences of such a wonderful Godly book as Deuteronomy being written for such a ~~purpose~~ purpose, and so many of them have tried to make out that it wasn't done by the priest specifically, that it was done, that the book ~~at~~ had been in there some time, but it represents a newer development, or something like that.

But it is very difficult to imagine just how it got there in those circumstance, and it is a ~~much~~ much simpler theory the way they originally all presented it, that is was a deliberate attempt to increase their income. But at any rate, Yes?.....
.....

AAM: There are phrases which show openings.....end of P 12

P13

...It says there that these are the statutes which ye shall observe to do in the land which the Lord gives you, ye shall utterly destroy all the places where the nations which you shall possess serve their God. Ye shall not do so unto the Lord your God, but unto the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your1... to put His name there, even into His habitation, and thither thou shalt and thither ye shall bring your burnt offerings. Ever in v.11, v. 10 ~~xxx~~ says, When God gives you rest from your enemies round about so that you can dwell in safety, then there shall be a place where the Lord your God shall choose to cause His name to dwell there, thither shall he bring all that I command you for burnt offerings. v.8, Ye shall not do after the things we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes, for ye are not as yet come into your rest? but when the Lord gives you peace around you, then you have one place. It is repeated several times in this chapter. It is given as a command for a changed situation after the land is entirely conquered. Now it contradicts the ...2..., yes, it contradicts it, just as there might be a law somebody might have stated in 1770, George Washington might have said, If you want to decide an important matter, send your appeal to London. In 1770 he might say that, and in 1790, he might say, If you want to decide an important matter, send your appeal to Philadelphia which is where they're2½..... There was a change in circumstances. There's no contradiction, there's a change in circumstances. It is presented as a change in circumstances. After they conquered the land, there was a different situation than when they are travelling toward it. But then when you come to the P document, what the critics say is that P has no command on this matter, but it assumes ~~that~~ ~~the~~ sacrifice at one place. It assumes the ~~fact that~~3.... of the Deuteronomic law. Well, you see, here's a sharp agreement between P and D. There's no disagreement, but they say P being later, the law of Deuteronomy coming separate, you

~~max~~ didn't have to present it. Well, of course, P with all the detailed priestly rules presupposes naturally that all this is going to be done in one place, the whole background of the Bible stand is that there is to be one temple where these things are carried out, but it is not explicitly stated there. Now, number 3, the place of sacrifice, number 3, I am going to mention here the matter of asylum. Now the matter of asylum. You might say, What's this got to do with religious institution? Well the critics make it ...3½... with religious institution. They relate it very definitely to religious institutions. They say this. Here is Gray's book, George Buchanan Gray, Critical Introduction to the Old Testament, telling how Deuteronomy enjoins the destruction of the Canaanite altar, and then saying in P there is neither direct prohibition of many altars, nor direct command to confine sacrifice to a single place, but ~~it~~ it is throughout assumed that legitimate sacrifice can only be offered on one altar. Then he goes on and says while there were many altars, there was ample means of asylum. Ex. 21:13-14. For in actual early practice, the altar was the place of asylum. With the abolition of all altars but one it became necessary to invent fresh asylum, hence, the cities of Deuteronomy's laws, these laws of Deuteronomy 19:1-13, the cities of refuge, of peace, Numbers 25:29-34. Now you see, how it connects up? The critics say there were plenty of places for asylum as long as you had many altars. Therefore in J and E you don't need cities of refuge. In actual practice they say the altar was the place of asylum. And so you have the cities of ~~refuge~~ refuge. Now the fact of the matter is, you have the cities of refuge told of in Deuteronomy, and the cities of refuge told of in Numbers, and the critics say there are sharp contradictions, a mass of contradictions between these two accounts of the city of refuge. One in Deut., and the one on Leviticus, which ~~show~~ show that they represent an entirely different background. But they say that JE does not have such a law. Well, why should it have such a law? J and E is nearly all narrative, with a very little bit of law in E, nearly all narrative, narrative of the time before they came into the land. Why should there be such a law. Well, they say, it ~~is~~ has a contradictory law. The law is that the altar is the place of asylum. You didn't need any place of refuge, because you have altars all over the land. Now what could prove that the altar is the place of asylum. You see the development.

Here is JE. You can sacrifice anywhere that God has given his name. Therefore if you have altars everywhere, you don't need any asylum. Then you have D, and establish three cities to which the man can flee to be safe, and then you have P, and you would make it six cities, and so now you have six cities, and you call them cities of refuge. You see the development? The first step in D coming as the result of the law of the altar, and then P extending it and enlarging it, using different terminology, calling them cities of refuge, instead of just cities.

Well, now what is the contradiction between these? Well, in the first place, in JE there is no reason he should tell about ~~altars~~ cities of refuge, they weren't established until they got into the land. Why should it be contained in the little bit of law that is in E, just a little covenant, the first covenant made at Sinai forty years before they come into the land. Why in those three chapters do you need to have anything ~~fix~~ about cities of refuge. What they say right in those chapters you have a statement on asylum. Now what do you have? Ex. 21:13,14.

What is the law here? Ex.21:~~31~~13,14. It says he that smiteth a man so that he dies shall surely be put to death, and if a man lying not in wait, but God deliver him into his hands, that is to say, you are not watching for a chance to kill this man but through some accident/^{you killed him,} a man has not laid in wait, but God delivers him in his hands, then I will appoint thee a place whither he shall flee. Does that sound as if the altar was the place to which he should flee? Actually I mispoke myself a minute ago when I said there ~~was~~ no provision of cities of refuge. Isn't that the very provision of cities of refuge? If a man lie not in wait, but God deliver him into his hands, then I will appoint thee a place whither he shall flee. Here he is forty years before they go into the land, and he is not saying that he shall flee to my altar. He doesn't say that, He says, Then I will appoint thee a place whither he ~~shall~~ shall flee. It is exactly the law of D and P. The critics say, Gray says, there was ample means of asylum, but ~~the~~ with the abolition of all altars but one, it became necessary to invent fresh asylum, hence the city of ~~the~~ ^{D's} ~~the~~ laws, Deut. 19. Now was D inventing something that never was heard of before?, If JE right in Ex. 22 says, Then I will appoint thee a place whither he shall flee. Suppose you were talking to somebody over in Spain who was going to come to this

country. And you were to say, when you get to this country, we will provide dormitory space for you. We'll give you a place to live, and then suppose that the man arrives. When he gets you here you say, Now you being a first year student we are going to put you up on the fourth floor. Now he'd say, Look at the sharp contradiction. You didn't say anything over there about the fourth floor, now I'm here you say something about the fourth floor. Well, over there it was said, there would be space provided, but what is the necessity of telling the precise place long before you get there? When you get there you give him the precise space. Now God says in Ex. 21, at the very beginning of the giving of the law, He says, I will appoint thee a place whither He shall flee, and then when they get to Deuteronomy, and they are just about to enter the land, he says, I will set apart three cities to which he flees. It is exactly the same. The alleged contradiction is simply imported as it is in so many other hundreds of cases. But, of course, that's not what they are talking about in this place. They don't even record that phrase in their discussion. Here's what they refer to, the next verse. But if a man come presumptuously upon his neighbor to slay him with guile, thou shalt take him from mine altar that he may die. Now I hope many of you have your Bibles open so you can actually see this before you. Ex.21:13,14. 14, But if a man come presumptuously upon his neighbor to slay him with guile, thou shalt take him from mine altar that he may die. Now there is probably not a general book on the criticism that has ever been written from the critical view that has not ~~sax~~ stated in it, that previous to the time of Josiah any one, the place of asylum was the altar. As George Buchanan Gray says here, While there were many altars there was ample means of asylum. Ex.21:13,14. In actual early practice the altar was the place of asylum. You find that in all the critical books. It is one of the points they all give. But look at the two verses and it doesn't say that at all. I will appoint thee a place whither he shall flee. Does that say, Here's a man who has killed someone by accident, Let him run to my altar. Get12.....the altar and get ~~ahold~~ ahold of it and hang to it, and wait there for the next ten years until people get tired of wanting to kill him, ~~hanging~~ hanging on to the altar. There was ample places of asylum because there were ~~many~~ ^{many} altars. That's ridiculous.

It would naturally be the case that anybody suddenly in danger and looking for a place where he might be safe would be apt to think if he was near the altar of God, to run and take a hold of it. You would think surely no decent person would grab me here as long as I am in this sacred place. It would be a natural guess as to a safe place to go if there was nothing else handy and you had to grab something quick, it would be the most natural thing, but it is altogether different from a city of refuge to which you go and spend a few years in order to prevent the beginning of a feud. And righthere in the passage they say that there was plenty of place of asylum. The text actually says, I will appoint thee a place whither he shall flee and show that in the idea of the E document the altar was not sufficient place of ~~an~~ asylum, there was a need of a place, and the promise there will be a place. So you say that what he says that while there were many altars there was ample means of asylum was flatly contradicted by the fact that he uses as proof ~~that~~ that it is true. And then he goes on to say, For an actual early practice the altar was a place of asylum, I Ki. 1:50, the only other place that I know of anywhere in the Bible in which you have the suggestion of a man fleeing ~~to~~ to the altar. And there in I ki. 1:50 you read, Adonijah feared because of Solomon and arose and ~~went~~ went and caught hold on the horns of the altar. Now why did Adonijah run to the altar. Because he had killed someone unawares, and they didn't yet have cities of refuge to which eh should flee, and therefore the altar was the asylum, and that's why he ran there? Nothing of the kind. Adonijah was a man who had tried to make himself king. And David made Solomon king, instead, and naturally Adonijah was afraid, and he ran, thinking that Solomon would have him seized and killed, so he ran and caught hold on the horns of the altar, and it was told Solomon, saying, Behold, Adonijah fears king Solomon, for Lo, he's caught hold on the horns of the altar, saying, Let King Solomon swear unto me today that he will not slay his servatn with the sword. And Solomon said, If he will show himself a worthy man, there shall not a hair of him fall to the earth, but if wickedness shall be found in him, he shall die, so King Solomon sent and they brought him down from the altar. That's the only passage they can allege to show that the altar was the place of asylum and you didn't need cities of refuge. And it just wouldn't

do for a city of refuge. It doesn't fill the same purpose, and the only place the claim to point to such a law has in that very same verse the statement that God will ~~supply~~ provide a city of refuge. Yes?????.....end of P 13

P 14

.....appoint him a place," is very definitely implying that the altar is not a place which is already present.... that there is going to be a special provision. The only way you can get that out is to change the text. The text as it stands definitely does not say that. And that is the way with so many of these alleged contradictions and developments. So very very many of them rest upon the reading into it of a supposed contradiction, simply because something is not specifically mentioned. There is just a tremendous amount of that here. If you take the, if you assume the, take the Bible as it stands, you will find there are difficulties as in any book, but you will find that 9/10ths of the alleged difficulties that the critics point to are perfectly understandable and explicable if you take the Bible as it stands, but if you will divide it up and put JE here and P here and D here, and assume that they are written at different periods, well, then naturally you have from that viewpoint, that they are written at different periods, then they have a different meaning, then you look at every difference of phrase you can find in them, and allege it to contradiction, you can find hundreds, yes, thousands of them, but many of them which they give, in fact the majority of them, if you will just look at the actual passages, you will find that it immediately disappears when you look at the actual words. Now I notice here on page 112, or starting on 111, where he's dealing with this matter, that Carpenter says, Carpenter says about it that (he's got quite a bit. I don't know just how much to read to you), on page 110, "One further instance, perhaps yet more significant, under similar conditions to the forgoing, Moses is commanded to issue a law for the appointment of six cities of refuge, three on the east of Jordan, three in Canaan, Numbers 35:9-34." There you see they have six cities. Now, skipping down a little he says "In Deut. 19:1-13 the same3.... is again created on a different basis, and in different form, the land which Israel is to occupy in the future is to be divided into three parts with a city in each." Now you see the sharp contradiction. Numbers says, six, one on each side of the Jordan, Deut says three.

Isn't that a sharp contradiction.? Actually, Deut. is given after the country across the Jordan has been conquered, and Moses is about to die. And Moses says When you go into the land of Canaan, and take the land, God will divide it into three sections and put a city of refuge in it. Numbers says that there will be three on each side of the Jordan. In Numbers it tells of the establishment of three on each side, they are already established there, Now Deuteronomy says When you go into the other section, there will be three. It doesn't say three more, it says, Three. And so they say there's a contradiction where one says three and the other says six. Well, if you take the two absolutely apart, then there is a contradiction. One says three and the other says six. As they stand in the Pentateuch, they fit together just perfectly. There's not the least suggestion of a contradiction. He says here that in Deuteronomy the same thing is again treated on a different basis and in a different form. He gives the three parts of the city in each. Hither the manslayer, ... $4\frac{1}{2}$... anyone of the three divisions may plead. No tribunal is mentioned before which he may be cited to appear. The tribunal is mentioned in the other. None is mentioned here so you see a contradiction. Well, why does it need to be mentioned, when he's giving them his exhortation to obey the law, and telling them that in a case of accidental killing somebody may flee to the city of refuge which God will appoint. He doesn't have there to go into the details of the tribunal that they may be called before ~~that they~~ to prove they haven't intentionally killed the man. In Numbers, the law for the priest, you give all that detail. After the man gets into the city of refuge, he can sit down and study the detail and find out what his regulations are, what kind of a tribunal he may have to appear before, but if it is necessary not for him to know about the tribunal, but to know about the provision of the city, so that if he accidentally killed someone, it could happen easily when men were out cutting trees, doing that kind of work around, he accidentally killed someone, and immediately the person's relatives say that he killed him intentionally, and that they are going to kill him. Well, he doesn't need to know ~~what~~ about the tribunal immediately, but he needs to know where the city of refuge is, and so he flees there, and he's safe until the tribunal looks into it. Well, he says, No tribunal is mentioned. He continues, "But a trial is obviously implied

for in the event of ~~the~~~~his~~~~guilt~~ his guilt being made clear, the elders of this city are charged with the duty of fetching him from his place of shelter and delivering him to the6.... It is added here that if Yahweh shall enlarge their border they may assign three more cities for similar asylum." Now, listen what Carpenter says. He says, "Why should the leaders already divinely warned that he must die, ~~then~~ issue two such laws in a two weeks interval? What causes could have intervened to make such repetition necessary? And if they were repeated, why should the arrangements of the first be modified to the second?" How have they been modified? One mentions a trial, the other doesn't mention it. Now, elsewhere he goes into it, ~~and~~ and one calls them cities and the other calls them cities of refuge, and there are three or four other differences of phraseology like that. One says there was no hatred beforehand, the other says, he killed him unwittingly and unintentionally. Different phraseology, exactly identical meaning. He says, "Why should the leader, already divinely warned that he must die, issue two such laws in a few weeks interval? The situation itself seems to create a presumption against the hypothesis of unitary authorship, and this is confirmed by the respective literary characteristics. For ~~Ex~~ P, killeth any person unwittingly, D writes, killeth his neighbor unawares, and ~~hateth~~ hateth him not in time past, you notice/? Alleged ~~contradictions~~ contradictions, and most of them disappear if you examine the text. Well, now so much then for number three, the matter of asylum. I am not going to take the time to go into the matter of sanctuary in the wilderness. They allege that according to one document the tabernacle was outside the camp, and according to the other it is inside the camp, and actually, as ^{Orr} Ford points out in his book, here, he goes into the examples fully, actually you will find that there are two or three references to the camp outside the camp, when Moses on account of the sin of the people, takes it out, and it says, he took it out, and in all other cases it is ~~inside~~ inside the camp in either one, and so you find one of them that has it both outside and inside the camp, while the other, of course, has it always inside the camp, and the reason is that the narrative section tells how it was taken out for a brief time, on account of the sin of the people, and even

that point inferred that the usual place was inside, because it says that Moses took it out, on account of the sins of the people, which certainly implies that it was in. So that that is one which the critics make a great deal of, and Orr has a very excellent discussion of it. By the way, I'd like to introduce you to this book, The Problem of the Old Testament, by James Orr. If somebody knows a little bit about the criticism, and asks you to recommend them a good book, don't recommend this one, James Orr, The Problem of the Old Testament. The reason is this. Orr takes for granted a little too much background for the average reader to catch what he is driving at, so I have known people who have had work in the criticism in some good Christian college, and said to me, Oh, I studied through Orr, and I've asked them a few questions and found they had no idea in the world what Higher criticism was about. For a person without background, Orr is of little value, but for a person who has had this course, or its equivalent, and has a definite clear idea of what the criticism is, which you have when you finish this course, then when you take up Orr, you will find it a mine of valuable material, and helpful ~~at~~ discussion. I am not able to use it a great deal in this course because he presupposes so much ~~background~~ background that we have to get over in this one semester course, but if you go on he takes up, there are one or two concessions he makes which I think are quite unnecessary and which the critics have grabbed a hold of, and talked a lot about, while ignoring the great amount of fine material in his book, but it is a mine of excellent material, and excellent discussion of these problems. In fact, anyone who after they have had this course, would like to take Orr and study it, and write me a good paper on it, I'd be glad to give you a credit for doing the amount of work that would represent one credit of work, I am ~~glad~~ glad to give you a credit for that reading assignment, because it is very much worthwhile, this study of Orr, and I hope you will all have it listed, to use it sometime while this course is fresh in your mind. Now, if it isn't, get some simpler book and read it first, before you read Orr, because otherwise you may not get into it far ~~enough~~ ^{enough} to get the value, but it has tremendous value in it, and this matter of the sanctuary he is particularly good on. Now I didn't include that because we are trying to rush a little bit, I didn't give it a number. 10^{3/4}

But I gave 3, Asylum. Let's make 4 the Priesthood, and this matter of the priesthood, of course, is the matter that so much is made of by the critics. They say there is no special priesthood in JE. Well, in the covenant, the law of the covenant, those four chapters, we don't have anything about the priesthood. How much do you expect to have in those four chapters? I forgot it had anything about the cities of refuge. But I noticed as I read it, that it's right there in the place that they say denies the cities of refuge, there is a very ~~definite~~ definite statement that God is going to appoint a place. But in just those three chapters, the introduction, the basis of the covenant, you can't expect everything to be included. There's no particular reason why it should say, Who's going to be the priest, but JE, they say, has no particular priesthood. Now P is where they say there is contradictions. D and P. P has the priesthood limited to the descendants of Aaron, while D, they say, has the Levites as the priests. So, they say anybody could be a priest, and then the Levites are priests, and then it is just the families of Aaron. And so, (n)aturally you won't find any ~~priest~~ Levites mentioned in the time of Abraham. There were no Levites around then to have the priestly office restricted to them at that time. But in the book of Deuteronomy they say it always speaks of the Levitical priests as if all the Levites were priests. That is not the fact. It does not speak of the priests and tell you who are going to be priests. In exhorting the people as a whole, he doesn't tell how the priests are to be appointed. There is no special point in that. That has already been done, established, there is no need of it in his repetition of the law in his final address. But he tells their relationship to the Levitical priest, to the priests who are selected out of the tribe of Levi for this ~~purpose~~ purpose, and in some places he refers to the Levites, and in other places to Levitical priests. As Orr points there is there a suggestion that there are some Levites who were not priests. The critics claim that all of the Levites are priests. There is one place where there is a mention of the provision for the Levites, for the priests, the Levitical priests, it says all the tribe of Levi, and the reasonable interpretation is, this is provision for support of Levitical priests and of all the rest of the Levites. But in the RSV they insert the word 'even,' to make it, "The Levitical priests, even all the Levites," as if to say all the tribe

of Levie were priests, or at least, potential priests. That is inserting a word which is not in the original. It is just as reasonable to take it as a succession (13½) as to different things, one including the other, as to take it as to which are absolutely synonymous. They wanted me to discuss that verse in connection with my section on Numbers for the new commentary, and I did it, but it seemed rather strange for me to do it, Because it is a verse in Deuteronomy. I thought it should come into the discussion on Deuteronomy, but they called my attention very specially to the verse, ~~and~~ as I had a similar thing I would be able to do it best, so I looked into it rather fully at that time. But the claim is that there is this constant narrowing down, and that Aaron is unknown to Deuteronomy and to JE. Well, right here in Deuteronomy we read in Deut. 10 a ~~xxxx~~ sections which they talk of a good bit as the contradiction with the section in JE, we read here in v.5, I turn myself and came down from the mount, and put the tables in the ark which I had made, and there they be as the Lord commanded me, and then it continues, and end of P 14

P 15

....the specific referene ^{to Aaron the Priest} Eleazer ^{son of Aaron} in the priest's office ministering in his stead. Now, of course, it is necessary then to take it out1...., it couldn't be there because, if it is there, you have the Aaronic priesthood in Deuteronomy, and of course, with their theory of development, the Aaronic priesthood was later. I haven't looked it up. I brought Addis along. If our time was a little bit longer than it is, I would look it ~~up~~ up and see what it says, but I'm sure they'll have to take it outQuestion:.....

AAM: They reference is Deuteronomy 10;6,7, and I just noticed that this noon when I was reading what one of them said, Oh, here, They say, that in verse, Oh, they cannot take this out. Look at this. I was reading this noon how they said, That in Deut. 10:8 it says that at that time the Lord separated the tribe of Levi, and there the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and they says that is after the death of Aaron, that the tribe of Levi is separated is after the death of Aaron, therefore there wasn't even a Levitical priesthood at this time when Aaron died, Well, I think that's misreading the phrase, at that time, Because it goes right on and talks about him in the mount. I think at that time he2.... earlier than when he came down from the mount. But the way they take it is taken in the

light of these three verses which go on to tell about the death of Aaron, and if you do that you can't very well take the verses out and say they are ^{not} part of D at all. They belong in that particular document. So it makes a dilemma for it. How will you get the best contradiction, by keeping the verses in or by taking them out? But it is a frame of ~~mind~~ mind into which people get. Once you reach the conclusions that the Pentateuch is full of contradictions, you just find them everywhere staring you in the face, and you will have the same situation ~~with~~ with any person. If you come to the conclusion that I am absolutely undependable, and unreliable, you just start in watching, writing down everything I say, and see how many times you can find I said one thing that contradicts another. As I said at the beginning of the hour, I gave illustration of how exactly, how you can find exact contradictions to what anybody says, or if you know the situation, they don't contradict at all. If you take the Pentateuch as it stands, step by step, you will find that 90 per cent of your alleged critical contradictions disappear, but if you separate the verses out and say this is one document and this is another, look how they contradict each other, you get contradictions there as you can get them in any place if you treat it that way, and the greater... That is the one thing I want to have in mind that the alleged development among the document is not a development from polytheism to monotheism, because there is no one who could allege that J and E is definitely a polytheistic document. There are very very few passages in it where there could be the claim the slightest suggestions of polytheism or animism. It is only a development alleged from more primitive statements, anthropomorphic, to that which does not have them. You don't naturally find them in a law, as you find them in any narrative, where you are dealing with divine acts. But the principle of practically all of the alleged differences become very minute when you examine them carefully. There is little reason for them, but the two big ones that they base their ~~ex~~ development on are the persons who perform the sacrifices, and the place of the sacrifice. Those are the two big ones, and on those two the argument from history is built, and they can make that argument from history on these two sound like a very very strong argument. But the big thing I want you to have in mind is that the claim that there is development in the documents is a claim which does not stand up on careful fair

investigation of it. That is a very very important point. Well, we'll continue tomorrow morning...end of class, 4/18

class of 4/19

....back into the primitive age of Israel's history. This is a good example of the way the critics deal with the Pentateuch. Mr. Goertzen.....6.....

AAM: It would be the combined JE, whether it was originally J or E, I don't recall

.....Oh, no, I ~~wasn't~~ didn't make it clear. What he says is ~~this~~ this. There is the story of the rebellion of ~~David and~~ Dathan and Abiram, he says, you remember the story of Dathan and ~~Abiram~~ Abiram. The rebellion of Dathan and Abiram is from JE. These you know were men from the tribe of Reuben, and who rebelled against Moses leadership. That's from JE. Now you take that out, and then you just have P left, but then as Carpetner mentions, in P, he has pointed out, you have evidence of secondary division within P, and Dathan and Abiram were taken out, because you have two stories there, one of which represents Korah as a layman, and the other represents him as a Levite. One represents him as opposing Moses because all the congregation is ... 7...., the other as opposing the exclusive priesthood of the descendants of Aaron. So that he says, You take out the story of Dathan and Abiram because JE, you see, you have parallels, you have Dathan and Abiram doing things, you have Korah doing things. They are both doing things against Moses. It is a parallel. So you take them out, and then when you get through you still have P, but you still have parallels, and so you can divide P up into ~~two~~ two stories in turn, one of which he says belongs to the original framework of P, that makes Korah a layman. But if you take all the passages that speak of Korah as a Levite, take them out of that, Korah is not mentioned as a Levite, he is a layman..... to belong to any other, but you take them out that say he is a Levite. Then you put those together and you have another story, and of course, in that story He is a Levite, so you have, you see, according to them, then, three phrases, you have Dathan and Abiram objecting to Moses leadership, you have Korah objecting to Moses leadership, and you have Korah ~~objecting~~ objecting on behalf of the Levites to ~~the~~ the priesthood of ~~Aaron~~ Aaron. Well, now, is not this quite convincing proof that the story of the rebellion of Korah is actually three different stories coming

together, because you have three different grounds of opposition. You have Dathan and Abiram who aren't even Levites opposing him, you have Korah who is a Levite, opposing on the ground that all the congregation is holy, Moses has no right to take this leadership over all the congregation, and you have Korah ~~obj~~ objecting on the grounds that the other Levites are just as good as the Aaronic priesthood. Well, now, does that prove three distinct ~~scri~~ stories? I hope you all explained it correctly on the paper, because we've looked at so many other similar stories that if you have the background of the story in mind, it should be very easy to see what is wrong with it. I would say that as you ~~have~~ read what the critics have said on these laws and on these stories, their whole attitude is that of men who show absolutely no ~~example~~ conception of what life is or what life is about. Absolutely none. They go to it as if it was simply a collection of words, and if they can show in these words two words that differ, or there is one word here which isn't there, they make an argument for a distinct source, which is ~~absolutely~~ absolutely contrary to what you find in the experiences of life. Life is not so simple as they try to make it. Life is complex. You find, well, we'll take a situation in the government. The democrats, not so long ago, were cutting down the size of the army. Truman cut down the ~~and~~ Air Force to what they wanted, he cut down the Navy to what they wanted, he was severely criticized by people in the army. He said our finances won't support so much of the military force as you want. He was severely criticized by the military ... 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ Today, only three or four years later, you find that the democrats are strongly urging a far larger army, and a far larger navy than what the administration wants, they were fighting for it in congress the last three or four days ago. Now what a contradiction. You must have two distinct sources. They can't both be true. How could the democrats take one stand, and four years later take the exact opposite. They must not both be true, If you go at it the way the critics do, but if you look at the facts, you find that when the democrats were in power, they were trying to balance the budget, and to expend as much money for military expenses as were necessary, without expending what was unnecessary, but would upset the finances of the government, and once they are out of power they are trying to embarrass the

party in power, by taking the side of those who are urging great expenses that themselves would never think of making if they were in power. Now that's no great criticism of the democratic party, it simply is human nature. It simply is politics the way it is. And if take any great disagreement within the church, most anywhere, where you find a leader with a large group of people against the leader, you will find that among these people who are opposing the leader, there are atleast four or ~~five~~ five different grounds of opposition, and you will find that the ringleaders in the opposition are trying to round up people to stand with them in their opposition, and they are giving to the people to whom they talk, the arguments which they think will be effective to that person. That's human nature, that's what you always find. I know of a man who was a college. He told me, he said, he went into ~~that~~ that presidency and he stood for what he thought was right. That happened about thirty years ago. He stood for what he thought was absolutely right and true, and he said he wasn't there very long before a group of people over here were opposing him strongly in what he stood for. Pretty strong a group of people over here opposed him strongly on another point, pretty soon a group over here on another point. After he'd been there a number of years he said it just happened that all the groups got together and he was thrown out. Well they all got together. Actually the difference between them was ~~different~~ greater than the difference between them and him. But they united against him in opposition in rebellion and they threw him out. A year and a half later many of them were wishing he'd come back again, because other groups were in control with whom they had less in common than they had with him. It is human nature. It is always the case. You go to a meeting of any church body and you will find that the group that is more or less in control has certain policies they are trying to carry on, and you will find that the ~~chances~~ chances are that the rest agree with them in eighty percent of the matters. But here is a group that disagrees in one 20% and here is a group that disagrees in another 20%, here is a group that disagrees with another 20%, and these ~~groups~~ groups all get together, and they get together in opposition to the ones in control. It is just human nature. It is the way things work, and it is exactly again the stroy of Rebecca which we looked at and

and noticed how Rebecca gave one argument to Jacob, and she gave another argument to Isaac, and she was doubtless absolutely sincere in both arguments. They both counted to her, one may have counted more to her than the other, but they both counted to her, but she used with each person the argument that would carry weight with him, and in this rebellion here we have the Levites not liking it because one group, the Aaronic priesthood is placed in priority. Now, naturally, every other family knows that they are much better qualified than the Aaronic priest, but probably if any other family were asked, suppose your family is not considered, which other group would you think was best? They would probably all agree that the Aaronic priesthood was the best. It was just their own particular family. It probably was the best of all, but we can see, most of can see anybody else....15.. it compares ~~with~~ with ourselves or our own immediate associates, and so they all gottogether, the levites in this temporary period, or at least a large group of them in opposition to the Aaronic priesthood. Well, they were necessarily a small group, the Levites, out of the whole thing, and it wouldn't have amounted to anything, except it just ahppened that at this time there was a large15..... in the tribe of Reuben. Reuben was the first-born. Why then should Reuben be in a subordinate position? They wanted to get supremacy. Why should the Levites and Moses have supremacy, and so Korah.....end of P15

P 16

....but when you find it in the Biblical accounts, and you get more or less full details as in this story of Korah, why the critics says, Here's the JE story, and then when you get the P story you divide that into two different stories, and one of them said Korah was a Levite and the other doesn't so the other makes him a layman. Well, if the other made him not a Levite, they'd ~~be~~ surely tell what tribe he did belong in. They don't make him a layman by not saying he's a Levite. You notice it is an argument from silence, and an argument from silence which is ~~quite~~ ridiculous because it is definitely stated, only they give those passages to the other, and it really is amazing if you will take up most any of these critical books, and read their ~~max~~ statements, as you read about this contradiction, this contradictions, and this one, and this one, and this one, it

just piles up and it just sounds as if the Bible is just absolutely undependable, and it is just full of contradictions, absolute proof it must have come together in some process of gathering a lot of contradictory things together the way they claim. But if you will take their alleged contradictions and look at them one by one by one, and examine them carefully, you will find in 9/10ths of the cases that there is absolutely no contradiction whatever. The contradiction is based on the fact that one mentions a fact which another one doesn't mention but certainly doesn't deny, or they are dealing with two distinct things, or it is imported in some way, an alleged contradiction, that will take care of 9/10ths of their alleged difficulties, and when you get rid of these 9/10, it is easy enough to see that the other 1/10 may very easily be similar, there may be circumstances that you just don't know about, like the incident I mentioned yesterday when somebody saw me come out of the building, and then somebody saw me go into the building, at just about the same time, and they flatly contradict each other, and yet both ~~statements~~ ^{statements} are absolutely sure. One man could say that in ~~1860~~ 1861, Edwin F. Stanton was the most pronounced critic of Abraham Lincoln in Washington, constantly slamming him. Heard of an expedition going over to Africa to hunt for a big gorilla for a zoo, and he says, Why do they go to Africa? The original gorilla's right here in Washington in the White House. And he was talking like that all the time, the most extreme ~~absurd~~ absurd statements, and another man will tell you that General3..... said to Edward M. Stanton, that year, 1861, what do you think you are going to do, Mr. Stanton? And Mr. Stanton said, I am going to make Abraham president of the United States, and in the latter part of that year he was the most devoted follower of Abraham Lincoln. Two statements made about 1861 and absolutely true, both of them. You'd think it impossible that somebody who was the most bitter opponent of Abraham Lincoln would become one of the most ardent admirers so quickly as that. But Abraham Lincoln, even though he knew how Stanton talked about him, and knew he talked the same way ten years before when he first met him, knew he had insulted him in such way that very few people ever would stand for anybody like that, knew that he was the best man in the country for the position of Secretary of War, but nobody else probably every would have thought of him for that position

because he had had no~~h~~ experience. But he had the qualities needed, and Lincoln put him into it, and Stanton was so surprised at ~~was~~ what he did, and in the course of a month working he ~~learned~~ learned so much about Lincoln's willingness to trust him, and Lincoln's remarkable intelligence, and his unusual personality, that he completely changed his whole attitude. If you just had the two statements about Stanton you'd say, What utter contradiction. One or other of these two men is a liar, but they fit together exactly. And so in the tenth of cases where you can take Biblical statements, and there seems to be a contradiction, it is easy enough to believe that if we knew the whole facts of the matter we would find the inherent contradictions easily explainable, if we knew the full facts of the ~~situation~~ situation. There is some other factor ~~not~~ entering into it that we just don't know about in this particular case. Now it would be perfectly silly if the critics came with a thousand contradictions we couldn't answer, to say, In these thousand contradictions in every case there is some other factor we don't understand. No, their evidence would then be sufficient I would say, to destroy any intelligent person's belief in the Bible. But what I say is, that examining their criticism, ~~examining~~ examining their denials, examining their statements and their alleged contradictions and finding that in 9/10 of them, let's be conservative, let's say 3/4 of them, finding that in 3/4 of them examination of the statement shows that the alleged contradiction is5 $\frac{1}{2}$ with the desire to find contradictions, or a state of lying which is so convinced they are there, it is very easy to see them whether they are there or not. They are actually, if you look at the words as they stand, the contradictions alleged is easily explained by the factors given in the Scripture when you recognize that, you prove that in 3/4 of the cases, then it is only common sense to assume that in the other 1/4 or 1/10, or whatever it is, if we knew the facts there would be a factor which would ~~be~~ explain them. Now this case of Korah was such an exact parallel to the story of Rebecca that we discussed it rather fully of course, but I just wanted to see how many of you had, instead of simply getting facts from me here, have gotten principles. I mean, it is nice to get the facts of what it think of the story of Rebecca, but that's not as thousandth as important as getting the principle ~~involved~~ involved, the exact same principle is here with Korah, so I was interested. Now if some of you didn't recall the story,

that's no criticism as far as this class is concerned, because in this class it is not something that is ~~something~~ assigned. Ordinarily a person would know before they got this far, but there are people who don't, through circumstances for which they are not to blame at all. Therefore I don't think that this paper will make a great difference in your mark for the ~~xxxx~~ semester. That is to say, I'll be greatly pleased with those that I find having the understanding, but I'd like you all to know it, but I will understand if you didn't show it ~~that~~ that there may be reasons why you didn't on this particular page which you will make up by showing it on others on a later paper. But somebody said about Dr. Robert Dick Wilson, that his two great objects in life were to prove that you could trust the Bible and you couldn't trust the criticism. And it is a fact that critical statements, when you examine them, it is not an attack on the integrity of the individuals, but it is a statement that a person that accepts the critical view and writes and works on it, gets into a frame of mind, where he is so convinced that the Bible is ~~xxxxxx~~ full of contradictions that he easily sees them most anywhere, and he naturally makes very strong statements about it. And so it is not criticising their personal ~~integrity~~ integrity to say you can't trust it, not at all. But it is criticising the type of work they are doing, to say that you cannot trust their statements, you must check with the original and see just what the facts are. It is remarkable how often when they claim there is a contradiction, you will find the very next completely solves the contradiction, but of course they say that verse belongs to another document, and therefore is not relevant at all, and there is no real reason for putting it into another document, except their feeling that it doesn't go with this, that removing it creates a contradiction, why it certainly is not a scientific or proper way of dealing with the matters of that type. Student: 9.....

AAM: No, the critics would say it must be two different stories. You have two groups of opposition, it must be two stories, so the Dathan and Abiram group is the JE story, and the Korah group is the P story. They are two distinct stories.....

.....AAM: No, no, I guess I didn't make that clear. The critics say there were two stories. There is a Dathan and Abiram story, there's the Korah story. They are two distinct stories. One is the JE story, one is the P story, combined into one document. Now they say, ~~they~~ take out the Dathan and Abiram story, that is JE,

what you have left is the Korah story. Now they say when you look at the Korah story, you find that it has two strata, that in one of these strata Korah is a Levite opposing the supremacy in the priesthood of the family of Aaron, but in the other of these stories it doesn't say Korah was a Levite, but it says that Korah was ~~is~~ talking about the fact that all the people are holy and opposing Moses' leadership. So there are two strata in the P story so they divide the P story into P1 and P2, distinct stories, but I was pointing out that actually what you have is what you have any time you have opposition to a leader anywhere. You have four or five distinct groups which have different emphases, it may be two it may be four or five, probably there were four or five here, two main ones. Now in this Korah is the agitator, he's the leader. Korah is interested in opposing Moses, and he is interested in opposing Aaron. He may be more interested in one or the other, I don't know which, but when Korah talks to the Levites he stirs them up to oppose the leadership of Aaron. When Korah talks to the Reubenites he stirs them ~~up~~ to oppose the leadership of Moses, and so you have Korah taking two attitudes, just as Rebecca took two attitudes, and he probably was sincere in himself meaning ~~in~~ both attitudes, though he may have been a hundred times more interested in one than in the other, or only twice as much, we don't know, but he was trying to bring these people together to stand unitedly against the leadership of the group, and you will find that ~~in~~ any group, I don't care where it is, I don't care what the group is. If you have a group that is going forward and accomplishing anything in the ~~if~~ world, you have life in ~~that~~ group, and you have groups ~~within~~ the group that are questioning the leadership, and the chances are they are questioning it on different ~~groups~~ grounds, but if their opposition becomes somewhat intense, you will find the different groups getting together, and you will find them encouraging one another in their opposition, even though the basis of the opposition of the different groups to the one who is involved in it. And the Korah story here is simply things that do happen in life, but it is not just a simple ABC as the critics seem to assume a document has to be, and therefore to their viewpoint it is full of contradictions. It is an attitude which is oblivious to what life really is. Now they will say, for instance, in Numbers you have six cities of

refuge. He says there are to be six cities of refuge in the land. In Deuteronomy he says when you go into the land, it contradicts, you are to appoint three cities of refuge. Now they say, What a flat contradiction. In the first place, Numbers says cities of refuge, Deuteronomy just says six cities, how would you change your terminology that much in a few weeks? Well, how would you? I may change it that much in two days in talking about a thing. I'll give the same matter in different terminology, anybody could. But how would you change your terminology that much in a few weeks, and how would you change it so? To say six cities once and three in the other. It is very clear that you have an evolutionary process here, at first you didn't have any asylum, cause you have13 $\frac{1}{2}$, then you establish three cities, then you establish six. There is a development. Well, actually, if you take it the way the Bible stands, numbers says establish six, three this side of the ~~N~~ Jordan, three the other, definitely said. Deuteronomy they've already established three one side of the ~~N~~ Jordan, they ~~has~~ haven't ~~conquered~~ conquered the land on the other. When you conquer that, establish three cities. That's what remains. As it stands in the Bible there is absolutely no contradiction whatever. The language used is different. Numbers is the precise law for the priest's application, Deuteronomy is the exhortation for the people's knowledge, and a man who wouldn't use different language in those ~~two~~ two instances, would not be qualified to be a leader, because the situation called for a different type of ~~wording~~ wording. As it stands in the Bible, it is perfectly reasonable, but the critics say, Look at this, and look at this, ~~and other~~ ^{utter} contradictions, must be two different documents and shows a development. I tried in the early part of this course to give you a very careful and fair picture of the way in ~~which~~ which the criticism developed. Now we are looking at it as a whole, and I hope.... 15....., but the fact is that as you look at the picture as a whole, it has developed into something which is very definitely.....end of P16

P 17

... absolutely unfair, and that's the result that we have to come to..... this is a work in which it is good to deal with people in such a way as to show them that it's ~~utterly~~ ^{other} unfairness. There are [^] instances where you are dealing with

people who are convinced of the fairness of it, and that's not the approach to start with. The approach to start with is more like the approach I have been giving to you to show the fundamental bases of it, that they do not stand, but on the ~~fact~~ fundamental bases of it there has been erected this great mass of unscientific attitudes, and then on the basis of these ~~unscientific~~ unscientific attitudes, the actual thing is largely presented. The real bases on which it was founded are not mentioned so much any more in the apologetic, or if they are, they are sort of ~~buried~~ buried in the mass of all the alleged contradictions, most of which simply disappear as we look at them. Well, I think if you have a student in your church who has gone to a place where a required course in Bible, or an elective course in Bible has been given.....2.....If you can simply get a statement out of the textbook he is using, which on careful examination of the fact is palpably wrong, if you can get two or three like that, and show that to him, you should be able to destroy his confidence in the text book, and in the whole approach. It is not necessary to take up everything, to take up all of it with him, but it is vital for you to have an understanding of it.....2 $\frac{1}{2}$approach. Now we are dealing with the matter of the alleged development within the documents. And, of course, that is to ~~quite~~ quite an extent a matter of the alleged contradictions, but you can take these alleged contradictions, and prove they show development in almost any case, and naturally the more complex which you ~~say~~ would say is, therefore, later, is the law-book for the priests which go into fuller detail. You might take a man who writes an article in the American Medical Journal, on some disease, and the same man writes an article in modern medicine, or in Hygiene, on the same ~~the~~ disease. In one case he writes for the layman, to give them an understanding, in the other case ~~he~~ he writes for the trained medical man to show him these developments. Now you take the two articles, and you will find that one is much simpler than the other. One is couched in simpler language, deals with a few main essentials, leaves aside a certain important, but secondary fact, which the trained expert would say, really make the article hardly competently deal with the subject, but yet which you couldn't go into with the layman because he doesn't have sufficient background. You take the two articles and look at them written by the same man, and you find quite a pro-

nounced difference of style, and you will find that it would be very easy to say, Here is the more simple stage of development, where only a few basic facts about this disease are known. These are presented in a very simple way. Subsequently, very important additional details are discovered, a more complicated attitude is taken ~~for the~~ toward the matter, a different style is used, and ~~then~~ therefore you have a development here. You have this the earlier one, ~~and~~ and this the later one, as a matter of fact in most such cases, you will probably find the order of writing is exactly like the order of the Pentateuch, that the man writes his scientific articles before he writes his popular articles. He probably gets a familiarity with the subject as a whole, and with the major advanced details which he is studying, before he takes up the task of making it understandable to them. Of ~~course~~ course, not so many people have the ability to write the ~~different~~ different types of material, but if you can get a man who has the ability, in writing his material for the layman he will have in mind his more ~~detailed~~ detailed material that he can't put in, and will avoid saying anything which is untrue, which a popular writer who didn't know the whole view would find it very difficult to avoid doing. That's exactly what you have here. You have the priestly legislation giving the full detailed laws so that the priests ~~study~~ study it and apply it as circumstances arise. You have the exhortation to the people taking that which is vital for them to know, and stressing it to them, the priestly legislation tells about the Jubilee once every fifty years, ^{and} when Moses talked in his address in Deuteronomy he never mentioned the Jubilee. Why should he? Fifty years from ~~now~~ now they ~~will~~ may all have forgotten it. He talked to them about the seven year changes which it is vital for them to know about and be prepared for. In the law book which is to be applied from time to time, forty years later as the Jubilee approaches, it is time to start talking about the Jubilee, not at the very beginning. There'd be no harm in mentioning it, but it is not necessary to mention it. It is certainly not necessary to drive it home to the people. And so the documents as they stand ~~will~~ warrant a reasonable book, with many things in it which we don't fully understand because it deals with thousands of matters happening in the course of these many years, and if everything in it were explained it would require a few encyclopedias, rather than a book the size of the....6½....

But it gives that which is vital for us to know, most of its major matters are easily understandable, and with many of its minor matters, we understand enough of that is ~~is~~ value, but ~~often~~ there are often when you look closely at it, other facts that simply weren't given, but the bulk of it is understandable to us, and it is reasonable the way it stands. Now you take that and you break it up into these documents, and you take your narrative, and put it nearly all in the earlier, and you find that what law is in the narrative is mostly comparatively brief, they put into it the law of the covenant, and it is the beginning law, it is the vital fundamental law. It doesn't stress those things which apply particularly to ~~the~~ Canaan which was forty years off, but it stresses things which will apply in all the times and it tells them what kind of altar they are to make. If you make an altar of ~~stone~~ stone, it is to be on hewn stone, if you make an altar of earth it is to be such a way. That gives you your general situation for sacrifices. It is ~~the~~ God's will that his people sacrifice to him. That is vital, at all times. It is laid down at Sinai. It is to be carried on through the wilderness. It is to be carried on in their settled life. It is to be carried on in ~~the~~ when they are under invasion. It is to be carried on when they are off in exile. It is to be carried on wherever they are, or whatever they are doing, they are to have ~~the~~ sacrifice, and general principles for it are laid down. Then in the priestly law they are given ~~the~~ minute details for the carrying on of the regular sacrificial system during the centuries when they are ~~the~~ settled in Canaan. And then in Deuteronomy they are given exhortation for that which the laymen need to know about the carrying on of their settled life in Canaan with special reference to the life in Canaan which they are now about to enter. If circumstances make it impossible to carry out sacrifice in the way prescribed in Deuteronomy and the priestly laws, then they are ^{not} going to say, Oh, now we can't sacrifice. No they are then to say, These things are vital in normal conditions, but you ~~just~~ don't drop sacrifice because you can't do it according to precise regulations. You don't drop it for that. You are in school here, and I say, learn this tomorrow, learn this the next day, learn this next day, come to class at a certain time, take examinations, you have all that, you graduate from school, you say, now we have no assignments, no

examinations, therefore, we don't ~~study~~ study anymore. Well, that's the trouble unfortunately. Many do that. ~~But~~ But if your life of service to the Lord is to be worthwhile, outside of the settled conditions of the school, you won't have prescribed assignments, prescribed class times, prescribed examinations, but you will be carrying on the study according to your own system. And the same applies to sacrifice here, and to all these matters. The general law as given in the Book of the Covenant is applicable to all periods, and all situations. Precise details are given for the period in Canaan, and these details are vital, and God punished them if they ignore them. But when there comes a time of crisis, the land is overrun, the people are in hiding. The people are shut down in certain sections of the land, the people are taking off into exile. That doesn't mean they stop sacrifices. You go on and you worship God the best you can. If you don't worship him according to the full prescriptions, you worship Him according to part of them. But it is far more important to worship Him. Like the professor at Princeton gave a talk in chapel, and he said, he said, speaking the truth in love, the vital thing is you speak it is love. Now, he said, You get too excited. You don't show a loving spirit. You get all excited whether the earth moves around the moon or moves around the sun, or what, and he said, they argue about it and all, the sun and the moon and the stars move along in their orbits, and don't pay the least attention to what you say. And when you got through with it the emphasis was, When you speak the truth, be absolutely sure you are speaking it in love, and if you are not, don't speak it all, since no one of us have perfect love in our heart, that means no one of us will ever speak. So I gave an address when a man was ordained, in which I took the same text, and I reversed it. I said, God said, Speak the truth. He's given us the message. ~~And~~ Go out and speak it. Give the words to people. Point out the condemnation of sin, point out the evil in their life, point out their need of a savior, give the truth! That's what God called us to do. Now, I said, He said to speak the truth in love, and let us pray God to give us a loving spirit. Let us do our best to get a spirit of true love in our heart and in our attitude. We must keep growing and improving in that all our lives, and none of us will reach the stage we would in it. But do not let the fear that you don't have perfect love in your heart cause you to keep quiet and let souls

go to hell because you don't give them the truth. Speak the truth, but speak it in love, but speak the truth. The professor there in the seminary had the emphasis of it completely changed around. And that's exactly what the critics do with this matter of sacrifice. They make it as if, according to Deuteronomy and the priestly law every little detail of this was so tremendously important, it must be carried exactly that way, and that's not the teaching of the Bible. The teaching of the Bible is ~~that~~ ^{the} sacrifice, the great principles are the vital things. Here are the minute ways ~~as~~ of carrying it out best ~~which are given~~ when you are settled in Canaan, and God will punish anyone who does not think it important to try to carry out his prescriptions exactly as He has given them, but when conditions are such these don't apply, then you don't drop the whole institution of them. As Jesus said, The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath, and that ~~is~~ covers all of this. Well, we'll stop here. ~~and~~.....end of class April 19, 1955

Bibliography, PENTATEUCH

NOTE: For reference books related to the text of the Pentateuch, etc., the Bibliography for Advanced Hebrew should be consulted. For reference works in the field of introduction general, the Bibliography for Old Testament Introduction should be consulted. This list consists of books of immediate reference in this course

I. The Pentateuch as a whole:

- Addis, W.E., The Documents of the Hexateuch (1898) --Standard higher critical work following the Wellhausen hypothesis.
- Allis, O.T., The Five Books of Moses (1943) --Standard refutation of Documentary Development hypothesis. Hard to read in spots--much good material.
- Briggs, C.A., The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch, American critic (1897)--chief value of book is that it introduces reader to the views of a wide range of scholarship.
- Bissell, E. C., The Pentateuch, its Origin and Structure, (1885) Older volume presenting general conservative view, hard reading but well up-to-date in the face of recent critical changes.
- Aalders, G.C.H., Short Introduction to the Pentateuch, (1952), Conservative with a tendency to concede things not necessarily conceded (my opinion).
- Carpenter, J. E. & Harford, G., Composition of the Hexateuch (1902) Much like Addis (see above)
- Finn, A. H., The Unity of the Pentateuch, (1926) Conservative work with good style of argumentation but difficult to read because of the absurd manner of printing.
- Green, W. H., Moses and the Prophets, (1882) Other works by same author on other bibliographies. This is a critique of W.R. Smith "The Prophets of Israel". Worthwhile reading.
- Kuenen, A. The Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch, (1886). One of the standard critical works for historical reference.
- Mitchell, H.G. The Word Before Abraham (1901) Higher critic but with a much better grasp of conservative argument than most similar works.
- Porter, J. L., The Pentateuch and the Gospels (1854) An excellent little work showing the veracity of the Pentateuch by the Gospel usage.
- Spiers, W., Age and Authorship of the Pentateuch (n.d.) Popularly written, conservative in force.

- Wiener, H.M., Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism (1909)
---- Pentateuchal Studies (1912)
Written conservatively by a theologically inclined barrister.
Interesting style. (Wiener wrote the articles on the Pentateuch
for ISBE)

II. The Israelitish Economy of Pentateuchal times

- Cheyne, T.K., Traditions and Beliefs of Ancient Israel (1907),
Author a well known higher critic--volume shows how these items
are reflected in the Pentateuch.
- Frazer, J.G., Folk Lord in the Old Testament, (3-vols and a 1-vol
condensation) Compares O.T. tradition(!) with comparative
economies.
- Pederson, Johannes, Israel, Its Life and Culture, (1926) English
edition

(emphasizing the work of Moses)
- Buber, M., Moses: The Revelation and the Covenant, (1944) Inter-
esting presentation with traditional Jewish view mingled
with a type of form criticism.
- Nehf, A., Moses and the Vocation of the Jewish People, (1959-Eng.
edition) A vindication of the "real" Moses.

III. Pentateuch and Archaeology:

- Allbright, W.F., The Archaeology of Palestine, (1932) Other artic-
les by the same author short be watched (read) with interest.
- Kyle, M.G., Moses and the Monuments (1920)
The Problem of the Pentateuch (1920)
Both conservative, scholarly works although the author often
attempts (my opinion) to prove too much from too little.
- Rowley, H.H., From Joseph to Joshua (1950) Excursions to determine
source of Israelitish faith and practice.

IV. Detailed Studies:

- Green, W. H., The Unity of the Book of Genesis (1895), still
valuable today.
- Bunkel, J.F.Hl., What remains of the O.T. (1928) Oral traditionist
and author of valuable commentary on Genesis.
- Harper, W.R., The Priestly Element in the Old Testament, (1905),
all the intrigue of P and the critical conclusions. Author
not sound on basic principles in Pentateuch

- Jack, J.W., The Date of the Exodus, (1925) Argument for the early date based on internal evidence from the Pentateuch
- Welch, A.C. The Code of Deuteronomy, (1924)
Deuteronomy, the framework to the Code (1932)
The Work of the Chronicler, (1938)
Thorough critic, of interest in this course because of his revision of previous agreement on Deuteronomy.

V. General Information

- Robinson, H.W., ec. Record and Revelation, (1938) Publication of Society for Old Testament Study)
- Rowley, H.H., ed. The Old Testament and Modern Study (1952)
This and the previous volume are collections of essays largely by liberal scholars and of general interest in Old Testament study.
- Urguhardt, The Bible, Its Structure and Purpose, n.d., five volumes on the Pentateuch, of general interest.

(Biographical nature)

- Cheyne, T.K. Founders of Old Testament Criticism, 3-vols. (1893)
interesting sketches of liberals and conservatives alike.
(Note for interest his article on Sayce)
- Duff, A. History of Old Testament Criticism, (1910), In reality, a sketch of Pentateuchal criticism, easy to read.

VI. Commentaries

In general the commentaries of Keil and Delitsch present a unified picture from conservative viewpoint. Those in the Westminster series a unified viewpoint from critical view. Best known of these is that of Driver on Genesis (14th ed. 1943)

Of special interest: Pentateuch and Raschi's Commentary, Am M. Silberman, ed., (1946) Hard to read (thin paper) interesting Mediaeval Jewish data.

- Driver, S. R., An Introduction to the Literature of the O. T. Edinburg 1913
Released as a Meridian Book, 1956. 9th edition
- Addis, W. E., The Documents of the Hexateuch. London Vol. I 1892. Vol. II, 1898
- Carpenter & Harford, The Composition of the Hexateuch. London & New York 1902
- Hastings Dictionary of the Bible. New York, 1903. "Genesis", H. E. Ryle
- Skinner, John, Genesis in the ICC. New York 1925
- Brightman, Edgar S., The Sources of The Hexateuch. Abingdon Press. New York, 1918
- Pfeiffer, Robert H., Introduction to the Old Testament. Harper & Bros. New York, 1948
- Bewer, J. A., The Literature of the Old Testament in its Historical Development.
Revised ed. New York, 1948. (2nd ed, 1933) 3rd edition revised & enlarged by
Emil G. Kraeling, New York. Columbia University Press, 1962
- Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1962. "Genesis" by
S. H. Hooke
- Speiser, E. A., Genesis (The Anchor Bible Series) New York, 1964
- Harrelson, Walter, Interpreting the O.T. New York. 1964 (Holt, Reinhart & Winston)
- Anderson, B.W., Understanding the Old Testament. Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1957, 1966
- Eissfeldt, Otto, The Old Testament - An Introduction (Eng. trans. by Peter R.
Ackroyd) Harper & Row, New York. 1965
- Weiser, Artur, The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development (text is that of the
Fourth edition, 1957 with some minor revisions by the author) 1961
- Kuhl, Curt, The Old Testament - Its Origins and Composition (Eng. trans by C. T. M.
Herriott) John Knox Press, Richmond, Va.) 1953, 1961, 1962
- Von Rad, Gerhard, Genesis. Trans by John H. Marks. Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1961
- Simpson, C. A., The Early Traditions of Israel (Basil Blackwell: Oxford) 1948
- Holzinger, H., Genesis in Kurzer Hand-Commentur zum Alten Testament. Herausgegeben,
von D. Karl Marti, 1898.
- Fohrer, G., Einleitung in Das Alte Testament. Heidelberg, 1965
- Noth, Martin, Überlieferungsgeschichte Des Pentateuch. Stuttgart. 1948

Brown, Jerry Wayne, The Rise of Biblical Criticism in America, 1800-1870 The
New England Scholars (Wesleyan University Press, Middletown,
Connecticut) 1969 \$10.00