...a few remarks I want to make about the precedure I want to include in the outline, so this course then, Introduction to the Pentateuch, will have as I, Introductory, and under that, A, The Importance of the Subject. D. L. Moody once is said to have made the statement that early in his ministry he found that everyone to whom he spoke knew that they ought to be saved. They said yes we have never accepted the Lord though we know we should. The Bible says this and we know it is true, we ought to do it. He would quote a verse from the Bible, that settled it, that's what the Bible said, it was a matter of whether they were willing to do what they knew was right. But he said that toward the end of his ministry he noticed a change, he noticed more and more that when he presented the Bible's teachings, people said, yes, but how do we know this is true, how do we know that this is the word of God? There was a spreading doubt about the dependability of the Word of God, about the fact that what it says is true. Now there are various problems which have contributed to this change of attitude throughout so much of our world. But no one of them has been more important, (1 3/4) as important as the effect of the higher criticism. Three hundred years ago the people believed the Bible was true or they believed it was false, but in the last 300 years there has sprung up a method of approach to the Bible which is superficially called the higher criticism. There is no harm in using that for a name, though it is not a strictly accurate title for it, but it is an approach, a study, a criticism--there is nothing wrong with the word criticism of the Bible, and there is nothing wrong with the word "higher criticism" because higher criticism means the criticism that is not dealing simply with the minutia, to know what the text exactly is and what it means, but to know where it came from, who wrote it, when it was written and how dependable it is. There is nothing wrong with higher criticism, but higher criticism during the last 200 years has swung very strongly against belief in the ~~sys~~ Scriptures. And brought forward an approach to the Scripture which was previously unknown. This approach has resulted in an idea that the books of the Old Testament were mostly written by many writers, instead of by the ones whose

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/61-62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

names they bear, written at many different periods and in sections of different periods. For instance Gen. 1 might be written at 600 or 500 B.C., and Gen.2, perhaps, 400 years earlier. And that the book, or different verses, or even parts of verses were written in widely differing periods, and then were brought together later by ~~editing and~~ editors or redactors, into the volumes as we have them today. And this idea has come to be accepted by most scholars, in nearly every university in the world where anything is taught about the Bible, today the higher criticism is taught. And nearly every theological seminary that is over 25 years old, this higher criticism is taught. I was at a student conference in Canada where there were students from all over the United States, and I gave them, I was to give some lectures so I gave out a questionnaire, to find out what they knew, what their background was, and I asked "have you been bothered ~~about~~ by questions about the higher criticism, and I found that out of nearly 150 students there were not over 5 or 6 who said yes. The rest never heard of it. But as we went on in our discussion I found that, though they hadn't heard the name "higher criticism" their viewpoint had been affected by it, at point after point they had ideas in their mind which are the result of the development of the higher criticism, which were taught in classes in English, in Literature, in History, in various other subjects, because the teachers in these lines to a very great extent, go to the recognized Old Testament scholars to get their answers to these problems. And this higher criticism has been applied to Old Testament and also to the New Testament, and today there is hardly a question, hardly a page of the Bible you can take up but what you will find books written which divide it up into sections, and analyze when this part was written, and when that part was written, and when the other part was written, and how they came together by a natural process, which leaves God altogether out of ~~the~~ account. So the higher criticism is one of the most effective forces in our world today, and it is something which you may meet many people who know nothing of it by name, but you will meet few people who have not been affected by it to some extent. And if you become the pastor of a fine Christian church somewhere and your people are all very godly people,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

perhaps people who don't know a great deal, haven't a great deal of education, but good Christian people, if they are they will go ahead economically, you will find. And before you have been there very long you will find that some of them are sending their children to secular colleges, and before very long you will find that these young folks are coming home with questions about the Bible that their parents are unable to answer, and if you can't answer them you will lose these young people, from your church. I have run onto many pastors who have been in exactly that situation. Taking a church which seemed so absolutely devoted to the Scripture without a trace of unbelief in it, but soon find that, as the young people go out to college, they have these questions, and these doubts, about the Scripture, about which they have to have an answer to, or else they soon get the attitude well these people are just old fogies in the church there, they don't know anything about modern thought. Now that is true of, I should say, about every page of the Bible, that this has been done to a greater or less extent. There are two different areas in which people's faith has been undermined, in the Bible, one is particularly in the historicity of the facts, and most especially in the early chapters of Genesis. Now that is discussed in the course in Old Testament History, which goes into those problems rather fully. We do not touch upon those problems in this course, but the other problem which also is very important and perhaps more pervasive than that one, is the matter of the documentary criticism. The question of whether these books are (7 1/4) written under the inspiration of God's Spirit, by the men whose names they bear, some of them of course bear no names, but written as unifed books containing the truth of the things with which they deal, and dealing with many matters which are direct communication from God to them, or whether they are the result of people thinking along different lines, brought together more or less in an accidental sort of fashion. Now if we were to take up the whole of the Bible and to look at every page of it, and to see the evidences , pro and con, we could easily spend every bit of our three years on it. But we do not feel that that is necessary. We do feel that it is vital to take one section where this approach mainly

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

began, and the section which is the place where people begin to accept this approach, as a rule, and to take that section and really learn to understand it. To learn how the higher criticism of the Pentateuch developed is a standard example of the methods of the higher criticism, but more than that, it is the place where it began, and having become convinced that it is valid there, scholars then extended it to every other book of the Bible. That is where it began. That is one of the prime examples of its method, if it is valid there, if it works there, it is reasonable to think it will work in other places.

On the other hand if you can find that the methods used are erroneous there, then we will find that we have little reason to worry about them in most other places. A little tiny smattering of the arguments of the whole Old Testament would not be a fraction as helpful to you, as a thorough understanding of just what the higher criticism of the Pentateuch means, and upon what bases it rests. Now there are fine Christian schools in which the people know nothing about the higher criticism except to have it occasionally sneered at and ridiculed, and students go out and talk to other ~~students~~ persons who already are of the same view as they are, and they sneer at and ridicule the higher criticism. It is easy to do that, but it is easy to ridicule anything. People ridicule our Christian faith and it is not difficult to do. You can take ignorant people and you can ~~take~~ increase their loyalty and their support of you by that sort of an approach, but if you are going to be effective working for Christ in these days, you're going to have to deal with young people who go to college or theological seminaries, you're going to have to deal with people of intelligence who read magazines and books today, and see the ideas there and who will not be satisfied with simply brushing it aside with a word of ridicule. And when you meet these people, if you get the value you should out of this course, you will have a tremendous advantage. You will have an advantage not only because you know what it is they're talking about, but because you will know the bases of it better than they will, and that will give you a tremendous advantage. The higher criticism is a growth.

It is a theory that today is taught in practically every theological seminary over

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

30 years of age. And in practically every university in the world where anything is taught about the Bible, if ~~is~~ these theories today, that are today taught, would have been advanced 100 years ago, people would have just put them aside and ~~payed~~ paid no attention to them. It would have been too big a ~~job~~ jump from the view they held to these views. But it gradually developed by the presentation of evidence which seemed to people absolutely unanswerable. I think one of the saddest stories I ever heard is the story of Franz Delitsch in Germany. Franz Delitszch was a great lover of the Bible, he translated the New Testament into Hebrew for Jewish evangelism purposes. He was a very, very ardent, intelligent fine Christian man, but Franz Delitszch, Friedrich, lost his faith. Friedrich became one of the great founders of Assyriology. But Friedrich became convinced of the high criticism and wrote books and articles to prove that the Pentateuch was made up of different divisions, different sections from different times. And his father couldn't bear the thought of such an idea. To him the five books of Moses were a sacred work that had been given him by revelation of God, they were so sacred, he loved to study them, to try to figure out what they meant, to apply them to our Christian lives, but to examine them in the way that his son was doing seemed to him terrible. In fact, when he finally felt he had to make a study of them from that viewpoint he told someone he felt as if he were starting to dissect his grandmother's body, that's the way he felt, taking up what was so sacred and examining it from the viewpoint of the higher critics. But as he examined, he found himself unable to answer the argument, and the result was, being a man of great honesty and great integrity, that Franz Delitsch said, these arguments I cannot answer, they must be true, and he changed the last editions of his commentary on the Pentateuch to be in accord with the main position of the higher critics. And he did the same with his commentary on Isaiah. The commentary still contains great amounts of fine Christian study, very valuable, but he was simply unable to answer this and gave in to it, being a man of great honesty and of great integrity. Yes? (J.Gueiros: Dr. MacRae, would it be interesting to made distinction right here between a destructive higher

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

criticism, and a constructive higher criticism?) // Yes, well, we will do that. Thank you for the suggestion, Mr. Gueiros. I did say a word a few minutes ago that higher criticism is simply the study to see what the facts are as to origin, there is nothing wrong with higher criticism. But I wanted to speak about the way that most of the higher criticism had moved, and so when we call it higher criticism we are using the term rather // superficially, but the greater part of the higher criticism today has moved in that direction, ~~destructive~~ is what its result has been, and...

P.2 (3/4)

...of the higher criticism of the Pentateuch. Sixty years ago--even forty years agoo--you go into most any theological seminary, and you would find the students all agog, is this true, or isn't it true? Was the Pentateuch written by Moses or is it made up of sections written by different people at different times. The professors in those seminaries today are convinced of the higher criticism, and the students who go there are mostly convinced of it, or at least are ready to take what the professors say, and there is no great argument about it. And the result is that you take any student from a present-day liberal seminary, or who has studied religion in a university today, and he is convinced of the higher criticism, but he is largely convinced of it because his professor told him of it. He is convinced of it because he is given a few arguments for it, which seem very strong to him, and he has assumed that is correct, he has not gone into it very much. And if you simply come along with some ridicule, he puts you down as an ignoramus and that is all there is to it, but if you know more about the real basis on which it rests and the arguments ~~on~~ which were advanced a hundred years ago, which carried the day for it, if you know more about it than he does, and then you can go on and show that, though they have much in it that's very strong, yet there are very great weaknesses in it, and to show what those weaknesses are, and to show some of the newer recent developments, that are not usually taken into account by those who are convinced of the higher criticism, you have a tremendous advantage in dealing with it.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

So I feel that, rather than give you a little bit about all the books of the Old Testament to show that they are dependable, if you can take this one vital section , the Pentateuch, and can see how during the last 200 years the higher criticism went through these different steps and (2 1/2) , see the views that were held in one period or another, how they gradually changed and what the arguments were on which they changed, see the basis on which the whole thing rests as it is taught today, if you can get an understanding of it, you have something which will be of tremendous value to you in your Christian service. It may be of great value to you now as you deal with individuals, or you may have very little use for it for three or four years, but I'll guarantee you, if you get a real knowledge, that within the next ten years there will be many times when you will find this tremendously valuable, to have not just a superficial knowledge of it, but to have a really good understanding of what the destructive higher criticism of the Pentateuch is, how it has developed, and why it is wrong.

Now this is a matter which we could spend courses on, and we feel that our primary task in the seminary is to give you a foundation of understanding of the Bible, a foundation in methods of doing Christian work, that you can go out and serve the Lord effectively, and we confine ourselves on the higher criticism of the Pentateuch to this one course. Therefore, in this course, it is very important that we get a very clear understanding of its main points, that we get a very clear understanding of these, that we get its principal features solidly in mind, so that you will have them when you need them, even if it be five or six years from now, and I think it is helpful that you realize that this is not a straw man, some kind of a fool idea that a few people hold, but that this is a theory built up as a result of very brilliant minds, examining a large mass of data, and coming to certain conclusions of which they are thoroughly convinced, and that while they are wrong in their conclusions , you can deal with them much more satisfactorily if you realize the force of the arguments with which they deal and realize the strength of certain aspects of the data that they have and the importance of certain other data that they are apt to overlook

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

that offset those data which at first sight look in the direction in which they would argue. To get an understanding of just what it is and how important it is, and why it is wrong, would be worth a great deal more time than one course, but it is very, very important, and therefore, this is a course in which I feel you must stay right on top of the course right from the beginning. We must hold the course thoroughly in mind. This is not like the course last semester: Old Testament Introduction.

There we dealt with separate sections, and each section was more of a unit by itself, and some of those sections were very important, but you could know all about this section and nothing about that one, and we could know all about that one, and nothing about that one. Each section was a more or less watertight compartment, though there was some overlapping. And we dealt with the critical theory of the canon at considerable length and I hope you know the answer to that, because that is a matter which may become tremendously important at any particular time. At present it is not under much discussion and it might be many years before it comes to a great deal of attention. Whereas this is a matter which will hit you in the face whenever you're dealing with people with any modernist background at all. Or whenever you read magazine articles by anyone who has done any work in the study of religion other than from a fundamental viewpoint, and this is a matter in which each sections builds on the section before. It is more like Hebrew in that regard. If you don't get the first ones, the second ones will be meaningless to you. And if you don't get the second ones, the third ones will be meaningless to you. It builds right along in sections. In the last semester, I tried to be very generous in allowing people to be late with papers if they were in beginning Hebrew and beginning Greek last semester. This semester each part builds on the part before so we cannot get behind at all. We must keep up to date, we must be present, we must be on time, because we have too much material to cover to waste time repeating things that someone misses through not being here for the first two or three minutes, and if you don't get the discussion of the first few minutes you may not have the background for the rest of it.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

I'm going to assign seats in this course, so that I can take the roll as I did last semester and know whether you miss any particular time. If you miss many, it simply will be very difficult to make them up. This course builds, each step on the step before, and it is tremendously vital material. Some of it is difficult to understand, I think I can make it clear so that anyone can understand it, but I can't do that if you're not present to listen to it, and paying close attention as to what I give you about it. So we are going to assign seats in this class so that we can easily take the roll and be sure that everybody is here. And we are going to give a very sizeable number of quizzes as a little extra incentive to keep up with the material that is given in class. It is a 2-unit course but we are meeting three hours. But of these three hours, on Monday and on Thursday, we will always have a little quiz in the last part of the hour. Now sometimes, rarely, that might be as short as five or ten minutes, it will never run more than half an hour. That is rarely. I might once in a while give a whole hour, but it will be rare. But we want to give you this incentive to keep up with it, because each week builds on the week before, and these quizzes will always included what has been covered in that day's lecture. I don't want you to be wondering about reviewing the day before while we're covering that day's lecture. That day will always be included in the quiz. So much then on A, the Importance of the subject.

B, The Importance of the Pentateuch. This --#1, Place in the Old Testament.

The Pentateuch, as you all know, I believe, is a Greek word, which means five-fold. The Pentateuch is the five-fold book. It is the five sections that make up one production. Just like the Pentagon is the five-sided building. Now this book is divided into five parts. The critics no longer talk of ~~that~~ a pentateuch, they talk of a hexateuch, they combine Joshua with it, and then divide it up the way they do the rest. But we call it the Pentateuch The Five Books of Moses is perhaps a better way to call it. It is the beginning of the Scripture and everything else in the Old Testament looks back to it, the Jews very properly gave it a place of preeminence, in their synagogue and in their study. These five books of Moses are the foundation to this day. The Jews always read from the Pentateuch in their

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

services. They read from other books, skipping through different sections, but they go straight through the Pentateuch. It is the foundation of the Old Testament, it is the law upon which the rest of the Old Testament stands. The Pentateuch has its place in the Old Testament, it has its place in the Bible, of similar importance. When Jesus argued with the Sadducees, instead of taking arguments that would have been clear and easily given from later parts of the Bible, he gave arguments from the Pentateuch that were a little more complicated. And the reason was not that he didn't think they believed the rest, but that they realized the primacy, the solid foundational nature of the Pentateuch, and therefore he rested His argument on immortality, not simply on the resurrection, not simply on the clearer statements in the last part of the Old Testament, but on the statement about God being the God of Abraham right there in the Pentateuch.

The Pentateuch is foundational to the main principles throughout the Bible. They rest back into the Pentateuch, they are introduced there, they have their start there, and they develop from that, and if you can blast the Pentateuch into a thousand pieces, you have disrupted the foundation for the rest of the Old Testament, and of course the New Testament claims throughout to be based upon the Old. The apostles are constantly saying this is what the prophet says, this is what Moses says, this is what the Old Testament teaches, they are building upon the Old Testament. And in the Old Testament the Pentateuch is primary, so that the Pentateuch has a place in the Old Testament, and a place in the Bible which gives it a very special importance, we study its contents to some extent in the course in Old Testament History. We are not interested in this course particularly in its content, except as they enter into the questions of the higher criticism. And the higher criticism deals with authorship, though not exclusively with authorship, so C, The Importance of the Authorship of the Pentateuch. Now who wrote the Pentateuch?

Well, you might say, what difference does it make who wrote it, God gave it to us, it is God's revelation, and if we accept it as true, as what it says as correct and to be believed, what difference who wrote it? Well, the higher critics do not accept it as

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

true, they do not accept it that we can believe it, because they believe it represents human ideas at many different periods, combined together into one rather heterogeneous collection. But it is important that we believe ~~that is authored~~ in its authorship. It might not be, if we believe it's true, what difference does it make? Who wrote the book of I Kings, who wrote 2 Kings? Who wrote 2 Samuel? How many here think Samuel wrote 2 Samuel? Nobody. I'm glad there is nobody because it all deals with events after his death, during the time of David, so I think it is perfectly obvious Samuel did not write the account of events after his death. It's a crazy title for it, 2 Samuel, a book about David's reign. It's a crazy title, it doesn't mean he wrote it, he has nothing to do with it. We believe 2 Samuel is true but we don't know who wrote it, and it doesn't matter. Who wrote the book of Hebrews? ~~But~~ Nobody knows, but God gave it to us. It is God's production, the Holy Spirit led him, and that is...

P.3. (3/4)

...all who accept the higher criticism believe that at least portions of the Pentateuch are entirely contrary to fact, and that some of them believe that most of it is simply mythology and legend, I would say. There is a trend back to accepting the main historical facts, different from 40 years ago, because 40 years the effects of archeology had not been felt to the extent it has today, and 40 years ago it was comparatively rare to believe even existed, or to know practically anything about Moses. I heard a professor at the University of Pennsylvania quite recently speaking very, very highly of Moses as a great founder of the nation. He believed thoroughly in the greatness of the man, but he says the only thing he did was to found a nation. He says that is enough greatness for any man. He says he didn't make laws, he organized a committee that gathered together some laws from some other nations, put them together and made a rather poor combination of laws. ~~An~~ But he believed much more about Moses than most of the higher critics would have 50 years ago. So we'll look into it step by step and see how much we can see.

But right at the moment I'm asking this question, does it matter who wrote the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Pentateuch? Well, it wouldn't if God didn't tell us. If we believed it true, that's all that matters, yes. But if it is true, then its particular statements are true, and in Exodus 17 we find a definite statement, in the book of Exodus, in ~~verse~~ chapter 17, verse 14, we read: And the Lord said write this for a memorial in the book, our English version says, in a book, the Hebrew says, in the book. Write this for a memorial in the book and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua. There Moses is commanded to write the account of the event that has just occurred in the previous verses. Now that is a claim that Moses wrote that much at least down. Ex.17.14.

Now in Ex.24 we find in verse 4 that we read, and Moses wrote all the words of the Law, and rose up early in the morning and built an altar under the hill. And then, verse 7, we read and he took the book of the covenant and read in the audience of the people, and they said all that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient. What is the book of the covenant? That is Ex.20-23. And we will refer dozens of times to ~~that this semester~~ the book of the covenant, (Ex.20-23). Now it says here that Moses wrote this ~~book, wrote~~ all the words of the Law, and it says in verse 7 that he took the book of the covenant, and redd in the audience of the people, and they said, all that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient. So ~~here we have~~ these two passages in Exodus, ~~which~~ claim that Moses did some writing. ~~And then~~ In Numbers 33:2, we read: And Moses wrote their goings out according to their journeys by the commandment of the Lord. Then ~~we have an~~ account of the various places that the Israelites visited on their travels through the wilderness. ~~And Moses wrote~~ their goings out ~~according~~ to their journeys, ~~by~~ the commandment ~~of the Lord~~. Then ~~we go to Deuteronomy~~, and in Deut.31 we ~~have a statement~~, Deut.31.9-12, ~~and~~ Moses wrote this law and delivered it unto the priest the sons of Levi, which bear the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord unto all the elders of Israel. And verse 11 says, that Moses commanded them ... when all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God in the place which he shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing. Gather the people together, that they hear, and that they may learn, and fear the Lord

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

your God and observe to do all the words of this law. Deut.31.9-12 says that Moses wrote this law, and commanded it be read to all the people, and read in subsequent years to them. Does that claim the whole Pentateuch was written by Moses, or does it just mean the book of Deuteronomy? Well, it is pretty hard to think of it as being less than the book of Deuteronomy, at any rate. In this same chapter, in verses 24-26 we read, And it came to pass when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in the book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites to bear the Ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, take this book of the Law, and put it by the side of the Ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee. Deut.31.9-12 and vv. 24-26, say that Moses wrote the book of the Law of God and commanded it kept by the Ark. Was this the book of Deut. or was it the whole Pentateuch? At any rate the claim is made that Moses wrote a very substantial amount of material to be kept by the Ark. We are also told in the passages we notice in Exodus and in Numbers, that he was told to write certain things and put them in the book. We do not have a definite statement in any of the first four books that Moses wrote this book in its entirety. We don't have such a statement in there.

So under Internal Evidence is a, Direct Statements of Authorship, which I have read to you. Small b, The Pentateuch claims to contain information that came through Moses. You'll find repeatedly in various books of the Pentateuch, that the Lord spoke to Moses, saying. You find this statement over and over. While the statements that Moses actually wrote are comparatively few, yet there are a considerable number of them, as I have read to you. But the statements that God spoke to Moses are numerous, and there is nothing in the last four books of the Pentateuch which is not connected with a situation where Moses was present, and would have personal knowledge of it, according to the account the way that it stands. Now somebody may say, well, what about Genesis? Does Genesis anywhere say it was written by Moses? No, it does not. There is no statement in Genesis that it was written by Moses. Well, then, maybe were the last four books written by Moses

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

and not Genesis? Well, that might be a question that you would find it interesting to try to figure out, but it would be a theoretical question, not a practical question, Because there is nobody that I know who believes it. The higher critics, for instance, who divide it up into sections believe that certain parts of Genesis and certain parts of the other books go together, were written by the same individual. The believe there were many points where you have close contact between certain sections ~~suggested~~, and certain sections of the other books. Genesis is an introduction to the other four books, telling the history of God's dealing with mankind for that time. If we believe that Moses wrote the other books it would be quite natural for us to think of it as at least highly probable that he wrote the first book also. That is as far as we need to go at this point on that. The internal evidence ~~then~~ is very strong that Deuteronomy claims to be written by him. It's definite that parts of Exodus and Numbers claim to be written by him. It's clear that Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy all claim to contain great sections which it says the Lord spoke to Moses, And that everything in these four books, at least after the very ~~beginning things~~ of Exodus , which would be before he was born, everything else is something ~~where~~ Moses was specifically and directly connected ~~with it~~, and it is not at all unnatural, though not required by any specific statement in the Pentateuch, to believe that Moses also wrote Genesis and prefaced this to the rest. Well, ~~now~~, just a side there, ~~just a second~~, as to what we mean by Mosaic authorship. Does that mean Moses wrote every single word of these? Personally, I think he did. But I would not ~~make that a point~~ to argue about. No, I shouldn't have said I think he ~~did~~. There are one or two cases where ~~it names~~ a town, ~~which~~ gives ~~it~~ a name which was used later on, ~~and~~ my guess is that Moses used the name ~~of~~ the town in his time and that later on somebody put in the name ~~of~~ the place ~~that everybody knew that place as~~. For instance, if you would read that somebody came to New Amsterdam 1650, ~~well~~ you're writing an account, ~~of it~~, you might say he came to New York, It wasn't New York then, but the place we call New York is the place to which he came. There are probably--I don't mean to be dogmatic on it, I say there are probably--

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

places where certain names may have been changed later so they would be intelligible to people using the later names. Now personally, I have no difficulty in believing that God may have led Moses to write the account of his death, just before it happened. I don't see any difficulty in believing ~~that prophecy~~ that Moses may have written the last half of the last chapter of Deuteronomy, telling how he went up in the mountains and died. God told Moses what was going to happen, ~~he~~ and might have had him write it in the book before he went up there and (11 1/4) That's possible, Most people say, no, ~~they~~ think that Joshua added that after ~~he~~ went. Well, it doesn't matter, it doesn't affect the authorship of ~~it.~~ Moses can be author of the book and there can be small changes made in it later on by others who also ~~were~~ under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and kept from error. We believe that the Pentateuch, as it was in the original manuscript, ~~that the Pentateuch~~ was inspired of God and free from error, ~~that we believe~~. And if ~~there are~~ sections ~~that~~ were put in by other people than Moses, we believe they were also put in under His grace (12 1/4) . That is not our question in this course. Our big question is the authorship of ~~it~~ as a whole. I incline to think practically ~~thing~~ every in it, maybe even every word, is what Moses wrote. Now if somebody wants to ~~say I~~ think that when it says that "Moses was the meekest man on earth," ~~I think~~ Moses would have been terribly conceited if he wrote ~~that~~, I think that Aaron ~~put that in,~~ or Joshua put ~~that~~ ~~it~~ in later. I say, "if you want to think so, I don't object to your thinking it, so long as God inspired the man who put it in". Personally, I think Moses put it in, because I think in the light of the context, he was amazed at the meekness that he had shown in the situation. I don't think anybody else would show such meekness ~~in that situation,~~ when ~~these~~ people were criticizing his wife the way they did, And he sat back and left it in the Lord's hands and the Lord took care of it entirely, without Moses lifting a finger. And Moses was amazed and ~~he~~ wrote, Moses was the meekest man on earth. And I think he was. ~~But I don't think~~ if you want to ~~think as~~ Professor ~~Aldrich~~ of the Free University ~~of~~ Amsterdam ~~says~~ he says, Moses never could have written that, somebody

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

else put it in, must have I don't object, ~~if you think somebody else wrote it. I don't. I think Moses~~ though I do not agree. But ~~did.~~ But that's not our point. Our point is that the authorship of the book, ~~that~~ of most of what is in it, I would say of practically everything, but if you ~~want~~ present of the bulk of ~~(13 1/2)~~ it came from Moses, and that the whole thing is true and describes events and gives ideas that God wants us to have. ~~Mr. Gregory? (13 3/4)~~ ...

P.4. (3/4)

~~...(stu) Well that's a matter for professors to write. I'd be glad to tell you privately what I think about it, I don't think we'd better take the time of the class now.~~ Here and ~~But~~ I would say that the Pentateuch, as it was in the original manuscript and substantially as it was in the time of Ezra, and almost as it is today, ~~there are~~ contains a few minor errors of copying, but except for that I would say that it is true and it God's Word and this entirely dependable, that I know. ~~Well, now I don't want to get into other views, we have so much to cover this morning, I'd rather talk individually about (1 1/2)~~ questions in ~~other fields~~. We have much ground to cover, if there is something I haven't made clear let's take a minute for it. Mr. Abbott? (1 3/4) ~~(stu:~~ asks: "I- the title of this section is The Importance of the Authorship of the Pentateuch, Now that you've given all this, could you state it in a sentence?) The importance of the authorship of the Pentateuch, I just took a minute or two to discuss what I meant by authorship but I didn't necessarily mean Moses wrote every single word, though I don't see any reason why he shouldn't have written practically every word. ~~But the importance of~~ the authorship is #1 Internal Evidence; a, direct statements of authorship; b, ~~the~~ it claims to contain information that came through Moses. Then 2, The Attitude of the Lord Jesus Christ, ~~and~~ This is of tremendous importance. I really question whether many people realize just what the attitude of the Lord Jesus Christ was. Because if they did they would feel that the very basis of our Christian religion is at stake in this question of whether Moses wrote the Pentateuch or not. In Matthew 8.4, Jesus said, go thy way, show thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded. Did Jesus Christ know that this thing that the Jews thought

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

came from Moses came from an unknown writer of a thousand years after the time of Moses? Did He know that and still say the gift that Moses commanded? Certainly He implied that Moses had actually commanded that this be done. Mat.19.7-8: they say unto him why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement and to put it away? Jesus said unto them, the reason that that's contained in the book of your law is because of the hardness of your heart. He could have said that and that would've sidestepped the question of who wrote it, but He did no sidestepping. Jesus said, in verse 8, Moses, because of the hardness of your heart, suffered you to put away your wives, but from the beginning it was not so. In other words, he applied it to Moses specifically as having done it. Some people say oh, that's just a term for Law, they say Moses did it, they mean it is written in the Law. Well, we don't use term for Law that way; we don't say for Law that's written last year, "Blackstone commanded," or "King George commanded," we don't do that, and it is ridiculous to say that that's what the Lord did. He certainly thought that Moses had commanded when he made that statement. Look at Mark 12.19-26, which

The Sadducees are asking Him a question, I referred to a few minutes ago, about the Resurrection. ~~And~~ Jesus said, in verse 26, as touching the dead that they rise, have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the ~~book~~ bush God spake unto him saying. Now He could have said, have you not read in the book of Exodus, how in the bush God spoke to Moses saying." Then it would say nothing about who wrote it, and nobody would be excited about it. He wouldn't be saying they were wrong, He just wouldn't be discussing the question. But when Jesus said, "have ye not read in the Book of Moses," He was saying, "This is the book of Moses." In Mark 7.10 there is another reference to what Moses commanded, There are many such, I will not try to give you nearly all of them, But I want to give you a few outstanding ones. "But Moses said, honor thy father and thy mother." ~~Did Moses say that,~~ That is in the Ten Commandments, God said it. Why did He say Moses said it? Well, it means that Moses wrote it in a book in which ~~it is given~~ he says that God said this. Luke 16 is a very interesting chapter. ~~Luke 16.29-31. In Luke 16~~ verses 29-31 we read about Lazarus who had

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

gone to Abraham's bosom, and the Rich Man, in his torment, and he asked that he be allowed to go and tell his brother, and Jesus said: "Abraham saith unto him, they have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them." Why didn't he say, "they have the books of the Law and the Prophets"? That wouldn't imply who wrote it. "He said, they have Moses and the Prophets, and he said, nay, father Abraham, but if one went unto them from the dead they will repent, and he said unto them: if they hear not Moses and the Prophtets, neither will they be persuaded thought one arose from the dead." Jesus explicitly said that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. He put the seal of His authority upon this fact, and so it is not merely the question at stake as to whether the Pentateuch is written by Moses, but it is at stake whether Jesus Christ is the Lord of Glory or is not. If He were the Lord of Glory and knew that it was an old superstition that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, which wasn't true, but it was a good book and worth their reading, He could have easily side-stepped the question, but he explicitly time after time set His statement upon it that Moses wrote it. John 5.45-47 is a very good illustration: "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father, there is one that accuses you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me, but if ye believed not his writings, how shall ye believe my word?" How could Jesus say that if he knew that Moses never had written it at all? And many of the higher critics have believed that Moses never wrote anything. They used to even believe writing was unknown at that time. Now of course that is quite given up now because we have much writing from before the time of Moses. "If ye do not believe his writing, how shall they believe my word?" The attitude of the Lord Jesus Christ is very clear on this point. And therefore we can't say: "well, let's believe in Christ, be safe in Him, but what difference does it make who wrote the Pentateuch?" If Jesus didn't know what He was talking about, how can we be safe through believing in Him? The foundation of our religion is at stake in the question of whether Moses wrote the Pentateuch. Now I don't mean we should go out to the unbeliever and try to convince him Moses wrote the Pentateuch, as a way of bringing him to the Lord.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

A man needs to see himself as a sinner and ~~he needs~~ to see Jesus Christ as the all-sufficient Saviour to be saved, not to be convinced of the authorship of the Pentateuch. But after a man becomes a Christian then he needs to know ~~what are the places~~ where ~~he~~ to get his knowledge of Christian ~~things~~ beliefs. And if he is a Christian he will want to follow the Lord Jesus Christ and ~~he~~ will know this fact, that Moses wrote the Pentateuch because Jesus explicitly set the seal of His approval upon it. ~~Now of course, as~~ So we will see more and more as we go on, it isn't just ~~the~~ that question who wrote the Pentateuch, but is the Pentateuch true? You cannot hold the higher criticism and believe that the Pentateuch is true, you can't do that. But it centers around this question of the authorship. Is it written by the one man, at one time, giving the ideas God wanted him to have, or is it written by many men at different times, with different sections brought together into something that is entirely different from what any of the writers ever imagined that the book would be? ~~Well #3 then:~~

3, The Authority of Jesus Christ. What is our attitude toward Him? The question isn't what think ye of Moses? It is what think ye of Christ? But if you think of Christ as the Saviour, if you think of Him as the One who truly is the Lord of Glory, and knows all things, then you have to believe what He says, and when He says it as clearly and strongly as this, and bases so much of His teaching upon what Moses said, there can be no question about it. ~~Well, now, the authority of Jesus Christ, small a:~~

~~a. Proposed Attitude. Oh my, I meant to give you a brief quiz this morning, and it is quarter after already. I was intending to take five or ten minutes this morning. Well, the next meeting is Monday so I can do it then. So we will continue there Monday and will have not a whole last half-hour, it might be 25 minutes, it might be 15, so a little quiz Monday on what we cover...~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

...subject, the importance of the authorship of the Pentateuch, #3, the Authority of Jesus Christ is involved. Now under this, small a, Proposed Attitudes. There are four attitudes that are suggested for the matter of Christ's statements about the Pentateuch. And #1 is: (1), That Jesus Christ was a mere man. Now this is the position which of course most modern scholars take, that Jesus Christ as was one among the millions of men who have lived upon this earth, but that he was a very outstanding man in many ways. Some Jews have even called Him "the fairest flower of Judaism," and have tried to show that He gave teachings which were a conclusion to the teaching of the rabbis, which gathered together that which was best in Judaism, that He represented that which was the best of Judaism. Other Jews of course take a different attitude, a very antagonistic attitude toward Him. But the idea that he was a mere man, even if he was one of the finest men who ever lived, what difference does it make whether he thought that Moses wrote the Pentateuch or not? If you ask me the question of whether George Washington ever was in Elkins Park, or not, I might tell you that he was or wasn't, but my evidence wouldn't be worth that in the courts, anywhere on this earth. Because I was not here at the time, I had no way of knowing whether George Washington went through this property or not, 200 years ago. And if Jesus Christ was a mere man, walking about and talking, and being active in Palestine, in the first century A.D., what does He know about things 1400 or 1500 years before? It doesn't make the slightest difference what He said about that. If He said He saw something in His own day, His witness would be of importance. Well, He might say, like Josephus. Josephus was a mere man...

P.5. (1/2) ...he is a firsthand historical witness. There in his book against Appian he tells about the views of the Jews of his day, and what he says is of primary importance on the subject because he saw it, he knew it from firsthand information. But when Josephus talks about the antiquities of the Jews, and when he tells us what Saul said when he saw the Philistines coming, and he stood and said, "To be or not to be, that is the question. Should I kill myself and save my honor, or should I let the Philistines catch me and take

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

me as a prisoner?" and he gives you the soliloquy that Saul expressed, you know that Josephus is using his imagination. And it is interesting to see what Josephus things Saul might have said, but Josephus had only the Old Testament from which to get his information, so anything that Josephus says about Old Testament times is not a source for knowledge. It is only what is in the Old Testament that is the source, because Josephus knew nothing in addition to what he found in the Old Testament. It was long before his day, he had no access to any sort of evidence about it. Now if Jesus Christ was a mere man, it is altogether natural that He would refer to what Moses wrote, that He would say that you read this in the writings of Moses, and so on, because He thought what everybody else thought, that Moses had written it. And if scholarship comes along today and proves Moses didn't write them, we are no more surprised than if He thought the earth was flat, and scholarship today would prove it was round. We don't criticize Julius Caesar if he thought the earth was flat, he didn't know anything particular about it. And if Jesus Christ was a mere man, we don't expect Him to know anything about it, and His evidence here doesn't enter specifically. But most of those who have been greatly interested in this question have been people with a Christian background, and Christianity is based upon the belief that Jesus Christ is not a mere man, but that He is the Lord of glory. And so a century ago, when the higher criticism, the destructive higher criticism, began to be distributed throughout Germany and other countries, there were very ardent, earnest, Christian people who did not see how they could answer the argument, and yet, they said, we believe that Jesus Christ was the Lord of Glory, He was the second person of the Trinity, and He speaks of these as the writings of Moses, what shall we do? Shall we give up our belief in the Deity of Christ? They said, no, we have to find a way out, so they advanced a way out, which came to be called the Kenosis theory, that is (2).

(2) The Kenosis Theory

And this Kenosis theory is based upon Phil.2.7. We read in our English Bible, Phil.2.5-7, Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus who being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

This is the Greek ~~word~~ ~~and literally it would be, but~~ emptied himself; ~~English translation, made himself of no reputation,~~ but the Greek literally would be, "but emptied himself, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of man." So the pious German scholars who were earnest believers in the deity of Christ, and in His Atonement, ~~and in these great Christian doctrines,~~ but who didn't see how they could answer the arguments that were being brought against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, said, Here is the answer: Jesus Christ the Lord of Glory emptied Himself when He came forth, ~~and therefore though~~ He as God in heaven knew everything and had been active in the world when Moses was here, and knew all about what Moses wrote, or didn't write, when He came to earth and was incarnated, He emptied Himself, and therefore in this regard He was just like any other man. He only knew about great spiritual things, and when it came to history, geography, or science, He knew no more than anyone else, because He had emptied Himself. So the Theory of Kenosis is not a theory advanced by unbelievers to desparage the character of the Lord Jesus Christ, but it is a theory advanced by godly Christian believers, trying to make it possible for them to retain belief in the deity of Christ, and at the same time to accept what they considered to be the proven truths of science, such as that Moses did not write the Pentateuch. And this attitude was also taken by many in Great Britain, also. ~~And there were very~~ where some fine Christian scholars also who adopted the Kenosis Theory. Today you find that it has largely disappeared. We will not take time in this class to discuss it at length, it is a matter for New Testament study, rather than for Old Testament study. properly, the Kenosis Theory, ~~and will be given there or in Christology, but today you do not have~~ there are not so many people who are in that position of trying to find a way out; And therefore the theory of Kenosis has ~~pretty~~ largely disappeared. But of course the theory was strongly attacked. During those years there was much ~~examination~~ of it, discussion back and forth, and one reason why it disappeared is that there are very few people seeking that sort of a loophole today, but another is that it didnot stand up under investigation. If Jesus emptied Himself, what did He empty Himself of? The King

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

James Version assumes He emptied Himself of His standing as God, of His appearance as God. He was made in the likeness of man. People saw Him, saw a Galilean peasant, they did not see the Lord of Glory. He made Himself of no reputation, is perhaps a little too weak, but it does put the stress on the fact that it was the appearance involved, that He did not empty Himself of Himself, He didn't give up His personality, He didn't give up His divine attributes, He didn't give up His power, He didn't give up His knowledge, that He gave up His standing, the reputation, the position in which everyone would have to recognize Him as the Lord of Glory. ~~Mr. Brown? (7 1/4) No, we are going to look at the Pentateuchal evidence very fully, but in introducing it, I am mentioning the attitude people have taken toward the authority of Christ in this.~~ And these were people who were convinced by the arguments that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, but they said, what Jesus said has nothing to do with it, because He had emptied Himself. ~~(stu.) That, we are going to spend three months looking at that. Mr. Gregory? (8)~~ Now nobody who believes in the deity of Christ would say that He so emptied Himself that He knew nothing except what an ordinary person would know. He could not be the Saviour if He emptied Himself to that extent. ~~He,~~ certainly anyone who believed in His deity would have to believe that He did retain some spiritual knowledge that was beyond that of ordinary people. ~~You~~ couldn't say He emptied Himself of all of His (9) knowledge. So there was, He emptied Himself of His divine knowledge of matters aside from His own direct sphere of mission. That would be their view. But it is one of the reasons the Kenosis Theory didn't last, it was impossible to define with any accuracy what He emptied Himself of. They say He emptied Himself, therefore, He didn't know this. Well, what did He empty Himself of? There is no definite defining anywhere, and if something so important as that is taught in the Scripture, we'd expect it to be explained more fully somewhere, ~~not to rest on one word in one (9 1/2)~~ and in the context the word seems to mean He emptied Himself of the glorious standing which made it obvious to everyone that He was the Lord of glory. ~~And~~ King James says He

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

made Himself of no reputation. I think that is too weak, it doesn't mean that people hadn't heard anything about Him, it means that people didn't observe when they looked at Him, say right away, look, that is the Lord of Glory, that is the Creator of the Universe. You certainly would say that if you saw Him in His heavenly state, but the ordinary person looked at Him, He was just an ordinary man. He emptied Himself of the appearance of deity, but He certainly didn't seek to be deity. He didn't empty Himself of His divine power, His divine knowledge, of any of the attributes of deity. So the Kenosis Theory which we could spend a long time looking at the history of and looking at the various evidences about, but that would not leave time for our proper Old Testament study in this course, the evidence on the Pentateuch itself. we just want here to note the fact that this is one of the four attitudes we're going to mention that have been taken toward the authority of Jesus Christ. And that this is an attitude which was taken by a great many people 75 years ago, but which is taken by comparatively very few people today, and there are many books written on it, there are long discussions and you doubtless have a summary of it in courses in New Testament and in Theology, but this view of the Kenosis is an attitude which has been taken toward the authority of Jesus Christ. Yes, He is God, He is the Creator of the Universe, He is the all-powerful supreme Being, but when He was incarnate He emptied Himself, so He didn't know any more about Moses than you or I know. Well, if He didn't know any more about Moses than we know, how was He the great spiritual leader that people would think that He was? They would have to admit He had some divine knowledge. Well, they say, matters of criticism, matters of science, these didn't enter in to His mission. It is not a satisfactory escape, it is much more logical to take the first attitude, He was a mere man, He knew nothing. But that puts you outside the pale of historic Christianity, if you take that attitude. Now there is a third attitude, which is taken, and that is taken I believe by some today, this third. The Kenosis is still held by some but not many. The third attitude toward the authority of Christ, is the view of accommodation: (3) Accommodation.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

According to this view, Jesus Christ was the Lord of Glory. He knew all things, He was supreme. He was the Saviour, whose death would save all who believe on His name, but He did not come to teach science, ~~He did not come to teach~~ criticism, He did not come to teach us who wrote the Pentateuch; He came to teach us spiritual matters. And therefore, ~~that being the case~~, when He refers to the Pentateuch, He just adopts the terminology of His day. ~~And~~ this does not mean He agreed with it, ~~He~~ paid no attention to this problem. ~~That's~~ not what He came to teach us. That is the theory of accommodation. Jesus knew better but ~~why did He~~ take a few days to give ~~the people there~~ a course in Old Testament criticism ~~and~~ to prove ~~to them~~ that Moses didn't write the Pentateuch. That wasn't His purpose, ~~so~~ He just referred to it ~~just like anybody else~~. ~~Well, now~~, this is not immediately something that is impossible. ~~If you are going to present the Lord to somebody~~, and they try to get you into an argument about whether it was possible for a whale to swallow Jonah, you ~~are rather~~ foolish to take a long time arguing about that...

P.6 (3/4)

...~~but~~ that doesn't mean that it would be right for you to say something ~~and expressing~~ what you knew to be false, ~~For you to say oh of~~ course there was no way for a whale to swallow Jonah, that is just an old myth. What is important is to learn about Christ. If you say that you are taking a position, ~~which you cannot take if you~~ believe in Christ, because He refers to Jonah and to this ~~event~~ as a historical event. You ~~cannot take that~~. ~~Now you don't~~ have to discuss this matter, you ~~can~~ try to keep them on the main trend, ~~and after~~ they come to believe in Christ and ~~be~~ saved through Him, then it is good to go on to show them that they should accept what Jesus Christ accepted, and believe in the books that He gave us as our rule of faith and life, the whole of the Old Testament. It is all right to sidestep the efforts of people to get you to spend too much time on non-essentials, but that is a different thing altogether from making a statement that is contrary to (1 1/2) Now Jesus Christ could have accommodated Himself on this matter. We don't find anywhere in the Bible a clear statement that the earth is round. I am sure

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

He knew it ~~was~~ is We don't find any place noted He made a clear statement that the earth goes around the sun, instead of the sun around the earth. I'm sure He knew it does, because He had arranged it that way. But we do find certain cases where He says things that imply ~~that they were (2)~~ facts that the people of that time did not know He ~~we find that rather clearly, though it has not been much observed. He implied it but He doesn't state it.~~ He certainly never said anything about the earth's being flat. But that is a matter which He ~~keeps~~ kept out of — that was not part of His mission. Well, He could have kept out of the matter of who wrote the Pentateuch. He could have said, it is written in the book of the Law, if they will not hear the wonderful laws that God has given Israel, if they will not hear the testimony in the books of Beginnings --He could even perhaps have referred to the Book of Moses, meaning not the book that Moses wrote, but the book that you call ~~by the name~~ "Moses' Book," ~~that~~ perhaps He could've done, have that, but He did not, ~~But He goes way beyond it~~. As we noticed last time, He speaks of Moses writing it. He says "Moses wrote of me." He doesn't say "In the book of Moses you will find things referring to me." He says "Moses wrote of me," He says "if you will not believe Moses, how shall you believe Me?" "A Jesus made ~~He makes~~ definite statements which cannot be reasonably understood in any other way than as showing a specific belief that Moses was the one who wrote these things and who gave this law. Yes? (3 1/4) No, we are basing this on the verses I read last week. (stu.) Yes, I would say that when He said the Law and the Prophets, that doesn't say who wrote the Law. He could have said the Law and the Prophets, it is written in your Law, once He says it is written in your Law, but that does not say who wrote it. It is a Law, He could easily have sidestepped any specific statement that Moses wrote of me. Or that if you won't believe Moses' writing, how shall you believe my word? You can turn that around. How are you going to believe Jesus' word if you won't believe Moses' writing. He explicity refers to Moses as the giver of these laws, as the author of these books, as the one who spoke about Him, about 1500 years in advance. So that we have many explicit statements by the Lord Jesus Christ, which cannot be reasonably understood, as sidestepping the question. ~~Now of course the word~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

"accommodation" goes beyond a sidestep. Accommodation suggests that He actually used terms that say things that He knew were untrue. Well, how can you believe in Him as the great Lord of Glory, the great Lord of Truth, and have, and believe that He said things that He knew were quite false when He said them. He couldn't have accommodated Himself in that way. The before the idea of accommodation is not one to be cast aside when you first hear of it, as impossible, but is one to investigate, and see whether He simply sidestepped the question, or whether he actually accommodated by making statements that He knew were false, and we find that the statements He made imply very clearly that this book is the book that Moses actually wrote, that these things He refers to were given by Moses personally. And having said such things as that, if He accommodated Himself, He was actually saying what He knew was false, and the Lord of Glory could never do anything like that. So the view of Accommodation is just as impossible as the view of Kenosis.

A Student: Are there any other areas in which those who hold this view to turn to where Jesus was? (6) Well, there are usually not long discussion of this used the same method. That is, are there any other places where he adopted the terminology of the day? Well, there are usually not long discussions of this subject, but just brief statements, like in Briggs' book on the higher criticism where he says, well, Jesus wasn't there to teach criticism. He wasn't there to give them historical information, so naturally He didn't talk about those things, He just used the terminology of His day, that sort of thing. He doesn't go into it. Now He would probably say the same thing on another subject if He was talking about that, but the fact of the matter is , of course, that Jesus didn't come to teach these other things. He doesn't tell us when Hammurabi lived. There is a big argument today whether it was 1800 or 1700 B.C., when Hammurabi lived. We don't know. Jesus didn't even mention Hammurabi, but He certainly knew him, certainly could've if He had wanted to. But this matter is right at the very center of the Jewish religion, and the center of the predictions regarding Christ, and if it didn't matter He certainly could've avoided saying things that give a specific attitude toward it. So I feel it is very important that we examine the statements made and see how specific they are and then see how im-

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

possible this view of Accommodation is. Now there is a 4th attitude toward Christ, ~~and it is.~~ (4) that He is the omniscient Lord of Glory, ~~and that~~ is the view which the Christian Church has historically held, that He is the omniscient, that is the one who knows all things, the Lord of Glory. And actually there are only two views that can be logically held, because the second and the third views do not work out. Jesus Christ was a mere man and what He said doesn't matter, ~~on~~ things that He didn't directly see. Or Jesus Christ was the omniscient Lord of Glory, and whatever He said is true. Now that doesn't mean that we can take a word that Jesus Christ said and squeeze it together and get an answer to a cure for cancer out of it. Or that we can determine from it just how far it is across the Pacific Ocean, or that we can deal with a thousand other matters of science and history and literature that He didn't deal with. If His Word seems to touch upon them, we must examine the words very carefully before we draw conclusions ~~on~~ them, and see if we are not reading something into it, which we can easily do, but if after careful thorough examination we find we're not reading anything into it, but it's what He actually said, then let us stand upon it as being the Word of God and ~~no question~~ it is true, ~~and~~ if all science should differ with us on it, let's just wait a little while till science learns a little more, and they will find it is true. If it is clearly and definitely stated by the Lord or ~~anywhere~~ else in the Bible, ~~but be~~ careful ~~you don't~~ read things into the Bible or get things out of it that aren't actually there. So there are really two views: if Jesus Christ a mere man, then what He says doesn't matter; if Jesus Christ the omniscient Lord of Glory, ~~If He is~~ then Moses wrote the Pentateuch because Jesus speaks of it in ways that are absolutely impossible to interpret reasonably other than He believed that Moses wrote the Pentateuch.

Now Jesus nowhere says Moses wrote every word of the Pentateuch. He nowhere says everything we have in the Pentateuch today came from Moses. It would be possible to believe that there are certain insertions put in later, by people under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and part of the Bible. It would be possible to believe that and still accept

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

what Jesus said. I ~~don't think it necessary to believe~~ it. I personally ~~believe~~ think that we can believe that everything in the Pentateuch came from Moses with the exception of an occasional place perhaps where a geographical term ~~had the later term~~ was substituted later, ~~so~~ for an earlier one so that it would be more understandable to the people of a later time, ~~but~~ except for a very few things like that, I don't believe it is necessary. ~~But~~ Jesus Christ never said that every word of the Pentateuch came from Moses, but He did set His authority upon the ~~substantial~~ fact that substantially the whole ~~Ap~~ Pentateuch is from Moses, that he is the author of it, and that he was the one who wrote about the Lord Jesus Christ in the Pentateuch. ~~Queiros~~? Mr. ~~Curry~~? ~~(stu.10 1/2) Yes, I would think so. That is, Inspiration is a negative thing to quite an~~ Answer to an important question — extent, that is, it is a keeping from error. And therefore if the name (3) which was no longer (4) used ~~had~~ was substituted for ~~it another name, which was~~ one (1) the new name of the particular place, if that was done under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, it means that the man who did ~~it wasn't~~ did not make a mistake, and got the wrong name. Thus, ~~That is to say~~, if something happened in South Philadelphia, and ~~they used an old term and then~~ later on somebody says ~~oh, that~~ (2) is Elkins Park he is (1) really talking about, (3) and substituted Elkins Park, that would be clearly a mistake. And it would be possible for a mistake like that to come in in any book, but we believe that the Lord prevented any such ~~thing~~ mistake as that from coming in. Now we don't believe there may not be tiny textual errors that have come in in the course of time, we are quite sure there must be some, but the number is very small. ~~Now the four views then, under a, Proposed Attitudes, and so we mention b:~~

Reading b. The Authorship of the Pentateuch is Vital to our Faith. Some people say, "why do we care about Moses? Christ is what matters. But Christ cared about Moses, so if we care about Christ, we are interested in what He cared about. Who wrote 2 Samuel? Nobody knows. God did not give the information. It would be very interesting to find out, but people can argue about theories and it doesn't matter in the slightest. Who wrote Hebrews? Nobody knows. Some of our greatest Christian scholars have been absolutely convinced Paul wrote it. Some other equally great Christian scholars have been absolutely

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

convinced that Paul didn't write it. We don't know who wrote it, but we know it was written by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and it is part of God's Word. But who wrote the Pentateuch does matter. It matters because Jesus Christ explicitly refers to it as the work of Moses. It matters because He did this not merely once, which might possibly involve a textual error in copying, but He did it on various occasions. It matters because it is very clear that that is what Jesus Christ believed, ~~and therefore~~ If He was wrong on something on which He spoke so clearly and definitely as this, how can He be the Lord of Glory and the Creator of the Universe?...

P.7. (3/4)

...fine young people ~~believing~~ who strongly in Christianity. When we send ~~them off~~ to unbelieving schools to study, and there they have presented to them great masses of evidence ~~of~~ proof that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, we cannot simply brush it aside, and say, well if they believe in Christ, that's what matters, ~~because~~ if they believe in Christ they will continue to believe that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, or if they give up their belief ~~in~~ that the Pentateuch ~~being~~ was written by Moses, they will logically come (and usually do come) in time to give up any true belief in the deity of Christ. ~~Now this then on the authority of Jesus Christ is involved here. This was #3.~~

4, The Question of the Author~~ity~~ship of the Pentateuch forms the starting point for the Divisive Theory. ~~And~~ Today critical scholars divide all of ~~Isaiah~~ the Bible up into sections. There is not a book of the Old Testament that they don't divide up into ~~sections, into~~ different parts, by different people, and consequently none of them have very much authority. ~~But~~ All this began with the question of the authorship of the Pentateuch. One of ~~our~~ the officials ~~here~~ at the Seminary, not many years ago, moved to this area ~~and~~ entered ~~put~~ his daughter in the high school in this area ~~and who was there in the high school one day and she brought her books home, and he saw the books that evening that she was~~ happened to see what she was studying ~~to learn there in the school and it had in it~~ and was taught the higher criticism of the Old Testament explicitly ~~taught~~, as part of the teaching of the world, ~~which those high school students~~ were supposed to

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

learn. Here we have it right in the high school here in this township, in the book as that which the young children are required to learn. Now it shows how widely it is being taught, and these divisive theories had their start in the attitude toward the Pentateuch. So it is important not merely that we realize that we believe in Christ, we must believe that Moses wrote the Pentateuch; but it is important that we objectively and dispassionately examine the evidence in order to see that God has not simply given us here, something to believe on authority, but something there is clear strong evidence that can be examined. And therefore is able to help people when they begin to have difficulty in showing them how the evidence really is. Yes? (3 3/4) I am glad it is not today. But that was about three years ago when that was being done. Here I merely give it as an illustration that in many schools throughout the country, books of that type are being used. I was talking with a person a few years ago who was connected with a school of Education in a big university and this man was a professor of education and had been asked to work with another man in preparing a textbook for high schools. And he said that he went through this book this other man had prepared on modern history and found in it this statement !! the invention of printing did more for the common man than the Law and the Gospels together. And he said that he begged the man to take it out of his book, the author. He said how can you expect school boards to accept your book for use if you have a strong statement like that that attacks Judaism and Christianity both? And he thought he had done a great thing in getting that statement taken out of the book. Personally, I think it would have been much better if this statement had been left in. Because a book which would have one clear blatant statement like that, attacking the foundation of Christianity, would contain many subtle statements that would put unbelief into people's minds without their realizing they were coming against it. And if that book has been taken out and something which is more subtle substituted it may be worse instead of better. Of course, I don't know (5 3/4) But I just indicate the problem which faces us today. Now we have to move along because we have much

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

ground to cover. I hadn't better take more ~~than~~ on this point right now. ~~In fact, it's~~ 12 o'clock and we're going to have a little written lesson, so I better let you do it immediately. (exam)...

(6 1/2) ...so this matter of the authorship of the Pentateuch is a matter of very great importance. Now to understand it we want to see the movement ~~as it~~ develops, the movement which is today so very influential. But we will not come to the history of the movement for a little because ~~we have still~~ more introductory material, we have to look at. ~~So we go on to~~ D, A Survey of the Contents of the Pentateuch. Now this will be a very brief survey, because you are familiar with a good deal of it, I trust, and also because this is not a course in the content of the Pentateuch, or its teachings, but a course in the history in the rise of the Divisive theories, and a study of just what these theories are, and how much truth and how much error is in them. However, there are a few points of survey which would be useful for us to have in mind and we'll take just a few minutes on them. Under this, Survey of the Contents of the Pentateuch, ~~we will mention~~, #1, Types of Material.

As you pick up the five books of Moses you find that there is quite a variety of material contained in them. You cannot simply read a few words somewhere and be sure that you get an idea of what it is all right, you have to look at more of it, before you can do that. When I was first in Germany, one noon I was eating at a restaurant, and I happened to get to speaking to a woman who was eating there at the same restaurant, and she told me of a very unpleasant she had the evening before. It seems there was an American named Frank Harris, who had been editor of an American magazine for a good many years, but who before that had studied in Germany, and this man, Frank Harris, was giving some lectures in Berlin at this time, and a friend of this woman's had urged her to go and hear them, and she said, but I don't know any German, I can't understand German. Well, this woman said, I heard him last night, the first lecture, it was all in English, and you could understand every word of it and it was very interesting. So she said, well, then I'll go and hear him. So the second night she went and she was delayed in getting there,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

she was late getting to the lecture, she got there and stepped in in the back of the room, and she heard Mr. Harris speaking in German. She stayed for a half a minute, and he continued in German, she couldn't understand a word he said, she she left the room, went downstairs and said to the man at the desk, give me my money back , this lecture is in German and I don't understand any German, I was told it was in English. Well, the man said, it was in English last night, must be that he spoke in English last night and in German tonight. So he gave her her money back and she went home. The next morning she saw the other woman, and the woman said well why didn't you come to the lecture, it was a very, very interesting lecture. Well, she said I don't understand any German. The woman said it wasn't German, it was English. Well, she said I was there and she told her experience, how she left. Oh, the woman said, Mr. Harris quoted a German poem. He took one minute reading a German poem, that is the only word in German in the whole evening. And she came in just as he was reading this German poem, and that's all she heard and she thought the whole lecture was German. Well, in most anything there is going to be a variety of material , and you can't take half a minute or a minute of it and get an estimate of the whole thing, and in anything as lengthy as the Pentateuch and covering as much material as it does, as many different important matters as the Pentateuch does it would be strange indeed if there was not a considerable variety of material, and so at this point it is useful for us to just glance very briefly at the type of material there. And I'm going to mention four types. First, the type that most readily occurs to your mind, narrative. You read Genesis. If you open Genesis at random you might happen to hit Gen.49, and you would predictions in poetic form about the descendants of Jacob and you'd say, oh this is prophecy, very difficult prophecy to understand. You might happen to open to Gen.36 and read the list of the kings of Edom, you'd say oh this is just uninteresting lists of kings. You might happen to open to one of the geneological sections, and say oh this is just a list of geneologies. But the chances of that would not be great, because nine-tenths of the material in Genesis is narrative, and so narrative

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

occurs to us immediately, so put small a, Narrative, as the type of material that you find most commonly in the book of Genesis. Now you go on to Exodus and the first nineteen chapters is still narrative, that is, practically all of it. Chapter 15 is a song of poetry, celebrating the deliverance of the Lord at the Red Sea. Aside from chapter 15, the whole first 19 chapters are narrative. When I was 12 years old I began to read the Bible through, every morning and every evening I read a chapter, went straight through Genesis, enjoyed the narrative very much, wasn't much encouraged by the few geneological sections. Got into Exodus, got up to 19, then we had the law for a few times, but there are occasional chapters of narrative, then the account of the building of the tabernacle. Got into Leviticus, to the account of the sacrifices, what to do with the livers, and what to do with the kidneys, what to do with the caul, and on the fifth chapter of Leviticus, I got bogged down, and I think it was four months more before I picked it up again and continued, went on, and finished. But there was a marked change in the type of material, but up unto that point, the great bulk of it is narrative. Now there are a great many people who don't read the book of Numbers, and the reason is that as you start Numbers, you have lists of how many people in this tribe and how many in that tribe and how many in the other, and who is going to carry this thing, and how they're going to do onthe march. But you don't go through many chapters like that in Numbers, before you strike extremely interesting narrative, and about half of Numbers is narrative, and about half is other material. So if you take the book of Genesis, nine-tenths narrative. But if you take the Pentateuch as a whole I'd guess offhand that maybe a fourth to a third is narrative, but narrative is a very important type of material, and it is the narrative which gets by far the greater part of our attention today. However, nobody writes an important book of history that is all narrative, there is always other material, inevitably. We like to put it in an appendix in the back, if we can, but if the purpose of it is an important purpose, not just for interest, a good deal of it has to be interspersed through, and so b, Geneological Lists, Enumerations, etc. You have a Geneological List early in Genesis, the descendants of Adam, descendants of

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Cain, descendants of Seth...

P.8 (1/2)

...this sort of thing, there are quite a few chapters that are this sort of thing. Now we would find that sort of thing in an English book largely in the Appendix, or it might be in footnotes, but occasionally you find chapters given over to (3/4) a genealogical list in a book of history, but nobody says it must be by a different author, even though it sounds very different. It is much harder to read, easy to get bogged down in it, but we recognize that that sort of material is important, there is much of it in anything you take, and so there is a fair amount in the Pentateuch of this second type of material, (geneological lists and enumerations, and so on.) And then c: Law. And If we were arranging our material according to the greater bulk of it, we would have put this first. I didn't because it doesn't really start until you've gone through a book and a half, but Law is the largest type of material in the Pentateuch. There is more Law than anything else. In fact, the Jews called the Pentateuch the Torah, the Law. That is their name for it, the Law, or the Law of Moses, and in the New Testament it is often referred to as the Law. The Law or the Law of Moses, and so Law is a very common type of material. We start with the description how to build the tabernacle, no, we don't quite start with that, before that, we have the ten commandments, and then we have the book of the covenant, (2 1/4)

Then several chapters of instructions on how to build the tabernacle, Then Leviticus, Laws for the priests, Laws about how to make sacrifices, Laws on how to take sanitary measures, hygienic measures, all sorts of laws. On Numbers has new laws given. Deuteronomy is the word means the second Law, It is a repetition of the Law and it is Moses' exhortation, in which he repeats great portions of the Law, and so Law is the prominent type of material in the Pentateuch. Now it is very interesting to read a good narrative, but you're not apt to read a law book, just for interest, (unless you have fallen afoul of it in some say, and then it can be very interesting,) but ordinarily you take a Law book and study it, rather than read it. It's a different type of material. But the same person could easily

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

write it. ~~Mr. MacKeen? (3 1/4) We consider them ceremonial laws, yes. Well, that is a third type of material, Law, and there is a fourth type, which is not common in the Pentateuch, but of which we have a small amount.~~ And that is small d, Poetry. And I have already referred to a few of the outstanding sections of Poetry. Gen.49 is a poem in which Jacob predicts the general course of the future of the tribe. In Ex.15 ~~they~~ celebrate the crossing of the Red Sea. Miriam and others sang, ~~and they sang with (4) and then we have~~ poetry and you have a swing to it, ~~it is very different from any narrative, different from any Law. It is poetry~~. We have the song of Moses at the end of Deut. We have occasional sections of poetry celebrating great victories, or making predictions about the future, so that poetry is the fourth of the types of material we find. The third, Law, by far the most common. ~~The first~~, a great deal of material, ~~though~~ half as much as there is of Law, ~~and then~~ these other two, much less but yet a fair amount altogether. ~~Now those are the types of material that are found.~~

May be just a word more on the third ~~of them~~, on Law. The Law in the Pentateuch, we find in certain groups, ~~and~~ the first of those is the so-called book of the covenant, which we've already noted. This term "book of the covenant" is a Biblical term, not a term that somebody made up to describe ~~the chapters~~ Ex.20-23, ~~but it is a Biblical term, because in~~ Ex.24 we ~~find that it says~~ read that Moses and the elders of the people took this book of the covenant, and that the people agreed to follow it, and they made a sacrifice, and they established this covenant, and in v.8 Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people and said, behold, the blood of the covenant, which the Lord made with you concerning all these words. And this was the book of the covenant, the Law which God made with the people, contained in these four chapters, Ex.20-23. Then we have glanced at the Law of Leviticus, detailed laws for the priests. Nobody would expect all the people to learn the laws of Leviticus; the priests would have the book before them. Here are different kinds of sacrifices. You wouldn't expect to remember the difference between all these types, you have the book to consult, ~~to look it up~~. Full instructions

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

about feasts that occurred once in a long time; they'd look it up when the time came.

The book of the Law for the priests was found in Leviticus. (2) the word, (1) As you know, ~~comes~~ Levi comes from Levi, the tribe which was set apart for God's service. It means the Levitical legislation, the Law for the priests. ~~And~~ Then in Deuteronomy, we have Moses' farewell address. ~~There are and in Moses' farewell address, we have~~ three main addresses, ~~and in these addresses.~~ The first ~~of them~~ recapitulated the history; ~~but~~ the second and the second ~~is~~ are a recapitulation of the Law; it goes from Deut. 5 to 26, ~~and there the recapitulation of the Law.~~ This is not Law for the priests, ~~this is~~ but Law for the people. ~~It is~~ Moses ~~giving~~, goes through the Law, to stress ~~that~~ which the people are to remember and to observe. ~~We~~ Thus ~~have~~ there are these three main types of the Law in the Pentateuch.

I didn't ~~give that~~ make a special section in the outline for the three main groups of Law, but it is very important, so I hope you will note it and recall it, as it is a matter with which we will deal repeatedly in the course of the year. ~~So much then for #1.~~

~~Now~~ #2, The Five Books of Moses. In ~~the~~ very early times ~~of~~ the Israelites came to refer to it as the five (8) parts of the Law. Whether it originally was written as (3) five distinct books, (4) it is hard to say. Certainly Genesis is a unit by itself, gives the history until they went to Egypt. Then you jump forward to Exodus, there is a big break in time, and Genesis ~~certainly~~ forms a natural unit. ~~The same with~~ and Deuteronomy does also. ~~Deut.~~ is Moses' farewell addresses, and the account of his last days before going to his death. Luke ~~That~~ forms a unit. But when you finish with Exodus, you go right straight into Leviticus. Exodus tells how the tabernacle is made and set up, Leviticus goes on and tells what the priests are to do in it. It continues right straight on. ~~was there~~ originally a new book started there? We have no way to know. It is now and has been divided since the very early times into a separate book, Exodus and Leviticus, but it reads right straight forward. ~~Leviticus and Deuteronomy, there is quite a break because you finish the Law for the priests, and you start in directions for continuing the march.~~ But whether there was ~~a~~ break originally we have no way of knowing. At any rate, we have it divided now into

http://www.macrae.ori.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

five books, and these five books which we have now We ha give Greek name s to four of them in our English Bible. It is too bad we don't give them English names, but we don't. We g ive them Greek name s. We do not name them the way that the Jews do. The Jews did not have names for these books, they simply named them after the first word of the book. For instance, the book of Genesis starts in the Hebrew: (9 1/2)

WP60 P32 Doc 1 Pentateuch.7
Stephen Stopped 9/12

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. So the Jews speak of Genesis as (9 3/4) which means "In the beginning." That's the first word of the book. They just name it by its first word. But that is a good title also. We call it the Greek word "Genesis" which means beginning. So our title is the same as theirs, but ours is a summary, of it, "Beginnings." The book of beginnings. I wish we'd call it the Book of Beginnings, instead of Genesis. Most people know what Genesis means, so why speak Greek when we could just as well speak English, in describing a part of our English Bible? At any rate we use the Greek term, Genesis, and we need to always be reminded that means "The Beginnings." This is how everything starts. The Jews call it "In the Beginning," (10 1/4)

Now Genesis, as you know, contains, in its first eleven chapters, a list, an account of the creation of the world, and of God's dealing with people in general, the first eleven chapters, the creation, the flood, dealings in general. Then, with chapter 12, you got one family on which God specialized His attention. As the family He set aside to keep the knowledge of God alive in the world, and through to bring His Son into the world as our Saviour. So from 12 on to the end it is talking about this family. God's dealings with this family and their relations with other people, so in Genesis we have the account of this family, Abaraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, and ending up with their going down into Egypt where God had prepared a place to keep them alive through the famine, a place where they could grow in numbers, with the great economical advantage which Egypt had for this purpose. Now the second book we call also by its Greek name. The Jews call it by its first two words. It begins with (II 1/2) and these are

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Stephen Stamper 9/13

(3) since it starts with (4) the names of the sons of Israel who went down to Egypt, that's the way the book of Exodus starts, so that the Jews call the book of Exodus, the book of (1) "these are the names"; (2) or just "the names." The use the second word, "the names." They'll say (12) that means the second book, literally it is "the names." Well, (3) of all the poor names for a book you could ever think of, this is one of the worst, not the worst, but one of the worst. The name, what does that have to do with the Book of Exodus, nothing! It merely describes its first few verses. But it's the Hebrew custom. Not only Hebrew, it was used at that time in most writings. They didn't give names to writings, they used the first few words to designate them. The Babylonians did it constantly. The Babylonian story of creation is called (2) "When from above," (1) "Enuma Elish" (3) because those are the first two words, of it. That was customary then, to name writings by giving the first couple of words. So to this day, the Jews speak of Exodus as (12 3/4) "the Names;" And this book, "the names," we call it by the Greek word which the Greeks gave to describe the content of the book, and it is a very good description, Exodus. Exodus of course is Greek for "coming out." And sometimes we use the word in English, as people say "he made an exodus." We'll say, there was something happened in that meeting people didn't like, there was a great exodus. We sometimes use it, but not much. It is really a Greek word, rarely used in English except as a name for this book, "the coming out." Again, I say, if we called it in English, "the departure from Egypt," that would be a description of the book, but we use the Greek word, and if you know Greek you know just what it means, the description of the book of Exodus, much better...

P.9. (1/2) The third book begins:

...God called, "and called God to Moses, and the Lord spoke to him from the tent of meeting." And it goes on and gives the Laws that God gave to Moses. So the Jews call it (3/4) by its the first words, "and he called." Now you might say that is not such a bad description of Leviticus, because Leviticus is the Law God gave for the priests. So "and he called," is not too bad as description. But you have to have it explained to you would the name

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

~~how it fits.~~ Now if we called Leviticus "the book of the priests," that would tell us what's in it--the account of sacrificial and other laws important for the priests to have at hand. ~~The book of the priests.~~ But we take a Greek word, Leviticus, which means the book for the Levites, and the Levites ~~of course~~ were the tribe from which the priests came, so "Leviticus", if you know what it means, is a much better description of the book than the Hebrew word "and he called," but it's not ~~a very good, it's not~~ understandable to the average person. You say to the average person, we're going to study the book of the priests, and ~~they don't~~ would know what you're talking about. You say, we're going to study Leviticus, the average person who hasn't been a student of Christian things ~~would~~ would have no idea what you're talking about.

Now we skip the fourth book for a second, and glance at the fifth book. The ~~fifth book, this is just for the moment thinking of the title of it--the~~ fifth book begins in ~~the~~ Hebrew with the words, "these are the words which Moses spoke to all Israel beyond Jordan". So the Jews call it "these are the words," ~~It is~~ just "words." You say, what book are you reading now? Words! Well that's not much of a title for a book, but it's the second word of the book, so that it describes how it starts. Actually when you think of it a little, it's not too bad a title, ~~Words,~~ because Deuteronomy is Moses' words. Moses' Farewell Address would be a much better title, (2 3/4)

but we use the Greek, which is a good description, "second law,"

so Deuteronomy, ~~the second presentation of the law, in~~ other words, Moses' Farewell Address, where he drove the law home to the people. So Deuteronomy is a pretty title, but most people don't have any idea what it means, unless they know Greek. Why don't we talk English and say "Moses' Farewell Address" or "The Second Presentation of the Law"? Well, somebody says, ~~right away, well~~ it is too bad, we use Greek when we speak about these four books, but at least there is one of them that we use English for, that's the fourth one, we call that by an English name, "Numbers."

The fourth book, for some reason, the Hebrew did not take the ~~first~~ word ~~from~~.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabus/627Pentateuch-II/README.htm

It begins "and the Lord spoke," - ~~well that's~~ too much like Leviticus, "and he called," Or Deuteronomy, "the words." And the Lord spoke unto Moses in the wilderness. So they take the fourth word "in the wilderness," And that's the Jewish title, "in the wilderness." And if only we had taken the Hebrew title here, we would have a good title, ~~it is one case where they have a good title. Because~~ Numbers is the description of the wilderness journey of the people of Israel. "The book of the wilderness," "the wilderness journey," would be an excellent title. But we don't do that, we ~~take~~ the Greek title, ~~Now the Greek title here~~ is the poorest title the Greeks ~~got~~ for any of the five books. They call it ~~(4 1/2)~~ Arithmoi, and we don't stick to the Greek - we translate it into "Numbers." ~~And~~ Where the Greeks have got first-class titles like Exodus, and Deuteronomy, we keep them in Greek so the average person doesn't know what they mean, but where the Greek has a very, ~~very~~ poor like (4 3/4) Arithmoi, ~~why~~ we translate it so everybody knows what it means, but knows nothing about the book. ~~Because~~ of all the poor names for a book in the whole Bible there is none other perhaps as bad as Numbers. It doesn't fit the book. The first chapter gives the ~~sentence~~ census, and later on there is another ~~sentence~~ census, and these two chapters are ~~about~~ almost the only chapters in the book that the name "numbers" fits. And to call the book "Numbers" is like calling a history of the United States, Arithmetic, if the history happens to start with giving the size of Columbus' boat, ~~or something. Call it Arithmetic. Well, that's the way with this book. The Greeks call it "Arithmoi" and if we call it "Arithmoi" the~~ average person wouldn't think of Arithmetic, he'd just think of some kind of a jumble like he ~~things~~ does when he hears Deuteronomy, and he might look into the book to see what is in it. But when he hears Numbers he is frightened. So the average person doesn't' get half the value out of the book of Numbers he ought to get. Actually the book of Numbers is in some ways one of the most important books the Lord has written in the whole Bible. You read Genesis, it is the story of the Beginning, that's very important and interesting, but it's all past. You read Exodus and it's the story of how God delivers them, and the Israelites could never forget a God that delivered them from Egypt, and they shouldn't. And we

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Christians should never forget how God has delivered us from sin, and brought us into the kingdom of Christ, through the death of Christ. We should never forget this, ~~this~~, our departure from the power of sin, is the foundation of our lives. It is very important, but it is past. ~~And~~ While that it is tremendously important, we have a present life to live and that's what Numbers is: The Wilderness Wanderings, ~~and~~ That is exactly where the Christian is today, in his wilderness wanderings. So there are more lessons for the present-day life of the Christian in the book of Numbers than perhaps any other part of the Pentateuch. There is many a Christian who is always thinking of the dominion of sin over his life, and how he must get away from it, and regretting his sin, and be back in Exodus. He is thinking he is back under the power of sin, when he should rejoice in his freedom, and rejoice in the fact that Jesus has saved him from his sin, and it's under the blood, and go forward to live as God wants him to in this world today. So Exodus is tremendous, it is vital, but we shouldn't live in it, we should live in Numbers. And then there are other Christians who think they're already in the Promised Land, they think they're already perfectly sanctified, they think they don't have anything to worry about today anymore, and they are mistaken too, the Promised Land is a long way off. We have departed from Egypt, we are saved from our sin, but we have a wilderness journey, we are pilgrims and strangers in this world, while we live here, looking forward to the Promised Land to which the Lord is leading us. So Numbers ~~has~~ the account of how God led the people through the wilderness, how He taught them how to make preparations for their life there, the various experiences they had, and there is hardly a bit of Numbers, at least of the narrative, but what is filled with vital lessons for the Christian life, but how many a Christian misses them altogether because of that very unfortunate and misleading title, Numbers, and perhaps also ~~by~~ because of the fact that the first two or three chapters are chapters of enumeration, instead of like ~~so much of~~ the chapters of vital interest for the wilderness journey, ~~And~~ as we serve the Lord between our salvation and our eventual entry into the promised land. So here is the one case where the Greek gave a very miserable title, and we translate it into English so every-

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

body can understand it, and be misled by it. But I think it's good we know a little about these five books, what they are in the Hebrew, what they are in the Greek, how we call them in the English, and to see something of the trmendous blessing God has for us, not merely in Genesis and Fxodus, but very, very much in this book of Numbers. Well, this very brief survey of the names of the book, little bit of their content, and the book as it stands, seems to us to form a unit, from the creation, the beginning, on up through Moses' Farewell Address just before they enter the Promised Land. Now here we move forward to Mr. MacKeen? (9 1/4) Yes, I was asked a question about that after class also. Let me repeat what I said there, because I think it's good for you to keep in mind. I didn't spend much time on it. Nowhere in Genesis does it say that Moses wrote Genesis. There is no mention of Moses in Genesis. Genesis simply gives us the account of events, up unto the death of Joseph in Egypt. We have in Exodus, Moses as a very prominent character. From there on, very prominent and very important. Now we have, if you take the whole thing as one book, the five books, these are the book of Moses. If you're going to divide it up into five separate sections, who wrote the first, there is no evidence about it, but it was always assumed by the Israelites that the introduction to the law, the account of the history of the beginnings up to the law, contained in Genesis, was written by the same one who had written Exodus, the account of the experiences in which he was personally, vividly concerned. And when Jesus referred to the writings of Moses, He sometimes quotes from or refers to matters in the book of Genesis. Jesus refers to it as a unit which came from Moses, so I would say that, thereby, Jesus confirms the attitude which the Jews had taken that Genesis was part of the life of Moses. Now I think it is good to have the situation there well in mind, but it is not an extremely important matter for this reason, that those who accept the Pentateuch from Moses, they all accept Genesis as also written by Moses, and those who deny that Genesis is written by Moses, also deny that most of the rest of it is written by Moses. What I mean is not a point of

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

controversy with some saying, "Moses wrote four books and not Genesis," and others saying "No, Moses wrote Genesis too." There is no such division of thought. ~~It is considered as part of the whole thing.~~ Now, of course there is a difference, because ~~everything~~ after Exodus 3, ~~where we have~~ when he became Moses old enough to know anything personally. ~~from there on,~~ everything in the Pentateuch could have seen, observed, talked with the people concerned, ~~with, and~~ ~~given~~ known from personal experience, ~~and~~ Genesis and the first two chapters of Exodus ~~are some-~~ describe ~~thing~~ events that Moses could not have seen or known from personal experience, ~~and~~ nobody says that Moses saw what Abraham did and wrote down what he saw. But that ~~Moses~~ he was the one who put it into the form, substantially, that we have it today, ~~that is the belief of~~ in those who think that Moses wrote it. ~~This does not~~ believe ~~That doesn't~~ mean ~~to say~~ he ~~is~~ was the first man ~~who~~ to necessarily wrote these things down. Don't you think Abraham wrote down some of the Lord's dealings ~~of the Lord~~ with him? Don't you think that a good bit of it was written before Moses. Maybe all of it was written before Moses, but I don't think it was written in this form, or in this precise style. ~~Yes? (12 3/4)~~ I am You mean Genesis? ~~We are~~ saying that the books of Genesis, which we have today, was written by Moses. ~~Now~~ whether Moses incorporated into it material ~~which was~~ written at the time, there is no way of proving ~~one way or the other.~~ We just don't know, ~~but we~~ I do not hold that Moses either from ~~sat down and out of~~ his imagination, or ~~out of~~ from a direct revelation of God, wrote down a whole lot of material that nobody else knew anything about. ~~We~~ I do not hold that, though I do not deny the possibility. ~~Maybe~~ Perhaps ~~there was a time when~~ God told Moses to ~~come out on the mount someday and~~ sit down and God ~~just~~ dictated the whole book of Genesis. ~~It~~ This is entirely possible, but ~~it~~ and is not a point a faith.

P.10 (3/4) Probably was not what happened

~~...while Matthew was with him most of the time, there is quite a bit in Matthew that can be~~ (1) Matthew, they all

Yes? (1) That's exactly what I said when we began this course, I'm glad you remembered correctly. That's a very good book, by the way: Schultz's The Old Testament Speaks. Very good summary, and he has studied the recent developments. Excellent. And I'm

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

glad to see that a lot of you think that he got it from my classes. He did not cast aside, ~~abandon,~~ what he had learned, but went forward. (1 3/4)

Well, the summary then, we've looked at D, Survey of the Contents, and the, particularly what I said about the types of material will be very important as we go on, later, into the critical theory. Now we take up E:

E, Early Questions Regarding Mosaic Authorship. ~~And here I hesitate,~~ I had great stirring of thought, last week, over whether to call this E or II. Finally decided to call it E, because, that while it is quite different than what we've looked at thus far, yet the big thing we are interested in is the movement of the higher criticism. And what we're going to speak of under E is earlier than the higher criticism, and while some people may today think of it as if it is part of the higher criticism, it is really distinct from it, so I'm going to keep it under I, which is Introductory. ~~And under~~

The movement of the Higher Criticism which we will discuss later is a movement which began and spread suddenly through the world. It is a big movement with tremendous interest. But what we speak of now is the idea of the occasional individual, which had little influence upon the world at large, And would probably be of no interest to us if the higher critical movement had not come. So in view of its having come, it is important to glance at these matters. ~~There have been individuals, you~~ one can hardly think of an idea that some individual hasn't thought of and written down at some time. So it is not at all strange that before the higher criticism began there were individuals who questioned the Mosaic authorship, ~~but~~ and that some of these individuals thought of ideas which were later taken up by the higher critics. So I'm going to call #1, Ibn Ezra, Spinoza, and others. There are a few others that you will find mentioned in books about the higher criticism because they at some time wrote the statement that they did not believe that Moses wrote the Pentateuch.

~~Now~~ Ibn Ezra was a very famous Jewish rabbi at about 1100 A.D., who ~~and Ibn Ezra has written~~ wrote a commentary on the Pentateuch which is so highly thought of by the Jews, ~~that~~ Rabbinic Bibles contain it in the margin, ~~it and~~ along with one or two other commentaries, ~~in the~~

Stop 11/3/90

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

typed 10/11/90

margin of the rabbinic Bibles today. He wrote this commentary on the Pentateuch and his ideas, many of them, are considered as very excellent. He was a good student of grammar, a student of the content of the Pentateuch. He wrote a long time ago, there is a tremendous amount of material today that he did not know. But his book is very highly regarded by the Jews. He died at 1167, and in this book, when he discusses Deut.1.1, where it says that Moses spoke these words "beyond Jordan," Ibn Ezra has a statement, "and if thou understandest the mystery of the 12 and Moses wrote "and the Canaanites were then in the land," "in the mount of the Lord it shall be provided," and "behold his bed was a bedstead of iron," thou shalt discern truth. Now that's the statement that he made as commentary on the words, "beyond Jordan" in Deut.1.1. And I don't think many people of his day had much idea what he was talking about, but 500 years later, Spinoza, the founder of pantheism, a Jew who had abandoned Jewish teaching, and who developed the theory which is widely known today in various forms, known as pantheism. Spinoza wrote a book in which he strongly attacked Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and in this book, Spinoza quoted these words of Ibn Ezra, and he said that Ibn Ezra did not dare to speak out the fact that he thought Moses hadn't written everything in the Pentateuch, but that in these cryptic words he made clear the fact that he questioned that Moses had written it. Now that is his interpretation of Ibn Ezra. And I don't think it is a correct interpretation. Because at one place, Ibn Ezra wrote quotes from another Jew, otherwise unknown, who made a statement that a certain chapter could not have been written by Moses, but must've been written at the time of Jehoshaphat, and Ibn Ezra said this is wrong. He criticized this Jew for denying Mosaic authorship of that chapter. But what it may mean is that Ibn Ezra thought, that when it said these are the words that Moses spoke "beyond Jordan" that Moses didn't write that, but that was a heading somebody else put in later. And as to these other statements, now he says, "and the 12", "the mystery of the 12", what is the 12? Well, Spinoza suggests that 12 might be the 12 stones put up beside the Jordan River. Or he suggests two or three things that were 12, but his final suggestion is that it probably

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

means the last 12 verses of Deuteronomy, Because these 12 verses tell about the death of Moses. So his guess is that, Ibn Ezra meant, when he said, "if you understand the mystery of the 12," that he meant that if you understand the fact that Moses didn't write the account of his death but this was added later, so what it adds up to is, that probably Ibn Ezra thought there were certain verses in the Pentateuch which had been put in later than Moses, but he didn't want to say it, didn't want to arouse discussion and argument a bout it, so he just made this cryptic reference at this point in his commentary.

Spinoza however did not hesitate about raising arguments and discussions. Spinoza wrote very, very strongly about these things, he is very, very critical about the book of Genesis, of the whole Pentateuch, and some very few writings that came afterward, He took very critical attitudes, and said it is full of contradictions, misstatements, all sorts of impossible things, and took very extreme hostile attitudes toward the Pentateuch,

But those writers, Spinoza and those others, some picked out, the verses Ibn Ezra had mentioned and certain other verses, and they'd say these verses couldn't possibly have been written by Moses. Now these occasional writers, through those centuries, had little influence on the world. Very little attention was paid to them, but now that the higher criticism is a great influence, these arguments they gave are sometimes used today. They certainly are not arguments for the higher criticism. These men never heard of the higher criticism, but they may be arguments against Moses' having written those particular words. So I want to look at a few of these verses, because they are verses which you will find enter into discussion, some times, and occasionally somebody today will quote one of these, as if this proves the higher criticism, which it certainly doesn't. Yet they are matters with which you should be familiar. So #2 is:

2, Discussion of some of the verses involved. And there I will mention first the verse at which Ibn Ezra made this comment. This will be a, Deut.1.1. Yes? (11) I don't want to take the time for everybody to copy that. The thing to remember is that Ibn Ezra at Deut.1.1 said, if you understand, and then he quoted a few verses here and there, then

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

you'll understand this. Yes? (stu.) Oh, no, he was quite positive, he might admit that Moses wrote some sections, but (stu. 11 3/4) —oh, Ibn Ezra, we have no evidence how far he went, he just made this very cryptic statement, but Spinoza was very much anti-Jewish and anti-Christian. Some writers today would say he is one of the best Jews and best Christians who ever lived. (But that shows you how much Christians they are, when they can write that about him.) But he was a great thinker, an able man, and he wrote this book against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. He felt the Pentateuch had great spiritual truths in it but when it came to physical statements that it just was unreliable. And some later writers of these writers said that Moses wrote a good bit of the Law but that it was in separate small writings and that Ezra took all this stuff and put it together and wrote the Pentateuch. Now that was a theory advanced by some men, but it is not the higher criticism, and it didn't have much influence.

Well, now let's look at a few of these verses. The first, we call small a, is Deut.1.1, and this is one you're apt to hear a good deal about, because if you meet somebody who knows a little about the higher criticism they're pretty apt to be familiar with this verse. These are the words that Moses spoke to all Israel, beyond Jordan. Now I notice here, the King James Version says, "on this side Jordan, in the wilderness." But the Hebrew word there is the word which is generally translated "beyond Jordan." And the argument based upon it is, that whoever said that Moses was "beyond Jordan" when Moses said these words, must have been in Canaan, and therefore Moses couldn't have written them. That is their argument. Well, of course, it could be a title at the beginning of the book, put in later. The book of Deut. you could have a title put at the top, these are the words that Moses spoke beyond Jordan. That would be a possibility. It doesn't seem to me that if this was a title put...

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

...of the Jordan, at the side, which is usually translated "beyond Jordan." But this "at the side," it is used in the Scripture, this Hebrew word to indicate either side, and that is not usually admitted or recognized, but it is a fact if you look at the references which make it very clear, that it is used sometimes for one side, sometimes for the other side. Now of course even if it meant beyond Jordan, it could've been used by Moses, in the sense, "beyond Jordan," because Moses thought of Canaan as the land God had promised to His people. That is made very clear in Genesis, God promised a kingdom. Now from thinking of the land they was coming to, over there, he said it would be beyond Jordan. So even Moses could speak of that as "beyond Jordan," just as we would've said, we were in Transjordania. It is now called Jordan, but it was called Transjordania up until about ten years ago, and we called it Transjordania, Transjordan. We might say I'm in Transjordan --I'm in Beyond the Jordan. It is strictly speaking not logical, but it is the way we do. We give a name to an area and then use it simply as a name. But I don't think that is the case here because the word is used for sometimes one side and sometimes the other side. It was on the side of the Jordan, whether this side or that side.

I have a number of references here to the use of the term, where it is used for the various sides. Now Deut.11.30 is one of quite a number of instances which can be used for one side or the other of this phrase. Deut.11.30, Moses is speaking and Moses says it shall come to pass when the Lord thy God has brought in unto the land whither thou goest to possess it, thou shalt put the blessing on Mt.Gerazim and the curse on Mt. Ebal, are they not across Jordan, on the other side of the Jordan? And there it is used to describe the other side of the Jordan, that is the side that is called "this side of the Jordan" but the other side was the side where Moses was then. It is used in one verse, in the same sentence for both sides. Numbers 32.19, It is used in one sentence for both sides. There we read, in the English Bible it says: "For we will not inherit with them on the other side of Jordan, or forward, because our inheritance is fallen to us on this side Jordan, eastward," Well, now literally in the Hebrew it is, we will not inherit with them

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

across Jordan, westward, because our inheritance falls to us across Jordan, eastward. The same phrase exactly that is used, where it speaks of--these are the messages that Moses gave "beyond Jordan," is used in this verse for both sides. So it is "on the side of the Jordan." It can be this side or it can be that side. "On the side of," apt to be the opposite from the one where you are, but not necessarily. In this case he uses eastward and westward, instead of which side. We won't inherit with them across Jordan, from us, over there, because we already inherited across Jordan, from them, over here. So that it refers to the one side or the other side of the Jordan. But it is often said that this must mean the other side of the Jordan from where the man who is speaking. That therefore, Moses could not have written Deut.1.1. Well, it could have been, be a title put in later, at this part, it could be, but I don't think it is necessary in view of the use of the word. I think it entirely possible, that Moses, thinking of the fact that they're down there in the plains, next to the Jordan, they're soon going to cross the Jordan, to conquer Canaan, he puts a heading that these are the words that Moses spoke when he was here at the side of the Jordan, or "beyond Jordan" from the Promised Land into which they are soon to enter. Well, that is the first of these and we'll look at them Thursday. Mondays and Thursdays we're going to have a little quiz at the end of the hour. But never less than five or ten minutes. Never longer than half an hour. But--I should say rarely instead of never. But we'll have a quiz Thursday which will include Thursday's lecture and also the ... (5 3/4) - (beginning again at 6)

...so for this first exam I'm only going to assign a two-hour lesson, but I'd like you to have this ready by next Tuesday, please. Take a sheet of typewriter size paper, or note-book paper, and head the page, Designations for God in Genesis. Then start in please and look at the beginning of Genesis, and you read, In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. So you put 1.1 God, because in chapter 1, verse 1, you have the word "God." Then verse 2, it says the Spirit of God moved, so you put 1.2 God. And then you have 1.3 God. And so on. Now when you get over to chapter 2, you will find a statement re-

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

ferring to the ~~Lord~~ LORD God, and there the word "~~Lord~~ LORD" is all in capitals. Be sure that you copy it that way, all capitals. Because in the Hebrew there is a word Adonai which means Lord and if you have that word, in your English, it will be Lord in small letters. It might have the first letter large or small but the rest will be small. But when you have LORD, it does not represent ~~the~~ of English word Lord at all, it represents the name of God. God is a title, just like we say there is a man, there is an elephant, there is a horse, there is a dog. It is a designation of a type of being, not a name, ~~but since there is~~ In a country which has only one king, you may address him as "King" and since there is only one God we can simply say God, meaning ~~that~~ the one god, but it is a name of a type of being, rather then a proper name. The Hebrew word "elohim" is also used of other gods, which of course do not ~~exist~~ exist, but it is the regular word used for God in the Bible, "elohim." Now ~~the other way,~~ you ~~have~~ see LORD, it represents the Hebrew word which has the consonants, jod, heh, wau, heh. ~~And the Jews we think~~ pronounced that word originally, ~~We don't know how they pronounced it,~~ but we have many proper names like Jehoshaphat which starts with that, and which means that this name for God has judged. And we have Hezekiah, ending with it, which means this name for God is strong. ~~And we have~~ There are many names which include the ~~pronunciation, it would seem, of this God, of~~ this name for God. About 100 years ago some of the critics decided that the name originally must have been pronounced Jaweh (or Yahweh), so in their books they always refer to it as Jaweh. About 50 years ago they decided that was wrong, that it was pronounced Jahoo, so critical books written 40 or 50 years ago, refer to Him as Jahoo, like the beginning of Jehoiakim, which means the Lord has established, but then they gave that idea up and went back to the old Jaweh. Well, now whether it ~~means Jaweh or not, we don't know,~~ we don't know how it was pronounced. The Jews decided at a rather early time, (we don't know how early, perhaps at the time of the Exodus), ~~anyway they decided~~ that it was dangerous to take the name of God on profane lips, and therefore they discontinued pronouncing ~~the name,~~ it, and when they would come to it in reading the Bible, ~~come to it~~ they would just say, ~~the name, say those words,~~ "the name." "The name

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

has been very good to me. "The name" has done this, I will trust in the name." ~~But~~ that wasn't very satisfactory, so ~~pretty~~ soon they stopped saying "the name," and started saying "the Lord." ~~And~~ when they would come to this name of God, ~~instead of saying "the name," they would say "the Lord."~~ There are cases where they actually use the words, "the Lord" in the Hebrew, those cases are represented in English with small ~~l~~ord, ~~but where they come to "the name" and then say "the Lord" in those cases they pronounced the word,~~ as a noun, when they would see ~~jod, heh, wau, heh.~~ It is thought that someone in the early middle ages who knew a little Hebrew and not much came to the consonants in the Hebrew Bible of the name of God and saw that they had put the vowels ~~on it~~ of the word Lord or, and didn't realize they were the vowels of the word Lord, and therefore were pronouncing the consonants of one word with the vowels of another, and ~~consequently said Jehovah.~~

It is ~~thought~~ that ~~that is the~~ way the pronunciation Jehovah originated, ~~that it is a combination that way.~~ Well, personally, I feel we don't know how the name was pronounced, anyway. We cannot say the name of God because we don't know how it was pronounced. I hate to say Jaweh because the word is used so ~~much in very antagonistic books, speaking~~ about Jaweh, the tribal god, Jaweh the thunder god of Sinai, and all that sort of stuff, I hate to use the pronunciation Jawah. We're sure that wasn't exactly the way they pronounced, in fact, ~~the~~ pronunciation is always changing in every language, and the pronunciation may have been similar to that, quite ~~similar~~, it certainly wasn't exactly ~~because~~ those exact sounds we have today, ~~they wouldn't have had even 200 years ago.~~ Sounds are always changing. So I like to say Jehovah, because it is a name, ~~it is a name,~~ and this is a name. When you say the LORD it sounds like a designation of a sort of being, rather than a name, and this is a name. The ordinary reader, reading the Bible, when ~~they~~ read God ~~they~~ think ~~they have~~ a name, when ~~they~~ reads "the ~~Lord~~" they think ~~they~~ have a title, when ~~actually~~ it is exactly the other way around. When you come to the ~~Lord~~ in capitals, it is "the name," and when you come to God, it is a title or a designation.

~~Now~~ the result ~~of that~~ is, that ~~thus~~ people are in confusion about it. ~~Now~~ In translating

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

the Authorized Version, they found that the Septuagint had been translated by pious Jews who when they came to this name just put the Greek word ~~(12 3/4)~~ which means ~~the~~ Lord, and consequently the Septuagint nearly always translates it Κυριος, unless you have it preceded not by the word God but by the word LORD, and in that case they translated it God. ~~But the Septuagint has its translation~~ LORD for it, and the King James Version translated it LORD, except in, I believe, four cases. There is one case where he says they will praise me by my name, and then it has the first two letters, and that's in our English Bible as "by my name Jah," but I think there are three or four cases where ~~they have~~ the word Jehovah is in the King James Version, ~~three~~ or four. The American Standard Version, 1901, tried to substitute Jehovah all through, and I think there was a great advantage in that because what is ~~the~~ a name in the Hebrew would be represented by a name in the English and

P.12 (1/2)

~~...and it probably is not the~~ correct pronunciation, anyway we don't know what the correct pronunciation is. If you want to write Jehovah on this paper, like the American Standard does, I have no objection. ~~But~~ What I am interested in is knowing what the Hebrew has, having a word which will designate what it is. But I want you to make this list, and to put in about two hours, and in the course of this two hours, I want you to indicate every verse which calls God something, whether it calls Him God, ~~Lord~~ LORD, Lord God, or ~~if it should say~~ Almighty God, or something ~~like that~~ else. I want you to represent the verses, from Genesis, ~~right~~ on, and then you will ~~know~~ see how they fit together. This is very important in the history of the Higher Criticism. And rather than my simply telling you what is there, I'd rather you would discover it for yourself. So we will eventually ~~use~~ do it over a fairly large part of the book of Genesis. ~~Yes? (1 1/2) What I am assigning is two hours, I will later assign more, so there is no objection to your continuing futther. You will later cover quite a bit, but two hours will be sufficient for this time. Now of course if I find that there are a few of you who cover about a fourth as much space in the two hours~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

as most of you do, I'll think that those few probably spent three-fourths of the two hours sleeping, and I'll ask you to put in an extra hour or two for the next lesson to catch up. Mr. Brown? (2) If you want, make columns, but don't make over two columns on a page, because you might want to put a little further discussion on it. (more remarks on columns // and other questions.) Well, now that is the assignment for next time, I took a bit of time explaining it for the explanation is very important for our whole consideration of the higher criticism. This is one of the most important factors in it, and ~~for the~~ we will not have to explain that, when we get on with it, but we will have this chart which will make it easier to understand our discussion. The papers which were turned in last Monday on the quiz, some were very excellent, and some were not at all excellent. I think on the whole they were quite good. I hope that those who did not have very good, will review that material, I'm going to ask those same questions again sometime within the next three weeks, but I want you to have them thoroughly because they are basic to all our subsequent work in the subject.

Now we will continue with our consideration. We were on section I, under E, and we noticed that Ibn Ezra made a very cryptic statement in Deut.1.1, in which he quoted a few words from a number of other verses. His sentence by itself really doesn't make much sense, it is just a quotation of a few words from each of several verses, followed by the words, anyone who examines it carefully, let him understand what it means. Ibn Ezra did not take a position on the matter, but merely called attention to these verses. About 500 years later, Spinoza declared that Ibn Ezra meant that he didn't think that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. Spinoza also had been dead for several centuries.

But there was one case where Ibn Ezra said that another

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

references to a few other cryptic statements by medieval rabbi

~~rabbi of a hundred years before this time, he said that Isaac said that this chapter might~~ have been written the time of Jehoshaphat, ~~and Ibn Ezra said he disagreed.~~ Some critical books will say Ibn Ezra also referred to this other passage and points out that rabbi Isaac had already said it couldn't have been written by Moses, thoggh of course that is not ~~what Ibn Ezra said, but he did point to~~ the passage. ~~We're going to look at that and at the passage Ibn Ezra referred to, and at a few others of a few writers shortly after referred to.~~ ~~But as I mentioned to you,~~ these ~~arguments by these men~~ statements had very little influence ~~in the world at that time~~. You will now hear them given sometimes as arguments for the Higher Criticism, but what we call the Higher Criticism, had never been heard of by these men. ~~There were~~ One ~~of~~ two of these men ~~who~~ are said to have suggest that Ezra wrote the Pentateuch. ~~They said there was some material from Moses~~ using passed down from Moses, and Ezra wrote the Pentateuch. Nobody today ~~believes that~~ holds such a view, ~~today most scholars in the field follow the Higher Criticism and that we are leading up to.~~ ~~But now chronologically we want to look at some of these verses. #2 we already mentioned as discussion of some of the verses involved.~~ And I'm going to ~~look at 11 passages~~.

Such questions were based on eleven passages. Eleven

~~Now eleven~~ passages out of the whole Pentateuch ~~is very little.~~ ~~Eleven verses~~ — is really — out of five long books, averaging about 40 chapters to a book, ~~is~~ very little, ~~and there are a few others~~ which were mentioned ~~by people in those days~~, but not many. ~~They are hardly in a class with these.~~ ~~These are really all of the arguments that were presented~~ that amount to anything. I mean there were general statements, like, "the Pentateuch is full of contradictions," and questions about the historical possibility ~~possibilities~~ of certain matters (7 1/2) by some of these anti-Christian writers. But the passages they refer to to prove that Moses couldn't have written it were very, very few. But we want to look at these.

A We look first, briefly, at ~~the one in~~ Deut.1.1, where Ibn Ezra made his ~~quotation~~ note. Even now ~~And in Deut.1.1~~ much is made ~~to this day of the~~ of this claim, that Deuteronomy could not have been written by Moses because it begins with the words, "these are the words which Moses

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

spake unto all Israel, across the Jordan, in the wilderness. Or the King James Version says "on this side Jordan." But the Hebrew simply is be Ever, "on the side" ~~and "across" is sometimes translated in the Bible as "across," although there are other cases where it means "on the side of,"~~ or "beside." ~~And it is a fact that~~ In later Israelite history, the region east of the Jordan was called the region across the Jordan, the region beside the Jordan, the (8 1/2) ~~, that came to be a regular term for that area.~~

"So," ~~they say~~ some have said how could Moses, ~~tell,~~ who never was on the west side of the Jordan, ~~never was there~~ in his life, ~~how could he say,~~ have written these are the words Moses spoke across the Jordan?" That is ~~the argument which~~ is given as a big argument by many people. But I do not think that it is such a big argument. In the first place, as I mentioned last time, supposing that these words weren't written by Moses. Suppose the whole book of Deuteronomy is made up of the speeches Moses gave, and then that somebody put a title on it, and said, "these are the words that Moses spoke to all Israel on the other side of Jordan in the wilderness." ~~That~~ It wouldn't disprove Moses' ~~writing~~ having written the book ~~at all,~~ for somebody to put a title on it, expressed from ~~their~~ his own viewpoint, ~~that was not at all.~~ Yet But I don't think it is necessary to hold that idea Canaan was the land promised to Abraham, the land of Canaan centered in the area west of the Jordan. Canaan proper is west of the Jordan, though the land can be thought of ~~to~~ as also including some of this territory ~~beyond~~ east of the Jordan. ~~And~~ Genesis tells us how God promised Abraham ~~and~~ this land of Canaan, and they people were headed for this land of Canaan, they were ready to conquer ~~this~~ that land, but they did seize a certain amount of territory on the other side of the Jordan. Now from Moses' viewpoint, Canaan is where they ~~is~~ are going, Canaan is the promsed land, Canaan is their center, their headquarters, ~~it is also going,~~ though the Promised Land is also to include some territory on the other side of Jordan. Why should not Moses even have, ~~if~~ he thought of it as the other side of Jordan and have used that term, for the region where he was, said, we are now on the other side of Jordan, we are in the part of Palestine on the other side of Jordan from the main part. It would not be strange at all, for the term to be used in that way by Moses, with his thoughts centering in Canaan the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

way it did. So that it would not be at all strange for him to use it that way, even if he
¶ However, even this interpretation is unnecessary for
thought of it as meaning that, but it is clear that the term itself does not necessarily
there are places the term
mean that, because we have cases where it is used for the west side of the Jordan, cases
--part
where they say that they thought of the tribes were to be on the (11) of the
Sometimes the word is used for one side and sometimes for the other
Jordan, toward the west, and others on the ——— of the Jordan, toward the east.
It can point to and
So that the word used for that which is beside, or alongside the Jordan, could be used
came to be to refer to
for either side. Its ordinary use for the side to the east, but it could be used for either
side. So when a word has this much variety of use, and when even in the strictest way
¶ If however
that the critics might think of it, even in the strictist way, it would not be out of place in
and there is of course the fact that it could be
Moses' speaking, to say we are now in the (11 1/2) Jordan, now in the
section of the Jordan where the lesser part of the land is, of the Promised Land. It would
not be at all out of place for him to use it that way. And in addition where, even if it
to book at a later time
should be a title somebody put on later, it would not disprove that all the rest of the book
¶ The argument from Deut 1:1 and still is greatly
was by Moses. It seems to me that it is an argument that has been, tremendously over-
Each of probably for
stressed, and is to this day. But you will come across it, if you have discussions very
as evidence that
much, because it is one of the things that people point to immediately, to say Moses
the Pent. They say: "
couldn't have written it. Moses never was over there, how could he say, this is what I
¶ Yet even taken it contrary to the evidence
said on the other side of the Jordan." Well, he could, of course. And just as one example,
as meaning "the other side," Moses still could have used it as a
Caesar came from Rome. Julius Caesar lived in Rome but he took an army and conquered
geographical designation. Thus
France, and the area which they called Gaul includes not only France but also most of the
(2) part (1)
northern part of Italy, and they called the northern end of Italy, the Romans called this
(3) "Cis-Alpine Gaul," that is, "the part of Gaul on this side of the Alps," and the part of Gaul that
was beyond the Alps they called, "Transalpine Gaul," the part of Gaul across the Alps. So
Julius Caesar's most famous work, his commentary on the Gallic wars, is the account
of his battles in Transalpine Gaul. and he would say I am in Transalpine Gaul, that is what
he would say. He didn't think of it from the viewpoint of the point he was but from the view-
point of the empire as a whole. and surely Moses would think of it from the viewpoint

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

of the Promised Land, which was their objective, rather than from the particular point at which he happened to be. He might, from the point he happened to be, but it would not be at all unusual for him to think of it the other way, and nor would it for any of us....

P.13. (1/2) ...will be Gen.12.6, and this is one which Ibn Ezra mentioned, and one of which a great deal is made today. Gen.12.6 is when Abram first came into the land of Palestine. And we read that God is telling him to go into the land that God is going to give him, that he came to the land of Canaan, verse 6, "and Abram passed throught he land unto the place of Sichem, unto the plain of Moreh. And the Canaanite was then in the land." And that is one of the big arguments that is made against Moses' having written the Pentateuch. The Canaanite was then in the land, even books by some conservative writers will say this cannot have been written before the time of Solomon, because the Canaanite was still in the land right up to the time of Solomon, so when you say "the Canaanite was then in the land," it means that now the Canaanite isn't in the land, therefore Moses couldn't have written it. But that is a type of argument which seems to me does not prove at all what they claim to prove by it. How do the Israelites in Egypt know whether the Canaanites was in the land in the time of Abraham or not? How do they know that? The story here tells that God said to Abram, that God said "come to a land that I'm going to show you," and Abram left Mesopotamia then and came across to this region, Well, what did he find when he got there? He found a land with many cities in it, a land with a great many people in it, he was a stranger and a pilgrim in the land. He lived in tents, in it, he had no settled dwelling, he didn't own any of that land. God promised to give it to him, but he gave it to his descendants, a couple of hundred years later. He did not give it immediately to him. He followed God's promise and came to Canaan and when he got there he found that there were many people in the land, and he lived there as a stranger and a sojourner among those people. Now if this was written in Palestine as the critics were saying, the people might be expected to know the history of Palestine, perhaps, a good deal more, but

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

these people down in Egypt, and now they're in the wilderness, and Moses is writing this story, it is important that they understand the life of Abram, that they know that the Canaanites were in the land. We don't know when the Canaanites went into the land. I'm sure there continued to be Canaanites there to the very end of history, though they were conquered by the Israelites and probably greatly reduced in number, but the fact that when Abram came the Canaanites were there in the land, is important to the full understanding of the story, and especially to people in the wilderness, not knowing a tremendous lot about Canaan, and introducing Abram's coming, it is natural for Moses to tell them of it, and it is one of the big arguments against Moses' writing it, it does not seem to me to be much of an argument at all against Moses writing this. But if somebody feels the Moses couldn't have said the Canaanites were then in the land, supposing that later on, after the conquest, after the bulk of the Canaanites had disappeared, some scribe, thought well now people are going to think Abram just came into the land and everything was just right at his hand, because most of the people here now are Israelites, He put a note in the margin saying that at that time the Canaanite was in the land, and that note got later included in the text. Suppose that was so, it was a true fact, that inspiration of the Holy Spirit means God kept from error, nothing false was put there, it was true, --if this line was inserted later giving a true fact, clearly taught elsewhere, and was important for our understanding of the subject, it wouldn't interfere with Moses' having written it as a whole. But I don't think it is necessary to think that, I don't see any reason why Moses should not have written it, Now that is small b. Now small c is Genesis 14, and this is another that a great deal is made of, Gen.14.14, and of all of them, this is the one that strikes me as the most likely to show a later change, the most likely. Verse 14 here, it is telling about how Lot was taken prisoner by the kings from Mesopotamia, and these kings started to return to Mesopotamia, and Abram took his servants and went after them, to rescue Lot, and we read in Gen.14.14, and when Abram heard that his brother was taken captive, he armed his trained servants, born in his own

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

house, ~~and~~ and pursued them unto Dan. And he divided himself against them, and smote them and pursued them unto Hobah, which is on the left hand of Damascus. ~~Well, now,~~ this word Dan, ~~people say,~~ ~~cannot~~ have been written by Moses. And they have ~~a pretty good argument for it,~~ an excellent argument. ~~That is, if you turn over to~~ Judges 18.29, ~~there you find~~ a statement that the tribe of Dan, which Joshua had placed in southern Palestine, was unable to drive out the Canaanites from that section, and therefore ~~they~~ left the section that had been given them and migrated to the very north of the land, ~~and~~ ~~we~~ read in verse 28 that they came to a valley up there and built a city and dwelt there, and verse 29 says that they called the name of the city Dan, after the name of Dan their father who was born unto Israel; howbeit the name of the city was Laish at the first. So Judges 18.29 says that there was a city in northern Palestine which is the direction in which Abram pursued these people, which was called Dan in the time of the Judges, but formerly ~~it says the city was~~ called Laish. ~~And~~ therefore they say, how could Moses, a few centuries before, have said that Abram pursued them to Dan? ~~Well, there are those who~~ have tried to answer this by saying, ~~well,~~ he may not refer to that Dan, ~~he may refer~~ to another Dan. ~~Well, the fact is of course that~~ the word Dan means "judge," and it is a very common name in connection with cities, ~~because~~ a place is judgment. In an area you will likely find there is a central place, a place of judgment, just like we speak of a county seat, ~~we have them all over the country.~~ It is the sort of name that might easily have been in most any area, so it is not impossible ~~that there was~~ a place called Dan ~~here~~ at the time of Abram ~~and that that is what~~ Moses referred to. ~~It is not at all impossible,~~ but ~~this~~ we are told, ~~that a town called Dan was established there later on, and that that town had formerly been called Laish.~~ It seems to me at least possible that some other word was used here by Moses, ~~Moses said, he pursued them as far as then he names a place way up there to the north,~~ and then later on, the ~~town~~ tribe of Dan is settled ~~there,~~ ~~and there comes~~ to be ~~the~~ regular term for the whole length of Palestine, "from Dan to Beersheba," ~~it is the way all through the latter part of the book~~ that is describing the

~~whole length of Palestine. It goes from Dan to Beersheba and Dan is the extreme north,~~ well he ~~went~~ was to the north of Palestine and then pursued ~~them on~~ near to Damascus, ~~and consequently~~ it is not at all impossible that someone at a later time, seeing a name here which nobody understood, because it had ~~now~~ disappeared, and knowing that Dan was the name used ~~up~~ in that area, ~~now~~, substituted Dan. I don't think that can be proven, I think it is still possible that Moses wrote it, but if somebody later substituted a later name, ~~why~~ it doesn't seem to me that it ~~introduced any untruth into it whatever, or that it~~ interferes with Moses having written it as a whole. If somebody would say that the Pilgrims ~~when they~~ came ~~over~~ to this country, they thought of settling in New York, but ~~then they~~ decided instead to settle in Massachusetts, ~~And so they settled up there. Well, you make that statement and~~ somebody ~~says there wasn't any Massachusetts~~ at that time, ~~when they came here and there~~ was no New York, it was New Amsterdam. ~~But~~ if you ~~made a statement~~ today they thought of settling in New Amsterdam, it wouldn't mean anything to people today, that name is forgotten, ~~because~~ (I think it was 1664, ~~wasn't it, when~~ the English ~~came to~~ the little Dutch settlement of New Amsterdam and seized ~~it and named it after the brother of the king of England, the Duke of York,~~ they named it New York. ~~And it was New Amsterdam a very brief time, maybe 50 years, and then it became New York, and~~ today we say "he went as far as New York," ~~we wouldn't necessarily mean that that name was used then. So that this use of Dan~~. If I were asked to guess, did Moses write Dan or was Dan put in later, ~~I'd say~~ I'll guess it was put in later, but it is only a guess, ~~I don't feel at~~ all sure. Somebody else thinks Moses wrote it, I don't see any way you can prove ~~he~~ didn't, but I don't think in either case ~~that~~ it proves whether Moses wrote the book of Genesis. ~~It seems to me that~~ It is an argument that is vastly overrated. ~~That is c.~~ ~~But~~ you will come across it, if you have ~~much discussion~~ you will come across it, because ~~it~~ is given as a ~~strong argument~~. ~~Now d:~~

~~d. Gen. 22.14. And there~~ In 22.14, here is another of the cases to which Ibn Ezra referred in his notes on Deut.1.1, ~~he just quoted from a few other verses~~. He didn't

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

give references, because there ~~were no~~ not yet any chapter divisions, ~~when he wrote, no such reference could be given.~~ But he quoted a few words from a number of verses, and one was this, Gen. 22:14, where ~~Abram~~ Abraham found a ram caught in a thicket on the mountain to which God had ~~led~~ led him, where he offered Isaac, and it says, "and Abraham called the name of that place Jehovah Jireh, as it is said to this day, in the mount of the Lord it shall be seen." He called the name of that place "the Lord will provide," as it is said to this day. In the mount of the Lord He will provide. He will provide His lamb, ~~and will see to it,~~ He will see to it. Our translation here just says ~~He sees to it~~ "it shall be seen," it is the same verb. Now they say the temple was not built on Mt. Moriah till the time of David, so how could Moses call that the Mount of the Lord? Well, if Abraham offered Isaac there, and if he offered Isaac at a place which God showed him, designated to Him, made him walk three days to get to, and pointed out a specific place, it would seem rather natural, after Abraham's experience, that they would refer to that place as the mount of the Lord, even if the temple wasn't built there. So to say that this couldn't have been said until after the temple was built is certainly making a very big assumption. But it is one of the main arguments made against Moses having written ~~the~~ this section. ~~That was 22.14. Then we look at Gen. 36. Yes? (stu. 12 3/4) : I didn't get that at all. I didn't understand that.)~~ All right, thank you for ~~calling attention to it. There probably are others that~~ didn't either, and so glad to have attention called, ~~we'll~~ take another minute on it.

As we said, Gen. 22 tells ~~also~~ how Abraham was told by the Lord to take his son Isaac and to offer him "on one of the mountains which I will tell thee of." ~~This is in Gen. 22.2,~~ So Abraham takes Isaac to a place that God is going to designate, in the mountain of Moriah. And the word Moriah means "the ~~Lord. The~~ mountain of the Lord," ~~to a place that he would designate.~~ ~~So God leads~~ Abraham, he makes this trip with Isaac, comes up ~~here and~~ offers Isaac here, ~~on~~ the mount. But before he kills Isaac the Lord stops him and says "I see now you were not going to withhold ~~anything~~ even your beloved son from me..."

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

...to die for us, but he had this happen in Abraham's experience on a place which the Lord pointed out to him. And he went there and God provided a sacrifice, provided a ram, and so we read in verse 14, and Abraham called the name of that place, Jehovah Jireh. This is one of the places where we have Jehovah, you see, in the Authorized Version, Jehovah Jireh. And Jehovah Jireh means the Lord will see. It is "the Lord will see to it," the Lord will provide. The Lord makes the provision. And of course the Lord did make the provision, for our salvation through sending Jesus Christ, to die there, in this general area, for our sins, but He prefigured it by having Abraham take his son up there and be just ready to sacrifice him, and then the Lord provided a sacrifice, because no one of us can provide a sacrifice that can atone for our sins, it has to be provided by the Lord, and the Lord provided a ram, as typifying His only begotten Son, Whom He would provide, not Abraham's son, but the Lord's Son, Whom He would provide. So we have this peculiar verb here, verse 14, which you have all read, because I doubt if anybody here has failed to read the book of Genesis through by this time. I hope most of you have read it many times. I think likely everybody here has read this verse, but I doubt if many of you have understood. It had the Hebrew transliterated. He calls the name of the place Jehovah Jireh, which means "the Lord will provide," the Lord will see to it. And Abraham called that the name of the place, and then it says, "as it is said today, In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen." Well now the Lord will see, in the mount of the Lord it will be seen. You see, it is saying, Moses is saying, here is the place where it has happened and that place is still called by a name going back to what Abraham did. Now the Jews believe that it was at that very place, that Solomon built the temple. We don't know whether it was or not, but it certainly was in the area somewhere in that general area. It may be that this was the very spot of Calvary, rather than the spot where the Temple would have been. We don't know. But that general area--they're right near each other in any event--that general area there, God pointed out to Abraham, and had Abraham come there to make his sacrifice, to give Abraham this lesson and to be a lesson for us ever since then. So Moses said, And Abraham called the name

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

of the place Jehovah-Jireh, as it is said this day (the "to" is in italics), as it is now said, In the mount of the Lord it will be seen. Just how much the Israelites remembered in Egypt, or as they came up through the wilderness, about this incident in the life of Abraham, we don't know. We don't know what may have been said about this place, but those who think that all ancient stories surround buildings and places of importance later on, those who think that they have here a good source for the origin of the story, the fact that the Temple was built in that area. They can assume that, but they can't prove it. It just as possible that it was remembered from the very beginning where the place was. At any rate, there is something of a mystery in it, but there is certainly no sufficient proof to say Moses couldn't have written it. If Moses didn't write it, however, I think that all of you who have read this verse, that few of you have ever understood it. You've understood the chapter as a whole, you could've read the chapter straight through without this verse. Suppose somebody inserted this one verse later, at the time of Solomon, it would not mean that Moses hadn't written the rest of the chapter. Suppose these eleven verses we're speaking of were all inserted later, it wouldn't prove that Moses didn't write the hundreds of words in the Pentateuch. If these verses weren't a part of it. I don't say it's necessary to think that. I don't see any reason Moses couldn't have written them, but I don't tell anybody can prove them that he didn't, and if they did, I don't see how that would prove Moses didn't write the book of Genesis. Well, that was d.

Then e, Gen.36.31. And Gen.36 is an account of the descendants of Esau, probably one of the chapters that you folks know least about, because it is one of the chapters of enumeration, genealogy, lists of names, the descendants of Esau, and of the kings who were kings over Edom, the descendants of Esau. And you have an interesting verse in verse 31. And these are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel. Now this is the verse that Isaac, the rabbi, a hundred years before Ibn Ezra said, at least Ibn Ezra tells us he said, that's all we know about Isaac, but Ibn Ezra said that Isaac Ben Jacob said that this chapter, this

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

list of descendants of Edom, must have been written not earlier than the time of Solomon. Because it says that these were the kings before there was any king of Israel, and there hadn't been any king of Israel till the time of Saul, so it must be after the Israelites had a king that anybody could've written this statement, according to Isaac. But Ibn Ezra said he does not agree with that. Today you will find many people saying, well, how could Moses write the Pentateuch? Look at chapter 36 with its list of the kings of Edom, how could Moses have written that? That couldn't have been written till the time when the Israelites had kings too. They will say that. And suppose it was true. Suppose that this list of the descendants of Esau, this list of the kings of Edom, to which most of you have paid very little attention, and if you read Genesis a second time, you probably skipped over it, suppose it was inserted at this point by somebody, who thought when they were telling about Esau in the -- the last thing about Esau was in chapter 35, well let's insert a list of his descendants, it would be of real interest. Somebody put it in later, and it's a true list, inspiration of the Holy Spirit means it was kept from error, it is true, it is interesting information about Esau -- suppose this was put in centuries later, that would not disprove Moses having written the Pentateuch, it would not disprove his having written the book of Genesis. But I don't think it is necessary to assume that it was written later. Moses' time was several generations after the time of Jacob and Esau, and Moses after he had to leave Egypt you remember, when he got into difficulty there, he fled into the wilderness, and he lived up in the wilderness there for 40 years, and he was near the edge of the land of Edom, and he could very easily, as he pastured his flocks there, have come in contact with people who would tell him all about developments in Edom, and he could have been interested, because Esau, after all, was a brother of Jacob. And he could have been interested and gathered all this information and had all this information at hand, and if Moses at that time already knew the material that is contained in chapter 35, the chapter before this, he would have read verse 11 in which God appears to Jacob and changes his name to Israel, and God said in Gen. 35 11, God said to Jacob, I am God Almighty; be

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

fruitful and multiply; a nation and a company of nations shall be of thee, and kings shall come out of thy loins. (Gen.35:11) God had told Jacob that his descendants were to be kings, and several hundred years later Moses, in the wilderness, recalls the promise God had made to Jacob and he realizes that Jacob's descendants are prisoners in Egypt, down there having to do disagreeable work in Egypt, and while they are doing that. Edom has already had kings, and Moses had a list of the kings of Edom. So when Moses included this list in the book of Genesis, he remarked in v.31, these are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom before there reigned any king over the children of Israel. The critics say this couldn't have been written until the Israelites had kings. But the Israelites had been promised kings and all these centuries had passed and they didn't have any yet, and Edom had all these. So even if this chapter was inserted later, which I think extremely unlikely, it would not disprove Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. But I personally see no reason in the world why Moses could not have written it. Yes? (9 3/4) We don't know, you see, this is all we know about the kings of Edom. We know nothing more about them. But I would say there was no reason to think any of them were later than Moses' time. There is no evidence. Yes? If there of course that would prove that couldn't have been written at that time. (stu.10) No, if there were, you can be sure we'd hear about any such proof as that. Yes? (10 1/4,stu.) Well, of course (10 3/4 1/2) was a king of Mesopotamia, (stu) Well, they did, but this says before Jacob had kings. Israel had no kings yet. These were the kings of Edom before there were kings of Israel and they say how could anybody say this before they had kings of Israel, when they hadn't had any yet? You see, that's their argument. Mr. Gregory? (11) Well, no, Suppose I were to make this statement. (Suppose I were to say, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was president of the United States before any MacRae was. You would say, that's a rather silly statement. Why would I say that? There was never a MacRae who was president, Suppose there was a Kennedy president before there was ever a MacRae president, and you'd say that is silly, there is no reason to think there ever will be. But if 200 years ago, the Lord had predicted to my ancestors that there would be a MacRae who would be

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

president of the United States, then it would not be a silly thing to say, because then I would know there was going to be a MacRae president! ~~(Stu.12) Oh, yes, completely. Well, I take too~~ long on this point. I was going to have you write for 15 or 20 minutes and there is only five left, so we can't do much writing in five, but the things I have written out for you today wouldn't take about 15 minutes, which is very bad. I'll have to instead give you just one question instead of two. And that one question I'll give the same for everybody, which I don't like to do. Name, today's date, and then mention the types of material that we have in the Pentateuch, and say as much about each as you can in four minutes. ...

P.15. 2/5/62. (3/4)

... to get our papers back from Pentateuch. It seems rather senseless to do the work for nothing." Well, I don't appreciate anonymous letters, although when you have something to say you think is important and you don't want to give me your name, don't hesitate, I'd be glad to have your opinion anyway. But I appreciate it better if it's signed, but that doesn't mean that I'm going to tell the rest of you who signed it. But this question here made me wonder about one thing because all the papers thus far in Pentateuch were put in the boxes last Thursday morning. And Mrs. Baker put them out and the particular name signed to this she specifically remembers putting in the box, so she said she could have put it in somebody' else's box, I hope you would've put it in the right box. One could make a mistake, but they were put out last Thursday, after class. I intended to have them finished by Wednesday and put out so you'd have had time to look them over before class, and I could've discussed them with you, because I do want you to understand just how I'm marking them. As the the O.T.Introduction, we're in a different situation there. There the papers were long, require considerable work. (2)

but I have to have them before me in order to mark the course properly, because you can't--say somebody is right between two marks, I want to have all the material about that person to look over and be sure I give the right mark. But sometime before the end of this semester I will make the long papers of O.T.I. available to you if you want to get them.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

when I put them out on a table, half of them are taken usually and half of them ar e never taken. So if you've got this material in your head it doesn't matter so much whether you get the paper or not, but they will be available to you later. But in Pentateuch it is my hope to get them back quite promptly, not always easy to do with a class of this size, but I am anxious to do that because I do not expect you to be able to understand the succeeding work in this course, that is, starting about tomorrow or Thursday, if you do not have what precedes well understood. Up to this point, that is not so, but what we have thus far is quite important for understanding the relevance of what follows. So I'll give you these papers back and I'd like to explain to you just how I marked them. The quiz that I gave you last Monday was, half of it on material done before. That is, one long question on material done before, one short question on material that was taken during that day. Now that second question half of you was on kenosis, what it is, and the other half on accommodation, and considering you'd have no chance to read your notes but simply to hear it in class, I think most of you did very good and understanding of it. There were very few whom I did not give full credit to for that 2nd question. Now on the first question, (explanation, 3 3/4, on the marking) though, that was an extremely important question, the question that I gave the two of you. The question that I gave half the class was, what evidence is there that Moses wrote the Pentateuch? Now you know that includes the word wrote, that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. You will read things about Moses in the Pentateuch, that doesn't prove he wrote it. What evidence is there in the Pentateuch that he wrote it? You read statements about Moses, that does not prove he wrote it. And you will find it says this is the speech Moses gave, well, that is very fine, but that doesn't prove he wrote it. I did mention that there were frequent mentions of Moses in the last four books, being one through whom most of the information came, one who was connected with practically all the events, and would know by first-hand observation what happened. That is important supporting evidence as to his having written it. But that wouldn't come under this question. That question was, what evidence is

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

there in the Pentateuch that Moses actually wrote the Pentateuch. ~~And~~ In class I gave you a number of specific verses, in which it is said that Moses wrote something. I gave ~~you those references and I read you the verse, and~~ it is important to know that the Pentateuch actually says that Moses did some writing, and that he wrote some of what is in it, but the Pentateuch nowhere says that Moses wrote all of it. ~~We couldn't prove that from the Pentateuch. We have other evidence on which we (5 1/2)~~

But the Pentateuch says that Moses wrote some of it, so I wanted you to say specifically, what he wrote, and the papers that were given into me on that quoted,--oh, by the way, I didn't ask you to memorize the verse or the reference, so I told you you could use your English Bibles, and that way you could find the reference very quickly, so if you knew the passage, the reference would be very easy to find. I'm not asking you to memorize the references, but I am asking you to remember what the passage is. ~~For instance, it~~ says that God commanded Moses to write the story of the warfare against the Amalekites. ~~Now if you stated that, I wouldn't have marked you down for not giving the reference. The reference of course for that is~~ (Ex. 17.14). It states in Ex. 24.4 that God commanded Moses to write the words of this book of the covenant, and ~~in~~ verse 7 of that chapter, ~~it~~ says Moses wrote the words of this book of the covenant. ~~Well,~~ I explained to you, the book of the covenant is ~~Gen.~~ Ex. 20-23. One ~~man~~ student in the class said that Ex. 20-23 is the book of the covenant, which was given through Moses. Well, that didn't prove Moses wrote it, and I couldn't give credit for that. He had the idea, but not the specific thing ~~that~~ related to the question, which was, what evidence do we have that Moses actually wrote? But in chapter 24 we have these two statements that Moses wrote the book of the covenant. You remember there ~~was~~ is a statement in Numbers that Moses wrote in the book the lists of the marches ~~which they made.~~ And then in Deuteronomy there is the statement that Moses wrote these laws, God commanded Moses to write these laws. That is in two different passages in Deuteronomy. ~~Now I then gave ten points for this question. If you had a good statement for the second one, the matter of Kenosis, and if you had each of these references given and~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

discussed, given or referred to. If any were missing I took some down for it. Most of you on this question got ten or eight or nine, though there were a few sevens or sixes and a very few who were much lower. Now, incidentally, the one who asked this question I have just referred to you, he got an eight on the quiz, which I thought was very good. Now the other question, ~~that the other half was asked,~~ was what is the New Testament evidence that Jesus believed Moses wrote the Pentateuch? ~~Now this~~ I question is more important for us than the other one. The fact that it says several times that Moses wrote parts of it may suggest that he may have written the whole, but it doesn't prove it. But we know that the Hebrews believed that Moses wrote it all, it is referred to many times in the rest of the Old Testament, as the work of Moses. It was Jewish tradition, believed by practically all the Jews till very recently that Moses wrote all the Pentateuch. It has been the tradition of the Jews and of the Christian Church. But to us the thing that determines it is the fact that Jesus Christ said that Moses wrote it, and that I gave you specific references. ~~I didn't ask you to memorize these references again, but told you you could use your Bibles and find them,~~ and in your paper I found that some quoted Mat.8.4, some Mat.19.7,8, some Mk.7.10, some Mk.12.19-22, some Lk.16.29-31, some Lk.24.27,44, and some Jn.5.45-47. Now there are other references which I did not give, where Jesus referred to the Pentateuch in a way to imply He believed Moses wrote it, and some of these are very explicit: e.g. "Moses wrote of me"; "If you won't believe Moses' writing, how will ye believe my words?" Statements like that. Very explicitly (1) show that (2) the Lord (3) took the position that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. So I made a list of these seven passages which were mentioned in your papers, ~~these seven passages, and noticed which ones different people referred to. Nobody referred to more than five of these seven passages. Sometimes a different five. If five of them referred to, and a decent discussion of them, and a good discussion of accommodation, I gave ten points. If there were only four referred to, I gave 90 points, with three I gave eight points, and so on down. So that's the way I marked these papers then, and many of them were very good.~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Now in the ~~statement~~ Quiz that I gave you last time, I intended to give a sizeable quiz but did not notice how fast the clock was moving, so instead I just gave you a brief ~~question, name and describe the~~ types of material in the Pentateuch. Now on this question ~~of~~ the types of material in the Pentateuch, I had told you of four types, ~~and I had given a little discussion of it. My discussion of it involved the fact that~~ some of them occurred a great deal and some very little, ~~but I did~~ describe. I thought ~~that would include how much there~~ was of each, ~~but it wouldn't necessarily. A man came to me this morning and showed me that he had named all four of them and that he had discussed, described~~ what kind of material they are, but he didn't say which was common and which were uncommon, he didn't say how much, and he had been marked off for that. Well, the question could be logically interpreted, "describe" as not including how much, ~~so~~ though I had stated that and intended it to be included, so if any of you gave a good description of it, and named all four but did not include how much there was of each, let me know, show me your papers, and if that is the case, I'll add two points to the mark in that paper. Because it would be a valid interpretation of the question, as I gave it.

Now those four I didn't mark equally, I gave a different number of points to each of them. If you had them all right, there was a mark of 9 on the paper, and incidentally, I noticed that the man who gave me that question I read to you a little while ago, did get 8 on it, which is again the same mark he got on the other paper, very good mark. So I don't think it was senseless, even if I hadn't turned it back to him. But the first of these, I only counted 2 points, the reason being that it was the most common, everybody ought to know it, narrative, so common that I didn't think a person deserved a great deal of credit for remembering. I think everybody did remember. But this question, narrative, naturally to explain, narrative means an account of events, but then practically all of Genesis and the first half of Exodus were narrative, and shorter passages (13 1/4)

that was all stated, that was two points.

Now the second question was a very important one, and consequently I counted

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

~~about~~ three points for it, and there was one very excellent paper, in all other regards, which completely omitted the second, and I hated to take three points off of her excellent paper, for forgetting genealogy...

P.16 (3/4)

...and that sort of thing, genealogy, enumeration, lists, all that sort of thing. There is not a, well, if you include the list in Lev. of what you're going to do with the caul of the animal, what you're going to do with the kidneys, the liver, all that sort of thing, it could be quite a bit, you might think that was law rather than enumeration, but certainly there was a good bit under this head, quite a few chapters. That was three points. And then the third question for which I also counted three points, is one which should have been obvious to everyone because the very name of the Pentateuch, is the Torah, the Law, and the third was Law, and at leas t half the Pentateuch, probably a good deal can be put under the category of Law. You might say this one and the second overlap, because you can have Law which flow rather freely, and you can have laws which are 1, 2, 3, a, b, c, pretty much like enumeration. But this third was Law, about half of the Pentateuch, and then the last one I only gave one point for. So if you had the other three and not the last, there was only one point taken off. That was poetry. Poetry doesn't go under any one of the others. But there were comparatively few chapters of poetry in the Pent.° There are the blessings of Jacob, in Gen.49, song of Moses, and ~~so on, there are~~ a few other chapters, ~~like that, and~~ mostly celebrating some great event. It is not particularly important in relation to the higher criticism. IN fact it doesn't fit into the ~~divit~~ critical theory at all, ~~so perhaps it is important to realize there is something that doesn't fit into the theory, but the reason it does not enter into the development of the theory, so I only counted one point for that.~~ Now that is a lot of points, nine, to give for about the last five minutes of class, and so I'm sorry I didn't notice it earlier and give you longer, as I intended to do. Now, those were quite important matters, all four were dealt, all five that were dealt with in those two quizzes, and I will ask all five of them again some time again during the next six weeks, because

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

they are very important. If you have questions about them please get them straight, and be sure you have them well in mind. Then we began on the second point under capital E, Early Questions regarding Mosaic Authorship, and I mentioned that the early questions did not produce any great results. They did not cause any great stir, and no great number of people followed them. Today the Higher Criticism which is followed by a great number of people, incorporates many of those arguments. But those arguments didn't lead to the Higher Criticism. So in a way you might say they're not as important as what is coming, but still they are quoted and referred to today, a good bit, and some of them, so it's important we have an understanding, and here we get into rather close reasoning.

We get into a brief section here in which someone said, how can you have something as closely reasoned as this, as logical. Well, if you all pay close attention I think we can get it clearly in mind. But I'm going to speak briefly about each of those we've already spoken of and then go on to the others. They're not nearly as important as the material yet to come in this course, but I would like you to get a good understanding.

The first one was Deut.1.1. The problem in Deut.1.1 is that the Hebrew says, that Moses spoke, these are the words that Moses spoke unto all Israel (4 1/2) at the side of the Jordan. That is the problem. Now the King James Version got around the problem very nicely. They just translated (4 1/2) it as "on this side of the Jordan," which is not a translation; it is a paraphrase. Actually the translation of (4 3/4) might be a little difficult to know how to translate it in view of the way it is used. It is generally said that the Hebrew word is means "beyond Jordan." I think it you would say "Beside Jordan" it would not be too far from it. Or "on the shore of Jordan," but perhaps it's a little nearer "beyond," because it is often but by no means always as a general rule it is used as that section which is across from you, the other side. So the argument that these men, that Ibn Ezra perhaps had in mind, that Spinoza stressed, was this: if Moses who never crossed the Jordan, never came into Canaan, but was always

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

east of the Jordan, or rather south of Palestine, if Moses said these are the words that were spoken beyond Jordan, why it shows Moses didn't write it, because Moses never was in a place from which he would speak of that as "beyond Jordan." It is as if I were to speak of the other side of the Mississippi River, when I was in California. But, Now that just occurred to me as an illustration. Now that wouldn't be so impossible, at that. I was brought up in Northern Michigan and I had lived the largest portion of my life, by far, back here in this area. Now suppose I were to retire and move to California. And suppose that someone were to think it worthwhile to write a story of my life, and were to come out there to see me in California and discuss matters. Well, it would be quite natural to say, I was brought up in northern Michigan, I spent most of my life in Delaware and Pennsylvania, but I spent a few years on the other side of the Mississippi in California. It would not be at all unnatural to say that, even if I was in California when It was said, because the greater part of my activity would have been on this side, and the viewpoint of the thing as a whole would be the other side. Now that is an argument which I think can legitimately be given about this. Moses is writing this for Israel to which God had promised the land of Canaan. The land of Canaan is mostly west of the Jordan River. That is where the center of the life of Israel is to be. That is where Abraham spent most of his life. That is where Jerusalem was to be, where David was to be the great king, the side of the Jordan which is toward the Mediterranean, the western side is that which is principally in your mind, as you think of Israel in Palestine. So it is not at all unnatural to speak of the other side of Jordan as where Moses when he wrote this. Even if Moses writes it and has never been on the western side of the Jordan, he is writing for Israel, from the viewpoint of Israel, God's dealing with Abraham, with Jacob, with Israel afterwards, it is not at all unnatural for Moses to say it that way. And then I mentioned to you that though this is entirely reasonable if we take the word as meaning "across Jordan", usually used of the other side of the Jordan, yet it is a fact that the word is sometimes used of either side of the Jordan. Across Jordan is sometimes used of one

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

side and sometimes used of the other side, and right in this third book of Deuteronomy we find that in the third chapter of it the phrase is used of both sides. In Deut.3.8 he says that he took it that time out of the two kings of the Amorites, that land that was on this side Jordan--that is the King James translation, but the Hebrew was just (8 1/2) the land in cross-Jordan area. That's part of Moses speech. Well, now let's suppose that Moses didn't write the Pentateuch, and suppose that across the Jordan always means the other side from where you are, as the critics try and point out. Well, if it does, whoever wrote Moses' speech, if they were writing in Palestine, they were writing what Moses would say over there, and in his speech over there, to the people, to have him speak of what they had already conquered as across Jordan would be utter nonsense. Nobody would be quite so silly as that. But to speak of it as the area across from the main part of the land that God had promised them, on that side of the Jordan, the (9 1/2) is entirely natural and in Deut.3.8 in Moses' actual speech he refers to it as the the region east of the Jordan, while in the same chapter, in verses 20 to 25, he refers to the west side as "beyond Jordan." And there the King James translates it "beyond Jordan." That is when Moses tells the people, you are to go over beyond Jordan and there you are to fight, and then you who have land on this side are to come back to your possession, but first you must go and fight "beyond Jordan." And he prays to the Lord, he says, "let me go over and see the good land that is beyond Jordan," and there he uses it of the western side. Thus the phrase "beyond Jordan" is used of either side. And usually used of the east side, the one away from the main center of Palestine. So the argument and this is an argument which you'll often hear, if a person takes almost any Bible course today in a university, this is apt to be given as a conclusive proof. Why Moses couldn't have written the Pentateuch, because Deuteronomy begins with the phrase, "beyon Jordan," and Moses couldn't say "beyond Jordan" when he was on that side. But it is given as a conclusive argument, but as I hope you see it is not a conclusive argument

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

at all. And we can go one step further, even if it were so, the fact that the title of the beginning of the book of Deuteronomy says, these are words Moses spoke to all Israel, on (11) "across Jordan." That wouldn't prove Moses didn't write the book because ~~that~~ it could be a title ~~for~~ put at the top (2) by somebody else, (1) later on (3) I don't think it was. I think Moses could have written it. But if you want to take this verse beginning, as a title given by somebody else, it does not affect the Mosaic authorship of the book as a whole. Now this one is very important, this Deut.1.1, that's why I repeat it again, what I gave you before about it. If you get in a big discussion of it sometime in the future, or if ~~you have~~ a student in your church ~~who~~ has gone to a university where he is facing this problem, and you have to deal with it more fully, get out your concordance and look up the phrase (11 1/2) אֵלֶּה הַדְּבָרִים I'm not going to take time to give you all the cases where it's used in the Old Testament of this type and of the other type. You can easily find it in any good Bible concordance. I have given you two or three good examples, but in a big discussion you could then look up and find the other statements, because there are quite a number of ~~statements~~. Cases for ~~this type~~, cases for the type. Yes? (12 stu.) Well, on this particular point, I don't think the time element comes in to this particular point. The location might. But I was saying there is, that as far as the location is concerned, it could be used from the location where they happened to be at the time of writing. Or it could be used with thinking ~~of the location which according to the whole book is the main center~~ of Israel (12 3/4)

~~and so it could be thought of as the center~~ ~~Thank you for (13)~~

Now that was a. Now b. And by the way some of you I've seated up front and some of you quite a ways back. It's easier for people up front to ask questions than in the back, on account of distance, but if there is anything I don't make clear, please don't hesitate to ask me, no matter where you are sitting. If there is anything I don't make clear, please always ask me about it. If you think that there is a very great

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

weakness in the argument given at any point, please don't hesitate to raise the point. ~~If you have a side question of interest...~~

P.17. (3/4)

and ~~small~~ b. I mentioned Gen.12.6 ~~and in Gen 12.6~~ Abraham passed through the land unto the ~~Plain of Shechem~~ place of Sichem, unto the plain of Moreh, and the Canaanite was then in the land. ~~And that I imagine everyone has but I'll take just a second to recapitulate. The Canaanite was then in the land.~~ The critics say that when Moses ~~wrote,~~ did any writing, the Canaanite was then in the land, so why would he say at this ~~previous~~ time that the Canaanites were in the land. They say this must have been written after the conquest, after the Canaanite had been completely removed from the land. Else why would you say then the Canaanite was then in the land? But it never strikes me as a very strong argument, ~~because a person is not writing in reference to~~ (1 1/2) ~~he is writing according to how they were when this event happened. And he~~ is bringing out that when Abraham ~~came~~, God said come to a land I'll show you, I'm going to give to you and your posterity, -- ~~you~~ get there and the Canaanite ~~is~~ in the land and Abram ~~is~~ a stranger and a sojourner, living in tents, his whole time there. So it's a good thing to remind people of, even if they already know it, that the Canaanite was in the land, at the time of Abraham. Even if he is still in the land when it's written, ~~I don't see any~~ Personally I don't see any force to this argument, but it is one that ~~is~~ Ibn Ezra uses, and one that you will find frequently referred to, so it is ~~one that is~~ very important that you be familiar with it.

Now c, ~~I gave~~ Gen.14.14, ~~that~~ Abraham pursued the kings from Mesopotamia as far as Dan, ~~v.14 says,~~ and 15 says he divided himself against them and smote them and pursued them to Hobah which is on the left hand of Damascus. Now everybody knows that Palestine is ~~spiek~~ spoken of as From Dan to Beersheba. Dan is the extreme northern end, Beersheba is the extreme southern end. So if Abraham who is encamped with his flock and herds in the southern part of Palestine ~~if Abraham~~ is said to have pursued as

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

far as Dan it shows he went clear up to the northern end of Palestine. It is a very natural way to tell how far he pursued. Doesn't say anything much about the city or anything, ~~it~~ is not the city he is interested in, it is the general area, as he pursued ~~this (3 1/4)~~ them in order to rescue Lot. So there ~~must~~ would be no problem with this verse, if it were not for the fact that in Judges 18.29, we have an account of a migration of the tribe of Dan from the southern part of Palestine to the northern part. They found in the south, they couldn't conquer the Canaanite ~~there,~~ so after they left the Canaanites were still in the land down there, but they went to the north ~~and~~ there ~~they~~ settled way up ~~in the north~~ and we read in Judges 19.29, "they built a city and dwelt therein and called the name of the city after the name of Dan their father, howbeit the ~~name of~~ the city was Laish at the first, ~~and~~ so it is usually considered that this verse says, that this place up there wasn't called Dan until the time of the Judges, but was called Laish. And here it says that Abraham pursued as far as Dan. Well now does that prove then that Moses couldn't have ~~read~~ written it. ~~Well~~, In answer to that I pointed out that the name Dan means a place of judgment and consequently even though they named the city after their tribe Dan, there's no reason why there could not have been other places named Dan, so there might be another place in mind. But that if ~~it~~ there was not, if it is this place which didn't get the name Dan until two or three hundred years after Moses' time, that it could easily be that a copy of this book, coming with the Laish, which if he said he pursued them as far as Laish, and the Laish was forgotten in their day, and he is not talking about the city anyway, he is talking about the area, how far they went, he would substitute the word Dan which would be understandable to everybody. If so, that would be a change made at a later time, to keep exactly the same idea, but to make it easier to understand. It would not change the fact in the slightest, so that there would be no problem of inspiration, no change of fact, but simply a change inthe way it is said to make it clear. Like if you would say that Columbus did not sail to the region of New York but only down further

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

southwhen he came this way. There was no New York in the time of Columbus, and when the Dutch settled it they called it New Amsterdam. It wasn't till after 1660 they called it New York, but we today speaking of the place might use the term "New York" for the area, so this is a case where I don't think it's necessary to believe that Moses didn't write it, but where it is not impossible that the word was changed at a later time. Just the use of this word doesn't prove the whole thing was not written till after that time. Well that was c. Now d, is Gen.22.14, and there we read--now this one I don't seem to have gotten the idea as clearly to you, and perhaps it is understandable why, because the verse as it stands is not easy to understand in the English translation. The English translation of it in the King James Version is, "and Abraham called the name of that place, Jehovah Jireh, as it is said to this day, in the mount of the Lord, it shall be seen. Now anybody who didn't know any Hebrew would naturally say, what on earth is that? He called it Jehovah-jireh, as it is said to this day, In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen. Now of course all of you here, knowing Hebrew as you do, immediately recognize that when it says Jehovah-jireh, that means the Lord sees, and the Lord sees, as it is said to this day, In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen. And this is the account of where Abraham took his son Isaac to make a sacrifice to the Lord, but God gave him a sacrifice instead of Isaac, and said I see, you didn't even withhold from me your beloved son, Isaac, I see you really love me, and it was a test of Abraham, and more than that, it was a symbol, a prediction of the way in which the Son of God would be actually offered, not merely partly offered, and then offer a ram instead, but God's Son actually would be offered for the sin of the world. It is a wonderful type of God's sacrificing His own beloved, only begotten Son, that we might be saved through Him.

Well, now the problem here is, he says, as it is said, in the mount of the Lord, it shall be seen. Well what does that mean? As it is said in the mount of the Lord it shall be seen? It isn't clear what it means. But the best sense that can be derived from it is, that Moses is saying, that this place in the mountains of Moriah,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

where Abraham sacrificed Isaac, is a place which retained the name! "The Lord see to it," "The Lord Provides", that that name remains on the place, and the objection to it is, that it was on Mt. Moriah where the Temple was built in the time of David, and so they say, when it calls it the mount of the Lord, it must be referring to the place where the temple is, and it wasn't there till David's time, so how could Moses have known this? Now, it doesn't seem to me that that is a very strong argument.

Because we have many places in Palestine which were named after what Abraham did there, and this was one of the most important events in Abraham's life; this offering of Isaac, and God providing a ram in the thicket in his place. And Abraham would name the place, and Moses would say to the people, the place where Abraham offered Isaac, that is called, in the mount of the Lord it will be seen. That is the place where God provided it, that that would be then, even if there was no temple there, for another four hundred years. It doesn't seem to me that it is much of an argument. Now of course people claim they couldn't have that name there until the temple was built there, but God knew where the temple was going to be built when He told Abraham to go and offer Isaac in a place I will show you", in the mount of Moriah. God knew the temple would be built there later. And we don't know it's the exact spot of the temple anyway. Maybe this wasn't the spot of the temple, it was somewhere in that area. Maybe this, instead of being the spot of the temple, was the spot of Calvary. Maybe it was the very spot where Jesus was Crucified. We don't know, it was the general area. But nobody says this wasn't written until after Jesus was crucified. Nobody advances that argument. There is no reason why it couldn't be a name given to the place in the time of Abraham. I think I read Mr. Kaufmann's question before he gave it, if I didn't, why (10 1/2) yes? That was d, Gen.22.14, does that make it clear? Any questions at this point, please ask it because they're not so easy to make clear, and I want to be sure that you all thoroughly understand that.

Then, next is Gen.36:31. Now Gen.36, the whole chapter is the story of the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

descendants of Esau, ~~It is a list of Esau's descendants~~, followed right after the account of Jacob and Esau's relation ~~to~~ with each other, and ~~where~~ the two of them ~~get together and~~ bury Isaac. ~~And then it tells about Esau's~~ descendants, and it lists ~~his~~ leading descendants, and it ~~lists~~ names the kings of Edom, ~~and~~ Then in v.31 it says, "and these are the kings who reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel." ~~And people~~ The critics say Moses could not have written that, ~~because when~~ They say, When Moses ~~was there~~ there was not yet any king of Israel, so how could he say these are the kings of Edom before there was any king of Israel? ~~Why there wasn't any yet for a long time afterward.~~ They say this couldn't be written till they actually ~~had~~ was a king of Israel. ~~These are the kings that reigned in Edom before there was any king in Israel.~~

Well, suppose ~~that in Mexico they were to have a king, and~~ they were to ~~have~~ five kings in Mexico, and ~~you~~ someone would say, ~~now~~ these are the kings that reigned in Mexico before there was any king in the United States. You would say, "what a silly statement, there isn't any king in the United States." So the critics say it must be that ~~this was~~ written after there were kings in Israel. That is their argument, and that is an argument you will often hear. Well, now, suppose the argument is true. What ~~does this~~ would it mean? It must prove that chapter ~~36~~ was inserted later, the account of the Edomites, or it might simply prove this one verse was inserted here. ~~it might prove that, that this one verse was put in later. It~~ is true, there is nothing uninspired about it. Inspiration means kept from error, and it is true that there were these kings of Edom before there was any king of Israel. So it would not be an incorrect or false verse; ~~it would be as~~ it would be as much inspired as anything else. ~~but~~ Suppose somebody put in this verse later, saying, "Isn't this remarkable; they had all these kings before there was any king in Israel." ~~he put them in.~~ That would not prove that Moses didn't write Genesis or the Pentateuch. But I don't think you have to admit ~~even~~ that the verse might have been written later. It is not quite ~~in~~ the same as ~~situation that~~ it would be to say these were the kings ~~of~~ in Mexico before there was any king in the United States. ~~It~~ That is not ~~in~~ that situation ~~because~~ the ~~very~~ just chapter before it, ~~in the very chapter before it and I~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

(hope most of you have the Bible before you--in the very chapter before it) Moses...

P.18. (3/4)

...and among these promises he said a nation and a company of nations shall be of thee, and seed shall come of thy loins. So a promise is given in chapter 35, that there are going to be kings over the descendants of Jacob, kings are going to be descended from Jacob. Then in chapter 36 he tells about Jacob's brother Esau, and he tells how Esau has got so many descendants, and got these great kings from him, this great country of Edom, and Jacob's descendants were still simply slaves in Egypt, and in a situation like that, with David's descendants simply slaves in Egypt, when they've been promised they are going to have kings, and now they're coming out of Egypt, and Moses writes it and Moses describes the descendants during that time, of Esau, and Moses had been in the wilderness 40 years, he had had plenty of chance to learn all about this, he was on the border of Edom, Moses could easily say, "these were the kings of Edom, before there was any king from Israel?" It would be a very natural thing to say, because God had said, there are to be kings of Jacob in the very chapter before this, so if you note the context the argument is not valid. Now that, I think, is quite important. Now this is not merely, of course, what was going to happen, week after next, about the rise of the higher criticism, because that all builds one thing upon another, and it's a thing that has built in a form that has spread over the world, and has tremendous interest, and then it has taken up these arguments and used them, but they're isolated individual arguments. But I do think you should understand these arguments, and be able to discuss them if they're brought up to you, as they will be. If you have any dealings with students in liberal seminaries, or if you become pastors of churches in which you have students who go to universities, and take any courses in Bible in those universities, or if you are in missionary work and your people begin reading books about the Bible and they pick up some of these critical books and they come to you with their problems, you're going to have some of these to answer. So it is very vital to have an understanding of them

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

F. Numbers 12.3 ~~Now that was e.~~ The next point is ~~And~~ f is an argument of very different type, an argument which was not raised by Ibn Ezra, but one which we find used quite a bit today. ~~Numb.12.3.~~ And there are quite a few people today who say Moses never could have written Num.12.3. ~~And you~~ where we read ~~Numb.12:3 (and you read)~~ "Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth." ~~That is what it says about Moses here.~~ I have a book here, "A Short Introduction to the Pentateuch," by Prof. ~~Aldridge~~ Aalders of the Free University of Amsterdam, He's a very godly man and a very great defender of the faith, but ~~on this matter of the Mosaic authorship,~~ I think he has gone astray, regarding ~~And in his book on this~~ In his book he denies the higher criticism and tries to answer it right down the line, but then he says that some of these verses, ~~he says they~~ couldn't have been written by Moses, ~~and so he says~~ the things that Moses' laws were correctly preserved, and other ~~different~~ things, but that somebody in the time of David put it all together, ~~and wrote the whole thing~~. ~~Well,~~ I don't think his arguments are valid.

But this particular argument seems to impress him very specially, ~~because he~~ says, ~~in~~ two passages, Moses is described in a way that implies another writer. "Moreover the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt, in the sight of Pharaoh's servants, and in the sight of the people," Ex.11.2; "And ~~the one I just read you~~, and Num.12.3, "Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men which were on the face of the earth." Prof. ~~Aldrich~~ Aalders says these words cannot be ascribed to Moses without accusing him of matchless pride and self-conceit. ~~that's what he says.~~ ~~Now~~, I do not think that he is right ~~in that~~ in this at all. I took so much time in discussing your last paper, which I would've taken last Friday but I didn't have it ready for you, to get it to you by Friday, I think maybe we better postpone the quiz till tomorrow, and continue on this ~~right~~ point now, for today. So, if there is no objection, we will do that.

~~Well,~~ he says, "these cannot be ascribed to Moses without accusing him of maximum pride and self-conceit." ~~Personally,~~ I don't think that is so. I think one of the remarkable things about the Bible is that the Bible states matters as they are; it does not twist things around to make them different than they are, the way that ~~we would~~ today.

http://www.maccaelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

For instance, the Bible tells us that David was a man close to God's own heart, the Bible speaks very highly of David, yet the Bible tells us in the plainest language how David was guilty of adultery and ~~of~~ murder. The Bible gives the bad and the good about a character. ~~And you will find that~~ Moses is shown to have become angry at ~~this~~ Egyptian ~~and~~ murdered ~~and to have~~ fled from the country, that he held back and refused to serve the Lord, ~~saying~~ "send anybody you want, but don't send me," so God practically forced him to go back and bring the people, ~~Also~~ that Moses lost his temper and said to the people, "you rebels, shall we get water out of the rock for you," and that God condemned him for it, and told him he wouldn't go into the promised land. We find Moses' faults brought out in the clearest fashion. Now if his faults are brought out in ~~the clearest fashion~~, why should not his virtues also be brought out clearly and plainly? That is to say, we feel that we should not say anything that sounds good about ourselves, about our good qualities, people will think we're conceited, we hope somebody else will say them, when we don't say them ourselves, and then we try to cover up the worst features about ourselves. But the Bible speaks plainly and directly and gives both sides. ~~And~~ these two verses, I do not think show self-conceit at all. ~~Now~~ the ~~one~~ that ~~he~~ quotes in Ex.11:3, says, that Moses was very great in the land of Egypt in the sight of Pharaoh's servants, and in the sight of the people. This isn't saying Moses is a wonderful man; this is saying Moses is a man of great standing, he was great in the eyes of Pharaoh and in the eyes of his servants. You can't understand that account in Exodus without understanding this here is Pharaoh, the greatest monarch of the day. Moses comes right into his court and ~~there~~ rebukes him, tells him God says He is going to punish him, tells him God ~~calling~~ on him to let the people go. ~~he does that~~ repeatedly. You try to do that to President ~~Kennedy~~ of the United States and see how far you get. You may get into the front room of the White House but you won't get any further than that, and after you go four or five times, they'll lock you up. You have to have an appointment in advance, and he has to have a definite ~~the~~ understanding ~~if he ever of what~~ ~~wants~~ to see you. Pharaoh was the same way, only more so.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

~~But Moses~~, after the miracles he did, ~~Moses~~ after the way that he authenticated himself, ~~he~~ was recognized there and was able to ~~come~~ right in. Pharaoh was afraid of him; he said let him come in, I'll hear what he has to say. He was very great in the eyes of Pharaoh and of his servants. You have to know this fact to understand how these things could happen as they ~~are~~. ~~It is not~~--there is no self-conceit in it. Now the same is true of the statement in Numbers. And if you read the passage I think you'll see how it is. ~~And if~~ you take the statement of what it means, it's not giving an overall judgment of Moses but is a statement of his conduct in this particular situation. ~~Now that will take us about three minutes to cover, and we have only about 30 seconds left, so I think~~ I'll ~~leave that till tomorrow~~. ~~Then we'll have~~ the quiz tomorrow...(9)

(9 1/4)...these verses which certain men suggested to show that Moses was not the author of the Pentateuch, and that it must have been written later. ~~And~~ these have been taken up by the higher criticism, but they did not lead to the higher criticism. It is a separate development altogether, ~~and this they would never lead to~~. ~~And~~ But just at the end of the hour we mentioned Numb.12.3, and I read you how Prof. Aldridge ~~put with that~~ Ex.11.3 which said that Moses was very great in the eyes of Pharaoh, and I discussed in general the ~~matter~~ fact that the Bible speaks more ~~clearly of~~ plainly about men's evil than other books, it does not paint ~~them~~ men as perfect; it shows even the best of its characters, ~~it shows their~~ mistakes, ~~their~~ and errors; why should it not also ~~give the true statement about~~ the good things about them. ~~I pointed that out, and pointed out how in Exodus that verse which~~ was not one of these earlier verses given, ~~I'm not including my outline, but which is mentioned in connection with this one~~, I pointed out how the context required it, and the same is true in Numb.12.3, this ~~is~~ one ~~which was used, and~~ has been pointed to for a long time, but I don't think ~~that~~ it is valid at all.

Numbers 12, ~~Chapter 12, Numbers~~, "And Miriam and Aaron spake against Moses because of the Ethiopian woman whom he had married, for he had married an Ethiopian woman. And they said, has the Lord indeed spoken only by Moses? Has he not spoken also by us?

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

And the Lord heard it. (V.3) Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth. V.4, "And the Lord spake suddenly unto Moses, and unto Aaron, and unto Miriam, Come out ye three unto the tabernacle of the congregation. And they three came out." And then you remember that outside there, the Lord spoke to them, and the Lord criticized them for their criticism of Moses, and the Lord struck Miriam with leprosy, (you remember.) Moses did not lift a hand in the situation. Now Moses was not a gentle fellow; he was not an easygoing fellow. Down in Egypt, when he became angry at the Egyptian who was persecuting the Israelite, and killed him. Later on, you remember how he stood and said, "you rebels, he said, shall we bring water out of the rock for you?" And God greatly punished him for that. Well, now, most men who get angry and upset about things, and aroused about the progress of their work, as Moses did there, if someone were actually to be criticising their family, speaking about their wife the way these people were speaking about Moses' wife, (criticizing him for having married this Ethiopian woman) a thing which, after all, was between him and his wife and the Lord--if they had been doing, most men, that's when they would have gotten aroused and angry, but Moses got aroused when he thought his people were being wrongly treated; [his nation,] he got aroused when God's honour, [he thought,] was being injured. But here was a situation where his family and his personal situation, his personal honor, was being criticized and attacked in a way that most men would become extremely angry and upset, and Moses did nothing, and the Lord called them out, and the Lord did it, and I can well imagine Moses, a few years later, as he was putting the finishing touches on this book, looking back and saying, "my! my! people won't believe that! They just won't believe that; when they think of the error I made, losing my temper and not getting a chance to go into Canaan, for it, and the way I killed the Egyptian, they won't believe that I would be that. Well, he says, Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the people on the face of the earth. He doesn't mean that was his character, but he means that on this occasion, on this occasion, when he was so wrapped up with the cause of the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Lord and the work of the Lord, he showed this tremendous ~~weakness~~ meek in relation to his own personal situation, his own personal choice, his own personal honor, and his personal relation to his wife, and the Lord said, "If Miriam's going to make such a fuss because of the dark skin of Moses' wife, if she thinks that whiteness is so important, we'll give her real whiteness!"

~~P.19. (1/2)~~

~~...take away her leprosy and to cure her of it, and it was~~ the verse is necessary for the understanding of the situation. It wouldn't fit otherwise, what we would expect in general, or what we would expect of Moses. ~~Now~~ you just grab the verse out of context, and think that he was saying, "I, Moses, am the most gentle, meek fellow that ever lived, ~~and that's not~~, ~~that would be strange to say, it~~ doesn't fit with the other things we found out about him. But in relation to his own personal honor, on this particular occasion, he showed a meekness which hardly anybody on earth would be expected to show. ~~And it~~ explains the situation. ~~Yes?~~ ~~(1 1/4)~~ Yes, ~~now you say "possible."~~ ~~I say it would be in every one of these we have looked at,~~ ~~We haven't looked at a single one where if you take it out you (1 1/2)~~ Every one of these we have looked at it is possible that somebody put it in later on, as an explanation, which was a true explanation, it was not false, it was inspired of God, ~~it was~~ kept from error, it was entirely true, ~~but as an explanation which had not been (1 3/4)~~ Moses wrote, ~~and~~ it would not interfere with the Mosaic authorship as a whole. But I have not seen a single case where I think it is necessary to believe that ~~that~~ it was put in later on. The one where I come nearest to thinking that it might most likely be later is Daniel. Because we have a definite record of ~~that~~ a certain name being given to a town on the extreme north much later. There it seems to me ~~(2 1/4)~~ that that name was probably changed, after all, we are not told what happened there, but just how far north he went, ~~and that~~ when that name was changed, it was well to substitute the name that would be most understandable to the people of the time. I don't say that's necessary, but I think

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

that it is perhaps almost probable. But in any of them I think it is possible, they do not affect the integrity of the narrative. You could read straight along without them, but it does seem to me that it is required for a clear understanding of their records, and that if not there originally, it would be understood from the broader context? Therefore I think (2 3/4) my own guess is that Moses wrote it. Well, that then is f. Now g: Objections

G. (1) Numb.21.14. And here is one of the early ones that was raised, I think even Ibn Ezra referred to this, "Wherefore it is said in the book of the Wars of the Lord, What he did in the Red sea, and in the brooks of Arnon." Here he refers to, and tells of an event as they enter Palestine, enters Transjordan, and then he says, "Wherefore it is said in the book of the Wars of the Lord, what he did in the Red sea, and in the brooks of Arnon." Well, they said, how could Moses have written this, there wouldn't be any other books to refer to then, this must be written at a later time, referring to a book that was used as a source. But this doesn't say that this is taken from that, it refers to another account, and with these tremendous events of coming out of Egypt and coming into the promised land, and with the people who had lived in Egypt, where writing was common, and where it was customary to make monuments for any great event that occurred, it would not be at all strange if other accounts were made, and were distributed, Such they were not inspired of God, but they were accounts by people who told what they had seen, They who celebrated the Wars of the Lord, celebrated the victories, and so on, and Moses makes a reference to one such book. It does not mean that that book is inspired. By inspired we mean kept free from error, the book would probably be mainly true because it was what somebody had observed, but it would not be kept from error, as Moses' writings were. It would be a book which people were using, and Moses makes a reference to it. It does not seem to me that it proves that this was written later. But there again, as Mr. Gregory just pointed out, if at a later time somebody wrote in the margin at this point, why that's, it is what you find mentioned in this other book, the book of the Wars of the wars of the Lord, this book that is widely distributed in Israel, If somebody wrote that in the margin and it got copied

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

into the text, it would not interfere with the integrity of the whole, it would be perfectly true. There would be such a book which had this statement; if there wasn't it never would have been said. It would not be contrary to fact at all, nobody would write such a thing in the margin if there wasn't such a book in existence. It would be a perfectly true statement in such a case, but it would not interfere with the Mosaic authorship of the book as a whole. I personally see no reason why Moses might not have written it. But again if it was a later insertion, it does not affect the Mosaic authorship. Yes? (5 1/2)

Question: The point that I have in mind is regarding the inerrancy of the Scriptures, when we start thinking of these interpolations. How can we then fit this idea of the interpolations with the idea of the inerrancy of the Scriptures?

Answer: In these cases we have looked at so far, I personally do not see that in any one of them it is necessary to believe that Moses did not write it. But even supposing that they were written later, does any one of them introduce error into the Scriptures? Is there any one of them which contains a statement which is not true? The Scriptures are just as inerrant with these statements in as they could possibly be with them out. They do not introduce any error. If they were put in at a very early date by some later writer, the Lord kept that writer from error in putting it in. There is nothing in any one of these particular statements that contradicts anything else in the Bible, or that adds to the Bible, or that contradicts our general knowledge of any sort.

Question on Jesus' reference to Moses' writings

(6 3/4) Well, we'll have to ask him, some time, but at present all we can do is to make our guess from the sound of the words, and I would say from the sound of the words, that I don't think that those words fit with the idea, that Moses wrote a few laws, and a (7 1/4) was added to it later, and then a whole book of which Moses

Answer by AAM

might have written one-tenth was called the writing of Moses--I don't think Jesus' words fit with that at all. I personally think it extremely likely that the whole Pentateuch, as we have it, was written by Moses, but if somebody else wants to say that when Jesus refers to it as what Moses wrote, it can mean that Moses wrote the bulk of it. Say, Moses

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

wrote nine-tenths of it--these are things that Moses wrote, it is substantially Moses' writing. But that under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, God allowed certain things to be inserted or added later, I have no quarrel with such a person. I would say I do not see that it is necessary, from the words of Christ, to think that every word of the Pentateuch is written by Moses in the first place. I do not think that is necessary, though I personally see no difficulty in thinking that it is probably the case, ~~but as to which of the two are true, I didn't mean to make a facetious remark, or anything. I just meant to point out the fact that when it comes to interpreting His word,~~ we read the word and use our own judgment as interpreters. But I don't think we can reasonably use our judgment to say that, in spite of His word, very little of the Pentateuch is by Moses. I think that it is a possible ~~interpretation of His word~~ that all is by Moses, but ~~I think~~ it is a required interpretation that most of it is. ~~That's my feeling. Yes? (8 3/4) No, not (8 1/4)~~ It is altogether possible that Moses had a very considerable source of material, ~~that~~ Abraham wrote the account of most of the events of ~~Abraham~~'s life, and ~~that~~ Moses ~~collected~~ what portions ~~he desired out of it~~ to include in Genesis, ~~and that he~~ might have had something that Isaac had written, or something that Eliezer of Damascus had written, "Memoirs of my experiences while Steward of Abraham," something like that. It's not at all impossible. ~~He may have~~ had sources ~~from~~ Genesis. ~~But~~ when we get ~~here~~ to Numbers, Moses was there, Moses himself, ~~Moses~~ was the important character, ~~and therefore~~ he could ~~have~~ asked ~~anybody~~ else, if he didn't remember just how something happened, ~~where~~ he was in one part of the ~~(10)~~ camp and the other, ~~end of the camp something else happened,~~ he could've asked somebody, ~~but~~ that he would've used written sources for ~~that~~ where he was present, I just don't think ~~that's~~ probable ~~at all~~. If I were to write a history of Napoleonic wars, you would ~~be interested, if interested in the book at all, in knowing~~ what sources I used, what first-hand accounts I read by people who were there. ~~But~~, if I were to write a history of ~~Faith~~ Seminary, you would know that nine-tenths of what was in it, I had personally

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

observed, and you would know that I might have been unclear in my recollection of a few things, and asked some other people a few questions as to how they remembered it, and checked it by my recollection, but that I would look up any written account of the history of Faith Seminary, or things related to it, in order to get material for such a book, would be extremely unlikely. So that the use of sources by Moses in Genesis, absolutely. The use of sources by Moses in the later books of the Pentateuch, that is, after Exodus 2, well there is no reason for it, if Moses wrote the Pentateuch. See, therefore, if his reference here is this is where I got this from, then it is indeed an argument against the Mosaic authorship. But if it is simply as it sounds, simply, well, you will find another account of this over there, that's all he says: wherefore it is said in the book of the wars of the Lord, what he did in the Red sea, and in the books of Arnon, and at the stream of the brooks that go down to the dwelling of Ar, and lies on the border of Moab, In other words, it sounds like a reference to a book of poetry, celebrating the victory, rather than a book of facts from which any knowledge of it would be been gained by Moses. That was g, Numb.21.14.

H. → h, Deut.2:12. If we have been going at these in straight Biblical order, except for Deut.1.1, because we already took that as a. h then is that right here we're skipping Deut.2.12, and there in Deut.2.12 we find a statement that the Horims also dwelt in Seir beforetime, but the children of Esau succeeded them, when they had destroyed them from before them, and dwelt in their stead, as Israel did unto the land of his possession, which the Lord gave unto them."

Now the words here of which considerable was made by certain writers 300 years ago was, "as Israel did unto the land of his possession, which the Lord gave unto them." They say, this says that Israel had already conquered Canaan when this was written. And he is referring to how the Edomites took the land of Edom, he says like Israel did. Well, now, this is an account of the Israelite coming to Edom on their way to Canaan, and it seems like a rather silly thing for somebody later to say, that when the Israelites are coming to Canaan and in fact yet taken their land, anyway, that the Edomites had taken the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

land of Seir, as we know they had, 300 years before this. ~~the~~ The Edomites had taken that as Israel ~~did to~~ was to take the land of his possession. ~~It seems I mean,~~ If Moses didn't write it, ~~and~~ but it was written by somebody 500 years later, ~~it's~~ a queer way to say it, ~~as Moses did. So to my notion,~~ that it is not something which sounds as if it were written at a later time, ~~but~~ rather ~~than that time, but it sounds~~ like a case where the Hebrew perfect has a different sense than our English past. ~~In fact~~ It is sometimes used to

~~P.20. (1/2)~~

~~passages. God has done this, referring to~~ something that's going to happen in the Millennium. ~~Things~~ that God has established, they are clear, ~~they~~ are mentioned in the Prophets in the perfect, ~~because~~ since it is God's definite promise, it is just as certain as if it had already happened. ~~Now~~ We don't use the past tense in English in that sense, but the Hebrew perfect is used that way repeatedly in the Prophets, ~~and so it would seem to me that a~~ better English translation would be "as Israel was to do, to the land of his possession." ~~That is, that God has made it definite that Israel is to do~~. It wasn't yet done, but it was already established in the mind of God, ~~and~~ it seems to me that ~~that~~ this interpretation is just as necessary if this was written later on, as it would be if it was written by Moses. In either case, you wouldn't say that the Edomites had done it as Israel had done it when Israel hadn't yet done it no matter when you're telling it. So it does not seem to me to be much of an argument against Mosaic authorship. It is simply a place where it is difficult to ~~get~~ render the exact sense of the Hebrew perfect into our English, whose tenses are so different from ~~what the~~ those of Hebrew is. ~~Well~~ This is not one of those of which a great deal is made, but is one which at first sight is rather difficult just what to do with.

[Heading] ~~Next is small i,~~ Deut.3.11. ~~Now~~ this is one that Ibn Ezra gave in his list, ~~a few of them,~~ with Deut.1:1. Ibn Ezra said, if you can understand these verses, then you can see the solution of certain things. ~~In other words,~~ He didn't tell us what he meant, ~~at all,~~ but he lumped them together in such a way that ~~present~~ critical writers say, "this is what he meant." ~~(2 1/4)~~ ~~was very sure~~. But what the verse says is:

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62-Pentateuch-II/README.htm

"For only Og king of Bashan remained of the remnant of giants; behold, his bedstead was a bedstead of iron; is it not in Rabbath of the children of Ammon? Nine cubits was the length thereof, and four cubits the breadth of it, after the cubit of a man." The critics say: Now Og had an iron bedstead. They say how could Moses write a thing like that? This sounds as it is preserved hundreds of years later in the museum. and so how could it could be written by Moses who was there when it happened? Well, Moses is not here telling us about the conquest of Og king of Bashan, That is told in Numbers. I mean he is not telling it as part of his history, he is here giving us his farewell address. And in his farewell address to the people, a very few months after that happened, he is reminding them of these things, and reminding them of the way God has been with them. He says God enabled you to conquer Og king of Bashan, and he says Og king of Bashan had an iron bestead so big as this, why he says here, it is right in Rabbath Ammon, which was one of the towns in Transjordan that the Israelites had taken over. Today it is the capital of the kingdom of Jordan. they call it a Mosque today. In that town, evidently, where Og had been king a few months before, they had destroyed most of the things of the king of Edom, but they had preserved this iron bedstead for two reasons. First, because it showed the tremendous size of the man, showed the power of these people whom God had enabled them to overcome, and second, because it was made of iron which at that time was a very rare metal. Actually iron begins to come into use in Palestine at about this time, and the iron age was not under full swing till two or three hundred years after this time. But here was the king of this land who was able to import some thing out of this metal which at that time was very rare. And Moses feels that it is something that will impress the Israelites with the way God had blessed them and led them, and will enthuse them for going on to conquer Canaan, the other side of the Jordan, and he refers to this thing which they have kept. Now to say that this Og had an iron bestead, "Behold, it's still there to this day," that that would have to occur years later is no reason in the world why he could not have said it a few months later. Like I should say, one spring,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

when our graduating class gave us a very nice tape recorder, I could speak to the students the next fall, and say, last year's class gave us their graduation gift, a very fine tape recorder. Why here it is, look at it. I could say that. That isn't it over there, I'm just indicating what I could make a reference like that a few months later. It doesn't require years to make a statement like that. A few months would be enough. Yes, they say the tone of this is the tone of looking back, way back: "Og king of Bashan, only he remained of the remnant of giants, behold, his bedstead was a bedstead of iron, is it not in Rabbath of the children of Ammon?" They say, "Why would anybody say that only a few months after it happened?" They say that it sounds as if it were referring way back, "Here is where George Washington slept." Well, somebody might say, "This is where John Kennedy stayed when he was on his campaign." But you could still say that in some part of the country that he visited on his campaign had visited the same trip that no president ever visited before, or probably ever will again. You can say that after a few months, it doesn't have to be years and years ago. But you can make it sound as if it were years ago. Well that's Deut. 3:11, this is one of those of which much was made right at the start.

Now the next one is in the same chapter, Deut. 3:14. "Jair the son of Manasseh took all the country of Argob unto the coasts of Geshuri and Maachathi, called them after his own name, Bashan-havoth-jair, unto this day." Now they say, these are called this "unto this day," Well that must be centuries later. How could Moses say unto this day when this conquest only took a few months before? How could he say unto this day if he is writing this or stating it when it occurred only a few months before? Well, why shouldn't he? Why shouldn't I, as somebody that went into Germany right after, shortly after the allied troops had gone across that finger bridge you remember, that bridge that was left, and they got across so quickly on it, and then shortly after the thing collapsed. And why shouldn't somebody say, "why there was this tremendous bridge, push across and they got across here into Germany, about the b (record unclear 8 1/4)

(continue on back of this page!)

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

¶ Shortly after the end of the Second World War I went to Europe to buy books for the seminary library. While in Germany I was greatly interested in seeing the remains of what had once been a bridge across the Rhine river. This river had been the last great barrier to the Allied armies from entering Germany. After their rapid rush across France they came to this great river. All the bridges across it except this one had been destroyed by the fleeing Germans, and they were hastily trying to destroy this one when the Allied army approached. The attackers were surprised to see this bridge still standing and rushed across it. Just as the last men were safely across they heard the sound of timbers breaking and the bridge toppled into the river and its broken timbers (2) most of (3) floated away. Although this had occurred only a few months earlier, a man who described what had happened might easily have said: "Look there. Some of the old bridges' posts are still standing unto this day!"

The critics assume that "unto this day" must indicate a time centuries later, but in such stirring times of great change as this time often moves fast

to ¶ 95

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch/README.htm

that great farewell address which we call the Book of Deut., ... why they're still there, you can still see the posts of the bridge where they went across, why shouldn't somebody say that a few months later, "unto this day." Why does it imply a few centuries? That is the argument. So when he says "unto this day," it must mean centuries later. But you can say "unto this day" just a few days later. (8 1/2) Maybe you wouldn't in a few days, but a few months, it certainly is not at all unusual to say this name Jair conquered this and it's still called by his name. He gave his name to it, it's not called by the previous name any more. The emphasis that you put in a phrase like this, "unto this day," is a thing that will vary from place to place, and you'll find people in one section of this country who wouldn't use a phrase like that for anything unless it happened centuries ago, and you go a few miles away and find people using a term like that for something that happened two years ago. You can't make set rules as to how people going to use terms like this. Usage of such phrases varies from group to group, and "unto this day" there is no reason why it can't mean that change was made and the change has stuck. It is still so a few months later, we expect it will stay that way. Mr. MacKeen? (9 1/2) No, they say that this is evidently something that happened long ago, because it says "unto this day" and it's still there. Well, that is Deut. 3.14 and there is only one more I'll mention to you.

K. Deut. 34:1-12 And this is another that is probably referred to by Ibn Ezra, who's not sure, because he says, who understands the mystery of the 12, and nobody knows for sure what that means. But Spinoza's guess was that he meant the 12 verses of Deut. 34. And these 12 verses of Deut. 34 are the verses that tell how Moses left the people, went up into Mount Nebo, looked over into the land, and died there, and the Lord buried him. And Moses was 120 years old when he didd and his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated." And these 12 verses are the obituary of Moses. And it is usually held that somebody wrote those verses rather than Moses. And it is usually believed that though even if Moses wrote the rest of the Pentateuch, this that tells how he left the people, went up into the mountain, and died there, and nobody knows where he was buried, that

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/RESUME.htm

somebody else wrote that. From very early days there have been people who thought that Joshua wrote it after Moses went. Well, maybe he did. I don't know. But this tells how Moses went up into the mountain, how he stood there, what the Lord showed him and what the Lord said to him, and how would Joshua know that? They say Moses couldn't tell in advance what was going to happen. No he couldn't. And neither could Joshua tell at all what happened. Maybe Moses told Joshua what to write and Johsua wrote it after Moses went up. Maybe he didn't. Maybe God led Moses to write it in advance what was going to happen. I don't know. It doesn't affect the authorship of the book. I don't see any more proof that Joshua wrote it than that Moses wrote it, or that anybody later wrote it. If it is true it has been kept from error, it tells us things that nobody could have known at a time when he could have written it. And therefore God either revealed it to Moses ahead of time or God revealed it to Joshua afterwards, or God revealed to some later person. In either event it does not interfere with the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch as a whole. I see no objection to thinking that Moses wrote this last chapter. But if somebody else doesn't think so, I see no objection to believing it was added later. But what is important is that it was written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and is free from error, and that what is said in it is definitely true. Mr. Hugill? (12 1/2) Well, they wouldn't say much about that, because there are many books that are written that way. This book of Deut. tells what Moses said in his farewell address and that part is in the first person, that part is "I," but the rest of Deut. is in the third person, and many people write things in the third person about themselves. That's not uncommon. It is more usual writing about yourself, to write in the first person, but if you're going to write a long account in which you do many things, people don't like the sound of I, I, I, and there are people today who write accounts of the situations that they have been leading in, and do it in the third person. I've never heard that (13 1/4) used as an argument before. Yes? (13 1/2, stu: Dr. MacRae, the answers that we have been given to these questions are good explanations to those of us that

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

~~which of these is the doctrine of inspiration necessary to the explanation I've given you?~~ (stu.) "Well. In relation to this last one, unless you believed in the doctrine of inspiration you cannot believe ~~there is~~ that we have any way ~~to~~ of knowing this last explanation is true, because nobody was with Moses. Answer: But if you don't not believe in the doctrine of inspiration, that doesn't not mean you have to believe somebody made up a story a long time after. You could just as well believe that that's is what Moses thought was going to happen, and he wrote it down, or that Moses told Joshua what he thought would happen and Joshua would write it down, as to believe somebody imagined it later. I don't not think (3) Oh well on the particular question of whether Moses wrote it, that inspiration, (4) has to enter ~~into it~~ on any of these. ~~I think from our viewpoint, our understanding of it, inspiration enters in, but I do not feel, aside altogether from any matter of inspiration, that it enters into~~ the question ~~of~~ whether Moses wrote these particular statements or not. ~~Now we've looked then at these various verses and now that was 2/ Discussion of some of the Verses involved.~~

3. ~~Now I want to just mention very briefly~~ Conclusion Regarding these Verses.

~~And~~ there are three points ~~under~~ in the conclusion, ~~of which~~ the first two ~~are points that~~ I have been discussed in connection with almost every one of these verses. ~~so merely to state them~~ is enough ~~for now I believe. Those are small a,~~ a. In most ~~cases~~ of these verses there is little difficulty in accepting the idea that Moses wrote it. The only one ~~that I have much difficulty with~~ where I find (2) is the mention of Dan. (Gen. 14:14. Here) To me it seems at least ~~probably~~ probable that somebody later on changed (11) the word ~~to be easier to understand~~ for clarity. It doesn't not change the thought or the ~~(2 3/4)~~ meaning. ~~But~~ In most cases there is little difficulty. I don't not say there is no difficulty. I don't not say we can prove that Moses wrote any of these books, but I do say that I don't not see much difficulty in thinking that he wrote ~~any one~~ all of them. ~~The small b:~~

b. Even if some of these verses should be later interpolations, their number is far too small to disprove Moses' authorship of the Pentateuch as a whole. After all, I only mentioned to you eleven verses ~~and verses of this type~~ from which arguments like this were made. There

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Part 4 cont'd

wouldn't be ~~even~~ double that number and I don't know any others that would seem as strong as these. ~~Suppose~~ there ~~were 20~~ verses in the Pentateuch, which were written later and inserted, ~~that~~ wouldn't disprove Moses' writing the book as a whole. ~~It is~~ a very small number of verses ~~amount,~~ on which questions of this type have been made. ~~So that~~ I do not say that I have any objection if somebody wants to believe every one of these verses is a later insertion. ~~No~~ one of them could ~~not~~ be ~~just~~ taken out without affecting ~~content~~ it goes right along smoothly without them, ~~because they are not~~ essential to the idea ~~in any case~~. They could easily be later interpolations, but I don't think they are. I personally think Moses wrote every one of them, but I don't think ~~that~~ it is a point of faith ~~that we have to hold~~. ~~But c.)~~

c. ~~Even~~ ~~if~~ ~~at most~~ if these verses could be shown to be interpolations, that would not prove the critical theories that are taught today.

~~Small c is more important than a or b.~~ Answers to these arguments were given two or three hundred years ago by godly men ~~who wrote~~ in answer to ~~the men~~ who raised these questions. There were a few radical anti-Christians in those days who ~~did~~ said that the whole Pentateuch was just a mass of inaccuracy, confusion, contradiction, and so on. But there weren't many. There ~~were~~ a somewhat larger number who said, Moses couldn't have written the Pentateuch because it ~~has got~~ contains these verses, therefore it must be later, but there ~~were~~ are comparatively few who wrote like that. The mass of thinkers were not affected ~~by it~~. ~~I mean~~ there were a few non-Christians who would say ~~on~~ that the whole Bible is just a lot of contradictions ~~there would be a few people like that,~~ but most people, even those who were only very nominal Christians, considered that the Pentateuch was true, and that Moses had written it, ~~and~~ these questions ~~as distributed~~ did not affect any great number of people in those days, and none of these arguments ~~none of them~~ led to the rise of the higher criticism, which ~~has~~ had been such a tremendous force in the last hundred years. The higher criticism rose from an entirely different place. ~~And~~ the higher criticism, ~~after it~~ got thoroughly under way, ~~then~~ it incorporated some of these ~~as~~ arguments, ~~for it~~, but they were never proven. ~~So that~~ what we ~~are going into now~~ will discuss next is much more important than this ~~X~~, and what we're going onto as the next discussions are

~~now is what~~ will build very steadily and it will be ~~very~~ extremely important to get ~~it in~~ a proper understanding ~~and proper~~ of their content as well as of their order. ~~So capital II, you see this has all been Introduction so far, I.~~

II, The Rise of the Theory of Partition: ~~This is what~~ I want you to understand how it rose, how it developed step by step. So you can see, how theories which advanced (7 1/4) such ideas but seemed wild and fantastic have gradually been adopted because of what has led up to them, and the way people have gotten used to one idea and then have gone on from there to another idea. ~~Well~~, the first of these, ~~A~~, is the least important thing under II, yet it is one which you must get accurately, because it is frequently reversed.

A. ~~X~~ Astruc's Clue. ~~And~~ I want you to remember the date 1753 not because of its importance, but because it is much referred to. ~~The date of it is 1753~~. In 1753 Astruc wrote a book which is often thought to be the beginning of the higher criticism. ~~Now, #1.~~

~~X~~ Who Astruc was: Almost any conservative book you read about this will say, "Astruc, a profligate French physician," or "a French physician of profligate life." Well, I don't think that if he was of profligate life that it necessarily proves ~~that~~ his ideas on a scientific matter were incorrect. ~~But~~ In fact I don't not think we have any proof he was of profligate life. ~~The bulk of the French perhaps are and were at that time, and~~ Sent this fellow was quite a fine scientist and an expert in venereal disease, and he was personal physician to the king of France, so he was a man of real scholarship and real standing, whether he ~~had~~ was a profligate or not is something I don't not think enters into the argument. ~~as far as I know there is no proof he did have.~~ ~~Because~~ In any case he was a man who did scientific work that was highly recognized at that time. ~~But~~ Astruc was from ~~originally~~ a Jewish family who had become Christian two or three generations before him, and his father had become a Huguenot pastor, and ~~70 or 80~~ seventy or eighty years before this time when King Louis XIV destroyed the Huguenots and ordered that everyone must join the Roman ~~X~~ Catholic Church or be subject to torture and persecution, thousands of Huguenots escaped from France and fled to

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Germany, ~~to~~ Holland, ~~to~~ Switzerland, ~~to~~ South America, ~~to~~ North America and throughout the world. ~~and you~~ you can find their descendants to this day, ~~and~~ Thousands of others were hunted down in the forest and ~~were~~ were killed, ~~and~~ or were terribly mistreated. A small group managed to survive in the forest, and some of their descendants ~~of them~~ have lasted to this day and have remained true to their Christian teaching, until within the last ~~30~~ thirty or ~~40~~ years when most of them adopted the higher criticism and the modernist view. But there were a great number of Huguenots who, in the face of the persecution, recanted and joined the Roman Church, and the son of this Huguenot pastor, Jean Astruc, ~~the son~~ joined the Romanist church and became a Romanist, but he became a student of medicine, ~~and~~ professor of medicine, then the personal physician to the king, and he also wrote books on medicine which were widely recoggized. ~~Now~~ I wouldn't not be surprised if ~~there was a little bit of a guilt fooling in his mind~~ he had a guilty conscience, when his fellow Protestants had suffered and died for their faith, or had fled the country, and he had ~~at his~~ ~~having~~ given up his faith ~~and~~ completely in this way. I wouldn't not be surprised, I don't yet not know. for certain. But in any event, ~~he~~ Astruc wrote a book which he called ~~Some Conjectures About the Sources from~~ Short title here? Which Moses Drew his Material for Genesis." Now that's not the exact title, it's approximately that, because it was in French anyway. ~~and I could give~~ you the French ~~title which I have here but I don't think it is necessary.~~ It is a book simply giving his theories about the way that Moses wrote ~~the Pentateuch, and the~~ Genesis, not the Pentateuch, and the words Moses wrote Genesis is included in the title of his book.

?? NO !! ← When ~~Now~~ the book came out in 1753, it got very little attention, and actually the higher criticism began ~~40~~ forty years later, but it followed the line direction Astruc had pointed out, and so it is necessary to know something about him. ~~but I see that clock is moving, we don't have a great deal of time for our little quiz, so we'll have to speak about Astruc Thursday.~~ Told you what he is and I may ask you who he was Thursday, but as to what he held, we look at that Thursday, and now would you please write on your paper your name and the number of the seat, in which you are sitting. That is row A, B, C, D, E, F, G, and H, --some have slipped back a ways, but we haven't many backsliders inthis class, and put the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

~~number of the seat (further instructions)~~...

~~P.22 (1/2)~~

...rise of the partition theory, and under that we mentioned ~~chapter~~ capital A, Astruc's theory, and I think I mentioned 1, Who Astruc Was. ~~Wha~~ And I told you a little bit about the man, his history, and so on, most that you read about it inthe average conservative book is he is a profligate French physician, and I don't think that is quite the way to refer to him because I don't think his personal character is particularly important inthis connection. I don't know of any proof that he is profligate, but there may be proof that I'm not familiar with. But I do think he had something of a gnawing of conscience in the way he had deserted the faith of his forefathers. I think that made (1 1/4)

~~but as far as we're concerned,~~ ~~Astruc~~ He has been greatly over-rated. The fact that he presented a point which became tremendously important in the higher criticism later, is what gave him his tremendous importance and therefore it is necessary you know about this, because anyone who is talking to you about the higher criticism and knows anything about it, has probably heard of ~~Astruc~~ him. ~~and I gave you the date when he wrote his book, 1753, and this date 1753 is worth remembering. Not tremendously important~~ but it is usually referred to as beginning of the higher criticism, ~~1753.~~ This date (1753) is and is thus worth remembering. ~~And~~ It so happens that another tremendously important date in the higher criticism, far more important than this one, came exactly ~~100~~ one hundred years later. ~~Which makes it easy to remember the two dates, which are the same except for century. 1753 and 1853. Now #2:~~

2, Astruc's book. Now his book, as I mentioned, did not ~~have~~ get much interest. A few people read it; some liked it; and some that we would be apt to think of as radical or liberal referred to it ~~with real~~ rather contemptuously and disdainfully. Most people ignored it. It was not an influential book, but it so happened that the theory it presented later became influential and ~~So~~ that is why it is important. ~~Now here is the theory contained in the book:~~

Astruc said that ~~Moses who wrote~~ the author in Exodus 3 and following, ~~the~~ things he had seen, ~~had observed, had contact with~~ but that Moses could not possibly have observed the events of what he described in Genesis was told of

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Genesis, or even of Exodus 1 and 2. And therefore, he said, Moses must have had written documents before him. Now at this point I have no quarrel with Astruc except perhaps with the words "must have had." I would say Moses "may have had." It is altogether possible that God dictated Genesis to Moses, God revealed Genesis to him as something (3 3/4) revealed out of the sky, given to him in words or in pictures, which he saw, and wrote down what he saw. It is possible, but I personally think it extremely unlikely. My guess is that Moses had written before him, so I have no quarrel with Astruc's conjecture that Moses may have had written documents; Now the next conjecture that Astruc made is this, that Moses used these documents without changing them much. If a man writes a history you might read thirty lives of Martin Luther, and you might sit down and write a new one. Most of which would be taken from the books you had read, but it would all be in your own words. Nobody could tell without research what you got from this book, what you got from that and what you got from the other. Or you could do like I occasionally get a term paper, or a paper here which when I look at doesn't sound like the sort of language that I expect that student normally to use. And then I will find that two or three paragraphs he has copied verbatim from a certain book, and then two or three from another book, and then maybe two or three more from the first, now that's not writing a paper, that's just copying some stuff out of a book, and that may be good exercise for you in copying but it is not serving the purpose of writing a paper which is for you to think the thing through, and study and gather your materials, and give in your own words what you find. Nevertheless, if Moses were to tell the story of Abraham, and if Moses had Abraham's account of the experiences he had and if he also had the account of Eliezer of Damascus of the experiences he had while he was Abraham's steward, and if Moses chose to copy a whole paragraph from one and then a paragraph from the other, we have no quarrel with him on that. We will say it is not our present-day method of writing, but if Moses chose to do that, we do not object, provided the Holy Spirit oversaw that he didn't copy anything that was erroneous.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

That what he copied was free from error. It was a correct, true statement, we believe, no matter where Moses got it. So if Astruc wants to consider that perhaps Abraham, perhaps Moses copied verbatim what Abraham and others had written, I have no quarrel with him, except I think that here he is making a guess which I think is quite improbable, but I do not say it is impossible. But then when Astruc says we can figure out the different sources that Abraham used, we can figure that here are certain sections which go together to make one account, and here are certain sections go together to make a different account, and we can put these together and can reconstruct the sources of Abraham used. Well, I say, if you can do that, it is very interesting, I don't object a bit to your trying to do it, But I question whether it will be possible. Of course it all depends if Moses simply copied word for word from two different writers who had very different styles. It might be possible to separate them. I don't question that such a thing might have occurred, but I am skeptical about the possibility of our proving it occurred, or of our separating them out if it did occur. Now Mr. P (7) I referred to the possibility Abraham might have written things down, and the possibility Moses might have copied them. So I used the Abraham correctly, and I also said Abraham when I meant Moses. I did both. So I hope you were able to figure which I meant. I don't think that Abraham wrote the Pentateuch as we have it today, but I think it altogether possible that Abraham wrote the story of his sacrificing Isaac (7 1/2). Well, I have perhaps been discussing the theory now more than telling you what it is. But what his theory is is this:

That Astruc said, that when you read the book of Genesis you can separate the book of Genesis into two main documents, which you call the A document and the B document and he said, you can see that Abraham had an A document and he had another document, the B document, and Abraham copied from one a ways and then he copied from the other a ways, and then he copied the one a ways. That's Astruc's theory. That there are two documents which of Genesis which Moses put together, and that we can separate them. Yes? (8 1/2) If I say at any time that Moses wrote the story of Jacob's

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch/README.htm

life, please write Moses down, don't write Abraham. But Astruc's theory is that Moses had two documents, and he copied from one and he copied from the other, and he copied from the one and he copied from the other, and he put them together to make one book. And I don't say it's impossible, that Moses might have had two documents, but I say it is extremely unlikely that he did so that he did, that he would copy word for word in such a way that we could separate them out, and get them back again.

Now Astruc's clue is our title of this main head, A, and that is because Astruc's book contains a theory that the way you could separate the documents was according to how he referred to God. Astruc said Gen 1:1 - 2.4 says God said, God did, God spoke-- it is all Elohim, Hebrew word for God. And then he says, when you get to chapter three, you find him saying, and the Lord God said, and the word LORD is L O R D in our English Bible which stands for the Hebrew Jod Heh Wau Heh, which is the name of God. So he says, chapter 2 is by a writer who refers to Him, not as God, but as Jehovah. And he says, chapter 1 tells us the story of creation, and chapter 2 tells us the story of creation. So, he says, you have the story of creation as one writer told it and then you have the story of creation as the second writer told it, and Moses didn't want to decide between the two so he simply put one down first and then he put the other one down, and then he copied the whole of both documents, copying from one and then copying from the other. And Astruc's clue is the variation of the divine name.

(3) Now Astruc says in his book, "Some Conjectures on the sources from which (2) Moses wrote the book of Genesis," Astruc said you can divide up, here is manuscript or document A, and he tells you, 1.1 - 2.4, and then he tells you what else is in it and what is in it and right on, and shows you everything that he thought was in document A. And then he shows document B, which starts at 2.4, the middle of verse 4, and then goes on a certain distance, and then you skip a little which is one, and then returns again, and he gave you document B. But Astruc found ten sections, anywhere from a couple of verses to as much as fifteen verses, ten different sections that he couldn't prove were in

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

one document or the other. So he said there were ten separate little writings that Moses included (like perhaps the list of the kings of Edom) which things like that, there were ten little writings that Moses had had, which he incorporated along with in addition to his two main documents. Now stop 1,4,19 that is Astruc's theory, and it would be of no importance to us if it were not for the developments that came later, but in view of them it is very tremendously important to know about it. Yes? (12 1/2) Well, he would say that in some cases Moses took one verse from one, one verse from the other, one from one, one from the other. But he would also say that there is a possibility that in some cases the source that uses the name Jehovah, might have occasionally used the word God, because it would be thinking of him, not as Jehovah the friend of the men whom he helped but as the God who created the universe, and therefore thinking of Him in His power, it might use the word God once in a while, but rarely. That would be...

P.23. (1/2)

...basic ideas which are still accepted today by all critical scholars. Yes? (stu) I don't think Astruc would say they're altogether the same, but he would say that they are practically the same. (stu) Oh yes, I think there is a great difference, and we will go into that, thank you for raising the question, it is a very important one, and we will go into that. But right at this point, the thing I want is to be sure you understand what Astruc's clue was and in general what his theory was. That is 2, then, Astruc's book.

3. Then we will call it Consideration of Astruc's Theory. And under that

a. Astruc accepted Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. He not only accepted it, he insisted upon it. You see how different is Astruc's view from these points we have been looking at, which said to were evidences to show Moses couldn't not have written the Pentateuch. Those were given a couple of centuries before Astruc, Be those verses we have looked at and which I want you to be sure to review, and keep in mind them, and I will occasionally test you on them to see if you are reviewing.

NO Astruc never questioned that he insisted Moses wrote the Pentateuch, but he

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

wanted to find out what sources Moses used, ~~and~~ I have no objection to anybody's trying to find out what sources Moses used. My only objection is when somebody insists that I must take his theory as to what the sources were, unless he gives me absolute proof that his theory is right. This cannot be done. I don't object to Moses having sources in writing ~~the book of~~ Genesis. ~~And that suggests B a~~ Astruc extended his theory only to Genesis and ~~Exodus~~ the first two chapt He did not make any suggestions about anything after that. ~~Yes? (3 3/4)~~ Yes. ~~I say~~ Answer. ~~that if the~~ Holy Spirit led Moses, in telling about Abraham, to ~~take a book that he had, or two books, and~~ copy a paragraph from this book and a paragraph from that, one etc, ~~a paragraph from this and a paragraph from that,~~ with the Holy Spirit overseeing so that he would not take anything that was erroneous. After all, Moses wouldn't know what was true and what was false, because he hadn't lived at that time, ~~long,~~ but the Holy Spirit could. The Holy Spirit ~~thus~~ inspired Moses, keeping him from error, in what he said. I would say that that would be just as possible a way of Genesis being written as any other. But I would say ~~well some-body says this is how it happened~~ how do you know that is how it happened, ~~let's~~ have absolute proof before we are sure. It is only one theory, ~~presented,~~ how do we know it is true?

~~But when you say, I don't say~~ there is anything wrong with such a theory, so long as ~~you~~ you give it as Astruc did, merely as a suggestion of a possibility. He was not dogmatic, he just said here is a conjecture. ~~It's a possibility, but when you examine the evidence you decide whether the evidence is true or false. Well that was b then.~~

C. ~~And then c~~, Astruc admitted that ten sections of Genesis would not fit into either of his two documents. ~~And then d:~~

d. ~~d~~ Astruc's theory rests on the assumption that Moses copied the material directly from his sources, with little or no change. ~~So much for~~ -yes? ~~(stu. 6 3/4: It~~ seems to me that he is making Moses more an editor than an author, because that would indicate that somebody else had made more research ~~along the line~~ than Moses had ~~alone.~~ Answer: No, not necessarily, ~~I wouldn't think~~. An author in our present-day ~~sense~~ literary world is apt to be a man who makes things up. Moses didn't make anything up about Genesis. ~~What is in~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

~~Genesis, Moses~~ had no way of knowing what is in Genesis, except that either God revealed it to him, or he copied it from what somebody else had written. He had no other way. So I would say that he was an editor, ~~anyway~~ but he ~~was~~ not a fiction writer, ~~he not wasn't an author in that sense, but of course he could have~~ if he had fifty books on that subject ~~to read~~ he could have read ~~these books~~ them and then put the ~~th~~ whole thing into his own words, but I don't think there were fifty books in existence at that time about Abraham. I question if there were more than four or five at most, ~~but we do not know. But we don't know, but we must move on to the next one. Mr. MacKeen? (#3/4) Yes, write it out on a piece of paper and give it to me. Because~~ I must move on.

Nobody today follows Astruc's theory, so it is not important that we go into its details ~~of it~~. It is important that we ~~realize~~ to give him ~~great~~ credit for the first ~~two~~ clue ~~which~~ that was followed, as to general approach. ~~Well, now B is much more important.~~

B. → ~~#~~, Eichhorn. ~~And #1~~ Who Eichhorn was: ~~Now~~ Eichhorn lived about ~~50~~ fifty years ~~after~~ Astruc. ~~Eichhorn was~~ He was a German ~~professor~~ professor at the University in Goetingen, the university in Hanover, the Duke of Hanover was at that time king of England, ~~name was~~ who was named George III. ~~But~~ Eichhorn, ~~the professor in the university of Goetingen~~ was a brilliant scholar of oriental languages, ~~and~~ he wrote a book ~~in~~ 1783 on ~~the~~ Introduction to the Old Testament, which ~~1783 he wrote his first edition of his book on Intro. to the Old Testament. He was a brilliant scholar, and he~~ had a tremendous influence, ~~and~~ Eichhorn, more than Astruc, is the father of the higher criticism. This ~~because his theories had influence, had great influence~~ very great. ~~This~~ book went through four editions, the ~~fourth~~ last one ~~was~~ is 1823. ~~You see~~ A span of ~~40~~ forty years ~~is~~ was covered by the four editions through which this book went. ~~and in this book~~ In it he deals with all the books of the Old Testament ~~and he had~~ with great insight. He is highly regarded by scholars today for the theories which he advanced. ~~But~~ We are primarily interested in his theory about Genesis. ~~And so we say #2~~ Eichhorn's Theory ~~regarding~~ about Genesis. This ~~Now Eichhorn's theory regarding Genesis~~ theory was substantially the same as Astruc's, though Eichhorn does not admit that he got anything from Astruc. I think he was an honest man, I do not think

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

he would read it in Astruc and then say he originated it himself. Yet it is possible he had had heard of it and gotten the idea, or read it and forgotten he read it. Whether he got it from Astruc unconsciously or not, nobody can say. He presented it as something he had thought out himself, But what he presented was substantially the same as Astruc's clue, (that is, there are two documents and you can recognize the two documents by the names of God that are used). that is the main criterion for the documents. He got more material into the documents than Astruc did. He had some sections he couldn't get in, but not as many as Astruc. And he divided Genesis and Exodus one and two into these two documents, the same as Astruc. And thus far we cannot that what Eichhorn advanced is necessarily at all wicked. He said Moses wrote it. He did not deny the Mosaic authorship, and while I think the Bible teaches Mosaic authorship, I don't say Mosaic authorship is nearly as important as the truth of the book. That is, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and is correct and free from error. But he held that it was a book by Moses, Moses used documents. We can't figure what those documents are, Moses copied verbatim. (very possibly.)

Now Eichhorn gave new names to the documents. He named the part that uses the name Elohim (God), he called it the E document (E being the first letter of our western transliteration of the word Elohim). So he calls that the E document, and then the document that has the word Jehovah in, he calls the J document, and those two terms are used up to the present day, though not exactly the same things he used them for, but somewhat the same. So he originated this terminology, which is used today. The E document and the J document. Now thus far, we have no great quarrel with what Eichhorn did, if only he will not be dogmatic about it, if he will say this is a possibility. Perhaps this is where Moses got his material. (Perhaps this is the way he gave.) We have no great quarrel with that, as a possibility, so long as you're not dogmatic and say you're sure it is so. We don't mind you're saying it is sure if you can find real evidence that is absolutely convincing. But until you do, we say, don't be dogmatic about it. But

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

if you want to advance it as a theory, I certainly see no harm in it as a theory. So Eichhorn's theory regarding Genesis then considers that J and E documents, or let's just say the E and J, because the first one is...

P.24. (1/2)

...take a second here to point out what some of you may have noticed, in chapter 2 and I think a little of chapter 8, it always speaks of the Lord God, and then it goes on and just speaks of the Lord. And this term Lord God is not used very much. So Astruc and Eichhorn advanced what seems to me a very reasonable theory, that is to say, that you start in calling Him God, I am not even sure they advance this theory, it may have been advanced by the early fathers, but the theory that after chapter 1 speaks of God, when chapter 2 starts calling Him Jehovah, for a while it calls Him Jehovah God, simply to bring out the fact that this is the same God as in chapter 1; And therefore, that if Moses got it from sources, he would have put in the word God there in chapter 2, simply to connect. But chapter 2 originally would just have said Jehovah in the source from which he got it. That is a very reasonable theory. That is to say, I don't believe there are such sources, but I think Moses when he wrote talks about God, the Almighty one, the Creator, the one who controls nature, and called Him God, And then, when He began telling us about God's relation to mankind more specifically he used the term which shows God in His redeeming quality in relationship with mankind, called Him Jehovah. but knowing that in the first chapter he so that he called him Jehovah, he put the word God with the word Jehovah all the time, just so we would understand, he wasn't talking about two gods, but was referring to the one he had already called God, so that the explanation of the fact of having the two names together there is I think a reasonable one. Well, that was #2 then, Eichhorn's theory regarding Genesis, and #3 is Eichhorn's four arguments. Now this is tremendously important. Eichhorn's four arguments:

These are the four arguments on which the higher criticism, as far as the documents are concerned, as far as partition is concerned, is mainly found. And we will

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabus/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

~~ma~~ devote many hours to the discussion of these four ~~documents~~ arguments, so it is extremely vital that you know what the four arguments are. ~~And~~ I want to mention them now in a certain order. ~~I don't~~ not care particularly that you know the order, I think, at least for today, and maybe for the next couple of days, if I should give a second argument, or to give a fourth, you should be able to give, know which I mean, in the order I give them. But ordinarily at least after two or three weeks from now, I won't call them first or second argument, I'll call them by the names.

~~Now the first argument, small a under 3 is:~~ a, Argument from Divine Names. ~~And this of course~~ is simply Astruc's Clue. ~~And this~~, critics today will ~~say~~ play down it and say that's a very small part of the criticism; ~~and~~ yet in their arguments they use it extensively, ~~and commonly.~~ They claim that ~~This is,~~ when you find LORD you know it's a J document (J for Jehovah, jod, heh, wau, heh). When ~~you~~ they find Elohim ~~you~~ they ordinarily ~~know~~ say it is not the J document, but they will admit that in the Jehovah section the word God might be used occasionally. ~~An~~ Jehovah spoke to man and told him, you must not eat of the trees of the garden, ~~but when it says that~~ Then Satan ~~spoke, Satan~~ said, Hath God said? Satan doesn't not call Him Jehovah there; he calls Him God. Well, that's is reasonable, That in the Jehovah ~~God~~ section ~~that~~ you don't not put the sacred name in the mouth of Satan, ~~and let Satan say God.~~ Jehovah not But there are very few such cases. ~~(of Satan referring to God (17).) Yes? (4 1/4) It would record it if they said it. But~~ When Abraham was speaking to Isaac you'd expect Him to say Jehovah, the name of God, but if Abraham spoke to a heathen, you'd expect him to just refer to God. That would be rather natural, I should think. (stu.5)

~~But~~ now the four arguments are a, the argument from Divine Names, and I think you know now sufficiently what this argument is, but and we'll will have much discussion about it, before we're through, b, Argument from Continuous Narrative. ~~Now when you say~~ continuous narrative, this means that if you take the sections that say God and the sections that say Jehovah and put each of them by itself, you can ~~rewrite (6 1/4)~~ the text (?) ~~till you have got a whole~~ find two complete story, ~~you see~~. ~~That one leads right up to the other, and you can take~~

Stop 1/3/91

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

out the other section and it doesn't disturb the continuity, that is the argument. I'm not saying that it works out all the time, but I'm saying that was the argument. And This was the claim that is a very important argument that you can read right straight along and it's complete and it doesn't need the other. That there is a whole story in each one of them, continuous narrative. You see, if the first half of Genesis used God and the second half used Elohim, this wouldn't be true. But if you can make a complete continuous narrative in most of them, that is a very strong argument. Certainly not a conclusive argument, but a strong one. Then C. The Argument from Parallel Passages. Now this strikes you, or strikes the heart of one critical view at least, immediately, as soon as he opens the book of Genesis. You'd say there is many a person today many an unbeliever you'd say I believe in the story of creation in the Bible, they'd say which story of creation do you believe, Do you believe the one in Genesis 1, or the one in Genesis 2? Well, Genesis 1 says Elohim, Genesis 2 says Jehovah, And so as you have two stories of creation, one in Gen 1 and one in Gen 2, that is a strong argument for two different documents, if you have two contradictory stories of creation. Now of course I hardly think Astruc or Eichhorn would say they were contradictory stories, because after all, they both believed Moses wrote it, and would Moses take two contradictory stories, and put them both in? They probably thought that the stories just gave different details, but you have, you see, two stories of creation. Now we read along in Genesis and they take the Flood story and that is divided up into two, so They say you have two Flood Stories, one the J and one the E. They say you have a story that Abraham went to Egypt and he lied about Sarah, said she was his sister when she was his wife, then you read that Abraham went to the land of the Philistines and he lied about his wife, there said she was his sister instead of his wife. So they say here are two parallels, one source had it happen in Egypt, the other source had it happen in Philistia, but it's the same story, so the argument from Parallel Passages is an argument, it is perhaps the strongest, one of the very strongest of the critical arguments, but it is an argument which

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

is ~~pretty~~ hard to fit with belief that God inspired the book ~~it~~ and kept it from error. The ~~because the~~ argument from parallel passages ~~just about~~ require that these parallels to some extent, at least ~~con-~~ contradict each other. So here you're getting into the area of denying the truth of the Scriptures. ~~Now~~ I am not sure whether Eichhorn got into that area, at least in his first edition, but Eichhorn became gradually more liberal in the course of ~~his subsequent editions~~ of his four editions.

d. ~~Now the fourth argument~~, Argument From Style. ~~And~~ there is no doubt that ~~is~~ there is such a thing as an argument from style. Twenty-four years ago the Sunday School Times asked me to review a book. It was the first time I had ever written anything for the Sunday School Times. They ~~said please write~~ wanted a thousand-word review of ~~the~~ this book. I wrote ~~them 200~~ two hundred words and said: "This book is not one you will want to play up." I simply gave a condemnatory judgment of the book ~~of~~ in 200 words and sent it to them. They wrote back and said ~~but we do~~ that they want it written up fully, ~~they said, Please write us not over a thousand words.~~ but please do not write more than a thousand words. So I wrote a thousand words on it, and sent it to them. They wrote back and said ~~we~~ they wish ~~you'd~~ I would enlarge this part and this part and this part, so that made it a little longer. Then they said ~~I think we'll~~ they will run it as a front-page editorial. Well they ran it as a front-page editorial without my name anywhere in it. I had never written an article for the Sunday School Times before, ~~that was the first year, I believe, of the Seminary~~. Shortly afterwards I was walking ~~Walked~~ down the street in Wilmington, ~~to the Seminary,~~ and a student who ~~one of the fellows~~ was sitting on the porch of the dormitory, saw me come by, and ~~he~~ said, "Dr. MacRae, I have just read your article, in the Sunday School Times." I had never had an article ~~there~~ before, and this, ~~didn't~~ not have my name on it, he had been listening to me lecturing for about ~~8~~ eight months, ~~and~~ he said he recognized my style as soon as he began to read the article. ~~So to me~~ That was the strongest evidence I had ever seen ~~up to that time~~ that there is a distinctive style by which ~~you~~ one might recognize the writing of one author as distinct from that of another, ~~author~~. Now there are people today who will say ~~make a statement~~ that the difference between the two main documents of Genesis is as great as the difference between Chaucer and modern English, ~~And people~~ but those who make ~~that sort of~~ such as an extreme statement I ~~would say~~ would are

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

talking utter absurdity. There is no such difference as that, but there are people who will say that. I doubt that most real scholar would make such an extreme statement, but there are popular writers who will not hesitate to do so. The argument from Style is that each document has a different style which is enough to fairly prove that a different person wrote it, and of course actually the first argument is part of the fourth, but they are separate because you see that? The first is really part of the fourth, but the first was it all began with the first, We will therefore argument given. It has been tremendously important though so we count it as a separate argument, but actually it is part of the fourth. As to the fourth argument we note that for instance, they say in Genesis it says that "God created man, male and female created He them." And then we'll read in chapter 2, that "they were naked, the man and his wife, and they were not ashamed." So they say that the method of the E document is to say "male and female," but that the method of the J document is to say "the man and his wife." And then they'll go through and see how many times you find male and female occurs in one document and how many times you find man and his wife occurs in the other, and say that this is a difference of style. And hundreds of words and phrases have been checked and analyzed that way in order to show what are the P words and what are the J words, what are the distinctive words of one document, and what are the distinctive words of the other document. That is the method that has been used in the Argument from comparison of the style. so that is the fourth argument. These four arguments are very important, and I'd like to discuss them all fully with you, but if I discuss even one of them fully with you today we won't have time for our little quiz, I haven't given you a half hour quiz yet, I will one of these days. But today we have ten...

P.25. (3/4)

...II was the development of the theories of Partition, and under that we were on B which was Eichhorn's Documentary Theory. On that, at end of the hour, we mentioned Eichhorn's arguments. I gave you these four arguments which I would like you to remember them in the order in which I gave them: (1) First, Argument from Divine Names; (2) Second, the Argument from Continuous Narrative; (3) Third, Argument from Parallel Passages; (4) Fourth, the Argument from Style. Now, these four arguments will be of tremendous importance in

http://www.macraelib.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

this course, ~~and~~ we will examine each one of them at some length, ~~a little later.~~ Now ~~It~~ it is very important ~~at~~ this point that you ~~know~~ what they are, and that you have a little understanding about them. ~~So four (this was 3 that named them)~~:

~~#4, Brief Discussion of the Four Arguments. We have extensive discussions of them later. But now we have a brief discussion of the four arguments, and the first of them~~, Argument from Divine ~~Names~~ Names. ~~You~~ you notice, that the names are used in a rather unusual way, ~~It was noticed by~~ the early Christian fathers, ~~and~~ it ~~was~~ discussed ~~by them. It is a~~ remarkable ~~thing, and I trust you all noticed as you did this assignment concerning this paper for last week - it is a remarkable thing~~ as you go through the first chapter of Genesis ~~and~~ you ~~have~~ the word "God" used ~~straight through for the Lord, and~~ then you ~~get into~~ the fourth verse of the second chapter and ~~He~~ is called the ~~Lord~~ God, ~~and for two or three chapters, almost every~~ time ~~He is called LORD, for about~~ a chapter or a little more He is LORD God, and then the "God" is dropped and it is just LORD from there on. And some of these early church fathers commented on ~~it, and~~ they ~~remarked~~ that as long as it was speaking about God in relation to the universe in general, or even the creation of man, it called Him by the ~~gaer~~ generic term God, suggesting the great powerful mighty one who controls all things, but then, ~~and~~ when ~~it~~ started ~~in~~ chapter ~~2~~, ~~dealing directly with~~ His personal relations to mankind, it used the personal Name, ~~He~~ Jehovah, which is represented by capitals LORD in our King James Version, ~~And it used~~ the personal name, ~~and~~ continued to put "God" beside it for about a chapter, ~~just~~ to make absolutely clean ~~it's~~ the same one ~~you're talking~~ about, and ~~then~~ thereafter generally used this personal name. ~~Now that it not~~ at all a strange thing ~~for~~ to do, to use two different terms in the same writing. If I run onto a relative of my wife's, I ~~will~~ say, "Grace was speaking of you this morning." Then if I speak to one of you about her, I may say, "Mrs. MacRae asked me to give you a message." ~~And~~ then if I ~~am~~ speaking to someone else, I may say, "my ~~she~~ wife said ~~so-and-so~~ such-and-such." Thus I may use different terms to refer to her. In a certain circumstance one term

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

is a natural way, and in another circumstance another is equally a natural ~~way to refer to a person~~. We ~~And we~~ refer to people in different ways and we don't always use the same term. ~~Now~~ There sometimes is a reason why we use one term or the other, but there are many cases where any ~~one~~ of two or three terms would fit equally well, ~~and there we have to pick one, and~~ there may be no special reason to pick one cause when any of the three would fit equally well, but we may use the one we have just been using unless there is some particular reason for a change. It is not at all an unusual ~~thing~~ to use different names ~~for different~~ or terms. In fact, in present day writing, it is quite a fad to change the style by using different terms, ~~like~~ This ~~you'll~~ may read in a college newspaper, O'Callohan made a homerun yesterday. The prominent Tigers baseball player followed his usual precedent. Then they'll ~~go and~~ may use another term for him, ~~and~~ they'll ~~have about~~ may use eight different terms, sometimes, one after the other, referring to ~~an~~ one individual. That is term-~~using~~ to an extreme, ~~which~~ but it is rather common, or at least was when I was in college. ~~Maybe~~ I may have ~~it has~~ changed since that time, but then it was very common.

~~Now~~ here we have these different terms used, ~~and~~ but the fact that ~~it sh~~ they appear ~~that~~ right at the beginning ~~you have~~ throughout a whole chapter ~~with one~~, ~~and~~ then a whole chapter ~~with another,~~ is very striking, ~~thing.~~ ~~And~~ It is only strange that nobody thought of Astruc's idea earlier, ~~but~~ Then it is ~~then~~ not difficult to go through the books of Genesis and put all the material with God in over there, and that with LORD over there, and see if it looks as if they make up two different documents. ~~So~~ We will have much to say about ~~that~~ this later on. ~~Yes, Mr. MacKeen? (5 1/2) Now that's argument two, and I want to go on and~~ Stop 11/5/71

Start 11/2/71 ~~speak about. Argument one is the Names. Argument~~ two is the ~~Continuous Narrative.~~ The Argument from Continuous Narrative. ~~This is to say, that if you were to read the story of the creation and have God in it, and then you were to read the story of the flood and have LORD in it, then you read the story of Abraham and you only have God in it,~~ only ~~and Isaac and only have LORD in it, you separate these from each other~~ then read the story of and ~~have a continuous narrative. And you would have no reason to think that they ori~~

formed two distinct documents, one with God and one with LORD. Now the argument of Eichhorn gave is, that if you take the Elohim passages and if you take the Jehovah passages and you took them by themselves, he says you will have a continuous narrative. He says Genesis gives you the story of creation according to the Elohist, that is the one that used Elohim, they call the Elohist. And he said chapter 2 gives you the story of the creation according to the Jehovah, or the Jawah 17. And then when you come to the flood, you read a few verses and it has God in, and you read a few verses that have LORD in and, if you take all the God passages you have an account of the Flood, and all the LORD passages, you have another account. So you have the story of the Flood in both of them, and they say, you have two continuous narratives, that was the original argument. Now if you wanted to take your sheet that I will give back to you, and read all the passages of God straight through, and then read all the passages of LORD, and see whether you think that is a continuous, complete narrative. That you are at liberty to do, I am not assigning it. But that would be the way to test this argument. I'm not assigning you, or even suggesting that you test it, for the reason that we are now looking at Eichhorn's view, and we are interested in views that developed from it, and nobody today holds Eichhorn's view, so I think our interest here is in seeing what Eichhorn said, but it is not including his arguments, because other arguments have disproved his main point, but the point that people hold develops from it, and to understand that, I want you to understand it.

So the second is the Argument from Continuous Narrative.

3. And the third is the Argument from Parallel Passages. And in a way it seems like the same argument, but it isn't, it is a very different argument, it may deal with the same material, but it is from an entirely different viewpoint. On the one hand, you may separate these two out, but here you have ten figures. Pull them out and here you have two complete hands (6 1/2) ask you have ten fingers, pull them apart + you have two complete hands

Illustration requested

[See over]

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

that's the Argument from Continuous Narrative. If you pull them apart, then what you have on both sides makes a complete story, that's continuous narrative. ~~Well, now,~~ if it makes a complete story, ~~you're going to have~~ parallels, but the argument from parallel passages is, this is not one complete original thing as we have it today, because you have the same thing ~~(8 3/4)~~ ~~That's the argument.~~ The same thing is repeated ~~over, they say.~~ ~~They~~ tell you a thing, then they tell you all over again. ~~Tells you~~ the story of creation, ~~tells it~~ over again. ~~Tells~~ the story of the Flood, ~~though there~~ the two are intertwined instead of one given first and then the other, tells ~~you~~ about Abraham lying about his wife, ~~only~~ in one case it says he ~~did it to~~ Egypt ~~and~~ in the other case it says he did it ~~in~~ Philistia, a different place but the same story, ~~fundamentally,~~ so they say the two accounts of the same ~~story~~ one says it happened in Egypt, one says it happened in Philistia. ~~And~~ they say there are ~~thus~~ many where ~~you~~ have ~~the same~~ thing ~~told~~ from a different viewpoint. ~~Now~~ of course the question we immediately ask is, did Abraham actually ~~do the thing~~ twice? Did he do it once in Egypt, and ~~did he do it~~ once in Philistia? If so, it's not a parallel but simply an account of two different ~~things~~. ~~That is the question we immediately ask.~~ When ~~you~~ come ~~to~~ the creation, we ask the question, are there two accounts of creation? ~~are there, or are there~~ not? That's a matter for examination. ~~But this, the third, is a tremendously~~ important argument, not ~~only~~ because ~~if provable~~ it goes a long way, ~~not~~ toward establishing the existence of two independent documents, ~~but for~~ establishing the incorrectness of the ~~way it stands today~~. But, ~~in addition to that, because~~, if ~~it has~~ parallels ~~with which are~~ really ~~the same~~ thing, but the writer thought ~~was~~ a different thing, then ~~if~~ it can be true. ~~(10 1/4)~~ This argument from parallel passages can easily reach the point where it undermines the ~~whole matter of~~ dependability of the ~~narrative. It is in some ways~~ (thus) the ~~worst of the arguments from our viewpoint~~, and ~~thus, you might say~~ the ~~most~~ important ~~from our viewpoint~~. ~~And then a fourth, the~~ argument from style. ~~And here~~ the argument from style is a thing you cannot brush aside

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Sybbi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

There are read lightly, ~~because there are~~ differences in style. ~~There is no question of that. But just how much~~ are there sufficient to prove ~~but there was difference is there in style, between~~ different writers, and how much difference may there be in the style of the same writer at different periods, or in discussing different subjects? ~~in style~~

It is not a simple matter. ~~And when you say, well this man used this word and this other used that word, well~~ after all, ~~we can't assert that~~ any of us can change our habits as far as individual words are concerned, ~~and we can have a reason why we feel that~~ We may because of it may to think it is better to use one term rather in a certain context than another ~~term in a context~~ certain. However, The argument from style is the most difficult one to examine accurately and fairly. ~~And~~ a very important ~~thing~~ to do, if ~~you're going to examine~~ one is the Argument from Style properly fairly, is to have a considerable amount of material. If two men each write a book on a subject similar, and you have both ~~those two books~~ in front of you, you ~~can look at the two books and~~ could study them carefully ~~and~~ to see the differences of style. Then if ~~you have~~ a third book was ~~given which is~~ written by one of the two men, you would have a basis on which to determine which of the two men wrote it. But if all you have is a paragraph from a man, then it is virtually impossible ~~pretty hard~~ to determine whether ~~another~~ some other particular paragraph is written by him or not. ~~You see,~~ Eichhorn thought he ~~'s position~~ had a pretty good situation for examining the argument for style, because he said ~~'s got~~ the E document, included ~~composing maybe more than half of the book of~~ Genesis, ~~maybe~~ about sixty percent ~~60%~~ of Genesis ~~in the E document~~, and ~~let's say 55 at random, say,~~ and maybe 30 or 35% in the J document. Well ~~that's quite a lot~~ this worked it out. ~~of chapters, and you can compare these chapters~~ carefully, and when he says, well, he says, E always says "male and female," and J always says "the man and his wife." ~~Well, you can~~ We can go ~~all~~ through and see if that's true, or not. We could compare and you can take a list of 40 different words ~~people say are~~ said to be typical words of the E document, with 40 other typical words of the J document. ~~Maybe you can~~ We could go through and see whether ~~the other one used them also, or not. You~~ this worked out. One can test such ~~his~~ arguments if ~~you have a very good~~ we have a considerable amount of material. ~~And~~ When as his argument was made, there was a fair amount of material, but the amount gets much larger when the theory is extended to the whole Pentateuch, ~~of course.~~

~~Well,~~ When we look at this argument later on, we will have many important things to

Eichhorn says that Provide enough material for a real study. But in the later critical views, the matter is far more complex. Eichhorn says that there are

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch/README.htm

say about ~~this~~ it argument, but we will not be able to examine it ~~at all~~ exhaustively because it is much too large a ~~subject~~ task to examine the number of uses of every word, ~~and all that~~ and this, it would take a ~~tremendously~~ very long time. ~~Yes? (13 1/2)~~ ¶ Thus far...

~~P.26 (3/4)~~ we have not made extensive examination of these ...arguments, ~~we do not make an extensive discussion of it now,~~ because, as I said, nobody holds Eichhorn's theory today. Eichhorn's theory was the beginning and you can't properly understand ~~in any reasonable way~~ the ~~today's~~ position people hold today without knowing something about Eichhorn's theory from which it developed, ~~but there were many~~ some of the intermediate stages. ~~and so we go on to G.~~ ¶ C. The Further Development of Eichhorn's Documentary Theory.

1. The ~~Under that, #1,~~ Extension of Eichhorn's Theory to the Rest of the Pentateuch. ~~Now the extension of it~~ ② extended ③ his theory to the rest of the Pentateuch I find it difficult to determine whether Eichhorn ~~did that~~ or not. ④ He did not ~~in~~ his first and second editions of his book, and ~~I'm~~ I can not at all certain he ever did. ~~But at least others~~ Those nevertheless who followed him did it very soon, even if he didn't ~~do it.~~ ¶ ~~So that~~ Everything thus far has ~~been consideration of~~ only dealt with Genesis and the first two ~~verses~~ chapters of Exodus. ~~But now~~ Somebody, whether Eichhorn at the end of his life, or some other writer soon after, ~~they~~ suggested requested that this division into J and E documents ~~which can be made~~ in Genesis ~~can~~ be carried ~~right on~~ through the rest of the Pentateuch. ~~Well, there~~ had been attempted ~~was none~~ had a ~~little~~ difficulty ~~now~~. ~~You will notice on your paper in Numbers, that~~ in carrying out this test, as we mentioned, the proportion of the names ~~is altogether different~~ in the later books is altogether different. ~~And so when it~~ (unclear?) came to the ~~extension of it to the~~ later chapters, ~~the matter was found that in~~ general ~~in~~ the later books ~~chapters it is common to use~~ find the name Jehovah was most common. ~~most of the time.~~ The name Elohim which is used ~~in~~ the majority of times in Genesis, is used ~~in a~~ only comparatively ~~small minority~~ few of times in the other four books, ~~and~~ Pentateuch, and that criterion is ~~not so~~ not as useful for ~~mka~~ making ~~the~~ a division ~~any more~~. Yet they said, ~~However, you have now~~ there is in Genesis a substantial amount of material, ~~so you try to~~ and determine the type of style ~~and follow it through, and~~ in order to see if ~~you get~~ each occurs the same type of style later, and they ~~said~~ claimed these two ~~that you did get the same types~~ of style, ~~so they say that these~~ and these are interweave in Exodus and Leviticus is mostly from the

stop 1/7/91

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

E source, they say, and Numbers again they interweave, found difficulty in applying it to Deuteronomy, though there are some sections they divided up.

~~a. Under 1, a. Note the matter of Divine Names. I just called your attention to the fact that the proportion is altogether different of divine names after that.~~

b. The Effect of this Extension on Belief in Mosaic Authorship. ~~And~~ This is tremendously important. As long as somebody I can divide Genesis into the sources ~~which~~ Moses had, I say you may have a hard time proving ~~to me~~ you can do it. But if you can probe it, there's no harm in it. I ~~am~~ interested to know where he got ~~his~~ material, ~~just so~~ you admit that what Moses put down is free from error, I'm perfectly willing to admit ~~he may~~ have had various sources from which he drew the material. But when you say ~~we have~~ two complete ~~passages~~ which Moses put together in Genesis, ~~and you~~ say he did the same thing with the rest of the Pentateuch, I say why on earth would Moses do that, when he saw these events himself? Why wouldn't he just write about them himself? ~~And then~~ when you say that one document says Abraham lied about his wife in Egypt, the other says he ~~lied about her~~ in Philistia, ~~well, I'd say that's pretty hard to fit together~~ with the idea of its being an inspired book. ~~But~~ you say, ~~well,~~ Moses was mistaken, Moses thought there were two different accounts when they actually ~~two different things when actually it was~~ two accounts of the same thing. That's what ~~you~~ claim. ~~But~~ when ~~you~~ get into later books ~~and you~~ find that ~~you say you have~~ two accounts of the sending of the spies, ~~which~~ contradict each other, ~~Well~~ Moses wouldn't put ~~in~~ two contradictory accounts of a thing ~~where~~ he ~~has~~ been right there! That is certainly impossible. Once you extend ~~it~~ to the rest of the Pentateuch, the Mosaic authorship automatically disappears ~~and so,~~ While Eichhorn and Astruc had no question, ~~but what~~ Moses wrote it, ~~no question in the world,~~ at least in their early writings, those who extend this to the rest of the Pentateuch have ~~all~~ completely given up any idea that Moses wrote it. ~~It is~~ documents ~~used~~ at a time far later than ~~this~~ Moses, ~~according to their theory, so your~~ Mosaic authorship ~~has~~ disappeared, sort of incidentally, in ~~the course of~~ the development of this theory.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

~~Well, that was b. Now #2, under C:~~

2. Claims of Contradiction and Disagreement between Documents. ~~Well,~~

Attention was called to Exodus 6:2, ~~and~~ this ~~is a~~ verse ~~which~~ became very important in the discussion ~~of the theory~~. ~~Ex.~~ 6, God says to Moses in v.2, "I am the LORD." (That is, "I am Jehovah.") ~~it would be--I am the Lord~~, The King James Version continues, "and I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob by the name of God Almighty, but from my name Jehovah was I not known to them." ~~Well,~~ ~~You~~ We read ~~back~~ in Genesis that Abraham made an offer to Jehovah, and that Jehovah appeared unto Abraham. ~~you~~ We read in Ex.6.3 in the KJV that God said to Moses, ~~I~~ He was not known by this name "Jehovah" to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. (3) So, they said here is a sharp disagreement between the documents. ~~And they said,~~ They ~~pointed out that~~ this could be ~~is~~ very easily understood; ~~your~~ i.e. the original ~~documents,~~ ~~the~~ ~~your~~ Elohim document has Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob all using God, and then, they said, we read that God said to Moses, I appeared unto Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as God almighty, El Shaddai, but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them." ~~He~~ They said this revealed ~~His~~ name to Moses; ~~and~~ therefore, (2) the ~~your~~ Elohim document (1) now that God had revealed His name as Jehovah, can ~~go on and~~ call Him Jehovah. But your Jehovah ~~selection~~ section(?) ~~writing~~ write(?) at a later time, was confused on this point. ~~He~~ (4) That writer (5) thought Jehovah had always been the name of God, so when he ~~writes the~~ wrote his story of creation he simply calls ~~Him~~ Jehovah. So, ~~you see~~, according to this theory, ~~you have~~ there is a contradiction between the two documents. According to one doc God is always called God, but according to the other doc He might be called God, ~~but~~ yet would be more apt to be called Jehovah. Thus ~~So~~ one document thinks that the name Jehovah was not made known until the time of Moses, and after that it used it. So ~~your~~ The criteria or of the divine names is not much use after Ex.6, but before that it is their criterion, ~~and~~ according to their view it ~~is~~ shows a sharp contradiction between the documents. ~~Yes? (9) Yes, well thank~~ you for raising the point, I want to ~~be sure everybody understands, before I'm through:~~

In ~~The verse here, Ex.~~ 6, God says to Moses, "I am Jehovah, and I appeared to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob by the name of God Almighty, but by my name Jehovah was I

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

not known to them." ~~Well.~~ The argument is that the E document said that God made known His name of Jehovah to Moses in the wilderness, and therefore the E document always calls Him God before that, because the name Jehovah was not known. But the J document contradicts the E document in that it has Abraham speak of Jehovah, and calls Him Jehovah before the time of Moses. ~~Is that clear? (10. stu: no.) All right, we'll say it again.~~ In ~~chapter~~ Exodus 6.2-3, God said to Moses I am Jehovah, and I appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob by my name God Almighty, El Shaddai, but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them. ~~Well now~~ if one document says He was not known to them by the name Jehovah before Moses' time, and another document says Abraham said Jehovah ~~told~~ him ~~this,~~ there is a sharp contradiction. If I were to say to you, I have just found out ~~that~~ Mr. Joas Gueiros ~~here,~~ ~~this~~ real name is ~~n't~~ Gueiros, ~~his real name is~~ Smith, ~~and I had been under a misapprehension about it, well then from now on,~~ I might always call him Mr. Smith, but if somebody ~~know I had said that to them, and if this person were to tell you how last year~~ I once called on him and called him Mr. Smith, you would say there is a contradiction, ~~because I said that I never knew it before that his name was Smith,~~ and here somebody says that last year I called him Smith, ~~so~~ there would be a contradiction. ~~And here they say, actually, the theory says~~ that God revealed His name of Jehovah to Moses and the Jehovah document calls Him Jehovah all through the book of Genesis, ~~so there is a sharp contradiction. Yes? (11 3/4)~~ Their argument, ~~the critical argument,~~ they say there is a contradiction between the two documents. They say one of them says that God was called God until Moses' time, and then He revealed His name unto Moses, the other that ~~they~~ called ~~Him~~ Jehovah right from the start. So they say, there is a contradiction. ~~Yes? (12 1/4) Yes, following this, most of the time it used the term Jehovah. That is why you have Jehovah used in the great majority of cases after this.~~ While before the E document used Elohim. ~~That's the~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

theory. Yes? (stu) That was the view of Eichhorn, that the J document was written later, that the E document gives the true situation. And the J document was written later by somebody who didn't know the facts about it. (13) In the book of Genesis there are more uses of Elohim than there are of Jehovah. (stu) ...

P.27. (3/4)

...(stu) You see, if you have Gen.1 and it uses the word Elohim, and Gen.2 and it uses Jehovah, now you have a clue as to two documents. Then you look at Gen.1 and it says that He made them male and female. you look at Gen.2 and it says the man and his wife. Now then you look ahead and wherever it says male and female, you say that must be the one document, wherever it says man and wife, it must be the other. And you take all the forms, the words, the typical forms of the cases in Gen. that have Elohim, and those are characteristic of this document, and (1 1/2) (stu) Yes, from here on, only style. And today most scholars will say it's style anyway, that the difference in divine names is just one of many different elements in style, but the way it started, (1 3/4)

Well, now, this argument then was that not simply they are two different documents, one of which refers to the term Jehovah and the other one of which refers to the term Elohim, but they are two contradictory documents, because according to one they call Him God, and didn't know the name Jehovah until Ex.6. While according to the other, they called Him Jehovah right from the start, so this means they contradict each other on this, And from here on, the claim was made more and more that the two documents contradict each other constantly. And for instance, they'll say, according to one document the Flood was comparatively short, according to the other it was very long. According to one document, Abraham lied about his wife in Egypt, according to the other it was in Philistia that he lied about her. They will take a case where you read that Isaac sent Jacob away, to get a wife you remember up in the land of Haran, and you remember the story tells us that Esau said he was going to kill Jacob. So Rebecca called Jacob to her,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

and Rebecca said to Jacob, ~~she~~ said I think Esau is ~~pretty~~ very angry about the way that you tricked him out of his birthright. ~~Now you go up~~ Go and visit ~~with~~ my brother ~~up~~ in Mesopotamia for a while, till ~~he~~ Esau gets over his anger, then ~~you~~ are come back. But she went to Isaac and said: "My soul is near death because of my disgust at these wives that Esau has taken from the people in the land here. ~~Now she said, can't we~~ Let's send Jacob up to Mesopotamia where he can marry one of our kindred," and Isaac ~~said~~ agreed fine and ~~he~~ called ~~him~~ Jacob in and blessed him and told him to go to Mesopotamia. ~~And~~ The sources said that one document ~~said that~~ says that the reason they sent him away was in order to keep him from being killed by Esau, while ~~and~~ the other document ~~said was the reason~~ says that they sent him away ~~was~~ in order to get a wife. So ~~so~~ there is a contradiction between the two documents. ~~And they go that way and~~ Thus they said they point out dozens ~~and dozens~~ of alleged contradictions between the two alleged documents. ~~They look at Gen.~~ They say that ~~they~~ Critics say ~~you have~~ plants were created, and then ~~you have the~~ animals and ~~created~~, then ~~you have~~ man and woman created. ~~They say you look at~~ But that Gen. 2, ~~you have~~ tells how man was created, and then ~~you have the~~ plants ~~created~~, and then ~~you have the~~ animals ~~created~~, and then ~~you have~~ woman, ~~created~~, and thus ~~you have a series of~~ they claim to find dozens and dozens of alleged contradictions. ~~So you see~~, ~~it~~ not! This view is very different from Astruc and Eichhorn's original view, that ~~we know the~~ (2) various documents (1) Moses ~~used~~ in ~~know the view~~ (3) putting ~~them~~ together in order to give us a correct true history. According to the ~~of that time. Now~~ later views we have false documents which contradict each other, and nobody knows which is true, and the way we can tell they are different documents is that they contradict each other. This, ~~and you see, you've lost~~ claims to for all dependability to the Pentateuch were given up ~~when it moves this far~~, and what started as a ~~perfectly~~ seeming harmless thing (though it would be very foolish to say it was true unless you could get real proof of it, but otherwise entirely harmless) has developed into something which strikes at the very root of all Biblical dependability. ~~Well, so much~~ SKIP to A on p. 125 ~~then for C. the further development of Eichhorn's documentary theory~~. ~~Now I hope you~~ It is important to ~~will~~ get this material well in mind, because it is background to the succeeding ~~messages,~~ lessons and without it it is impossible to ~~follow them, and~~ understand them correctly. ~~But~~ here developments I think we can start--maybe we better not start D today. I think some of you would rather

NOW SKIP to A on p. 125

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

show me how well you reviewed last week than to start D. So we'll start D tomorrow, and today we will have enough time for you to show that you really know something of the material we have already gone over. So please write down the question as I give it to you. I asked you last Tuesday to discuss the first and fifth books of the Bible, and there were just one or two who thought that the words "fifth book of the Bible" meant fifth book in the order in which I discussed it. That's not what the term book of the Bible means. It means book in the order in which they are in the Bible. And careful exegesis is important. I couldn't give credit for the wrong one because the statement was very clear. There were very few who made that error, but I'd like you to write down the question to be sure there will not be an error with it. The odd ones will please take this question: Discuss fully with scriptural evidence (you may use your Bible), what was the attitude of Jesus toward the authorship of the Pentateuch?

And the first question for the even is: Does the Pentateuch anywhere say that it was written by Moses. If so, where? (stu.7 3/4) Brief discussion. Take about 10 minutes on this first question. Then, just about at the very end of the hour I'll give you the second question. (8 1/4)

(record starts again at 9). ~~Under C, #1 was Extension to the rest of the Pentateuch, and we noticed that one of th~~ Once it was claimed that these documents extend into the rest of the Pentateuch, then the idea of Mosaic authorship has automatically disappeared. There was no longer any question then among these critics of the books of those who followed this, of their being written by Moses. And that as that happened, it was said that there were there came also, as we noticed in #2, the claims of contradiction and disagreements between documents. The original idea was that one writer simply used the name Jehovah, and the other writer simply used the name Elohim. But now it is claimed, on the basis of Ex.6.3, that according to the writer that used the name Elohim, the name Jehovah was not known until the time of Moses. While according to the other writer the name Jehovah was used right from the beginning. This is a tremendously important difference, and if the two contradict each other on such an important fact

http://www.macrae-lib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

as that, how can you trust either one of them? Well, that was the end of C, now we take up D:

D, The Fragmentary Theory and other developments in the early part of the 19th Century. And here we cross over to the British Isles, and Alexander Geddes.

Now Alexander Geddes was a Roman Catholic Priest in Scotland, and this man in Scotland wrote a book in 1790, on the Pentateuch, following it up with another in 1800, and in these books he took a position going much beyond the position of Eichhorn and these others. He said that he took the arguments that they gave to show that the A document and the B document contradict each other, and he showed that within them, you could use the same kind of arguments to contradict sections within them. And so he said actually there were 38 different documents that were used in writing the book of Genesis. That's why they call it the fragmentary theory. Some of these might be only a few verses, some of them might be a couple of chapters. But there were, he said, 38 different writings from which the material was gathered to write the book of Genesis, and the same would apply to the rest of the Pentateuch. Yes? (2 1/4) 38 for Genesis, 38 different things that a man had before him to write from. Now of course, if you were to be given a hundred thousand dollars by the Rockefeller Foundation in order to write a history of some institution, I started to say Faith Seminary, I doubt if they would give it for that purpose, but let's suppose if they did, you would then have to assemble material, and you would get early catalogs, you would get letters from people who were here in early times, you would get issues of the Christian Beacon which told about the opening in different years, and gave the news for that year. You might get newspaper articles, you might get articles in a few national religious magazines about the Seminary. You would probably have 50 or maybe 100 documents before you. If you started out to do this but as you looked over these documents, you would get the facts in your mind and you would write them up in your own words, and you might have footnotes showing the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

sources from which you got particular evidence, but Geddes' theory was not simply that the writer of Genesis had a lot of material from which he gathered facts; it was that he had definite writings which he incorporated, that he now you will occasionally find a book written today, that is like that, and it is usually a pretty bad hodge-podge. Somebody gets out a book on a thing, and you can see where he quotes from somebody always and then he takes from somebody else. I occasionally get term papers like that, in which the language, the style..., and style of certain authors the student reads...

P.28 (3/4)

... is presented in his own words. Well, Geddes' idea was that that was what was done in writing Genesis. There were all these various fragments from which a certain part was taken of each, and they were put together to make up the book of Genesis. Now Geddes received great criticism from his ecclesiastical superiors, and ordered not to write any more than he did write. However, what he said did not affect the supremacy of the Virgin Mary and the importance of purgatory or any other of the vital doctrines. It was only a matter of whether the Bible was true or not, and consequently the church authorities, while they remonstrated with him and told him he should not write such things, they did not do anything drastic regarding him, and so this Roman Catholic priest wrote this material which had very little influence in the British Isles, but which was widely read by scholars on the continent, and which had a very great influence on the continent of Europe. French and German scholars took up his ideas and wrote them in their words - yes? (stu. 1 3/4) He gives up the idea of the original documents. You see, Eichhorn divides them into the E document (or I guess he called it the A document)--the E document used Elohim, the J used Jehovah, with a few other sections.

To summarize: Now Geddes divided up the E and J documents into smaller ones, and I doubt if he would have many sections (2 1/4) but he divided it into continuous narrative, the whole thing, but into various sections, telling

2. Valeand Hartman.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

about ~~this~~, ~~into a~~ section telling about ~~this~~ ~~like~~ we might think there was an account of the life of Jacob in Haran, that would be a separate work, written by a different writer. Then the account of Jacob and Esau in Palestine before he went to Haran, there might be two different accounts of that, parts from one and parts taken from the other, but there is no long document, any more, from his viewpoint. It is a series of fragments which have been put together, large or small writings. ~~Yes? (2 3/4) Yes, well, my impression is that the number is 38, we don't need tremendous stress on the number, but we'll say it is about 38, but~~ What he says is, Gen. say 2:7 to 3:24 is one document, one fragment which was taken and incorporated by the ~~wts~~ writer. ~~Then he incorporates another writer and he tells us what he~~ figures they are. But he says these are different documents ~~which (2 1/2)~~ but ~~that is how it came~~ into existence. ~~Well,~~ this view that Geddes presented (#1) was taken up in Germany by two scholars, ~~One named~~ Vater and Hartmann. ~~#~~ ~~Now~~ Vater wrote ~~his writings~~ very soon after Geddes ~~did~~, so it had a very considerable influence. ~~I believe it was~~ in 1805, ~~if I recall,~~ very soon ~~anyway~~ after Geddes ~~wrote,~~ that ~~Hartman~~ Vater wrote, Hartman ~~did not write until~~ quite a bit later, ~~Hartman was~~ 1831, ~~but Vater is 1805~~. ~~And~~ by the time ~~of Hartman~~ the theory was on the way out. But Vater ~~was one~~ who had much to do ~~in~~ spreading this theory, ~~he~~ divides ~~up~~ Genesis into 38 fragments, varying in length from four ~~to~~ or five verses to several chapters, and divides the other books of the Pentateuch in similar fashion. ~~And~~ many scholars felt that ~~this~~ was right. Eichhorn had shown that it ~~wasn't~~ not a unit, it can be divided, there are contradictions between different sections, ~~so~~ why stop with two documents? Actually you can divide it further by the same principle, ~~further still~~, and you have all these different documents, so many that it came to be called the fragmentary theory. ~~And~~ For a time amogg the critical scholars, ~~this~~ was the dominant theory, the fragmentary theory.

#3. ~~Then #3,~~ Ilgen. ~~And Ilgen,~~ I questioned ~~whether to~~ put him here under the fragmentary theory, ~~or whether to --~~ so ~~that's why~~ I made ~~my title~~ D ~~to~~ include other

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

developments, in the early part of the 19th century. ~~I think~~ a good argument can be made for considering Ilgen as one who advanced the Fragmentary Theory, but since the line along which he moved was ~~one which was~~ picked up ~~60~~ Sixty years later and ~~was~~ is very important in present criticism, he is ~~today~~ now given an importance far beyond what he deserves. ~~Actually these~~ Writers were making theories in all kinds of directions, and Ilgen made ~~the~~ that was one in the direction picked up ~~60~~ sixty years later, ~~but he is so often mentioned we should mention him here, because of the fact that he suggested--he~~ H did not divide it into as many fragments as the others. He still thought there were main long documents, but he said that the E document actually had two kinds of material in it, and ~~so he~~ divided ~~the E document~~ it into a First Elohim and a Second Elohim. ~~So he suggested there was the~~ In addition to this J document, ~~there was a First Elohim and a Second Elohim, and that was his suggestion.~~ and he wrote in 1798, his book.

~~Well, now this is (5 3/4)~~

~~Eichhorn has two big documents, he divides one of them into two parts, but Ilgen wrote~~ this book, it didn't not have much influence. ~~He published it in 1798~~ At the time and he ~~And he~~ soon left the field of Old Testament study and went into the study of education, and became quite a prominent leader ~~in that field~~, so his influence did not remain. ~~But he sometimes~~ did divide ~~even in the middle of a book, between the First Elohist and the Second Elohist, or between the Second Elohist and the Jehovah.~~ Yahwist. He made a very detailed division. ~~A writer here who followed the critical theories, a Methodist writer of a few years ago, wrote a book on Old Testament criticism up to 1800, said Ilgen's argument is~~ In general sound, and ~~shows in several instances an advance in critical method over previous writers, but he~~ permitted his critical faculty to become subject to a preconceived notion of the functions of the different writers, and carried his theory of the characteristic distinctions between the two Elohists and the ~~Jehovahs~~ Yahwists to unjustifiable, almost ridiculous excesses. This led him to see the hands of two different writers in ~~75~~ seventy-five verses, sometimes on reasonable grounds, but often for no apparent reason save to support his theory. ~~Now there's one critical scholar criticizing another critical scholar's writing, but this~~ His book ~~of Ilgen's~~ was

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

very detailed, ~~75 verses, he divided into two different documents.~~ ~~Yes? (stu) Ilgen wrote his book in 1798. Well the one that comes six years later we'll discuss later on. Ilgen was 1798 and I don't think his book would have had any great influence, I don't think it did have, but 60~~ Sixty years later a new theory was advanced which swept the world and is believed by all critical scholars today, and ~~many~~ then people looked back and found that Ilgen had written something very similar in 1798, so they ~~give~~ gave Ilgen a great deal of ~~credit, now.~~ ~~When the theories came out 60~~ Sixty years later ~~people had even forgotten Ilgen existed but they looked back and found his book and found the theory he advanced was similar to theirs. So I am mentioning him here simply as part of this process of further dividing. You see what this would do?~~ If you have an E document, which includes more than half the material in the book of Genesis, ~~much more than that on the Pentateuch,~~ and if you have a J document which includes over a third, you've ~~got~~ have two ~~pretty big~~ substantial bodies of material to compare, for style, ~~for~~ usage, ~~and decide to try to see if~~ but it is a continuous narrative. ~~Now~~ if you ~~take~~ the E document ~~and~~ divide ~~it~~ into two parts, running ~~clear~~ all the way through, ~~well~~ you ~~'ve got~~ have less material to compare, you're in a much more shaky position ~~to make a decent decision~~ as to whether ~~there~~ is any truth to it ~~or not~~. ~~If~~ The more you fragmentize it you reduce the evidence on which any reasonable decision can be made. ~~But #4 is more important than Ilgen,~~ stop 1/9/91

Start 4. DeWette. ~~And~~ DeWette is recognized by the critics as a very brilliant scholar, ~~But DeWette~~ who for a long time hesitated between the documentary hypothesis and the fragmentary hypothesis. Sometimes he seemed to be favoring one, sometimes the other. ~~But DeWette~~ Nevertheless, he made one very definite suggestion, ~~and one~~ which has been followed by the critics to this day. ~~This was in his book in 1805~~. In 1805 ~~DeWette~~ he wrote a book in which he said the book of Deuteronomy is an independent part of the Pentateuch, composed in the time of Josiah, a little before 600 B.C., ~~at least~~ 600, ~~maybe~~ two 800 years after Moses. DeWette said the book of Deuteronomy is a separate ~~thing, it is~~ not written by Moses, ~~it is not written~~ but by the E writer or the J writer. Most of it ~~is~~ was written at

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

about the time of Josiah. ~~And~~ then ~~DeWette said, you~~ he pointed to the chapters in that book about the reign of Josiah where during the rebuilding of the temple they found a document and they took it and read it and they said great harm has come to us because we haven't been following this ~~document, and they covenanted to follow it, they made it the be-~~ ginning of their canon~~)~~ this he said was Deuteronomy." ~~And~~ there is no doubt that Josiah's reformation was tremendously affected by the book of Deuteronomy, no question that ~~Deuteronomy either was~~ the book found in the temple or ~~was a~~ part of it ~~I would say it~~ was the whole Pentateuch. ~~But~~ at any rate, Deuteronomy was there. ~~Deuteronomy~~ was influential at that time, ~~Now~~ DeWette ~~says that's~~ when Deuteronomy was written.

~~Now you see that is taking out, then, the fifth part of the Pentateuch, and putting it over here; this is by the E writer, this is by the J writer, this is by Moses, this is a different writer yet, the book of Deuteronomy. And that~~ was tremendously important in the development of the ~~whole critical approach. And DeWette is the originator of that~~ view ~~about the book of Deuteronomy.~~

~~Now if you want~~, you can say there are three documents: the J document, the ~~E~~ document, and the book of Deuteronomy. ~~That's what they say today, they say there is a D document, which is not all of Deuteronomy,~~ but most of Deuteronomy, ~~and some sections they say are J and others. Yes? (13) Well, now you're getting away from the main thing on which the critics all agree, into the point on which there is great divergence~~ ~~that is, Some of them have said~~ Hilkiah wrote it and hid it in the temple, and pretended to have found it. It was a pious fraud, for a good purpose, in order to advance a good cause; he told a lie about the book, because he knew if he told Josiah he wrote the book, the king wouldn't pay any attention to it, so he told him it's an old book Moses wrote and Josiah swallowed it. ~~They say~~, many of the critical writers have said it was a pious fraud." ~~In recent years writers are more and more convinced that there was...~~

unclear ?

...~~and~~ the ~~critical argument~~ that ~~that is~~ the book found in the temple, We have no quarrel with ~~that, only with the question whether~~ it ~~is~~ all (3/4) but we certainly agree that Deuteronomy ~~is~~ ~~and we agree that Deuteronomy~~ was ~~the~~ large influence in Josiah's reformation. But when they say Deuteronomy was not written until that day, ~~why of course that is something which~~ makes Deuteronomy a lie because ~~it~~ says that Moses wrote it. ~~Yes? (1 1/4) Well,~~ he bases ~~the~~ theory ~~in the first place~~ on the fact that this book ~~which was~~ found in the Temple contains ~~the~~ very orders to do the things which Josiah did ~~(1 1/4)~~; ~~He bases it on that. Then he has a lot (1 1/2)~~ ~~which we will hope to get two or three weeks to at the end of the semester. I have sometimes had to crowd it into the last few hours, which I don't like to do. I'd rather give it a couple of weeks.~~

~~Now Wm.~~ Henry Green's book on the Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch never mentions the problem of Deuteronomy, ~~and~~ I think ~~that is~~ very unfortunate ~~because it is a~~ very vital part of ~~(1 3/4)~~ ~~and the (modern) theories.~~ But ~~you can't~~ study the Pentateuch ~~without considering Deuteronomy~~ ~~and in fact, within the critical theory, Deuteronomy is a vital thing,~~ so ~~that's~~ why we put it ~~up~~ here at its proper ~~place.~~ ~~We~~ are not looking at the arguments yet; we are at present just seeing the developments ~~of the idea,~~ and ~~they will~~ claim ~~(2 1/4)~~ fits Josiah's time perfectly and ~~couldn't~~ have anything to do with ~~the~~ earlier period, ~~Of course,~~ we can look at Deuteronomy and ~~can point to~~ things that fit the earlier period, ~~and~~ have nothing to do with Josiah's time. ~~We can do that, and it is a big discussion.~~ I think one of ~~the most~~ interesting ~~things about it is that~~ a great many ~~of the~~ arguments on which the critical view of Deuteronomy ~~have been given~~ by scholars in recent years, ~~That is to say,~~ they tenaciously hold ~~to the date~~, that it ~~is~~ at that ~~last~~ period. ~~The University of Pennsylvania not long ago a doctoral thesis was written, a study of the language of the time of Josiah. What does (2 3/4) he say?~~ ~~? The book of~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Deuteronomy. A study in Deuteronomy of the language of the time of Josiah. It is accepted by all the critical scholars that that is when it was written. But there is great difference between them now as to whether it was written by somebody in the southern kingdom or the northern kingdom, or it was written then or a hundred years earlier. We believe there is no proof it wasn't written by Moses. We think that Moses wrote it, that it was in the Pentateuch from the beginning. We will look into those arguments later. At this point, I just wanted you to see how the theory developed. Mr. Miller? (3 1/4)

Well, now there are two main aspects in the study of the critical theory of the Pentateuch. First, is the division, the second is the dating. And when the division [discussion] is in progress, all kinds of various theories are advanced. It was not until 1875 that there was any unity about dating. From about 1875 a view on dating was established which is held to this day by most of the critics. But we'd better leave that to discuss. That we [should] spend a month on, so we can't take that up this morning. But it's good to have attention called to the impertance of the problem. I appreciate the question, but I mean that's why I can't go into so we take more time on it later. Yes? (4 1/4) DeWette was a student of history, rather than a student of doctrine. That is, there are some men who are interested in the literary division: Is this by two different writers, and so on. DeWette was interested in that. But he was mostly interested in the historical aspect, and he said, Deuteronomy just fits the time of Isaiah, That's when it was written. Now, DeWette said, I read Eichhorn, and he talks about the two documents, sounds very convincing, I think he is right.

Then a little later, he says, I read Vater, about all these fragments, very convincing, I think he is right, and he varies for a few years between the two and doesn't make up his mind until finally he accepts the third view, altogether different, which we come to very soon. It was not altogether different, but related definitely to both, but it was a little new suggestion. (?)

Now some of you may be tremendously interested in following DeWette's ideas, so this question is very much of interest to those who are, but for those of you who are interested in getting the main things, don't be worried too much about it. DeWette's idea?

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Because I want to be sure you get the main outline of the idea that developed. That is very vital. So we mention here as #4, we mentioned DeWette, and particularly his presenting this theory on Deuteronomy which was soon accepted among critical scholars and is held in its essentials by all critical scholars today. It is one of the few things advanced that early that still is held with little change, though today there is much discussion over certain features of it such as, was it in the northern or southern kingdom (etc.) that it was written. And DeWette said the big thing in Deuteronomy is, the centralization of worship in Jerusalem. Now there are those who say this is a minor thing and just attached as sort of an afterthought. That it was only after they were sure of Deuteronomy that they begin to (6 1/4) question the underpinnings on which the theory is built. Well, we go on then to #5, and this is Ewald's Refutation of the Fragmentary Theory.

Now you see that the Fragmentary Theory was the logical development of the documentary division. If you can prove that two main documents were put together to form Genesis, why that is very interesting to know how it came into existence. But if the evidence on which you divide it into two can just as well divide each of these into five or six others, and each of them into two or three, you have started on a process to which there seems to be no end. And that's what the fragmentary theory seems to me to demonstrate. That unless you - It isn't enough to prove that there is some difference between two parts. Let's say there are two different documents. Then let's prove that th we can solidly show there are these documents, because if you're going to divide and divide and divide until you get just little fragments, well, it sort of reduces the whole thing to absurdity. And Geddes and Vater and some of those others held very strongly to the theory which reduced it to the writer of it being a man who took this and copied a little and took this and copied it a little, and this and copied a little, and how could they prove that, how could you show all these different documents. Well, Ewald, who was one of the leading German scholars of the first half of the last century, first half of the 19th century, wrote his doctoral dissertation, in 1823, on "A Refutation of the Fragmentary Theory, the Unity of the Pentateuch."

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

And in 1895, Prof. William Henry Green of Princeton Seminary said that Ewald's criticism of the Fragmentary Theory is still worth studying for its brilliant refutation of the Fragmentary Theory. Ewald, as a young man, in 1823, wrote this dissertation on the fact that he claimed that Moses had written Genesis. He didn't hold very long that Moses had written Genesis, but he did at that time, that Moses wrote Genesis and that Genesis was not made up of just a lot of little fragments that didn't make sense, that actually there is a unity to it and he takes the parts of it into which you divide and you will find that many of them don't make any sense unless they presuppose other parts which are there, they cannot be simply separate accounts; there is a unity to it, there is a unified plan, there is a progress, there is a relationship. Ewald said, he said this fragmentary theory is just utterly unreasonable, and he wrote this in 1823 and gave the death blow to the fragmentary theory. It lingered on for a while, but lost a great part of its influence. And this book by Prof. Briggs of Union Seminary, written in 1893 strongly supporting the higher criticism, he says of the fragmentary theory, he says that it was a very bad and harmful theory, and that it was an excellent thing to show that it was simply not valid at all. This, we feel that the present critical theory has very much in common, actually, with the fragmentary theory, but the fragmentary theory, you see, starting with the division, went to this fragment idea which reduced it to, you might say, absurdity, and critical scholars reacted strongly against that. So now the movement is back in the direction of more unity to the Pentateuch, they see a unified thread running through it, so Ewald's refutation in 1823 was very influential on other scholars, and eventually very influential to the end of the fragmentary theory. No one today speaks really well of the fragmentary theory as held at that time, although the present theories really come rather close to it.

6. Then, Discussion of the Fragmentary Theory.

It died so completely there would be no point in discussing it, if it were not for the fact that the present development is very similar in many ways. Consequently, it is very helpful to see how it developed then and to see the parallel to the present developments.

/stop 1/10/91

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Start

~~Now~~ William Henry Green has three very strong points at which he criticizes the fragmentary theory, ~~and they are points which are worth being~~ familiar with. I will call ~~the first of them~~ a. It assumes the existence of many different writings from that time, of which we have no other evidence. ~~The assumption of the existence of all these different documents. We~~ would expect to find some evidence somewhere of the fact ~~that~~ there were this many documents at that time, from which a man could ~~take and~~ draw ~~this fragment, that fragment, and the other fragment.~~ ~~It~~ is an assumption of widespread literary activity ~~far beyond what there is any~~ evidence ~~of for~~ that period. A great number of ~~men~~ interested in presenting and discussing these various things from which these fragments could all be selected, ~~so when you, not to~~ assume, there were two documents, ~~there was~~ an E document, ~~there was~~ a J document. We have no ~~proof of them, we have no~~ evidence they existed, but ~~after all, it is~~ only assuming two things that were then combined into one, ~~but~~ to assume ~~38~~ different documents, of which there is no evidence, is a tremendous ~~big~~ assumption, ~~so~~ that is a strong argument against the fragmentary theory, ~~which~~ is equally strong against ~~many of~~ the "fragmentizing" theories which are commonly taught today.

~~Then b...~~ b. Such a process could

~~P. 30. (3/4)~~

~~a. It would~~ not make a unified work like we have in the Pentateuch. There is an orderly arrangement in the Pentateuch, ~~a proportion to discussion of different aspects, there is~~

It is more loosely bound together than our western writings usually are, but there is a continuous structure which could hardly come into existence just from taking a lot of different fragments and putting them together. ~~I had a fellow once who did some work in my class, later on wrote a commentary, he~~ was very interested ~~to write~~ a commentary on the book of Ecclesiastes, ~~and~~ I told him, ~~I said~~ study Ecclesiastes ~~then, study it~~ thoroughly, think the thing through, and write ~~your~~ conclusions. ~~Well~~ he wanted to quote, he couldn't write as well ~~(1 1/2)~~ as other writers, ~~he wanted to quote somebody, so he got out his~~ book ~~and~~ of ~~all~~ the miserable hodgepodge ~~you ever saw, simply he'd~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

say Ecclesiastes, and then he'd say so-and-so says, then he'd put a paragraph, so-and-so says, put a paragraph, and it was just a series of quotations, the most uninteresting thing to read, without any unity to it, without any real progress to it. If you're going to write something that is worth reading, you have to think it through, put it into a unified method of expression and have a systematic development, there. And just a series of quotations will produce anything that gives that unified impression that the Pentateuch gives, and the steady progress from one theme, from one development, from one context. So the fragmentary theory, Ewald showed, does not explain the fact of the systematic arrangement of the Pentateuch, with progress from one idea, one development to another. And then c. Ewald pointed out that in the Pentateuch you'll find section after section which refers back to what previously was said. It will be quite understandable if you don't have the previous discussion of the thing which is here presented. Things are brought in which you've been told before, how they came to be, where they came from, details about them. There is a building back on previous statements; there is a relation back in the Pentateuch, which is quite impossible with just the series of fragments put together into one volume.

So these three arguments I think are equally valid against most of the critical theories today; but they certainly are valid against the Fragmentary Theory, which reduced it to the great series of fragments. I think the present theories do the same thing, but they don't admit they do, that is, they cover it up with a more type of language. Well, so much for #6.

E. The Supplement Hypothesis. Now the Supplement Hypothesis, the development which naturally came out of these, was a view which was held by all the critical scholars for nearly 50 years. It was the dominant view in the critical schools in most parts of the world, and so we should know something about it because of its importance, historically, and also because of its importance historically and also because of its important place in the progress of the development from Eichhorn's original theory, up to the theories

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

which are taught as the assured result of modern scholarship, ~~today~~. The Supplement Hypothesis was advanced by a very sizeable number of scholars, ~~and I'll mention~~ one of the outstanding ones, ~~a man named~~ Bleek. ~~DeWette however, We should also mention here because~~ DeWette had not been satisfied with the Fragment Theory or with ~~the Docu-~~ mentary Theory ~~of~~ Eichhorn and had wavered back and forth between them, ~~he~~ jumped on the bandwagon with both feet, of the Supplement Theory and was very strong in its defense. ~~and~~ Ewald, who had argued for the unity of Genesis ~~as~~ against the fragmentary theory, fell in line with the Supplement Theory to quite an extent, ~~and Ewald said~~ it extended to Joshua, ~~also~~. ~~He said Joshua also is a part of it~~. So ~~they came not to speak~~ anymore of a Pentateuch, ~~but~~ of a Hexateuch, and that is ~~what~~ they speak of today. If you look in most critical Bible dictionaries today, you won't find any article on Pentateuch, ~~you~~ will ~~find it~~ on Hexateuch. Hexateuch, as you know, means the six books, Pentateuch ~~is~~ the five books, ~~and~~ they consider Joshua as part of the same thing and claim that these documents extend to the book of Joshua, though they have ~~a much~~ harder time proving it of Joshua than they do of the others.

~~Because the But this Supplement Hypothesis then, which was advanced by so many people, came to include Joshua as well, as, maybe we better make that a heading:~~

~~1. Extension to Joshua. Then~~ 2. Nature of the Supplement Hypothesis. ~~Now~~ the Supplement Hypothesis, which was the dominant view for at least ~~50~~ fifty years ~~goes~~ went back to Eichhorn. It ~~gives~~ gave up ~~this~~ the idea of ~~all those~~ numerous fragments, ~~It says~~ ~~no~~ there ~~is~~ a unity ~~there, there is a~~ progress, ~~there is~~ and structure. ~~But it says, you take Eichhorn's E document and you've got the~~ structure ~~there, so it says, the E document, the Elohim document, this document has~~ gives the original structure. This The E document tells ~~the story of~~ about the creation of the world in Gen. 1; it ~~tells the story of~~ about the Flood, ~~it tells of~~ are the Covenant with Noah, ~~it gives~~ and it contains you a series of covenants; it ~~tells you of~~ the progress, ~~the E document, which was about two-thirds of Genesis anyway, it gives you the progress~~ of the story. ~~This is~~ They consider the original, ~~is the E~~ document, ~~This is~~ the first writing. ~~You see,~~ Eichhorn said, "here are two ~~of them~~ originals:

Stop 1/11/91

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

They ~~hero is an E document telling what he thought. here is a J document telling what he thought,~~ ~~and somebody has combined these two into one. No, these men~~ said, the E document is the original. And ~~then the~~ J is not a separate document but ~~that Jehovah's~~ is a Supplement. ~~dry.~~ ~~He has~~ the E document before him and ~~he makes~~ insertions into it. ~~He makes additions. He~~ reads about the creation of the world in Genesis 1, ~~then~~ he adds more detail on the creation of man in Genesis 2, and the story of the Fall, he inserts. ~~that.~~

The E document ~~tells~~ how the world was created and then ~~says~~ and the world was filled with violence and God sent a flood; ~~He~~ tells ~~you~~ how ~~it~~ came to be filled with violence, ~~and gives you~~ the story of the fall. ~~So the E document,~~ the J writer, ~~the Jehovah, goes~~ through the E document and adds sections here and there, ~~and the big reason for this view is that, you see, the E document is the biggest, and the J document is much smaller.~~

~~No~~ In the J document there are statements which don't make any sense unless you know something ~~just before which is told you in~~ the E document. ~~So~~ they say the writer of the Jehovah had the E document before him, ~~he learned these things from E, and he made his insertion, so~~ J was a supplement, not a separate document. ~~Yes, Mr. Kaufmann?~~ (9 1/2) ~~No, you see,~~ this includes the whole Pentateuch, ~~and the whole Pentateuch, if~~ Moses ~~did it,~~ it would just be written down from his knowledge. If it is a compilation it must be by somebody later. Some of ~~them~~ said, that a great part of it came from writings Moses had written, ~~and~~ incorporated ~~in with these others.~~ And ~~they~~ vary greatly as to the time it was written. Some say the E document was written shortly after the time of Joshua; some say it was not written till the time of David. ~~But then they would add there were~~ more conservative scholars who accepted ~~this~~ view and who would have the final ~~thing~~ written at the time of David; there were more radical ~~ones~~ who would have the E document at the time of David and the final ~~thing~~ written later on, ~~they say,~~ the time of the exile. ~~But they all agree there was~~ more than 50 years ~~in which~~ practically all critical scholars agree that the E document is the ~~big~~ foundation, ~~and this is a writing which~~ gives ~~you~~ the ~~majority~~ of the material in the Pentateuch, ~~gives you~~ more than half of

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Genesis, gives you perhaps two-thirds of the rest of the book, so nearly two-thirds of the whole Pentateuch (except for Deuteronomy) is the E document and then the Jehovah's makes insertions. Yes? (10 3/4) This is not a documentary theory, this is a supplement. (stu.) Well, I have not--I mean, many, many people wrote. There are in German probably fifty books written during those fifty years, going into detail on all these points, and I have not checked on that particular thing. I could make a guess in line with my general knowledge of it. My guess would be that what they would hold was that by the time of the Jehovist, the name Jehovah was used by everybody and when he made his insertions he just didn't happen to notice that, according to the document, in order for it to have been from the time of Moses, that name was given, so he was used to talking about God as Jehovah all the time and he just used that name (11 3/4) It was an oversight on his part. That is my guess as to what they would say. I haven't checked in a month or two I could read them German books and find the precise things on this point, but I have not taken that month for this particular thing. But I have a knowledge of the whole thing enough to make pretty good guesses on a particular question like you asked, nine-tenths of which I think would prove out that way. So any question like that that any of you have, don't hesitate to ask. I may know the answer, and I may not, and may be able as in this case to make what I think is a very certain guess. Now the nature then of the Supplementary Hypothesis, you see the difference between it and the Documentary Theory. Not two documents, one original document, and then insertions. And you see the reason for it, the J document, which is the shorter of the two, at many assumes things which are explained in the E document. Therefore, they do not feel that the J document could have arisen as an independent document, but rather as an insertion, supplement to the E document. Yes? (13 1/4) They vary tremendously. There are some of them who would put the E document, some quite conservative men accepted the theory, and they put E document perhaps right in (13 1/2) time and the J document in David's time. Then there were much more liberal men who put the E document in David's

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

or Solomon's
/time and the J document maybe during the Exodus. But they wouldn't call it document, they would call it the supplementation.

P.31. (3/4)

...and in this dominant theory, the foundation document, (the German word "Grundschrift," ground-writing, foundation document, which (3/4) constantly referred to, is the E document, the document that uses the name of God as Elohim.

Now as time went on people began to see that this theory was not satisfactory. It is not satisfactory because of the fact that they found that the things that were assumed were not just assumed in J. The J document assumes some things which are explained in E, but the E document assumes some things that are explained in J. And then they also found that you take the E document and the J document and the style of the E document is not consistent throughout, that is to day, If you say here are two distinct styles, the style of the J document and the E document, pretty soon you find some parts of the E document in which if you just change the name Jehovah to Elohim, everybody I mean the other way around everybody would say it's part of the J document. They found many parts of the E document in which the style was absolutely indistinguishable from the J document, except perhaps by having the name Elohim occur maybe once in twenty verses or something like that. So there were difficulties which people gradually came to see in it, and it was felt necessary to make modifications of it. And so we will call #3:

3. Criticism of the Supplement Hypothesis. Under that a:

a. It does not fully explain the interdependence of E and J sections.

b. The same type of division could be extended to parts of the Foundation Writing--the E document itself.

And there was an English bishop named Colenso. He was an English mathematician who went into the Church of England and was made bishop of a section of Africa. He was missionary bishop of this section of Africa, and there in Africa, Colenso wrote a criticism of the Foundation Writing, a criticism of (the E document). And Colenso claimed that though

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

the people who hold the Supplement ~~Foundation~~ Theory ~~hold~~ said that the E document is the original history, he ~~claimed to~~ could find all kinds of unhistorical things in it; ~~unhistorical things,~~ inaccuracies, contradictions, and so on. So ~~Colenso~~ he wrote a strongly critical book attacking the historicity, not of the additions, but of the actual foundation document itself, ~~and~~ Colenso's book had quite an influence, ~~on the (5)~~ (?) are ~~particularly. Colenso. So~~ not

~~The result of all this was that~~ attempts were made to revise the Supplement Hypothesis.

~~So we will call #1,~~ The Attempted Revision of Ewald's the Crystallization Hypothesis.

Ewald in 1843 wrote a book in which he extended the supplementation still further; that ~~is to say,~~ there ~~is~~ was a first document and then there was a supplement under that, and then there was a supplement ~~under~~ to that, ~~and there's a supplement under that.~~ He suggested that the first writer ~~one who used~~ used E and ~~writes~~ wrote, and then a supplementer ~~you have one who uses~~ used Jehovah and ~~writes~~ wrote insertions, then there was ~~you have~~ one who ~~write~~ wrote E and ~~writes~~ wrote insertions, and then there was ~~you have~~ another who ~~writes~~ used J and ~~writes~~ made insertions. Thus you have a series ~~theory~~ of supplementations, one after the other, and the beautiful simplicity of the Supplement Hypothesis ~~is left~~ was wrecked by Ewald's feeling that one supplementation ~~won't~~ will not do it, ~~you have to have~~ but there must be a whole series of them. ~~And I guess we can't discuss that further today because we have run one minute over, so we'll go into this # (6 1/2) I hope you will remember well what we had today because it is the foundation for (6 3/4) and also for our little quiz.~~ (break in record) ~~(starting again at 7 1/4)~~ So this theory was taken as the Foundation Writing, the Grundschrift, and ~~that~~ Supplementary theory was ~~so acceptable to the critics,~~ that for a period of half a century it was almost undisputed among the critical scholars; ~~Now there were some~~ though conservative scholars in Germany ~~who~~ were attacking it, ~~there were~~ quite a few ~~of them,~~ and some of them wrote very strong books opposing it, but it won the day among the critical scholars and great numbers of people came to accept it as the fact about the development of the document of the Pentateuch. First there was the Grundschrift, the Foundation Writing, recognizable by Elohim instead of Jehovah, and then the Jehovah section, ~~supplementing,~~ inserted by the Jehovists later. ~~They didn't realize that his name~~ thought ~~Jehovah, that he was accustomed~~ the (2) supplementers

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

to use for God, ~~hadn't been used in the first place.~~ He didn't notice that it said ~~this~~ in Ex.6.3, that ~~it~~ hadn't been used before, so he simply used Jehovah in the sections he put in. ~~Yes? (8 1/2)~~ These are not small interpolations, ~~they~~ are big interpolations, ~~This is~~ maybe one-third. ~~No. The question is as to what the Bible teaches.~~ The Bible teaches that Moses is the author of the Pentateuch as a whole, ~~the Bible~~ nowhere says every word of the Pentateuch came from Moses. I personally see no reason why it may not be that every word did, but I don't find it anywhere in the Bible ~~taught~~ that that is something we ~~ought to~~ believe. ~~And~~ therefore, if somebody ~~has~~ an argument to prove that an occasional word, an occasional sentence ~~came in~~ at a later time, but under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit was kept from error, I ~~see no statement~~ that that contradicts anywhere in the Scripture. That is to say, I would feel personally ~~I think~~ all of it is by Moses, even the account of his death. I would feel it extremely unlikely that there would ~~be~~ over 20 or 30 words ~~at most~~ in the Pentateuch that were inserted later under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. But if somebody feels that there is as much as 1% ~~(8 3/4)~~ I still don't see how it would contradict anything taught in the New Testament or in the Old Testament about the Pentateuch. But this view was very different from that, because this view held that about two-thirds ~~of it~~ was written by the original Elohist, And that approximately a third ~~that is~~ of the book of Genesis was inserted by the Jehovist who had various misunderstandings, and who put in stuff ~~which~~ contradicted what was already there, without realizing the contradiction, and who ~~gave as~~ repeated extra things that were already told, and thus introduced a lot of confusion into the fine original account of the Elohist. That was the view. We should not think

Now the Supplement Hypothesis was far nearer to a conservative view than the views which the critics hold today, ~~far~~ nearer. ~~But what~~ For the point I'm trying to stress now is ~~how for~~ a period of between 40 and 70 years, varying with individual ~~edh~~ scholars, the critical ~~scholars~~ were satisfied with the Supplement Theory, ~~and felt~~ thought that ~~this~~ was the true view, and felt that they could defend it against others. ~~It eventually was given up.~~ Mr.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

~~MacKeen? (stu)~~ No, the Supplement Theory holds there is ~~one~~ document with supplementations. ~~(stu) Yes, I would be the supplement.~~ See, the original Documentary theory holds there are two documents, which were ~~combined,~~ interwoven. The Supplement Theory holds there is one document with supplementation added by the Jehovist, ~~by~~ the one who used the name Jehovah. Mr. Mackey? (11 3/4) The view of the bulk of those who held the Supplement Theory, (not all, there was considerable variety) but the view of the bulk of them was, that the Jehovist was a man who took the writing which was there, the Grundschrift, the Elohim writing, and ~~he made additions, and~~ that one man made additions at maybe 50 places, ~~that is,~~ in the Pentateuch as a whole (In the book of Genesis maybe 20 or 30) that he made additions to it here and there, ~~and~~ sometimes these additions would be as much as four or five chapters, sometimes ~~they'd be~~ only half a verse, but that he made additions throughout. ~~Yes? (12 1/2)~~ Yes, according to the view of the Supplement Theory, the original writing uses the name God up until Moses ~~has thk~~ had his revelation from God in the wilderness, ~~as Jehovah, and~~ then, when Moses gets that revelation, that Jehovah is the name by which He is to be called, from ~~now~~ then on, it usually calls Him Jehovah, All through the rest of the ~~practically~~ four books. Then, the Jehovist, according to that view, was a man who wanted to fill in with new sections ~~material he heard~~ here and there, ~~different things~~ which he thought were true, ~~he wanted to put in...~~.

P.32. (3/4)

~~...until the time of Moses, 800 years passed~~.

We could take a month trying to show weaknesses in the Supplement Theory but since the Supplement Theory was eventually given up by everybody, the main thing I want you to see is how it developed into what they all came to believe, and to see that it seemed satisfactory to all these critical scholars, for nearly fifty years. ~~Yes? (1 1/4)~~ ~~Yes, well,~~ between the Fragmentary Theory and the Supplement Theory, there is a vast difference so I want to be sure everybody understands.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

According to the Fragmentary Theory, there are a large number of separate small writings, which somebody took and put together. According to the Supplement Theory, there was one long writing, maybe two-thirds of what we have in the Pentateuch, and this long writing, somebody added supplements to various places throughout. The Fragment Theory didn't last long. It was not held a very long time because most scholars saw that it was utterly impossible to believe that a book was a unity of the Pentateuch, with the steady progress of the Pentateuch, could have come together simply by taking a lot of isolated small things and just throwing them together. They saw that it was impossible, and it was speedily given up, but it was the logical development out of the original documentary theory. And then the Supplementary Theory was a swing very much in the conservative direction, from the Fragmentary.

Now as we mentioned yesterday, two things we mentioned yesterday are very important and need to be enlarged a little bit. One of them is the fact of the extension of the documents to the rest of the Pentateuch, which was done, that had been done, that was done about the time the Supplement Theory began, and in the extension to the rest of the Pentateuch the Law was divided into two main parts, well, there are really three, but the book of Deuteronomy was separated out. The book of Deuteronomy is not included in the Supplement Theory, because it is recognised as being a separate work. And many would feel that DeWette had proved that it was the work found in the temple in the time of Josiah, and probably written at that time. Others might think it was written much earlier. But the book of Deuteronomy was considered a separate work. But the other four books, the Elohist starts with Gen.1, and so from Gen.1 you get the type of material the Elohist is going to have. Well, just like you have in Gen.1. If I were to give you, as I thought of doing, to say to you - give you three or four chapters of the Bible, and say what kind of literature do they contain, among the four types, we've given you? Remember I told you four types in the Pentateuch. If I were to give you Gen.2, you would immediately say, narration, the account of man in the garden, Gen.3 the account of the Fall. There is the account of Jacob's up in Mesopo-

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

tamia. There are the accounts of different experiences, there is narration in a great many chapters. If I were to give you a list of the kings of Edom you'd immediately say "enumeration" or "genealogy," that type. If I were to give you the ten commandments, you'd immediately say "Law." Well, when you look at Gen.1, which are you going to put Gen.1 in? There might be disagreement there. You might say "Gen.1 is narration; it tells about events, about what God did." But Gen.1 tells about this in a way different from almost any other chapter in the Pentateuch. Because Gen.1 said that God said, let there be light, and there was light, and it was evening and it was morning, one day. And God gave another command and the command was fulfilled, and God saw that it was good, and there was evening and morning, a second day. You have those phrases repeated through out first day, second day, third day, through seven days. Well, in other words, Gen.1 a big argument could be made that Gen.1 does not go under the heading of narration, but under the heading of enumeration; a big argument could be made for that. You do not find it said in Gen.1 that Abraham — what is the first thing Abraham did during his first year, he decided to leave Ur of the Chaldees, he left there he went up to Haran, What is the second big step in Abraham's life? He leaves Haran and goes over to Canaan. What is the third big step? You don't have that sort of [illegible] used except in this first chapter. So the first chapter is a sort of a bridge between narration and enumeration. Well, the result is, anybody looks at Gen.1 and Gen.2, and then you ask the question, with which does the Law in Leviticus belong? You would immediately say "Leviticus tells about one kind of sacrifice, what are you going to do with the kidneys, the liver, the caul, the skin, when are you going to make the sacrifice, and so on. Then it tells about another kind of sacrifice, what are you going to do with the liver, kidneys, the caul, the skin, and so on. It goes through in this enumerating style of presentation, which is much more like Gen.1 than like Gen.2." So that the great body of law in the books of Leviticus and Numbers was considered to be part of the Elohist document, to go with E. That is very important to the development to have that understanding in mind. How that the E document, as

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

it extends through the Pentateuch takes in a very large part of Ex., Lev., ~~Deut.~~, because it includes ~~that~~ material ~~which~~ goes in more or less one-two-three-four fashion, ~~which~~ includes the lengthy law books. ~~so~~ That material is part of the Elohist document. ~~Now we have a lot of hands raised here. I'll ask the one nearest.~~ ~~(J.Gueiros, 7 3/4)~~ Is that on account of similarity of style? That is the argument advanced: similarity of style. It is enumeration type ~~of thing~~ rather than ~~analogy~~ type. ~~Mr. Gregory? (7 3/4) No, I'm speaking of the Supplement Hypothesis in general. And trying to give the general idea of what it is (8 1/4)~~ now trying to stress certain details of it which become very important ~~as we move further.~~ Rather than to confuse you ~~last~~ time with giving ~~them,~~ I wanted you to have the main aspects of it ~~in the first place,~~ ~~and~~ then ~~to~~ go into these ~~details just a bit.~~ ~~I had already mentioned that it was extended,~~ that the documents were ~~extended throughout the Pentateuch. Now I want to make clear what was included in the extension.~~ ~~Yes? (8 3/4)~~ After ~~you leave~~ the first few chapters of Exodus, the E document can no longer be distinguished by the names of God; ~~but~~ the distinction ~~which is~~ used is the ~~fact~~ of enumeration, ~~or the style~~ of 1-2-3-4 lists, ~~that sort of thing. That is,~~ the complicated law is all considered part of the E document. ~~Yes? (9 1/4)~~ The Supplement Theory considers that the original E document which was supplemented by the Jehovist, ran through Gen., Ex., Lev., Numbers and Joshua. ~~It~~ might have a tiny bit in Deuteronomy, but most of Deuteronomy they considered to have been a separate production. ~~Yes? (9 3/4)~~ Yes, because ~~Deut. they think of as a separate production within that. (stu) Yes, that is to say, the question is, how did the Hexateuch come into existence?~~ According to Supplementary Theory ~~it comes~~ into existence first by the Elohist ~~writing~~ being written. Then by ~~to the Elohist~~, the Jehovist making supplements, and then by the book of Deut. being added ~~to it and put into it.~~ ~~Now Mr. Poe Gueiros, you had your hand up. (10 1/4)~~ ~~Yes. Mr. MacKeen? (stu)~~ You might call Deut. another supplement, but it is so long, that they don't mention it specifically as supplementation, ~~because a supplement is~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

(?) but Deut. was really another supplement, you could say, a big supplement, stuck in at the very end. Question. Answer. No, well the matter of time does not yet enter in the Supplement theory. Different people hold different theories. Time does not yet enter, that becomes very important in a later step, but not yet.

I wanted you to have Now, that in mind then, of the content of the E document, as it goes on through the rest of the Pentateuch, what it was. And what this Supplementary Theory was exactly, -- it is important, it was held so long and though conservative scholars attacked it strongly, liberal scholars were quite (11 1/2) dogmatic about it, and they were growing in numbers, and this they were convinced was a satisfactory explanation of how the Pentateuch came into existence. For that period of 50 to 75 years.

I was talking with one of the leading archeological scholars of America some years ago, and a man who is somewhat liberal, many people (11 3/4) ____ think of him as conservative, he is much more conservative than most archeologists, and I mentioned to him about how Princeton Seminary had gone -- well I guess that was before Princeton was taken over by the modernists, but I mentioned to him how Union had gone into modernist hands about 1900 or a little before, and he said to me, "oh no, during the last century, he said, Princeton held its old strict definite conservative view which they stuck to without any change, through the last century, but he said, Union Seminary through the century followed the varying shades of critical opinion in Germany, in its general viewpoint, well, now that was what he said about Union Seminary during the last century. These things that Union, and many others were tremendously influenced as they followed these shades of changes, but the thing I wanted to stress is that for 50 years or more the Supplement Theory seemed satisfactory to the critics, and they were satisfied to defend the Supplement Theory against a number of very strong and able conservative scholars in Germany, who were strongly attacking the Supplement Theory.

But after a period of a good many years it began to be apparent that there were certain weaknesses in the Supplement Theory, that the Supplement Theory doesn't fully explain

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

things because after all, in the Supplement Theory...

P.33. (3/4)

...statements in the E document that assume things that are in the Jehovist, and therefore how could they have been written before the Jehovist supplementation, and there was that weakness, and then Colenso, I mentioned to you, began to take just the E document and look for the contradictions in it, and he thought he found a good many, that is to say, the method used to find the break between the E and the J documents, aside from just the matter of (1 1/4) proper names, could be carried on, and divide up the E document also, and so among the great bulk of scholars were satisfied just to stand on the Supplementary Theory and defend it, but the best of them were trying to find an answer to these problems.

So I mentioned at the end of the hour how Ewald, who had been the one above all others who had destroyed the Fragment Theory, and who had had so much to do with the foundation of the Supplementary Theory, now Ewald advanced in 1843 an attempt to solve the weaknesses in the Supplementary Theory, and the attempt which he made did not get any wide acceptance, but coming from a man of his standing and his scholarship and a man who had so much to do with founding the theory, it has to be noted, and was noted by everyone at the time. This crystallization hypothesis of Ewald was to say, you can't explain everything by saying here is the E document, and then you get these inserted parts of Jehovists, he says you have first a small (2 1/4) then you have Jehovist insertions in it, and then you have some more Elohist insertions, and then some more Jehovish insertions, and that way, the new insertions which assume things that are already in there, that they don't explain, you have a series of them. Well, this tremendously complicates the theory. And it shows weaknesses that he felt were in the Supplement Theory, that there is a unity through the book of Gen. with many parts referring back to other parts, and that the assumption that they just were all added at one time to an original thing before, just didn't work out. So he advanced his crystallization hypothesis, but it did not get

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

much attention, nor did the next attempt to solve the problem, but then next attempt to solve the problem eventually was accepted, and is held today, ~~and therefore I'm going to give it a separate head. The Crystallization Hypothesis I just made 4 under E.~~

II Under II, F, The Modified Document Theory of Hupfeld. ~~Making that F, because eventually it became so important.~~ ~~Now Hupfeld~~ II, In 1853, exactly 100 years after Astruc's first writing in 1753, Hupfeld issued a book in which he said that he had the real truth ~~to~~ about the origin of the Pentateuch. He said the origin of the Pentateuch is not satisfactorily explained as a supplementation. He said that the document hypothesis which preceded it is more along the right line. ~~And that~~ seemed to many people at that time ~~a going back,~~ a reactionary attitude, going back to the views of ~~teh~~ sixty years before, ~~but~~ Hupfeld said that the supplementation doesn't work, that there ~~are~~ were separate original documents which were combined, instead of merely supplementation, ~~but~~ However, Hupfeld said we ~~have to~~ must modify the theory of the documents. He said instead of ~~their being~~ there two documents, actually there ~~are~~ were three ~~documents. The~~ main documents, ~~that's~~ not counting Deuteronomy. ~~Because~~ he said, when you ~~take the Elohist and you~~ look at the E documents, it is true ~~he said~~ that you find ~~Gen.~~ any enumeration style in general ~~1st day, 2nd day, 3rd day~~, etc., And you find that style in the lists of the kings of Edom, ~~and you find it~~ in various things in connection with the Flood, and ~~you find~~ it in these complicated laws of Lev. He said that many parts have ~~You have~~ that enumeration style which is typical of the E document, but ~~he said~~ that in many other sections, ~~he said~~, particularly from Gen.20 on, ~~he said~~ if it ~~wasn't~~ were not for the ~~proper~~ divine name, you wouldn't be able to tell the E document from the J document. He said there ~~is no difference after Gen.20. In~~ at or after ch.20 most of ~~the rest of~~ Genesis there is practically no difference in style between the E document and the J document, except for the matter of the divine names. ~~And~~ Therefore, he said, this "ground-writing," this foundation work, this E document which for 50 years has been considered to be the foundation work which was originally written, is ~~one thing. He said~~ actually ~~it is~~ made up of two which were combined together. Thus he said, there are two ~~elements~~ Elohists; ~~there is~~ the first Elohist and the second Elohist. ~~Now he says~~ He said that the first Elohist uses ~~writes here~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

enumeration. He writes Genesis 1, ~~the story of creation, he writes~~ the genealogy of the kings of Edom, ~~he writes~~ and the lists of the detailed laws of Leviticus. ~~He~~ He has an account of the Flood different from J's; ~~in that~~ he is more interested in the size of the Ark, ~~the~~ its measurements, ~~of the Ark, and~~ the number of days the water was coming on ~~the~~ earth, and all that, ~~he says all that sort of stuff~~ This first Elohist is interested in, ~~all kinds of~~ genealogy, enumeration, ~~but then he says~~, But Hupfeld said, there is a second Elohist, ~~and this second one~~ who did doesn't begin till Gen.20. But ~~that from~~ after Gen.20 on, he took practically everything in the first Elohist, ~~nine-tenths of it he took~~, except for an occasional chapter like ~~for~~ the a list of the kings of Edom, ~~he took from the first Elohist~~ and assigned it ~~he gave~~ to the second Elohist. ~~And so he~~ He said that the second Elohist included most of the material, commonly thought to be by the Elohist, from Gen.20 ~~on~~ to the end of Genesis and ~~a ways in~~ well into Exodus. ~~Yes? (8)~~

That's the . Ilgen's theory had been forgotten, nobody paid any attention to it. Hupfeld didn't think it amounted to anything, but today when they all accept Hupfeld, they look back and find Elgen presented very nearly the same thing 50 years earlier, but nobody pays attention to it. Well, they didn't to Hpfeld either for a while, but Hupfeld's theory is today accepted by all, so it is important that you see how it developed. Hupfeld's theory: the Elohist divided.

~~Well,~~ Now let's see ~~for a minute~~ what that does to ~~our argument.~~ the Our four arguments ~~that they gave~~ that they gave originally for the partition. The argument from divine names, ~~you say you~~ claimed that ~~have~~ two documents, ~~you can recognize them~~ could be divided by divine names. Now ~~you have~~ there were three documents, ~~and~~ two of them have the same divine names, ~~so that is no longer a help in that space, the divine names.~~ and (2) But they say that between the second Elohist and the J document (3) there is so much similarity it is very hard to distinguish them. ~~Consequently there~~ (1) They say (4) the divine names are the only thing by which you can tell the difference, ~~In some cases, in many cases. Of course~~ no many (5) (6) now they ~~have~~ added a whole lot of theoretical additions to it. ~~But the divine name is no longer simply a thing that divides it into two documents.~~ There You've are got three documents, two of them ~~holding~~ using one divine name and one the other, according to Hupfeld,

6/6/61 pages

http://www.macraeibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Let's see what that does to the argument from ~~xxxxx~~ continuous narrative.

According to the Supplement Theory the E Document gives a complete narrative ~~know that~~ the J Document gives a ~~somewhat~~ fairly complete story but not as complete as that in the E Document. ~~It is easy to~~ see the effect on this argument of the idea that the E Document has to be split into two parts. Instead of having a complete ~~story~~ story in the ~~Exxx~~ E Document, the whole situation is changed. The one that comes nearest to being a complete story is ~~now~~ the J Document, which is ~~much more complete~~ more nearly complete than either of the two parts of the former E Document. The argument from continuous narrative is thus greatly reduced in strength. It was thought at one time ~~to be complete with~~ the E Document, ~~being the~~ was a continuous narrative, and ~~the~~ J ~~just~~ sections ~~that were~~ had been inserted into it. Now the J is the nearest they have to continuous narrative and each of the two E parts is much less complete than the J. It takes a lot of twisting to get a complete narrative out of either part of the E Document after it is divided.

Now, what about the argument from parallel passages? That is the argument that divides up more and more because every time you find ~~xxxxxxxxx~~ something that sounds ~~xxx~~ ~~like~~ the same thing told twice, you say these are two different documents. Now ~~you have~~ there are three different ones to compare. You say ~~you have the story of~~ Abraham lying about his wife, ~~you have~~ three accounts of ~~that they say.~~ That would fit ~~in~~ with the idea of three documents, wouldn't it? But the trouble is, two of them are in one of their documents, ~~and one in another one.~~ But ~~xx~~ ~~the~~ more you divide it up the more you can imagine that you find parallels between some of the parts.

~~Now~~ What about the ~~four (?nc)~~ fourth ~~(?)~~ argument, the argument from style? Well, if I had a whole book ~~here~~ written by Mr. Hoff and another by Mr. ~~Bx~~ ~~Gxxx~~ Po Gueiros, ~~(?)~~ I would ~~take~~ examine ~~look at~~ these two books and compare their style and study their methods of expression. Then if I were ~~should be~~ given another paragraph ~~I might be able~~ and told that one of them had written it, I might be able to ~~tell~~ discern right away which one ~~wrote~~ it. I would be able to say, "Here's a long book by Mr. Hoff, which discusses all kinds of things. He talks about cars a great deal but he never ~~x~~ uses the word "automobile." And here's a book by Mr. ~~Gxx~~ Gueiros which keeps talking ~~xxxx~~ about automobiles and never calls one a "car." ~~(?)~~ This ~~have another~~ paragraph ~~I~~ can easily see whether ~~it~~ uses the sord ~~XXXXX~~ "car" or the word "automobile" and this may give a hint as to which of the two wrote it. But the less material I have from each of them, the less I am able to ~~discover~~ decide what ~~the~~ are the particular stylistic peculiarities ~~or peculiarities of the use of words are~~ Besides and one ~~person~~ writer might use two synonyms rather than ~~just sticking to just one of the two.~~ being limited to the use of only one. The more material you have the safer it is to make definite ~~rules~~ conclusions about ~~what~~ a writer's

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

people's style, the more you cut it up into small sections, the less you can be sure as to what evidence there is for specific style.

You might say, "Mr. A would never split an infinitive; such cultured people as he would never do such (nc?) thing." You find a paragraph that has a split infinitive, and you say, "Well, this can't be by writer A, because he never splits infinitives," but then you found a letter he wrote and it contains three split infinitives. At most, that argument was not valid at all so far as he was concerned. He might rarely split infinitives, but the fact that you would once find a split infinitive would not necessarily prove that it must be by another writer. In order to make an argument from style you have to have a large enough amount of material to be able to be certain about the special features of a man's style, what particular expressions he never uses.

As long as you have a long document, which you call the E Document, you can go through it and say, "Look, it always says, 'male or female;' it never says 'man and wife.'" And here is the J Document; it always says 'man and wife'; it never says 'male and female.'" But when you cut the documents down to half their previous length you do not really have enough material to make such definite statements about the use of words.

There have been many books written in which the words in these different documents have been listed and the number of uses counted, and they say: "this is a 'P' word," and "this is a 'J' word," but when they divide it into these smaller divisions it becomes very difficult to make such statements dogmatically. When they split the E Document into two parts they immediately cut in half the possibility of using as a guide. So you see, the cutting of the E Document into two parts greatly reduced the possibility of being sure that one could prove whether there actually were different documents or not.

Many people thought that Hupfeld (op?) in 1853 had made a retrograde movement in introducing this modified document theory. It was twenty years before it came to be accepted by the majority of critical scholars and perhaps forty years before it was accepted by all of them. But today every critical scholar in the world accepts it. The reason was not because that Hupfeld had made such a strong argument; it was the result of a later development, one that really was the uniting of the divisive theory with the effects of the theory of evolution.

In the period of the Supplement Hypothesis there were some conservativ scholars

Hupfeld's theory was not widely accepted and it was pointed out that the more you divide them the less you can be sure

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

about the style and whatever they said, the Jehovah style and the Elohist style are really in many sections almost identical; the argument from the use of divine names had to be given an importance far greater than it really deserves (?) deserved (?).

There were some conservative scholars in the period when the Supplement Hypothesis was so widely held, who tried to take the view that Moses wrote the original Elohist and that the Jehovah sections were incorporated later, but this was not widely accepted.

As Hupfeld declared, and many of the critics agreed that the first and second Elohist were far more different from each other than the second Elohist is from the J Document. As far as style is concerned, that is almost the only way to distinguish the J Docuemtn from the so-called second Elohist is by the divine names.

This view that Hupfeld had presented was quite widely received among the ctitics. Probably during the next fifty years there would have been another four or five views, and then the whole thing would probably have been given up, if it had not been for its eventually coming to be united with the theory of evolution. When this critical theory of the Pentateuch was joined with the theory of evolution the development fixed it into a form that came to be established and was held by most critical scholars for many years. In fact, it is still held tenaciously by most critical scholars today. (?) to this time.

To this time (nc?) except for

Except for Duhmm's (?) De Wette's theories on Deuteronomy it was mainly a matter of dividing documents by literary analysis. Now a big change came through the divisive theory becoming united with a theory of development. This put it into line with the thought-feeling of the day and gave it a push which caused this particular form of the theory that Hupfeld had presented to last right up to the present day, so that now practically every critical scholar accepts the fact as proven fact the existence of these three main documents. Before that happened, there was one more great revolution to occur, would take place, tremendously important change.

G. The Graf-Wellhausen Theory

If you mention the Graf-Wellhausen Theory to almost any graduate from a liberal seminary today, I think he might say, "What do you mean, calling that a theory! That is the fact about how the Pentateuch came into existence."

We are now approaching the climax of the development of the critical theory Critical Theory of the Pentateuch. We have seen the long series of changes in the theories, as they were raised and discarded. Now we are reaching the development of the form which came to be united with the idea of evolution

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Hupfeld. Now what does it do to the continuous narrative? Well, the theory --yes? Yes, the divine names according to Eichhorn, all the E--you could separate the E from the J document by the fact that one used one divine name and one the other. Now you have three documents but you only have two divine names, so that the divine names is still a help but not as much of a help as before. Yes? (10) No it is separate. (stu) E2, yes.

Now let's look at the Argument from Continuous Narrative. According to the Supplement Theory, you have your E document which contains all these sections, and they run along together and give a complete narrative. They claim. Now you have the J supplementation, and these supplementations, are only about half as extensive as the E document. Therefore, they all said, the E document is a continuous story, complete. The J supplementation, rather complete. But not quite like the E. Not as complete as the E. Yes? (11) The original E, the whole thing. Now I'm going to show the change made when you cut the E into two parts, Instead of having one complete story in the E document, you cut that up into sections into two new documents, now which one comes nearest to being a continuous narrative? The J document, because now the J document is much more complete than either of the two parts of these. You see, in other words, The argument from continuous narrative was thought to apply perfectly to the E document. But the J document, it applies fairly well, but there must be parts of the J that have been left out, when they were put together. But now you divide E up into two parts, and the result is that the best you have now from Continuous Narrative is J, and each of the two E parts, pretty hard to get a complete narrative, they try to do it by dividing verses of it and giving a few words of one, a few of the other, so when you string them together you can get a complete narrative. But it take a lot of twisting to get a complete narrative out of either part of the E document, after you divide it. Now whether

Now what about the argument from parallel passages? Well, you might say that argument is the argument that divides up more and more (12 1/4)

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

because every time you find something that sounds like the same thing told twice, why you say there are two different documents, why you now have three different ones to compare with, and so you've got--for instance, you find he story of Abraham lying about his wife, you've got three accounts of that, so that would fit in fine with three documents, wouldn't it? The only trouble is, two of them are in one document, and one in the other. But the parallel passages, you see, the more you divide it up, the more you can use that argument.

Well, then what about the fourth argument? The argument from style? Well, as I mentioned to you, if I had a whole book here, written by Mr. Hoff, and another one written by Mr. Po Gueiros, and I would look at those two books and compare style and study their method of speaking, I mean of writing, their manner of expression, their words...

P.33a. (Boundscriber bulk burnt out, so scale numbers are approximate: 1/2)

...another paragraph I could tell right away which of the two wrote it. You see, I have enough material to notice, here is a long book by Mr. Hoff, which discusses all kinds of things. He is always talking about cars and he never uses the word automobile and there is a book by Mr. Guetros and he is always talking about automobiles and never refers to a car. Now when I have another paragraph, why I can easily tell by whether it uses the word car or automobile which of the two wrote it. But if I have only half the book by each of them, I couldn't be so sure that he always says automobile and not car, far as I know he might say both of them and just happened in that half of the book to say one all the time. You see what I mean? The more material that you have, the safer it is to make definite rules about what people's style is. You say now , split infinitive, Dr. MacRae would never split an infinitive, of course. Cultured people like he never split an infinitive. Therefore, when you find a paragraph and you find a split infinitive in it, you say Dr. MacRae couldn't have written that paragraph. But now, if just the minute before you found a letter I wrote and you found three split infinitives in it, you'd say that

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

argument is no good. He doesnot split infinitives much, but he does once in a while. Now you take somebody else who splits them all the time, but once in a while he doesn't. You see what I mean. In order to make an argument from style, you have to have a large enough amount of material, together with sufficient data to know what the style is (2 1/2)

And as long as you've got this great long thing, this E document, you can go through it and compare and say look at here, here is this E document, it always says male and female, it never says man and wife. And here is this J document, it always says man and wife, it never says male and female. Well, you'd have to admit there are two cases in the opposite, but then those have changed in the course of transmission, those couple, but most of it, there is the same rule followed straight through.

Now you come to a new paragraph and in this paragraph you find one phrase or the other, you say that shows which document it goes to, but when you split the E document up into two parts you immediately cut in half your certainty of the ground of style, about anything. So you see how this has been a very severe damage to the argument from style, the cutting of it into two parts. The smaller your section, the harder it is to make a valid argument from the viewpoint of style. So the division of the E document into two parts , I would say, reduces by 50% the possibility of being sure on the basis of the evidence you can gather from the documents, whether they actually are different documents or not. And many people thought that Hupfeld had made a retrograde movement in introducing this modified document theory in 1853. It was twenty years before it came to be accepted by the bulk of scholars, it was perhaps 40 years before it was accepted by all scholars, and today every critical theory, every critical scholar in the world, accepts (4 1/2)

and we want to see how. Yes? (stu) Yes, it is a name with about 30 German words to it, which I could read you if I had it here, but I don't think it would add anything. Just that Hupfeld a book, and that is sufficient. You can find it. Yes? (stu) That was the problem that (5) dealt with mainly. The problem that Hupfeld dealt

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

with mainly was the fact that people pointed out that the Jehovist style and the Elohist style in some sections were almost identical. So his answer was well those sections were another document. Not differing much except in the use of the divine names. That was the (5 1/2) Yes, Mr. MacKeen? (stu)

No,

There were some conservative scholars who--in the period of the supplement hypothesis--tried to take the view that Moses wrote the original Elohist, and then the Jehovist was incorporated later. But that was not (6)

But now you see, you have your first Elohist and your second Elohist, and your first and second Elohist are far more different from each other than the second Elohist is from the J document. And Hupfeld brings that out. Why hadn't people seen that all these years? Why have they said, E document has this style, J has this style, two distinct documents, now you say you pick up this and this and this part of the E document, and the style is so near the style of the J document that you can hardly tell the difference, without the divine names you'd practically be unable to tell the difference. That is what they came to believe. But not immediately. That is what Hupfeld presented, and my guess is that Hupfeld's view was strong like the previous views went, and then the next fifty years there would have been another four or five views, and by this time the whole thing would have been given up probably, if it were not for its becoming united with the theory of evolution. And the thing was taken up by the theory of evolution, fitted into the theory of evolution, and that was what made the difference, that was what formed it into a form that came to be established and fixed and is held tenaciously to the present day by most critical scholars. It was that addition. You see, up to this time, except for DeWette's theories on Deuteronomy, it has been mainly a matter of dividing documents by literary analysis, but now it is united with a theory of development, and that is what puts it in line with the thought-feeling of the day, and gives it a push behind it, which took this particular form of theory, that Hupfeld made and made it last right through the present day, until practically any

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

critical scholar, ~~except~~ accepts the facts of these different documents, but there was one more great revolution yet to take place. The facts of the documents is held as held as Hupfeld presented it, but there is an important change, a tremendously important change, yet to take place. That is G, The Graf-Wellhausen Theory. If you mention that to almost any graduate from a liberal seminary today I think he'd say, the Graf-Wellhausen Theory, what do you mean, that is the facts about how the Pentateuch came into existence. But we won't have time today to look at that because if we did, I wouldn't know how well you're keeping up on the work thus far. We cannot do a lot of writing in that time of 8 minutes. Those two questions last time which were so important, I gave you before, about the Pentateuch, how we know--what does it claim about Moses writing it and what does it claim, what does Jesus hold about it? --I was very disappointed to find that quite a few did not have the verses well in mind. You don't have to memorize the verse but have them so you can find it quickly in the Bible. Many did not have them well in mind, and they should be thoroughly in mind because they are basic to this whole study, and so I will reverse the two of them for today. The odd ones take the question the even had before, and I hope that now you have it thoroughly in mind. For the odd ones: Does the Pentateuch claim to be written by Moses. Give the precise words. You may use your English Bibles. As for the even ones, what was the attitude of Jesus toward the authorship of the Pentateuch, precise verses. I'll give you the whole remaining ten minutes on just the one question. I hope every one will have it perfect. (Il)...

P.33b. 3/4)

...a number of empty seats here because today is perhaps the most important we've had yet, we are now coming to the climax of the development, that we have been looking at. Hope to finish that in the course of the first half of the hour today, not sure I'll be able to do that, but I hope I can. After I do, then we take up each of the arguments separately so from there on, each separate argument, as consideration which will take anywhere from half an hour to two weeks, each separate one will be a subject by itself. If you miss one

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

of those and get the rest excellently, you still have a great deal, but the lectures recently and today's lecturem, they are the foundation toall of that. And they are continuous, one building on the other, so it is extremely important to get them in proper shape. I trust that you all have clearly in mind the original document theory of Astruc's ~~stug~~ suggestion and then Eichhorn's development of the suggestion. Then the coming of the fragmentary theory, turning it into such an extreme that all scholars reacted against it violently, this dividing it up into little fragments. How could you ever get a great unity like the Pentateuch out of such separate diverse fragments. Then the supplementary theory which for half a century was accepted by practically all critical scholars, and seems to them to be the answer to the problem, but then they began tosee serious deficiencies in it, and we had Ewald's attempt to build the crystallization hypothesis, whichdidn't datisfy people, then we had Hupfeld's modified document theory, going back to the old document theory of Eichhorn's, but dividing the original E into two parts.

Then that didn't satisfy people either, but the next development utilizes that, so at the end of the hour we were just ready to take up G, the Graf-Wellhausen Theory.

A few years ago, a professor at Crozier Seminary whom I used to see at the U. of Penna., he has more recently been a professor at the Pacific Divinity School at Berkeley , California, told me that Professor Pfeiffer, professor of archeology in Harvard University was going to give a lecture at Crozier in Chester, and wondered if I or some of our students could go. Well, I knewPfeiffer would be very much worth hearing, but I was tied up that night, so I announced it and I think about 20 of our students went, but they were late ingetting to the meeting, and the man who had told me about it, Professor Pritchard, the author of Ancient Near Eastern Texts, with which I hope most of you are familiar, Prof. Pritchard presided at the meeting, and the students told me that when they came they came in to the back and hadn't yet entered the meeting, I guess they were taking their coats off out in the vestibule but they could hear what was said, and they heard Prof. Pritchard introducing Dr. Pfeiffer of Harvard, and Prtichard said, Dr. Pfeiffer

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

you will be happy to know that everyone here completely accepts the Graf-Wellhausen Theory, and then Pfeiffer got up to speak and then our twenty or so students came in, took their seats along with the 35 or 40 others who were, so I'm afraid Prof. Pfeiffer was under a misapprehension when he spoke, thinking they all accepted the Graf-Wellhausen Theory. Well, they said that Pfeiffer started in giving illustrations from archeology, discovered in recent years, showing the accuracy and dependability of various sections of the Old Testament, and he went through these one after another, showing the dependability and accuracy of the Old Testament from archeological discoveries recently, and our fellows felt that everything he said was just grist for our mill, his defense of the Scripture was very excellent, but when Prof. Pfeiffer came to the end of his talk, he concluded it with saying, that all this of course shows the remarkable facts of historical truth in the Old Testament we had never noticed before, but for real understanding of the Old Testament, we can never cease to give thanks to those great scholars who discovered the truths of the Graf-Wellhausen Theory, and that was his great conclusion to his talk.

Well, I give that illustration which happened about ten years ago, in order to show you how vital a force the Graf-Wellhausen is in the world today, and it is just as vital today as it was ten years ago, perhaps more so. We have been looking at the succession of theories about the criticism of the Pentateuch and we've been seeing how one was adopted and another was adopted, this one followed and that one followed, and seeing the progression of thought in it, but we now reach the stage where this progression of thought came to a point that came to be so accepted, that for the past 70 years I believe, more than that, for nearly a century now, for nearly 90 years, the great bulk of critical scholars in the world, have accepted the Graf-Wellhausen as the result of the --final result of scholarship regarding the origin of the Pentateuch. And today you go into most any university, anywhere, where there is any course that deals with the Old Testament in any way, and the results of the Graf-Wellhausen will simply be stated as if they were solid facts and there was no question about them.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Now since it is so solidly entrenched and has been for so many years, it is a very vital factor in the religious life of our world today. The average person knows nothing about the theory, but anybody who has ever studied at any liberal seminary, and that includes practically every seminary that is more than 40 years old, anybody who has ever studied at any such seminary, and anybody who has taken courses in religion at any university today, has had a very considerable part of the teaching of the Graf-Wellhausen Theory given to him as solid established fact, whether it goes by that name, whether he is familiar with the term or not. About 30 years ago there appeared in the magazine, The American Scholar, an article by Prof. Albright of Johns Hopkins University, in which Albright gave a series of recently discovered archeological evidences of the accuracy of the Old Testament. And they were very excellent, very well-given, but after giving them, --he'd been asked to give an article on Old Testament scholarship today, this was his material, all these wonderful evidences of the truth and dependability of various sections of the Old Testament,—but after he had devoted I guess thirty pages of the magazine to giving these very excellent things, then he concluded with about two or three pages in which he said, what is our conclusion, we must never forget the great debt we owe to the Graf-Wellhausen ~~Theory~~ and these other great scholars who gave us our true understanding of the Old Testament, and in his book on the archeology of Palestine, Prof. Albright, after giving quite a number of evidences against many of the extreme positions of the critics, then said, however, of the original independent existence of the great documents, J, E, D, and P, and the order of their development, there can be absolutely no doubt. Now many people speak of Albright as if he was a great conservative scholar today, and he is very conservative in comparison with a great many critics, but he holds tenaciously as do most scholars in any of our universities today to the main essentials of the Graf-Wellhausen Theory. It is a solid fact today which we have to face and which we have to meet and you can do work in a church, among people that know very little about the Bible, and never hear the thing mentioned or come in contact with many

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

of its viewpoints, but as soon as people begin going to universities and if your people are interested in Christianity, some of them are going to take courses in Religion, and they're certainly going to hear some of the chapel talks there, they are going to come up against the views I've given you. So it is vital that we know how the Graf-Wellhausen developed and what it is and what are our objections to it, and I called it , you noticed, the Graf-Wellhausen Theory, a term which is very freely used today among Biblical scholars for the first view of the Pentateuch. Now this view is sometimes called the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen Theory. Don't bother about that now, because I'll tell you a little more about Kuenen in a few minutes. Actually he was more important than Graf, in the development of the theory, but it is only in quite scholarsly books that that term is used: Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen Theory. Usually it is called the Graf-Wellhausen Theory, and occasionally just the Wellhausen Theory. But the theory we will look into its background now.

1, Rise of Naturalistic Theories about the Origin of the Pentateuch. Now by this heading I mean to suggest that I'm going to look briefly at a small group of men which went on quite independently of the widespread movement of analysis of documents at which we have been looking. Comparatively few people knew about this other movement, but it was this other movement which took up the documentary movement, and crystallized it and made it permanent. Now this other movement perhaps we should start it with a reference back again to DeWette. You remember of course that DeWette was the one who in 1805 suggested that the book of Deuteronomy was the book discovered in the Temple at the time of Josiah, and that it was written at that time or shortly before, that it was a pious fraud, in order to develop good things among the people and to make them think that Moses, centuries before, had written this code of law. Well, DeWette was thoroughgoing in his insistence that the Pentateuch was not a book that told about history, it was the development of people who had things they wanted to put across, so it doesn't tell us much about the times of Abraham or anything like that, or Moses,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

but it tells us a lot about the later time when they wrote these books, and DeWette's theory--he put out these theories and they influenced certain people but then he devoted himself to the literary analysis, and eventually became quite important in the advance of the supplementary hypothesis, as we mentioned. But I should mention here a man who was not directly of much importance to the theory and yet indirectly of great importance. His name is Reuss, now Reuss was a Hegelian scholar, one who was interested in theory of development and historical progress. And in 1833 Reuss wrote down certain propositions about the development historically of the ideas and laws of the Pentateuch. Now he never published these until 1879, so they didn't have influence in the world except on his students, but Graf whom we're going to look at later was one of his students, and had been greatly affected by him. Now Reuss said, that the Pentateuch grew, just like any other book, by natural processes, we must look at the Pentateuch just as we would at any book of religion of Greece or Rome or China or any other place and see the...

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

because everytime you find something that sounds like the same thing told twice, why you say there are two different documents, why you now have three different ones to compare with, and so you've got -- for instance, you find the story of Abraham lying about his wife, you've got three accounts of that, so that would fit in fine with three documents, wouldn't it? The only trouble is, two of them are in one document, and one in the other. But the parallel passages, you see, the more you divide it up, the more you can use that argument.

Well, then what about the fourth argument? The argument from style? Well, as I mentioned to you, if I had a whole book here, written by Mr. Han, and another one written by Mr. Po Gueiros, and I would look at those two books and compare style and study their method of speaking, I mean of writing, their manner of expression, ~~them~~ their words...

P.34. (3/4)

...he was interested in the development of ideas in relation to history, we will not look at his ideas much now, because we looked at them when they came to have great interest to us. But he was followed by Batke. Batke is always mentioned in lists, accounts of the background of it, but not a great deal is said about him, I'm not asking you to bother much about him, but to have him in your notes. Batke, 1835, wrote a book, claiming that it was a natural development of ideas, along with the (1 1/4) Hegelian principle. Yes? (1 1/4) Now that would take a long time to go into and probably it would be taken up in Apologetics, but Hagel was a very prominent German philosopher, about 1800, who has exercized about as much influence in the world today as any man perhaps who has lived since the time of the apocrypha. Hegel--I heard an interesting story about him once, he was at Leipzig, writing on his great book and he worked for three days, night and day, finishing up his book, he paid no attention to anything, just worked on it, and when Hegel finished his book, he heaved a sigh of relief as he wrote the last work, stepped out in the street and he saw great crowds, walking back and forth, and he said, what's the matter?

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

What's all the excitement? Excitement, they said, haven't you heard the cannonade? What cannonade? Why Napoleon has had one of his greatest battles, just outside the city, the day before. The whole city was in tumult, because in this battle Napoleon had been defeated, the battle was one of the turning points in the history of the world. Hegel didn't even know it was going on, he just confined himself so completely to his work on his book, and his book, has had an influence such as hardly any book except the Bible has had, in fact, the communists will claim that they have taken Hegel's theories and turned them upside down, or they say they turn Hegel rightside up, and dialectical materialism of the Communists, they will say is directly based on what they call a true understanding of Hegel. On the other hand, a tremendous amount of our modernistic theories of the background of the evolutionary theory, comes from the application of his theory, the development of forces from thesis, antithesis, and then synthesis. Now it's a long thing, a development of evolutionary business which you get quite a bit of somewhere in Apologetics, but which we can barely refer to here. But it was influential in affecting the minds of these people who developed these theories, these Hegelian theories, but they were a small group of scholars, a far larger group was working on the documentary division which we've been looking at, it is the union of the two forces that produced the Graf-Welhausen Hypothesis, and Kuenen is a Dutch scholar, actually more important than either Graf or Welhausen, to the development of the theory. Abraham Kuenen, professor at the University of ~~Leipzig~~ Leiden in Holland, in 1861, he made suggestions along this same line, was a thoroughgoing rationalist in his view on Scripture, but a very keen mind, and his book had great influence. Now this is a development of an entirely separate movement, a small movement, influencing a few scholars and their pupils. We have been looking at the big movement, Eichhorn and Ewald and the Supplementary Hypothesis and they--things which people were interested in, which they wanted to know how did Moses get the material or whoever wrote it, how did it come to gether. Now this was a separate movement, but the Graf-Welhausen theory is the bringing together of the new movement.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

So we go on to #2, K.H.Graf and Abraham Kuenen. In 1866, you see quite a little after Hupfeld, and Graf was not much influenced by Hupfeld, Graf however in this year, 1866, issued a book of the Pentateuch and in this book Graf said the great legal material which forms the bulk of the central books of the Pentateuch, particularly Leviticus and Numbers, he said these extensive detailed laws of sacrifice and laws of life, people, these extensive detailed things, which were part of the original Elohist, you might say, which were part of the Grundschrift of the Supplementary Theory, he said these laws are not the beginning of a development, they're the end of a development. They are the climax of the development from simple to complex, along evolutionary lines. They didn't use the word much then, Darwin's book had come out only about six or seven years before, but he said they are the climax of the development, not the beginning, and so Graf said, the critics are right that the Elohist is the foundation, the Grundschrift, that comes first as far as Genesis is concerned, as far as history is concerned, he said when it comes to law, these laws are not the beginning but the end, and they were written he said even after Deuteronomy, he said they would come way at the end of the exile, after Deuteronomy. Well, these are theories which Reuss had given in class thirty years before but they never had been published much and never had been combined with discussion of the Pentateuchal documents. And so Graf's writing in 1856 aroused great attention. But most scholars said this is ridiculous, this is absurd, they said, Graf presents a very, very impressive argument, that you have the simple laws, the (7 1/2) then you have more complicated laws in Deuteronomy, and then you have the most complicated laws of all, the laws of Leviticus, the importance of Numbers, and that section. That sounds very reasonable they said, simple to complex, but they said, look how the Pentateuch came together. Your E document is first, your Elohist, that's the foundation, and then comes your J Supplement later, and then comes Deuteronomy, and they said you can't separate this Elohistic section of the Pentateuch that has this 1,2,3,4 enumeration, first day, second day, third day, He saw that everything was good, and the evening and the morning were

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

the fourth day, and the fifth day, and so on, Gen.1, and the genealogy and all this, this -- you can't separate that, they said, from these detailed laws of (8 1/2) they are by the first Elohist , no question about it. So Kuenen, in Holland, made a suggestion to Graf, and Kuenen said to Graf why don't you take the bull by the horns and say that this part of the Genesis also is (9) Well, that's a complete reversal of the view that was held for fifty years, that this first Elohist was the very foundation, the earliest writing, now you take it and put it at the very end, and make it late. Some people called it a Copernican Revolution. Well, Graf died before he had opportunity to do much writing about that, but Kuenen in 1869 himself wrote a book in Dutch, which among scholars had a very considerable interest, and Kuenen thus was the first really to write up the Graf-Welhausen hypothesis. Kuenen here adopted Hupfeld's modified document theory, that is to say, Graf had said the Elohist here, the first Elohist, the Foundation, we take out the laws and put them at the end, but the rest of the first Elohist is the history, the beginning. Now Kuenen said you don't have to take that whole first Elohist and put in one place, the whole complete Elohist, because he says, Hupfeld has pointed out that a large portion of the Elohist is just the same in style as the Jehovah. So he said that part you can separate from the other, but he says the enumeration, first day, second day, third day, fourth day of Gen.1, this man lived so many years and he died, this man lived so many years and he died, this man lived so many years and he died, all this material of the foundation writing, he says, you can take that along with the detailed laws with which it goes, and put it at the very end, so Kuenen expressed the whole theory in Dutch, in a logical form, which attracted a few scholars to it. Yes? (10 3/4) Yes, he is recognizing Hupfeld's division of it and he is only putting the first Elohist last, not the whole thing. (stu.) Well, he is revising it. Yes. As I told you, each week builds on the other, and if you don't have last week's lesson in mind thoroughly, it is pretty hard to follow, because this is a progress which, if you have a full understanding of it, you're in a position to speak intelligently with the people you will meet who have only a

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

fragmentary understanding of it but who are very dogmatic on it, because their professors would be very dogmatic, but it is vital to see how it develops. And how the Copernican Revolution was made. Now we'll say more about that. I want to tell about the next step in its spread. And we'll come back and look at the details more. But the next step in the spread I'd like to mention, well, maybe we'll take just one minute more going over it, to be sure you have in mind the basic fact of what this suggestion was.

It is the middle part of the Pentateuch, that detailed law which was part of the Elohist because it is enumeration, statistics, what you do with the liver, the caul, the kidneys, how many years you take before you let the land lie fallow, and all the extensive detailed laws, the middle part of the Pentateuch. It has long been called the priestly law, it is (12 3/4) It is the book that Moses gave, not for everybody to memorize, but for the priests to have before them, to look up and check on these things when occasion rises. This was considered the first because it went with the Elohist in Genesis. Now he says it is the last because it is a more involved complicated law than that of Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy, as you know, is the people's law, it is what Moses exhorted the people to remember and to keep, the thing that everybody should have in mind, not that they should go and look up, see? So now this (13 1/2) Hupfeld division, the first Elohist is moved to the very end in the ~~series~~ theory, that's the Graf-Welhausen theory. Copernican Revolution which...

P.35. (3/4)

(stu) Yes, now here is the Supplementary View. E, your foundation writing, the Grundschrift. Then J, supplement, and D, Deuteronomy, the second law, written much later. And there ~~were~~ was great variety of opinion of when E was written and when the supplement was added. Now Hupfeld said, no, this E is divided into two parts, the first Elohist and the second Elohist, so now with Hupfeld's theory, you have these four,--the first Elohist, the second Elohist, the Jehovist and the Deuteronomist, not ~~something updated~~ supplementation

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

but all separate documents, which Hupfeld said,

and were all four combined at one time into one big Pentateuch. But then, scholars differ about dates. The first Elohist is first but which is next, is it the Jehovist or the second Elohist, and many of them say, the Jehovist is the second. So it is the first Elohist, and the Jehovist, and the second Elohist, and the Deuteronomy, and the Jehovist and the second Elohist are so much alike that you can hardly tell them apart (2 1/2)

so much alike that it's just a great question what belongs to one and what belongs to the other. ~~What's~~ But the difference between the first Elohist and the rest they're unanimous on, because this is the enumeration, ~~that~~ the tabulation, the listing, the statistics, the detailed laws, all that sort of thing, but this is the foundation (2 3/4)

Now, this first Elohist which contains the law book of the priests they come to call, not First Elohist but P for priests. It is the law book of the priests, and then you don't need to call the other Second Elohist any more, you can just call it E. So you have the law book of the priests, along with the enumeration, the statistics of Genesis, and so on, that we call P, the priestly book, the law book of the priests, with all these detailed enumerations in Genesis. Then there is Jehovist, and the Elohist (which was the Second Elohist of Hupfeld), and the Deuteronomy. Now Graf says, take part of the P and put it to the end. Kuenen says take all of it, so now you have the Jehovist, which they said was a late supplementer who inserted some stuff into this (4) * foundation writing. Now he is the earliest of all. And the foundation writing, which was the foundation of Genesis, that's at the very end, you see. ~~Now~~ So that is a view which all critical scholars today hold. That the oldest is J--for many years there was question which was oldest, J or E--but they all hold that J is the oldest, E is shortly after, maybe a century later, D is next, and P is at the end. Now that is the theory, the Revolution in the dating, complete revolution in the order. Yes? (4 1/2) All liberal Jewish scholars today accept it, the average orthodox Jew knows nothing about it, but if his students want to go ahead and get any advanced degrees they go into the University and I myself within the course of the

* Right on. Describe is one of these. Numbers from here are approximate.

http://www.macraelibrary.org/Sylabi/02Pentateuch-II/README.htm

and became solidly fixed and were held in that fixed form for about fifty years.

(It is important to keep in mind the development which up to this point, beginning giving with Astruc's suggestion and then Eichhorn's development of the suggestion. This was followed by the fragmentary theory Fragmentary Theory, which was carried to such an extreme that all scholars reacted violently against the idea of dividing the Pentateuch up into little fragments. dividing up the Pentateuch into little fragments. After all, how could such a great unity as the Pentateuch grow [where end [paren? come out of such separate diverse fragments? Then the Supplementary Theory was accepted for half a century by practically all critical scholars, and seemed to them to be the answer to the problem--until they began to see serious deficiencies in it. Ewald attemtped to solve these deficiencies by his Crystallation Hypophesis, but it did not satisfy people. It was followed by Hupfeld's Modified Document Theory, going back to the old document theory of Eichhorn's but dividing the original E into two parts. This did not satisfy people either, but it came to be utilized and tied together with the theory of evolution, and so this result came to be called the Graf-Wellhausen Theory. unitea war stop 1/24/91

A few years ago a professor at Crozer Seminary, whom with whom I had become acquainted when we had taken courses at the University of Pennsylvania, were both attending told me that Professor Pfeiffer, the professor of Archaeology and Old Testament at Harvard University, was going to give a lecture at Crozer Seminary which was then located in Chester, Pennsylvania--only a few miles from here, and told me that I or any of our students would be welcome to come and hear the lecture. I happened to be tied up that evening but I knew that Dr. Pfeiffer would be very much worth hearing, so I announced this to our students and about twenty of our students went to heaf the lecture. These students were a little late in getting to the meeting. When they arrived there they found that Professor Prichard (?) Pritchard (the author of Ancient Near-Eastern Texts, a very valuable (?no) workein (?) collection of ancient material with which I hope that most of you are familiar) was presiding at the meeting. The students told me that when they were in the anteroom were taking off their coats in the vestibule and had not yet entered the meeting they could hear Professor Pritchard introducing Dr. Pfeiffer and Professor Pritchard said, "Dr. Pfeiffer, you will be happy to know that everyone here completely accepts the Graf-Wellhausen Theory." As Professor Pfeiffer was beginning got up to speak and our twenty students entered the auditorium and took their seats, along with the 35 or 40 others who were present. I'm afraid that Professor Pfeiffer was under a misapprehension when he spoke, thinking that they all accepted the Graf-Wellhausen Theory. However, they said However, they said, that Pfeiffer started by giving illustrations from archaeological discoveries of recent years showing that the accuracy and dependability of various sections of the Old Testament. The students said that practically everything he said could be was something that

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

would be of value for us in our defense of the Scripture and they were very well impressed with the material he gave but quite surprised when he came to the end of his talk by hearing him conclude it by saying that he had presented evidence of historical truth in the Old Testament that had not been noticed before, but that for real understanding of the Old Testament we much never cease to be thankful and had to those great scholars who discovered the truths of the Graf-Wellhausen Theory. This incident, which occurred about ten years ago, shows how vital a force the Graf-Wellhausen Theory is in the world today. It is just as vital today as it was ten years ago--perhaps more so. We have been looking at the succession of theories about the criticism of the Pentateuch and have seen how one after another was adopted and then abandoned, and noticing the progression of thought, but we now reach the stage where this progression of thought came to a point that would be accepted by most critics. During almost for ninety years, now, most of critical scholarship in the world has accepted the Graf-Wellhausen Theory as the final result of scholarship regarding the origin of the Pentateuch. There you go into almost any university that would have a course dealing with the Old Testament in any way, and you will find that the results of Graf-Wellhausen Theory will be stated as if they were solid facts, about thich there is no question at all.

Since the Graf-Wellhausen Theory is now so solidly entrenched, and has been so for many years, it is a very vital factor in the religious life of our world today. The average person known nothing about the theory, but anyone who has ever studied it at any liberal seminary, and that includes practically every seminary that is more than 40 years old, and also anyone who has taken courses in Religion at any present university, has heard a considerable part of the teaching of the Graf-Wellhausen Theory presented as solid established fact, whether he is familiar with the term itself or not.

About 30 years ago there appeared in the magazine of the Phi Beta Kappa, The American Scholar, an article by Professor Albright of Johns Hopkins University, in which Albright described a series of recently discovered archaeological evidences of the accuracy of the Old Testament. These evidences were very well expressed and well presented. Albright had been asked to provide an article on Old Testament scholarship today, and his article included very solid evidences of the truth and dependability of various sections of the Old Testament, which was about 30 pages long. At the end of the article, after giving these very excellent presentations, he concluded with about two or three pages in which he said something like this: "What is our conclusion: it is that we must never forget the great debt we owe to the Graf-Wellhausen Graf and Wellhausen and those other great scholars who gave us our true understanding of the Old Testament."

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

In his book, The Archaeology of Palestine, Professor Albright, after giving quite a number of evidences against many of the extreme positions of the critics, went on to speak of the original (?) independent existence of the great documents J, E, D and P, and the order of their developments, saying that of this there can be absolutely no doubt.

Many people today speak of Albright as if he were a great conservative scholar. In fact he is very conservative in comparison with a great many critics, but he holds tenaciously, as do most of the scholars in present universities, to the main essentials of the Graf-Wellhausen Theory. It is widely accepted as solid fact. You can expect to have to meet it whenever you do work in a church even if you are working among people that who know very little about the Bible and have never even heard the details of the theory or come into contact with many of its viewpoints. As soon as they begin attending our present-day universities, if they are interested in Christianity, some of them will take courses in Religion and they are bound to come up against the views I have given described to you. So it is vital that you know how the Graf-Wellhausen Theory developed, what it is, and what are our objections to it.

You notice that I called it the "Graf-Wellhausen Theory," a term which is very widely used today among biblical scholars, as the fact about the development of the Pentateuch.

Sometimes this view is called the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen Theory. We will look further about the important part that Kuenen had in the development of the theory, actually more important than the part Graf had. Kuenen is not usually mentioned in connection with it, except in scholarly discussion. Usually it is called the Graf-Wellhausen Theory and sometimes just the "Wellhausen Theory." We will look into its background, now.

1. Rise of Naturalistic Theories About the Origin of the Pentatuu

Under this heading I want to discuss, to look briefly at a small group of men, and their activities which were quite independent of the widespread movement of analysis of documents at which we have been looking. Comparatively few people know about this other movement, but it was this other movement which took over the Documentary Movement and crystallized it and gave it permanent form.

Discussion of this other movement should start perhaps with a reference looking back to De Wette.

You remember that De Wette was the one who in 1805 suggested that the Book of Deuteronomy wa the book discovered in the temple in the reign of Josiah, and that it was written at that time or shortly before. He called it "a pious fraud" that it had been written in order to present some good ideas to the people and prepared in such a way as to try to make them think that this code of law had been written by MOses centuries earlier. De Wette was thoroughgoing in his

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

~~1. Rise of Naturalistic Theories About the Origin of the Pentateuch~~ (cont'd)

insistence that the Pentateuch was not a book that told about history but that it had been writen by people who had ideas they wanted to put across. It doesn't tell us much about the times of Abraham or Moses, but tells us a lot about the later time when these books were written.

De Wette published these theories, and a few people were influenced by them. Then he turned to the study of the literary analysis and eventually became quite important in the ~~new advance~~ of the Supplementary Hypothesis, ~~that we have already mentioned.~~

Here I must mention a man who was not directly of much importance in relation to the theory of the development of ;the Pentateuch but who was indierectly of very great importance influence so far as it was concerned. His name is Reuss. Reuss was a Hegelian ~~(or)~~ theories scholar who was greatly interested ~~in the development of ideas~~ ideas of development and historical progress. In 1833 Reuss wrote down certain propositions about the historical development of the ideas and laws of the Pentateuch. He never published these until 1879 so they did not ;have much influence ~~in the world~~ except on his students. Graf to whom we will pay considerable attention later on, was one of his students and had been greatly affected by him. Reuss said that the Pentateuch grew just like any other book--by natural processes. He said we must look at the Pentateuch just as we would look at any book of Religion religion of Greece, or Rome, or China or any other place. Reuss was much interested in the development of ideas in relation to history.

Reuss was followed by Vatke, ~~Vatke is always mentioned in lists called (?) to the background of Pentateuchal criticism, but not much is said about him.~~ In 1835 he wrote a book claiming that the Pentateuch represe represented a natural develpm development of ideas on Hegelian (~~op~~?) principles.

Discussion of Hegel should probably occur in Apologetics rather than here, ~~but in case you are not well informed~~ about him we should say that he was a very ~~prominent~~ German philosopher ~~about 1800~~ who ~~has exercised~~ about as much influence in the world ~~today~~ as any ~~man who any mere~~ man who has lived since the time of the Apocrypha.

I once heard an interesting story about Hegel. ~~It~~ I was told that he was at ~~Leipzig working on his~~ great book and that he and that in finishing ~~it up~~ he worked steadily for theree days, night and day, paying no attention to anything else. According to the story, when Hegel finished his book he heaved a sigh of relief ~~as he wrote the last word~~ and stepped out of the house into the streed. Thre, to his surprise, he saw great crowds walking back and forth and ~~excited~~, ~~"What is the matter?"~~ "What is all the excitement about?" "Excitement."

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Start → Cfwm 2/1/91

The Communists say that they have taken Hegel's theories and turned them upside down, or, as they say, they turned Hegel right-side up. They claim that their dialectical materialism" is directly based on what they say is a true understanding of Hegel.

At that time the Hegelians were a small group of scholars. A far larger group was working on the documentary division at which we have been looking. It is the union of the two forces that produced the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis. ~~He was actually more important in the development of the theory than either Graf or Wellhausen. Sometimes the hypothesis is given the name of the three and called the Graf, Kuenen, Wellhausen theory.~~

Abraham Kuenen was a professor at the University of Leyden in Holland who made suggestions along this same line in 1861. His view of Scripture was entirely retionalist. He had a very keen mind and his book had great influence.

He was actually more important in the development of the theory than either Graf or Wellhausen. Sometimes the hypothesis is given the names of the three and called the Graf, Kuenen, Wellhausen theory, ~~Sometimes the hypothesis is given~~ but usually Kuenen is not mentioned. This development was an entirely separate movement, a small movement influencing a few scholars and their pupils up to this point. We have been looking at the big movement of the criticism: Eichhorn, Ewald, the Supplementary Hypothesis, etc., things in which people were interested. They wanted to know how Moses ~~got~~ or whoever wrote the Pentateuch got his material and how did it come together. This was a separate movement. The Graf-Wellhausen Theory is the bringing together of the two movements.

II. K. H. Graf and Abraham Kuenen

In 1866 K. H. Graf issued a book on the Pentateuch in which he dealt with the legal material which forms the bulk of the central books of the Pentateuch.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

last few months have seen Jewish orthodox young Jewish scholars sit in a small class in which a learned professor has pointed out how everybody agrees that J is the oldest, E is the next, P is the latest, and I have seen no great objection raised to it on the part of any. If that's what scholarship says, that's (5 1/2) a sign it is, so that while the rank and file of orthodox Jewish people today know nothing about it, it is rapidly coming among them, and all Israel Jewish scholars accept it. Yes? (6) Herman Wouk? Defense against this theory? Is that so, well that's interesting, I hadn't heard of that. Yes? (6 1/4) There was a gradual change in terminology made. You had two E's, that's confusing. The First Elohist , you stop calling it E and call it P. (stu) Well, yes, different scholars had different (6 3/4) but these terms for the last seventy years have been accepted at every university, and the only change in them from the earlier terms, other people use other terms, is the substituting of P for the First Elohist and the other Elohist becomes simply E. Yes, Mr. Gregory? (7) No, the Supplementary Theory is completely abandoned, this is the Modified Document Theory of Hupfeld . (stu.) No, there is no foundational document. That term is purely used with the Supplementary Theory, not (7 1/2)

Well, now, #3, Julius Wellhausen. The professor, with whom I studied, Dr. Robert Dick Wilson, when he studied in Germany, Wellhausen was still a comparatively young man, though older than Wilson. Wilson was very subject to seasickness, and he said, Wellhausen was a wonderful man to have around if you're on a boat and not feeling well, because he evidently was very helpful to ~~Wision~~ Wilson when he was seasick, but Wellhausen was one of the most brilliant German scholars of the last hundred and fifty years. But Wellhausen had something that very few scholars had. ~~In addition to brilliance~~, he had the ability to express himself, not like the average German does, or did then, at least, in long sentences where sometimes you go for three pages and the verse at the end of the third page, and we have to look at the end of the third page to see what the verb is to get the understanding of the sentence. The German sentences are very very logical,

particularly Leviticus and Numbers. He said that these extensive detailsd laws of sacrifice and laws of life and people, etc. which were part of the original Elohist--the foundation writings of the Supplementary Theory--that these laws were not the beginning of the development but the climax of a development from simple to complex along evolutionary lines.

The word "volution" wasnot much used then. Darwin's book had come out only six or seven years before, but the influence of the idea of evolution is very clear in Graf's writing. Graf said, "The critics are right; the Elohist is the foundation, the foundation writing which comes first, so far as Genesis is concerned. But," he said, "when it comes to law, these laws ar e not the beginning but the end. Instead of Genesis, Genesis and the historical sections of the later books, He said these laws were written even after Deuteronomy, that they must not have been written until after the very end of the exile.

Reuss had given such theories in his class thirty years before but they had never received much attention; (nc) I don't know whether they had even been published. Those who were studying the Pentateuch had not considered them. However, Graf's writing in 1856 aroused great attention. Most scholars, haowever, said, "This is ridiculous; it is absurd."

They said it was clear that the E document, the foundation writing is the very beginning, but the other writings came later. Graf presented a very impressive argument. He said, "First you have the simple laws; then you have more complicate laws in Deuteronomy; then you have the most complicated laws of all, the laws of Exodus, and Numbers." The critics answered, "That sounds very reasonable, simple to complex," they said, "See how the Pentateuch came together; the E document is first, the Eloist is the foundation. Then comes the J supplement later, and then comes Deuteronomy." they said; "you cannot separate the Elohistic section of the Pentateuch that has this one, two, three, four enumeration, first day, second day, third day, etc." They said, "You can't separate that material from thos detailed laws of Numbers and Deuteronomy; they are all part of the first Elohist; there is no question about that." So Kuenen in Holland made a suggestion to Graf saying, "Why don't you take the bull by the horns and say that this part of Genesis is also at the very end?" That was a complete reversal of the view that had been held for fifty years--that the first Elohist was the very foundation--the earliest writing. Graf suggests put it at the very end.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

recognize it as being late instead of early. Some people called that change a Copernican revolution. Graf died before he had opportunity to do much writing about it but in 1869 Kuenen himself wrote a book in Dutch, which(?) received considerable interest among scholars. So (?) Kuenen was really the first to write up the Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis hypothesis writing. Kuenen adopted Hupfeld's Modified Document Theory. Graf had said, "The first Elohist is the foundation; we take out the laws and put them at the end but the rest of the first Elohist is the history, the beginning. Now Kuenen said, "You don't have to take that whole first Elohist and put it into one place because, because" he said, " Hupfeld has pointed out that a large portion of the Elohist has just the same style as the Yahwehost (?) (?) Jahwist.

"So," he said, "you can separate that part from the others." He said, "The part with the enumeration, first day, second day, third day, fourth day, this man lived so many years and died, etc.--all this material of the foundation writing, he says, "you can take that,along with the detailed laws with which it goes and put it at the end." Kuenen expressed this whole theory in Dutch in a logical form but at first few scholars were attracted to it. Putting the first Elohist last, but leaving the second Elohist as having written early.

This middle portion of the Pentateuch, the detailed law, that was considered part of the Elohist because its enumerations, statistics, etc., which had to do with the caul, the kidneys, (?) how many years you take before you let the land lie fallow, and all the extensive detailed laws, had long been called the Priestly Law. It was the book that Moses gave, not for everybody to memorize, but for the priests to have before them to look up and check on those things when occasion would arise. This had been considered first because it went with the Elohist in Genesis. NOw, Kuenen sayd, "This is the last because it is a more involved and complicated law than that of Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy you know is the people's law--which is Moses exhorting the people to remember and keep the things that everybody should have in mind--the things that they would have to look up in order to know exactly what was right. In (?) this theory the first Elohist is moved to the very end in the theory, that which had been thought to be the beginning, all the time before that waa s Copernican revolution indeed. It came to be called the Graf-Wellhausen Theory, though Kuenen really had much more to do with it than perhaps either of the other two. But although its great spread was due to Wellhausen .

Under HH Hupfeld's theory the E was divided into two parts, Now there were four documents The first Elohist, the seocnd Elohist, the Jehovist (?), and the Deuteronomist, not supplementations but separate documents, Hupfeld said, and he thought all four had been combined at one time into the large Pentateuch. There were still differences

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

among scholars. While all had agreed that the first Elohist was first, some had said that the Jehovist was second and then the second Elohist; others said it was the other way around. Actually, as we have noticed, the Jehovist and the second Elohist are so much alike you can hardly tell them apart. There is often great question as to what belongs to one of the two and what belongs to the other. As to the difference between the first Elohist and the rest, they are unanimous. All the enumeration, the listing, the statistics, the detailed laws, all that sort of thing was considered together as the foundation document. Now this first Elohist, which contained the law book of the Priests, the critics came to call, not the first Elohist, but the Priestly document; and so they give it the initial P. They don't need to call the second Elohist second anymore; they can just call it E. Graf had said, "Take part of the P document and put it at the end." Kuenen said, "Take it all, and put it at the end." And all the Jehovist, which had originally been thought to be by a late supplementer, who had inserted material into the foundation writing, is considered to be the earliest of all. Foudation writing, which was the foundation of Genesis, was now put at the very end.

For many years there was a wuestion which was oldest-- J or E, but soon they all agreed that J was the oldest, E was shortly after, maybe a century later came D (Deuteronomy) and P are at the very end. (In more recent years there has been discussion whether P is actually after D; some hold that it is earlier than D, though I'm not sure about that; better leave that out.

Today all liberal Jewish scholars accept this arrangemtn, though the average orthodox Orthodox Jew knows nothing about it, but if students want to go ahead and get advanced degrees they go into the university. There they hear about receive this theory and most of them accept it.

For a time there were two E's--which was confusing, so they stopped calling the first Elohist E and called it P, for Priestly document. For the last seventy years these terms have been accepted at every university; the only change in them from the earlier terms is the substituting of P for the first Elohist and calling the other Elohist simply E. The Supplementary Theory had been completely abandoned. The Graf-Wellhausen Theory is built upon the Modified Document Theory of Hupfeld. ~~The term "Foundatin Document" was used with the Supplementary Theory which held the field for half a century but today had been discarded of course.~~

3, Julius Wilhausen

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

after
~~when~~ you figure out what they mean, and they were ~~exact, they're~~ precise, but ~~they're~~ heavy, and
~~they're~~ difficult to read. The French style is to use ~~more these little~~ short sentences, that hold
your attention and ~~more,~~ keep you going more easily, but the German had only these long
flowing sentences. Even today, ~~and~~ their words are (2) long words often ~~that take~~ put four or
five words ~~and put them~~ together (1) sometimes very ~~forming simply~~ one long word, ~~and then~~ Wellhausen was
not only a very great ~~mind, a very great~~ scholar, but ~~Wellhausen~~ he had the unusual ability
of expressing himself in clear simple language that was easy to follow. He ~~and Julius~~ Well-
~~hausen~~ was only ~~33~~ 34 years of age in 1878, ~~34, excuse me,~~ when he issued a History of
Israel, which ~~took~~ put the theories of Graf and Kuenen ~~and put them~~ in to simple clear language
that could be understood not only by the very advanced scholars but by the ordinary
minister or ~~the~~ intelligent laymen. His ~~laity, and Wellhausen's~~ History of Israel took the world by
storm, ~~and that's why~~ the theory is called the Wellhausen theory because it was his
book that brought it to the attention of the world as a whole. Since ~~Now~~ Wellhausen was ~~being a~~
considered a very great scholar, his book was not dismissed as simply the work of a popularizer. ~~He was a~~
~~first class scholar, but he was a real popularizer.~~ Wellhausen also wrote on Arabic studies
~~He wrote on New Testament, he~~ wrote commentaries on some of the Gospels. He made
suggestions that had tremendous force in New Testament study, but his greatest influence
was in connection with the Pentateuch and some of the other books of the Old Testament,
~~and~~ this ~~book~~, the History of Israel, is one of the books that has had so great an influence as
not to be a turning point in the world of ~~book~~ thought. Most of ~~Because it caused~~ the younger students all
over, ~~to~~ gathered around the theory and accepted it. The older German scholars did not do so;
some of them, ~~even~~ some of the greatest of them, opposed this theory until the day of their
death, ~~and~~ (2) insisted, ingo some ~~of them~~ (3) on the Supplementary theory and others on the Modified
Document Theory, ~~the way~~ as Hupfeld had ~~given~~ presented it. They stood for those points of view
~~of theory~~ until they died, but they had no following. Of course there were also a certain number
of conservative scholars in Germany who had been doing good work in opposing the
whole business, some of them had ~~been~~ written ~~some~~ top very excellent material, ~~for that~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

purpose, and some in American too. But the older critical scholars did not accept this, but the younger ones all accepted it, and it spread like wildfire, and William Henry Green's book on the Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch, written about 1900, he said that in Germany, which has had such a change of theories within the last century, this theory will probably disappear and be replaced by another. Well, it hasn't. Green wrote nearly sixty years ago, and the theory is just as strong today, perhaps not in all details, but in the main, it is just as strong as it ever was. But Twenty or thirty years ago, people thought it was beginning to disappear; they thought archeology was destroying it, but today, while many of its effects have disappeared, its basic points are just as widely accepted I believe as they have ever been.

Well, Julius Wellhausen then is a man of tremendous importance in Old Testament study, everybody has to take a position either in favor of or against what he has. Before you could say I agree with this man, or this, or this. There were many different men of different views and you could shift from one to the other, but now this is the critical view, and as the older men died off, nobody replaced them, this view was accepted as standard, and I doubt if there are many critical institutions, many liberal institutions in the world, where, or many universities in the world, if there is any work in religion in them at all--where the main essentials of this theory are not simply given as fact. This is what scholarship has to--yes, Mr. Miller? (14 1/2) A very considerable number have not, quite a few have, but a very considerable number have not. But it is not necessary to go to Germany for presentations of it.

#4, Spread of the Graf-Wellhausen theory. And we want to mention some of the men who spread it in...

P.36 (3/4)

...discussion about this which very few held, today you do not find them. Today it is either accepted or it is denied. There is very little variation. A little bit on certain points, here and there, but not much. Today--of course, for one thing, there is not as much

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

interest in the Old Testament. ~~That's one thing about~~ Germany 150 years ago, the bulk of the people were raised on the Bible, they believed thoroughly in ~~the~~ its truth ~~of the Bible~~, they were tremendously interested with, and ~~consequently~~ anybody with any theory about the Bible could find a ~~good reading,~~ a good sale for his book. Everybody was interested, all the universities in Germany had professors ~~of Old Testament~~, who were ~~giving their time~~ writing books on the Old Testament. There was tremendous interest in it, much more than there has ever been in almost any country, all the theories were argued and discussed back and forth, and ~~all that.~~ ~~That has to quite a large extent~~ disappeared, ~~because~~ when the theory ~~becomes widespread~~ and becomes accepted, it leads to the conclusion that after all the Old Testament is just a human document, it grew up by natural process, and ~~if it is~~ there is no reason why so much interest in it. I ~~think~~ people ~~don't~~ say that, they just automatically lose their interest, ~~in it to quite an extent but~~

~~but I would think~~ that the spread of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis has been one of the greatest factors in producing general disinterest in Christianity throughout the world. One of the greatest factors in causing people to lose faith in the Bible, ~~and~~ of course these theories, ~~these~~ approaches were carried on through the rest of the Old Testament and through the New Testament. ~~I don't think I have beyond ten minutes left, so I better not say much about 4 now or I won't have a chance to find how well you know what we dealt with last week.~~ So there being ten minutes I'm going to just give one question to the odd numbered people and two questions to the even numbered, but the two questions take about the same time as the one. ...

(3)(starting again)...and about the tremendous ~~interest~~ influence which he had in the Graf-Wellhausen theory of the origin of the Pentateuch. Now I want to speak about 4, Spread of the Graf-Wellhausen theory. ~~Under that~~ a, The Opposition of the Older Scholars in Germany. ~~That I have already mentioned.~~ The older critical scholars in Germany had already accepted the division into these documents, ~~so some of them~~ through didn't call them J, E, and D, some ~~of them~~ called them A, B, C, and D--they still held to their theories, ~~which the~~ but what

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Wellhausen theories called the priestly document, at the end, they still insisted ~~it was~~ at the beginning. For instance, Prof. Dillmann of the University of Berlin ~~who~~ was one of the outstanding critical scholars of the last part of the last century, whose commentaries are still considered to contain much of great value, Dillmann denied the Wellhausen theory right ~~at~~ to the end of his life. He thought that the Elohist material was first, rather than last. ~~But~~ As these older scholars died out, they left no successor, ~~the younger scholars all accepted the fact—I shouldn't say "all", that's pretty broad, I'll say~~ practically all, I don't think of any outstanding exception—the younger critical scholars in Germany and in France, ~~they~~ accepted the Wellhausen theory, ~~and~~ so it came to be the established viewpoint, as the ~~se~~ older scholars died out in Germany and in France.

~~But~~ Now we want to cross over into our English-speaking world, ~~I'm going to~~ and I shall mention three outstanding individuals ~~in~~ connection with the spread of the theory, ~~b, c, and d under this~~ b, W. Robertson Smith. ~~Now he was a young man~~ This very brilliant scholar was brought up very strictly, in Scotland, ~~he was~~ born ~~in the middle of the 1840's~~ in 1846 and. After his education in Scotland he went ~~over~~ to Germany to study, ~~and~~ There he was tremendously shocked ~~in Germany~~ to find ~~street~~ trolley cars running on Sunday, and other ~~matters like~~ similar customs that that he had never seen in Scotland. ~~But~~ When he got over his initial shock and found that the German people with whom he was working were ~~a pretty~~ very nice decent people, and ~~pretty~~ that many of them were good scholars, he decided it was all right to ride a street car on Sunday ~~and perhaps~~ also that their ideas about the Bible ~~were~~ might not be so bad ~~either, so~~. In the course of his time in Germany, he became a very close friend, and devoted admirer of Julius Wellhausen. And adopted the ~~whole of the~~ entire Wellhausen theory. ~~Now Robertson Smith was a very brilliant young man and~~ returning to Scotland to the Free Church of which he was a member, he became Professor of Old Testament in Aberdeen University, ~~and soon~~ and the Free Church College. A few years later, he was asked to write the article on Israel for the 9th edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica, ~~and when he wrote~~ In this article ~~on Israel~~, he presented the Wellhausen theory of the Pentateuch as the truth regarding ~~the~~ History ~~of~~ Israel. This caused a great shock throughout the Free Church ~~in~~ of Scotland, ~~and~~ Robertson Smith

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

was accused of heresy, ~~and there was a~~ great trial ~~and he was accused of having violated his vow as a minister, but at~~ the end of the trial he was acquitted, ~~though~~ by a narrow margin, of having violated his vow as a minister, ~~he~~ was allowed to retain his ministerial rights, but it was decided for the sake of peace and harmony in the church he should be dismissed from his professorship in Aberdeen, ~~so they dismissed him from his professorship in Aberdeen, but~~ meantime he had been giving lectures all over Scotland, which he ~~called~~ entitled "the Old Testament in the Jewish Church." ~~And~~ these lectures, following the Wellhausen line, were printed and widely distributed. ~~Soon thereafter~~, Roberton Smith was invited to become editor-in-chief of the Encyclopedia Britannica, and ~~remained so~~ held this position for a dozen years, writing many other articles ~~in the Encyclopedia Britannica~~, presenting the Wellhausen theory and the critical view of the Old Testament. Then he was invited to become professor of Arabic in Cambridge University, ~~so he moved to England and~~ from this position as editor-in-chief of the Encyclopedia Britannica and as professor in Cambridge ~~he~~ exercised ~~a great influence~~ in favor of the Wellhausen theory throughout the English-speaking world. ~~A~~ very powerful influence ~~in the~~ spread ~~of~~ this theory. ~~And~~ these theories ~~of course~~ were the beginning in Great Britain of the application of the theory of ~~th~~ evolution to the development of the Bible, making it a human book rather than a divine revelation. There was a group of English scholars who tried to hold that the New Testament was God's revelation, ~~the New Testament~~ was entirely ~~all~~ true, and that Jesus Christ was indeed God as described in the New Testament, but the Old Testament was a natural development without anything supernatural in it. ~~And that~~ Such a view could not stand very long, ~~naturally, before long~~ and soon they began to extend the ~~same thing~~ attitude to the New Testament, ~~and~~ then ~~there was~~ after a time a group of scholars arose in the Church of England, who said, ~~well~~, the Bible of course is just a natural book, and we can't depend on anything in it, but we have the great doctrines of the Church, about the deity of Christ, and the Atonement, ~~and so on, and that died out~~ That attitude largely disappeared about 30 years ago, ~~so~~ that there were, ~~you might say~~, resistance movements along the way, ~~and~~ but the Church of Great Britain ~~was pretty well~~ became filled with the higher criticism, much more widely than ~~has been done~~ what has occurred in America.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

I read in a magazine just a couple of days ago that out of 27 million members of the Church of England, about three million are at all regular in attendance in church, which shows the effect on that nation which used to be perhaps the most church-going nation in the world, of the spread of these theories, with their doubt and denial of the Word of God, effected but Robinson Smith we mentioned as b.

c, Canon S. R. Driver. Now Driver was a man about Robertson Smith's age, he became professor in Oxford University, and had an influence as great as anyone else, if you leave out Robertson Smith, who may be about the same amount of influence, there was no other who had a greater influence in the English-speaking world, in the higher criticism. S. R. Driver as professor at Oxford was a brilliant scholar, who had written on Hebrew syntax, books that advanced our understanding of this field very greatly. Driver was a man who claimed to be a very earnest evangelical Christian, and very devoted to the teachings of the New Testament, and consequently it was much easier for Christians to take his writings and the writings of men like Kuenen and Wellhausen, who denied the supernatural altogether and considered all religion as just a development of human superstition. Driver claimed to be a very earnest Christian, as far as the New Testament was concerned, but Driver's Introduction to the literature of the Old Testament came out, I believe it was 1898, and went through many editions, soon became the standard textbook in the English-speaking world. In all seminaries where the criticism was accepted at all and in nearly any university where anything was taught about religion, in England and in America, Driver's Introduction to the literature of the Old Testament came to exercise a tremendous influence, and Driver in this book accepted the Wellhausen Theory, and taught it very strongly and very clearly, the book is full of detail on all of the Old Testament, but he has a very, very clear presentation of the Wellhausen Theory which he presents as fact. Now Driver does not take the attitude that Wellhausen would take, that this is purely a natural development, he would admit the action of divine revelation,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

But he says we must look at the facts and see how they came, and ~~here~~ that is what scholarship proves about the documents into which the Old Testament is divided. ~~the contrast between them, and all~~ this ~~of course~~ made his influence ~~all~~ greater. ~~Now~~ The third ~~group~~ whom we ~~might~~ shall mention is hardly of equal importance with these two, as far as his influence is concerned, ~~but~~ yet he had very considerable influence ~~in this regard is:~~

d, Charles Augustus Briggs. The name is familiar to all of you because Brown, Driver and Briggs is our best Hebrew lexicon. ~~and of course~~ Brown was President of Union Seminary; Driver was ~~a~~ the professor in Oxford who was just referred to; and Briggs was a professor in Union Seminary. ~~and they~~ ~~put 20 to 30 years~~ devoted great, during 20 to 30 years ~~they put tremendous~~ amounts of time ~~on~~ to working over the Hebrew words for that dictionary. ~~and it is~~ It is our ~~very finest~~ best Hebrew dictionary. ~~The fact that the~~ Since all three of them are strong modernists ~~is good evidence of why~~ we should never take ~~a~~ any dictionary as the final word ~~any dictionary~~ as to what a word means. ~~Look at~~ See what the dictionary ~~and get the~~ gives evidence. ~~You will find that~~ not in three-fourths of the cases, perhaps in nine-tenths of the cases, the evidence is sufficient, ~~and they have checked over all the evidence to prove the interpretation they give to be the correct one~~, but ~~there is~~ in at least one tenth of the cases, maybe more, ~~where~~ it is very wise to look over the evidence carefully and reach your own conclusions. ~~And~~ not The great value of the Brown, Driver and Briggs dictionary is not the conclusions they present, but ~~it is~~ the fact that they present so completely the evidence for the conclusions. They ~~give you~~ list most of the passages ~~which~~ that will be interpreted in any particular way, and most of the ~~instances~~ occurrences of ~~any~~ each particular form, ~~and so on, and consequently you~~ Yet...

P.37. (3/4)

~~...of the~~ big dictionary's ~~idea of the meaning of the word~~

~~but~~ Brown, Driver and Briggs, like any dictionary, can ~~also~~ mislead you. ~~but it is much less accurate~~ It is very useful because it has so much material in it, and they tried, ~~in this book,~~ to stick to the evidence. Briggs ~~had~~ also ~~written~~ wrote the discussion of the Psalms in the series of the International Critical Commentary, and ~~it~~ that is one of the most extreme volumes in that

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

series. There is hardly a Psalm that he doesnot divide up into two or three different documents, and he carries this to really an absurd extreme, but time after time, in his commentary on Psalms, he has notes expressing his disagreement with something inthe Brown, Driver and Briggs dictionary. His commentary is far more radical than anything that exists for the dictionary. Briggs who had studied in Germany for four years, when the Wellhausen Theory was just coming to the fore. He came, was a very prominent professor at Union Seminary in New York, and while he argued in favor of the Virgin Birth, and defended various New Testament doctrines, he wrote a number of books on the Old Testament in which he strongly espoused the critical theory, and he was strongly opposed in this by Prof. William Henry Green of Princeton Seminary, and the result was that Green and others brought charges against him in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church inU. S. A. The Assembly decided that his views were unChristian, he was dropped from the Presbyterian ministry for his unChristian views, and the General Assembly took action urging that none of its students should go to Union Seminary, the result, of which was that in 1898, just after this action happened, Princeton Seminary had more students by far than it ever had in its history. It was 30 years after that before it ever got up again to the high point that it reached in two or three years after that. Union Seminary had quite a drop, but the leadership of Union Seminary, who were in good standing in the Presbyterian Church, were not themselves disciplined, they continued in good standing, and eventually they gained control of the church. But for quite a time they were under a great shadow, as a result of the accusations which had been leveled against Briggs. Now I mentioned these three men, particularly the first two of them, as having been very influential inthe spread of these theories in the English-speaking world. Now I want very briefly to look at #5, Subsequent developments.

A man who used to be a colleague of mine, he and I were both on the faculty of another seminary before Faith Seminary was founded, Dr. Oswald T. Allis, about 15 years ago, 1943, issued a book on The five books of Moses, in which Dr. Allis investigated the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

~~matter of the~~ Wellhausen Theory, ~~and~~ Allis is a great man for details, ~~and~~ he counts the number of occurrences in just about everything he deals with, a tremendous worker in detail, and ~~there is~~ a vast amount of valuable and statistical information about various aspects of the theories ~~contained~~ in his book. In the last part of his book he goes into archeological evidence, ~~and~~ he has not worked near so much in this field, ~~so~~ is not nearly so accurate and dependable in ~~that~~ as in the other sections. ~~But~~ Prof. Albright of Johns Hopkins Univ. wrote a review of Allis' book after it appeared in 1943, ~~in which he simply tore~~ it to pieces. One of Albright's students said ~~to me,~~ the reason ~~is~~ that ~~he~~ didn't mention Albright often enough in the footnotes. I don't know whether ~~that~~ is fair to judge him that way or not, but I have known Albright very well and have a high regard for him as a scholar, and as a man far superior to most university professors in religion today, ~~and~~ I ~~was~~ shocked at the venom shown in his review of Allis' book, ~~but~~ one thing ~~for~~ which he greatly ~~criticized~~ Allis ~~very much for~~ is that he uses in referring to Hebrew words, the transliteration of Young's Concordance, which ~~he~~ says is not a scientific method of transliteration. ~~Well, granted that~~ Allis knows that well; ~~and Allis~~ said in ~~the~~ introduction to his book that he was using it because it was more familiar to the great number of ministers for whom his book was intended than the more scientific method which he might use, but Albright attacked him strongly on that, ~~but~~ another thing on which he attacked him was that most of his quotations and most of what he dealt with was ~~with~~ scholars of 40 or 50 years before, that he had very little to say about scholars of the 30 or 40 years before he wrote, ~~and~~ he said, if Allis really thinks the matter of the Mosaic authorship is important why doesn't he work on it harder? Well, nobody ever worked harder on a thing than Allis did on this, ~~but~~ Allis' quotations were from these earlier scholars rather than from ~~the~~ recent writers, ~~and~~ on that point of criticism I ~~feel~~ that Albright is very definitely wrong, because, actually, ~~there has~~ very little ~~been done~~ of any great importance in this field in the last 40 years. The fact of the matter is that during the period from 1800 to 1878 the matter was under intense discussion ~~and~~ the various theories ~~that~~ the documents ~~of the~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Pentateuch were ~~arranged this way, that way, and the other~~ widely discussed. ¶ As we ~~have gone through~~ and have seen, ~~and~~ there were all kinds of varying opinions. There were certain generally accepted views for a long period of time. ~~But~~ The Wellhausen Theory, which was published in 1878, ~~is~~ came to be accepted by the overwhelming mass of critical scholars, and is ~~so~~ accepted today in just about the identically ~~the~~ form inwhich it was ~~issued~~ presented at that time, ~~and~~ the critical world ~~takes~~ assumes that ~~this thing~~ it has been proved, ~~and therefore~~ so for the years since, say, 1905, the great bulk of their writing has not been to try to move the critical theory, but to work out further details, ~~of them~~, or to apply ~~them~~ it to the history. ~~And~~ Consequently it is altogether proper when you deal with this matter to deal particularly with the great scholars who developed this theory and who caused it to become accepted, ~~and~~ At that time there were a number of conservative scholars who wrote some very excellent works pointing out its ~~weaknesses~~ weaknesses and defects, ~~and~~ Comparatively little in recent years has been done in this regard which deserves to rank with what they presented. The interest was very great in those days, and the amount of study and ~~the amount of~~ writing was very great at that time. ~~However,~~ ¶ Now I want to give you ~~just~~ a very brief summary of the general trend of thought among critical scholars ~~as~~ since that time. The tendency of critical scholars at first was to do as Briggs did in the Psalms, to carry the idea of dividing the documents up into alleged original sources to a tremendous extreme, ~~and the result was that~~ There is hardly a book of the Old Testament which wasn't divided up into several alleged documents. Ezekiel for many years resisted the tide. They held that Ezekiel was the fulcrum on which the Pentateuchal criticism had been ~~ranged~~ based and the unity of Ezekiel, ~~was~~ they held to. But within the last twenty years, Ezekiel some writers have torn to pieces in the same way and have divided it up among many different alleged writers. ~~Not only that but~~ Very soon after the ~~issue~~ publication of the Wellhausen theory, ~~scholars began~~ --in fact, even before it became generally accepted-- scholars began ~~applying~~ to carry still further the type of argument by which they had divided up the books of the Pentateuch ~~up~~ into J, E, and P; and ~~divided each of them up, so they had~~ soon they were speaking of also of J1, J2, J3, and J4, into which they divided J, and ~~they had~~ also of E1, E2, and E3, ~~they had~~ of D1, D2, and D3, and ~~they~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

of ~~had~~ P1, P2, P3, and P4, ~~and~~ there ~~was~~ ~~discussion~~ which verse (or half a verse) came from P1, ~~and~~ which from P2, and which from J3, and so on, ~~and that~~ was carried to a tremendous extreme. Probably no one went further than ~~this that~~ Prof. Morgenstern, who was ~~the~~ president of the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, the principal school of ~~the~~ Reformed Judaism. Morganstern wrote articles dividing the Old Testament up to a great extreme and new theories about how everything developed ~~in it.~~ I heard him give a paper once in which he dealt with the matter of the Ark of the Covenant, which was carried before the Israelites, ~~and~~ he had read ~~in an Arab book~~ somewhere about an Arab tribe that ~~used to~~ have riding on a camel at the head of the men as they went to war, ~~they had a sort of a~~ basket ~~on the camel and~~ a beautiful young virgin, ~~was in this going before~~ the army. ~~so~~ Morganstern said probably ~~this~~ is the real origin of the Ark of the Covenant, ~~and then the~~ language ~~got~~ changed ~~and~~ it ~~was said to be an ark containing~~ the twelve tablets of stone, ~~instead of a~~ beautiful young virgin. ~~Well, that shows~~ I heard ~~him give that paper~~ ~~personally, but it shows~~ the extreme wild measures to which many critics went for a time! ~~Now they don't do that now, many of them~~. There has been ~~a great~~ reaction against ~~that~~ it. ~~and then~~ Albright ~~wrote this~~ review ~~to which I referred~~ of Allis' book ~~he said in the review~~ that Allis' argument against dividing up the documents ~~and so on, that Allis gave, he said was very~~ very helpful in showing the absurdity of this division into J1, J2, J3, P1, P2, and P3, ~~and so on, and he thought they were very helpful in that regard, he was against that position~~, but he said as to the actual existence ~~separately~~ at one time of the great documents, J, E, P, and D, there can be no doubt ~~was Albright's position on it.~~

~~Now~~ this trend, which some today speak of as second generation criticism, ~~that of men like Morganstern,~~ was carried to a fantastic extreme, and a number of books were written ~~making~~ ~~these~~ divisions. ~~But then~~ came ~~along~~ the ~~movement~~ of archeology, ~~and~~ archeological evidence began to show ~~more and more~~ ~~various~~ places that the ~~theories about late~~ ~~myths~~ in the Bible ~~which showed~~ nothing about events at the time they ~~were written~~, but which came into existence long after ~~that these~~ simply didn't hold up ~~statements in the~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

documents that were supposed to have come into existence in the 7th century B.C., were proven archeologically to be completely out of accord with conditions in Palestine at that time, and exactly in line with conditions at the time of Abraham, and archeology, thus has caused a tremendous swing in this, in fact. When I began teaching 30 years ago, the feeling was constantly being spread that archeology is giving the death blow to the Graf-Wellhausen theory, archeology is proving that it does not stand. Within the next ten years, conservative scholars used to say, people will give up this theory altogether, they will probably develop an entirely new one unChristian theory to substitute for it. But we wonder what it will be, and then they thought as to what it might be. But that has not occurred. Instead of that, the leading critical scholars hold just as tenaciously as ever to the main essentials of the Graf-Wellhausen theory. And it is more tightly held today than it was 30 years ago. In its principal points, I gave a paper when I was president of Philadelphia Oriental Club, a Club which includes professors of various subjects related to the Near East, not in the Old Testament, but Arabic, Cuneiform, and so forth, from practically all the colleges and universities and seminaries in this general area, When I was president of that about 15 years ago I gave a paper on "The Scientific approach to the Old Testament" in which I tried to show how

P.38. (1/2)

...general interest in their acceptance of what I gave, but those of them who were in key points dealing with these matters were generally quite opposed to my conclusions, and it was very interesting to see how the world as a whole is not greatly interested, doesn't know much about it any more, but if they want to know something about the Old Testament they just go to these men in key points and ask them what are the facts? And he immediately gives them the teaching of the Graf-Wellhausen Theory, which is, as I say, taught in just about every university where anything is taught about religion, and it is taught as fact in practically every seminary that is over 40 years of age, and it is coming, in recent years to be put in Sunday School literature, That did not happen till very recently, but

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

~~recently it is coming to be put into Sunday School literature~~ and ~~into~~ books ~~of general~~ popular use, ~~much more than before. Its results were~~ (1 3/4) before but not ~~much of it, now it is coming to the fore. So that there has, since the time~~ when the theory spread through the English-speaking world, ~~there was this~~ great extreme, ~~to which the~~ critical scholars went on it, ~~and then~~ there was a considerable reaction, ~~from~~ that, under the influence of archeology, but ~~a~~ reaction ~~that goes~~ a comparatively short distance, ~~gives up its great extreme, but~~ still holds to ~~its~~ essential points. ~~And they are~~ right in this city there are at least six different places where ~~this~~ is taught as fact. ~~Is~~ this part of the J document or is ~~this~~ part of the E document, ~~and I myself~~ within the last 3 months heard one of the world's greatest scholars ~~how~~ the writer of the J document probably lived in Jerusalem at the time of David, ~~and what~~ a brilliant writer, ~~he was~~ what a great thinker ~~he was~~, and ~~what~~ a marvelous literary man, the writer of the J document ~~was~~ ~~Prof.~~ John Garstang, ~~about~~ thirty years ago, ~~got out~~ a book called Foundations of Bible History in Joshua and Judges. ~~Prof. Garstang~~ was professor of Archeology in Liverpool University, He was ~~director~~ of ~~department~~ of antiquities of the Palestine ~~Government~~ for ~~a~~ time, and ~~did~~ a great deal of excellent archeological work, ~~in Palestine~~. ~~Now~~ this book, ~~which Garstang got out about 30 years ago, on Joshua and Judges,~~ has brought discussion ~~on~~ the archeological material bearing on most parts of Joshua and Judges, ~~and~~ most of the places mentioned in those books, ~~he has~~ in his appendix, which is the most valuable part of ~~his~~ book, ~~he has~~ a list of the places with a discussion of the ~~situation of the~~ archeological evidence at ~~this~~ place, ~~which~~ is very helpful, even if the place has never actually been excavated, to ~~tell~~ what could be learned from surface examination. But ~~if~~ you read the introduction to Garstang's book, ~~you find that in the introduction, that~~ in this book on Joshua and Judges, I have dealt only with the parts of those books that are from J and E. ~~He says naturally~~ P is a late document ~~and~~ I have not gone into it at all, ~~just copied the parts from J and E and have not dealt with P at all.~~ However, ~~he says~~, strange as it may seem, I have come across some striking archeological corroborations of events

described in P, but ~~he says~~, since that's hardly to be expected, we don't go into P in this book. ~~Well, that just~~ shows ~~you~~ how a great archeologist ~~that~~ way simply takes this ~~as background and as (4 1/4)~~ Now when the Graf-Wellhausen Theory ~~began to be spread~~ I have here ~~the~~ book of James Orr, shortly after 1900, on the problems of the Old Testament. He quotes various ~~ones~~ to show how some thought that J & E were practically non-existent in Joshua. Others thought that much of Joshua was from them, ~~he~~ said some extended on into Judges, some even into Kings. There has been great difference of opinion, but Garstang ~~in his book~~, 20 years later, assumes that ~~you~~ can tell exactly what J and E in Joshua and Judges, ~~and that is the early material so he deals with that, and~~ P ~~came~~ late ~~so he just doesn't pay~~ any attention ~~to P~~.

~~Well~~, Today ~~when they say it~~ is considered, just like the theory of evolution is considered in biology today, a person is not considered a scholar if he does not believe in evolution. ~~I remember~~ When I was in seminary, we heard of a professor at the university of (5 1/2) ~~in Germany~~, who ~~had a great reputation~~, one of the three or four greatest biologists in the world, ~~and~~ Then ~~this man~~ wrote a book attacking evolution, ~~and~~ After that, if you mentioned him to the professor of biology at Princeton University, ~~this man~~, ~~oh, he~~ says, "he's a good biologist, but there are a couple of hundred others just as good." He was ~~dethroned~~ as soon as he began to question evolution. ~~Well, it's~~ the same way with the Graf-Wellhausen Theory. It is assumed ~~to be established~~ fact, ~~and so~~ any ~~student whom you have in your class, whom you have~~ in your church, ~~who~~ goes to a university where anything is taught about the Bible, he is apt to ~~be interested in and want~~ to ~~learn something about~~ what they have to say, ~~and to~~ take these courses, ~~and if he does~~, ~~you~~ he is quite sure to ~~come up against~~ this ~~given~~ as established fact. ~~And~~ if you know the facts about ~~this~~, it ~~should be helpful in trying~~ to ~~be of~~ help to him. ~~But the material that is of great importance in the basic question, most of it came out 50 years ago, rather than within the last few years. So much for subsequent developments.~~

~~Now~~ #6, Summary of the arguments for theory.

Graf-Wellhausen Theory fall into two types. They are: a, The Arguments for Partition.

b, The Arguments for Order of Documents.

But a, The Arguments for Partition, and these are the same arguments that Eichhorn gave about 1800, and of course after all, if you don't have separate, distinct documents, how can you consider the question of whether there is a development from one to the other? So these arguments for Partition are of tremendous importance in any examination of the theory as a whole. I picked up the Cambridge Ancient History, I guess about 30 years ago, when it had just come out, and I remember reading in the Introduction to it, they said in the Introduction to the Cambridge Ancient History which was in about a dozen volumes, they said in the beginning that people reading this will be surprised at the progress that the scholarship has made. Thus, for instance, those who have believed that Moses wrote the Pentateuch and that we have a historical story of the children of Israel coming out of Egypt will learn from the Cambridge Ancient History that actually the Pentateuch is made up of separate documents, of J, E, D, and P, written over a period of many centuries and telling us very little about the early history. On the other hand, they said, it has been widely held during the last 50 years that Homer's Iliad and Odyssey are made up of various documents, combined together, written by different people, but of writers on this in the Cambridge Ancient History feel that this is quite disproved and that we can actually believe in a Homer who wrote these. You see, that the application to the Bible of this divisive criticism was not a unique thing at all. Eichhorn said in his original book, he said, I am going to deal with higher criticism of the Bible. Now he said to many Bible scholars, higher criticism will be something they never heard of, but he said to any student of the classics, it is a familiar term because about 1800 in Germany, before it was applied to the Bible, was being applied to the Iliad and the Odyssey and practically other work of ancient times, and they were divided up into many documents which are supposed to have gotten together through a long process. And that today has been largely given up, it is hardly done at all any more. It is to a little extent, but regarding the Bible, it came from those things

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

to the Bible, ~~it was applied to the Bible in~~ the long process we have looked at, ~~but~~ when it became united with the theory of evolution and as a result of that, ~~that crystallized~~ it, established, ~~it, fixed it~~, and ~~it has been held~~ in just about the form which Wellhausen presented in 1878. It has been held ~~to~~ up to this time, ~~and it and its further development~~ going on into application into other books of the Old Testament and the New Testament, and has been one of the greatest forces ~~in the~~ destruction of Christian faith in our present century, ~~throughout the world has many results. But~~ the arguments are the same ~~as~~ as the arguments given by Eichhorn, ~~the Argument~~ for Partition. ~~The first of those, as you know, is~~ the argument from divine names. We ~~want~~ to look at this, ~~and~~ see just how much or how little validity ~~there is to~~ it has.

It is, of course, very striking that ~~when you read~~ the first chapter of Genesis you find God all through, and the second chapter ~~is~~ the LORD God all through. ~~It is a very~~ striking ~~thing~~, an occurrence ~~like this~~, but it is comparatively seldom that you find anything quite the same elsewhere in the Old Testament, ~~You~~ though you sometimes find the names interlaced and used in various ways. If it were not for this very striking occurrence at the very beginning, I doubt if that would have occurred as a clue to people. Actually, if you've ever read a Russian novel, I'm sure you have observed how freely they switch the names. ~~It seems to be~~ I read a story of Dostoievski ~~once~~ and (Crime and Punishment, ~~it was called~~) ~~-~~ a most fascinating book, and yet when I finished it I could not remember any plot ~~in it~~. There ~~just seemed to be~~ was practically no plot, and yet ~~so~~ it was fascinating all through--tremendous writing. ~~But~~ In the book, ~~everybody in it~~ had a string of about five names, and he seemed to think you would get tired of it if he used the same name more than once in a chapter, so he ~~would speak, say, of a certain name and he'd use~~ might use the first name as she came into the room and then as she came up the aisle, he'd say " Miss so-and-so," and then toward the end he'd refer to her by her title, ~~and~~ pretty soon you'd have had four or five different names, one after the other, ~~and~~ you just had to remember the whole names in each case or you lost the thread. It seemed to be the idea that you had to have variety, and not use the same name

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

too much.

Well, we have a good deal of variety in the Bible , much of which I think can be explained from a similar approach, though not carried to anything like the extreme of these Russian novels. ~~But~~ It ~~just~~ so happens that in Gen.1, ~~deals~~ which deals as a whole with the universe, the general term God, theGod of nature, is used all through, and ~~when you get to~~ in Gen.2, where ~~He is~~ dealing with mankind, ~~He~~ it introduced the name Jehovah, the God of redemption . ~~But~~ we this argument ~~we plan to~~ look at rather carefully, ~~and see what the real factors are regarding it, and the second argument is~~ the Argument from Continuous Narrative. ¶ This is the ~~Argument~~ claim that when you separate these documents each of them gives you ~~the~~ a complete story and therefore ~~they~~ must have originally existed as independent documents. ~~Well, when you look at that,~~ ¶ the original ~~thing~~ was claim that the E document is a complete story, and the J doc ~~is~~ pretty much complete, but now as you know, the E document is divided into two parts, and consequently there is much greater continuity in the J document now than ~~there is~~ in either part of the E doc ~~but~~ to how great an extent is this argument valid? We must look at it ~~that~~ later.

~~Then~~ ¶ (3) the Argument from Parallel Passages. ¶ That is a very strong argument, ~~for~~ if the alleged facts ~~of it~~ can be proven, ~~it is a very strong argument for dividing up into different documents. But it is not an argument for dividing~~...

P.39. (3/4)

...~~actually, but historically it's where it all started so it deserves to be given a separate argument, but~~ ¶ (4) the argument from diversity of style, diction, ideas, and so on. ~~Yes, Mr. MacKeen? (1) Yes, when they did that, they rather much forgot (1 1/4)~~

~~quite completely, but the latest comprehensive book, like~~ ¶ Driver's Intro. to the O. T. ~~, that~~ was for a long time the reigning book in this field in the critical English-speaking world ~~for a decade, but~~ (3) Prof. Pfeiffer of Harvard issued an Intro. to (3) the Old Testament about 30 years ago, (4) which is now the most extensive book of that type ~~that there is today.~~ And Pfeiffer ~~thinks~~ says that the part of the J document in the early chapters of Genesis, ~~he says, really~~ should be separated from J; ~~so~~ he ~~makes~~ calls it an S document, ~~and~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

~~he calls that the S document,~~ making five, and he thinks that S was the very last, ~~but~~ what to be written. What others think was the very first, he thinks was the very last. ~~So~~ When you get that far, ~~of course,~~ ~~this~~ the argument from Continuous Narrative pretty much disappears, ~~but~~ in the original development of the theory, ~~it~~ this was one that a great deal was made of, ~~and even to this day~~ Even now it is often assumed in discussion, ~~a great deal (2), for this,~~ Thus they will say that a certain ~~this~~ document knows nothing about ~~such a thing as this,~~ a particular matter, because it is not mentioned in the material they ~~give~~ assign to that document. ~~Now~~ ~~those~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ four arguments for partition. There are also ~~I had not given you~~ ~~the~~ four arguments for the order of documents, the arguments for development. Those are ~~small b here,~~ the arguments for logical progress, ~~of~~ the arguments (2) (1) perhaps we should say, (3) for development, or for the order of documents. ~~Now~~ These arguments for development ~~are arguments that are~~ were presented by Graf, ~~and~~ Kuenen and Wellhausen, ~~in the change of taking~~ when they said the P document, which had been considered the very oldest, ~~and making it~~ was really the very latest, ~~and~~ ~~they~~ These are the arguments which ~~tied up~~ joined alleged the documentary division with the theory of evolutionary development, and put it into a form which fit the temper of ~~the~~ all age that was moving away from Christianity, ~~and made it stand as it has today~~. So these arguments are very important, ~~and~~ yet, of course, if you don't have separate documents these arguments would mean nothing; so the partition arguments are ~~really~~ equally important, ~~and the~~ most people ~~as a whole~~ know much more about the partition argument than about the development argument, so I ~~have not even given them to you as yet, but I'm going~~ shall to just very briefly list them now, ~~then~~ also we will examine them after we examine the arguments for partition. ~~Now~~ The arguments they give along this line can be divided into four main types, ~~of arguments.~~ well

The first of these is (i) the claim that there are discrepancies. For instance, they ~~take~~ divide up the story of the Flood and give certain verses in it to J and certain verses to P, ~~and~~ ~~certain~~ some to J and ~~certain~~ then some to P, basing it on the use of the names of God ~~or~~ and Jehovah, and also on alleged arguments from style. Also they try to make each a complete story, and they claim to have ~~a complete story.~~ one in each case. Overlooking About 15 years ago I ~~dropped in to a~~ visited a Southern Presbyterian church ~~one night~~ at

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Charlottesville, Virginia, ~~Southern Presbyterian Church, I happened to be in the town that day and I dropped in there,~~ and heard the minister preach on the Flood, and he began his sermon something like this. He said, "Just as you have been confused by the way in which ~~Jude~~ Luke and Mark are combined together in the Gospels, I'm sure you have also been confused when you read the story of the Flood in the Old Testament, by the way in which the various documents are combined together. So," he said, "tonight I am simply going to read you ~~those books on~~ sections of the story of the Flood which are from the J-E documents, and ~~we will ignore the~~ parts from the P doc. Then ~~so~~ he read certain portions of ~~it~~ this biblical account and then proceeded to give a very good evangelical sermon on the meaning of the Flood for the Christian life, ~~taken from~~ based on these sections, while assuming that the others ~~simply~~ were not reliable as being from the P document. When the critics ~~Now the way they~~ divide up the story of the Flood, ~~up,~~ they give most of the expressions of time to the P document, because ~~P as you know,~~ they say that P is interested in figures and enumeration, ~~history, and so on, therefore~~ so they assign most figures ~~are given~~ to P. After they ~~him, so you~~ give the passages that have figures in them, such as ~~to~~ the length of the Flood ~~given~~ to ~~the~~ P ~~document,~~ there are ~~you have~~ very few ~~of them~~ left in the J document, ~~and when you get through with this, you find~~ so they say there is a discrepancy, ~~because~~ They say that according to the P document, the Flood lasted about a year, while according to the J document it lasted only a few days. This alleged ~~so that is a~~ discrepancy, ~~it is a~~ created ~~discrepancy~~ by giving the figures (2) to the one (1) that gives the periods of time (3) and not to the other, ~~and~~ A great many of the alleged discrepancies are like this; others ~~of them~~ are created by assuming that two stories are the same when they're really different events, like saying that the story in Genesis 1, how Abraham went into Egypt and lied about his wife ~~Sarah~~, there ~~in Egypt~~. The story in Genesis 21, how he went into the land of the Philistines and there lied about Sarah to Abimelech, ~~of the Philistines.~~ are really the same story. They claim that ~~Now the assumption is made,~~ one of these is the J story, and the other ~~is~~ the E story, ~~they're both the story~~ of the same event, and ~~but according~~ then say that the fact that one says (3) and says it happened it happened in Egypt, ~~according to~~ the other in Philistia, ~~and so there~~ is a discrepancy. Well, ~~as you see, we'll~~ will go into that fully later; now I'm just giving a couple of illustrations ~~now~~ to show how the argument is ordinarily not valid. But once ~~one~~ you get into

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

this mode of thinking, they find innumerable discrepancies in the Old Testament, and you will find many, many people, with fine evangelical backgrounds, who taken some training under men who accept the Graf-Wellhausen theory who will be very strongly convinced that these discrepancies exist, these contradictions, and, but this we know, that the first argument which is from discrepancy, is an argument which might be used to prove different documents, and even different documents written at different times, different groups which had no contact with each other, but it is not an argument which proves development, or order, or progress, so that it is, while important in a group, it is less important for showing that the alleged evolutionary development than the later argument.

Now #2 is a very important argument, #2, The Claim that we find logical progress in the documents. Thus they say in the J document Abraham makes an altar wherever he feels like it, and they say the E document, which has the book of the covenant in it, follows in general this tradition. The Lord says, wherever I place my name, you shall sacrifice to me. Well, of course we say that's what he said at the beginning of the wilderness journey, and they were sacrificing in the wilderness, and they were but that is the first stage, two steps in the first stage of J and E. Then they say, Deuteronomy says you shall worship only in the place that God sets apart; when you come into the land you shall worship only in that place where God's altar is, that is, the unifying of the altar in one place, they say that could not have occurred until the time of Josiah, and that, they say, is the next step in it, is the unifying of it, forgetting all other worship, and then they say, that the P document assumes that it is at the one place, the P document having been written after the exile, at the time of the return, according to that theory. Well, now, you see, they claim a logical process, but you notice it is not four different steps actually. Actually, there are only two steps, but the way they express it it sounds like three or four. They make arguments like that all through, about the priests, about the offerings, and about a hundred other things, but hardly any of them sounds nearly as convincing as these two, about the altars and the priests. Those are their strongest points. So we

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

will look at those points with a fair amount of detail. Like on the priests, their claim is that in J, Abraham offered sacrifices, wherever he was, then they say, that in E, they say, you have sacrifice offered by heads of families. There is not much evidence on which to base that, but they claim that's what E teaches. Then, they say, according to D only the Levites can offer sacrifices, restricted to one tribe. Well, D is Deuteronomy. Moses' addresses to the people, in which he exhorts them not to sacrifice, it is -- but all of those are for the Levitical priests, who are in charge of sacrifice. But then when you get to P, they say, there after the exile, it is restricted still further, and restricted to the priests, not all the Levites, but just the priests can sacrifice, and so they say the whole story of Aaron is part of P, because he is the High Priest, and the trouble is you find Aaron mentioned 8 times in J-E, so in every one of these times this is, the redactor who combined the documents who inserted a mention there into the J-E document. Well, of course that kind of argument, you see the weakness of it. But the claim is that you have these various stages here, now there they claim to have three stages, as you see, and they claim that there are hundreds of other cases where there is progress noted between the laws. We say, no, that the covenant told at the beginning of the wilderness journey is the brief law that God gave the people as they began their progress from Sinai, then that the priestly legislation, so-called is the book for the priests that gives the minute detail that the people as a whole don't need to know, but you go and look up in the book, and then the Deuteronomy is Moses' exhortation to the people just before coming into the promised land, about the details of the law they are to obey. But they claim to see this progress to them. so this is a big argument we must look at in some detail. #(2).

(3) is a very, very strong argument, if the facts on which they allege it, can be proved. (3). Violation of laws as evidence of non-existence. In other words, the argument from history. They claim that these laws, which are supposed to have been given by Moses, you do not find actually being observed until the time when they say the documents were written. Now if that can be proven, that's a very, very strong argument.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

~~So we must go into that as much as we can when we get to that~~

¶ Since The partition argument ~~being~~ is the more obvious one, we have to spend more time on it. ~~Yes?~~

~~(13 1/2) No, what~~ ¶ They say ~~is not simply that wickedness--but~~ that good men, for instance, Samuel, ~~goes~~ about and sacrifices here and here and here and here. Now, they say, if the law was there, ~~and we can~~ to sacrifice only at Jerusalem, ~~how would~~ surely a good man like Samuel ~~be able to~~ would obey it, ~~then?~~ Of course, the answer is that the Philistines held the land and you couldn't sacrifice in the one place, and God preferred a sacrifice under the direction of a godly leader like Samuel, in various places, in that interregnum position. It doesn't prove non-existence of the law, but that it couldn't ~~(14 1/2)~~ be observed under those conditions. We will ~~Well we'll~~ go into that later.

P.40. (3/4)

~~...the years between 1875 and 1890, except for a comparatively few cases, because the trend was against division like this.~~ ¶ I mentioned to you how in the Cambridge Ancient History, it said in the edition that came out at about 1920, that according to their writers, Homer was a real man who wrote most of the Iliad and the Odyssey. Fifty years hardly anybody believed that, they were all convinced that the Iliad and the Odyssey came together by a prophet, like they believed about the Pentateuch with ~~the~~ many different writers. And to this day, there are some who hold that about the Iliad and the Odyssey. But there has been a big swing against it and there are many classical scholars who believe in the unity of the Iliad and the Odyssey as a whole, there are others who believe that there might be different writers, but that each of them is a unit, and while there are some who divide up a fair amount, it is nothing like it was a hundred years ago, now. But inthe case of the Pentateuch, the arguments for partition , which presented the evolutionist with the idea that you had a set of different documents which were put together to form the Pentateuch, these became crystallized and set by the connection with the being brought in connection with the evolutionary theory, and with the Hegelian ideas of development. So we look at b, the arguments for the order of documents, that these documents are different documents

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

showing development. And the first of these we mentioned was the claim that there are discrepancies between the documents. That's a long ways from the position of Astruc and Eichhorn. They said Moses used sources and we can identify the sources. Well, Moses used sources and if those sources disagreed, it would stand to reason that Moses would try to make a decision as to which was correct or else he would at least state his ignorance onthe matter. He would not simply include two things which sharply contradicted each other. But according to the critical theory that is held now there are such sharp contradictions and discrepancies between the documents that it is very evident that the writers of one were in ignorance of the other. And that the ideas were in many points contradictory. Now that doesn't prove development, but it is a step in the direction of development, to show that they are not, as someone might suggest, one original document, one original story, passed and gotten into three different forms, and then these forms again put together. That sort of thing of course can happen. We have the four Gospels written by four apostles of the Lord, telling the account of the events in different ways, different manners, but we do not believe any contradiction between them. And in the 4th century A.D. there was a man who combined them, taking sections of one, sections of the other, keeping the same words, putting them together, into his diatesseron, so we have one story of Christ. Now (3 1/2) Tatian , in making that came across a statement that Jesus did a miracle in Jericho and another statement that describes the identical same miracle, only describes it as up in Galilee somewhere, you may be sure that if Tatian put them both in exactly as they were, he would be of the opinion that they were two different miracles, not that there was a contradiction. But if he thought they were accounts of just the one miracle, he'd either say it happened in Jericho or he'd say it happened in Galilee. He would not include anything that he considered to be a contradiction. And so if there are discrepancies it points very strongly against there being simply developments of one original source. And that fits with the development theory. Mr. MacKeen did you have a question? (4)

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

In fact, as a matter of fact, originally, none of it was done fromthe English. It was done at first by French scholars, German scholars, and then there were some English scholars who took part in it, there have also been Italians and people of other nationalities, no, they certainly would not use English except as a rough manner of presentation. The (2) we mentioned was the idea of this logical ~~process~~ progress and I gave you one or two illustrations of it. They say that inthe J document we have a few very simple sentences, in the E document we have a number of quite elaborate things, and in the P document you have a great number of festivals with all little details of it given in great multitude. They say that shows a logical progression of development, we say nothing of the kind, we say in entering the wilderness, they were given knowledge about a few main things to do, then, we say, God gave to Moses what they call the P document, the law book for the priests, giving full detail about various festivals that people wouldn't keep in mind, but the priests could have it in a book so they could apply it when the proper times came. And then that in Deuteronomy just before they go into the land of Palestine, Moses exhorted the people to obey the law and repeated those parts of it which it was vital that people should have in mind, not merely go and ask the priests about when occasion arose, therefore that he took the festivals that occur most frequently and dealt with them, stressing those things that the people needed to know. Now we're going to have a day of prayer, I believe you all know, a week from today, that is our semi-annual day of prayer, we have these days of prayer and our program becomes rather stereotyped, we have certain things at certain times through the day, for all of you, members of the faculty, different kinds of prayer meetings, and meetings, and so on. But when it comes, I always ask well now what time is the faculty prayer meeting this year? I always ask that, and the Registrar puts it on the mimeographed sheet. It varies sometimes from one year to the other, and somebody said to me it is just the same time it has been the last three times. I will immediately say, what is that? I do not try to remember the details of this. Why should I? Each time we see what it is, if there is a problem we can look back and see

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

what the records were. When it comes to details of things like that that occur infrequently there is no point in asking people to remember them. You write them down and look them up when the time comes, but there are things that it is very important to stress so that everybody will have constantly in mind. We thus have a difference between the priests law book , which is Leviticus and Numbers, and the law book for the people , which is Deuteronomy. People are free to read the priests' book, the priests are supposed to be familiar with the people's book, but the purpose of the two is different. However, the critics argue that there are a hundred or more cases, they find, where you can show development from the simple to the more complex and then the more elaborate, or development as the Hegelians say, from the thesis, the antithesis and the synthesis . Some kind of a progressive development between the three or four. Usually they don't have an argument for more than two as a rule, sometimes three, but they claim four documents.

Now (3) I just mentioned at the end of the hour, violation of laws as evidence of non-existence, and that is an argument of which much is made, and one which can be very effective as an argument. If God said, you shall worship only in Jerusalem, only there shall you sacrifice, if that is what God said, in Deuteronomy, why then did Samuel go about from place to place holding sacrifices? Wicked men disobey the law, yes. But when good men disobey it, is not it pretty good evidence that there never was such a law up to that time. We have it now, I believe it is in the Constitution of the United States, isn't it, that the president is inaugurated on January 8--or something like that, early in January--and that is in our Constitution I believe, now if somebody tells me that Abraham Lincoln was--that this was in the Constitution when it was made and Abraham Lincoln was inaugurated on January 8, 1860 and again 1861 and again 1865, I'd say well now I read in the history books that it wasn't till March 4, he was inaugurated. Well, they say, it couldn't have been, the Constitution says it is January 8, or whenever it is. Well, I 'd say the history books say he was inaugurated March 4, I guess they couldn't make up their minds whether to inaugurate him or not, so they waited and had it two months

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

late. Well, they say, that doesn't explain it. Well, what is the explanation? The explanation is that this law was unknown at that time. The Constitution of the United States says March 4, is when the president is inaugurated. And it was only within the last twenty years that a change was made to change it to January, because of our increased communications, there is no sense in waiting that long. In the old days, you didn't even know by January who was elected, so it would have been silly to inaugurate in January. Today you know the very next day and it is perfectly silly to have a president who may have been repudiated in the election continue to be the head of the government for six months after the election, two or three months is plenty, two months, in between. So in changing conditions, we have changed the law. Now they say, the law of Deuteronomy was made in the time of Josiah, it fits the time of Josiah, they say. It represents the law of that time, now when you find good people acting according to entirely different principles at an earlier period, that is proof that the law had not been made at that time, that particular law. Therefore, they say, you can't possibly believe that Moses wrote it.

Now, I am anxious you know just what this argument is, that is very important. As to the details of the argument, we will go into them later. We are going to take up the eight arguments more or less in order, so at present I will not go into details of this argument, and the facts leading to it. But we will mention the 8th argument, that is the 4th under development, which is very similar. Well, it's not similar to this, but there is an overlapping. The 4th argument under development is the appropriateness of section to particular periods. I mentioned the argument just a minute ago that the law that they are to sacrifice only at Jerusalem was not known before the time of Josiah, because we find it was regarded repeatedly before that time, even by good men.

Now this argument is the situation of Josiah's time was one which fits in with the laws of Deuteronomy. This is an argument which applies more to Deuteronomy than to any of the other documents, so it is also applied to the P document, which they will say, contains certain things that would fit with the sort of ideas of the time of the exile,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

~~about the previous history of Israel~~, but ~~which~~ would hardly fit with the situation at any previous time. Appropriateness of section to the particular period. As far as development is concerned, while all four of the arguments need to be investigated, the second and the third ~~as you see~~, are by far the most vital ~~as far as~~ for claiming such a development, ~~is concerned.~~ Now I hesitate about ~~what~~ how to arrange ~~ment to give~~ these arguments, which they are all inter-related, ~~and~~ I thought for a minute of just dealing withthe partition arguments, and giving you the development arguments later, ~~altogether~~, but it seems to me you'll now get that ~~have~~ a better realization of the importance of the partition arguments ~~by having a little~~ if you have some idea of ~~what~~ the development arguments first. So ~~that~~ I wanted to state them ~~to you~~ in this brief form, ~~and~~ I want you to be sure to remember what these eight arguments are, ~~and I think it wouldn't hurt to remember them~~ in the order in which I gave them. ~~To have in mind what the arguments are,~~ You don't need at this time to worry about having much detail of particular incident under the last four arguments, but ~~just~~ be sure you know what they are. We will ~~what the arguments are~~. But ~~we're going to~~ take up the arguments in order and ~~going to~~ examine them and to see just how much or how little each of them proves. ~~And so we go on to III~~:

III, Examination of the Argument. for Partition .

~~P.41. (1/2)~~

~~Examination of the arguments for partition, we will mention first A, which you all know:~~

A, Divine Names . ~~Now under that we will notice certain points about it.~~

1, The Priority of this Criteria. ~~That is a~~ It is a point ~~that~~ is important ~~for us~~ to have in mind. Some ~~today~~ will say, ~~oh, well~~, That the divine names are ~~that's~~ just one among a hundred stylistic elements, that ~~is not~~ how we divide. ~~we could easily see how different~~ these documents ~~are.~~ Well, ~~we~~ will see ~~examine~~ later how much truth or falsity there is to such an argument, ~~as that~~. But one thing that we should have in mind is that this is where the division starts. In time this has priority. It was on this basis that they first divided into two main documents and then later into three (not counting Deuteronomy). It was on this basis originally. This was the start on which it was made. It is highly questionable whether

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

the documentary division ~~as a basis~~ that they are so sure of, ever would have gotten started if it were not for this fact, and of course, it is a very interesting ~~thing~~ that it so happened that the book of Genesis begins with a chapter that has only the word God, never the word Jehovah, while the second, third and fourth chapters use the expression the LORD Jehovah twenty times in the course of a few chapters. Thus as far as our use of the divine names is concerned, there is a sharp change between the first chapter and the second, third and fourth, and this ~~change~~ gave the start-off to the (2) theory. So it is pretty hard for anybody to push it aside and say oh this is just a minor argument, This is ~~not the main thing, this is how it started. This is what~~ where Astruc started ~~gave originally~~ and all the critics give great credit to Astruc and Eichhorn as having been the first who started the process which led (2) to their (1) finally (3) fully developed theory, ~~and it started with this, the priority of this material~~.

Now if the Bible had been arragged differently, one wonders if one ever would have thought of ~~it.~~ this for ~~Because~~ there are very few instances where you have such a situation, ~~just like this,~~ a full chapter with just God, and I don't mean ~~with just God, I mean with~~ one or two occurences, but quite a wide usage of the word God. You can find (2) chapters (1) later (3) ~~on~~ that have only the word God, ~~in it~~, followed by a chapter that only has the word Jehovah, ~~in~~, but maybe the word God is used only two times in the one chapter, and Jehovah only three times in the other, ~~but~~ there you have God used many ~~offhand, I would guess at least ten or fifteen~~ times, ~~maybe more in the first chapter,~~ and you have (2) Jehovah God used in the second, third (3) and fourth chapters (1) repeatedly. That is not found ~~a saying that is~~ over and over ~~through~~ in the Pentateuch; it merely ~~just~~ starts that way. Elsewhere you do not find ~~it~~, a chapter or two of one, and then chapter or two of the other. You ~~a chapter or two of one, a chapter or two of the other, you~~ (1) just don't find it, not with great numbers (3) ~~in it~~ at least (2). So much ~~as for the priority of the criterion~~. (4) of occurences.

Now point #2 is very important. #2 like point #1 is repetitious, something you are already familiar with, but it is so important that we need to stress it.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

¶ #2, The Graf-Wellhausen Theory breaks up this criterion. ¶ Eichhorn was sure ~~you had a~~ one document, the Elohist, ~~Elohim~~ using Elohim all through Genesis, and another, The Jehovist, ~~Jehovah all through, or~~ while substantially all through. ~~And~~ the Supplementary Theory ~~holds it, while they~~ did not believe in a J document at all, they believed there was an original document, the foundation writing, which used Elohim all through Genesis, and ~~then~~ they believed that the Jehovah supplementary inserted the J material, ~~But~~ The theory (1) (2) the Graf-Wellhausen ~~takes~~ the Elohist document ~~and~~ divides it in half, ~~I don't mean~~ not in half like you cut a yardstick in half, but they take out sections here and here and ~~do it, and~~ say these are the first Elohist, which they now call P and put at the very end of the development, Then ~~and these others~~ started in with Genesis 20 ~~and making~~ now call most of the Elohist material ~~from there on~~ in, the rest of Genesis ~~those~~ are the second ~~Elohist~~ E Elohist or the E document. ~~and~~ Actually, they say, the E document is so much like the J document that, except for the divine names, they are very, very hard to distinguish, ~~and in fact~~ ¶ Most of them will admit that there are many passages, perhaps at least one-third of the material, which they say you can't tell whether it is J or E, so they say the J and E were combined and they call that ~~J-E~~ JE. So though ~~when~~ they talk about four documents, in actual practice there really are three: ~~there is J-E combined with J and E, and~~ JE, and then D, and then P. ~~And of course these (6 1/2)~~ Most of D is in the books of Deuteronomy, so in the other four books you have really only two main documents, ~~J-E~~ JE, and P. ~~and J-E~~ JE uses Jehovah about half the time and Elohim about half the time, so (2) ~~that~~ this criterion is entirely broken up (1) in the Graf-Wellhausen Theory. ~~And~~ That being the case it ~~is~~ no longer can be logically used as the main support for the theory, but the average person who holds the theory doesn't realize that ~~they~~ at all he may know these facts but ~~they don't think them through~~ he does not realize in their significance in this regard. ~~They would~~ He may say, why it's perfectly obvious, you have one writer who uses Jehovah, another uses Elohim; ~~and~~ and who yet when you ask them what the main documents are, why the early one is ~~J-E~~ JE, made up of J and E, and ~~J-E~~ JE uses sometimes one name and sometimes the other. We have in our library a set of books put out in order to

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

present the ~~theory, the~~ documents of the Hexateuch, ~~and there is~~ a volume which is called "the oldest book of Hebrew History." ~~This~~ book is the ~~J-E~~ document, ~~It~~ gives you in English what the writer thinks was the original ~~J-E~~ document, ~~and he~~ puts one of these, in Roman type and one ~~of them~~ in italics, so that you can tell what is J and what is E, but a third of it at least--maybe half--~~he~~ indicated simply as ~~J-E~~ that you can't separate into J and E. so that actually J and E become ~~rather~~ very uncertain, ~~but~~ they are sure there is a difference between ~~J-E~~ and P, They are very sure of that, and in ~~J-E~~ between ~~that and P~~ this criterion is not much help, ~~actually~~. Though in the argument it always sounds as if it is. You read in any book, from a critical viewpoint, and you come to ~~the third~~ a certain chapter and they'll say the presence of Jehovah in this chapter makes clear it is from the J document, ~~They'll say~~, we immediately recognize that this is from the Elohist because of the use of the name Elohim. ~~That is #2. Now #3 is another fact that you are familiar with but that it is important to stress.~~

#3, This Criterion is confined almost entirely to the book of Genesis.

~~Your~~ alternation of divine names, ~~having~~ a fairly long passage using one and then a fairly long passage ~~with~~ the other, does not occur to any great extent after Genesis. The critics say that the P document uses the term Elohim as far as Exodus 6.3, ~~and then they say~~ in Ex. 6.3 ~~when~~ the name Jehovah was revealed after ~~that~~ the P document always uses Jehovah. ~~Well, if it does~~, from there on, you ~~have~~ only Jehovah in all three documents (in all four, counting Deuteronomy). So this criterion is no use after ~~it~~, Yet it is ~~a very~~ interesting ~~thing~~ that ~~along, later on~~, in Exodus (after Ex. 6) ~~you have~~ a couple of long passages fairly ~~long~~, that use Elohim. Why did they do that? ~~When~~ ~~everybody~~ agrees the name Jehovah was known by that time, ~~but except for those~~, the criterion is only good as far as Genesis is concerned, and I don't think that most people realize that. You will find people who say, ~~well~~, of course these documents, perfectly obvious, look at the different names they use, ~~and~~ the impression they have is that ~~it~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

goes right through the ~~same~~ mall. Actually the criterion is of no use, ~~practically speaking,~~ after the early part of the book of Exodus. ~~Then #4.~~

4, In Genesis and in early Exodus this criterion is not used consistently; in many cases the names are mixed. ~~Now~~ When I say "many" I don't mean 80% or even 40%.. The mixtures are not frequent, but neither are they rare. There are quite a number of ~~cases~~ places where the names are mixed and ~~where~~ you'll have one and then the other and then one and then the other, ~~and~~ in such cases the critics ~~will~~ say that the redactors who put them together changed one of the names. Or they will perhaps say, that half a verse ~~goes to~~ is from E and half a verse ~~goes to~~ from J. And even where they do that, sometimes they say that the redactor changed the name! ~~it actually was different from that originally.~~ It is true that in most of what they give to the P document before Ex.6, the name Jehovah does not occur, but even there are a very few places where it does. ~~But when it comes to the J documents and the E documents~~ Also there are in the material that they give to J, there are quite a large number of occurrences of the word Elohim, and in the material that they give to E, there are a few occurrences of the name Jehovah. The clue is used to quite an extent, but it is not absolutely complete. There are a number of cases where the names are mixed, and where they say, well, the redactor changed it, when he combined the two documents." ~~This is a matter which I don't think that I will take time to give you illustrations of~~, but I will give you some assignments, so that you can look at some of these ~~documents, you've already got your list of the occurrences made of names in the different verses, and you can~~ passages and thus see ~~you will get a better realization of it I think from seeing~~ how the names are occasionally mixed.

~~Now, as I mentioned,~~ In the J documents, ~~you do have quite a few Elohims,~~ it is mainly Jehovah, but you have quite a few Elohims, ~~and~~ In this case the critics come up with a good answer, they say that Elohim is used in the J document where the name Jehovah wouldn't quite fit, for instance, ~~they say,~~ where Satan speaks. It wouldn't do, they say that, in Gen.2, to put the sacred name Jehovah into ~~his~~ Satan's mouth when he says, "Has God said?" And they say that when ~~he~~ Eve is talking to Satan ~~she~~ she doesn't ~~take~~ use the sacred name...

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

...uses the term God in a form he would understand, instead of the proper name Jehovah. Well, we'll look at those from arguments a little bit under another head, but at this point, we will simply to stress the fact that the critics do admit that in the J document, they have to account for quite a few occurrences of Elohim and they admit that in the passages it is used because it was felt to be more fitting than the name Jehovah.

Now #5, Within the Documents we find that sometimes other similar names, which are used in a similar way. The most striking instance of this is Jacob and Israel. You don't have --you don't find that one of these alleged documents always calls him Jacob and or that one always calls him Israel. Now probably in the case of Abram and Sara, as you all know I believe, all the documents speak of Abram and Sarai, until and then we are told that God changed the name of Abram to Abraham and of Sarai to Sarah, and Well, you read on in Genesis, and after you are told that, you will always find Sarah and you'll always find Abraham, It is just as what you would expect. It has nothing to do with documents. The names are changed, and the new names are always used. But you find that Jacob is told that his name shall no longer be called Jacob but shall be called Israel, Before that time it is different in the case of Jacob before he is always called Jacob, never Israel. Now we are told that his name is not to be Jacob any more but Israel, because as a prince with God he has prevailed. There is After this, we you find that sometimes he is called Jacob and sometimes he is called Israel. And The two names occur about equal, frequency from that time on. And you cannot say, well, it would seem quite natural to say, yes, one of these documents always calls him Jacob, because it the other one didn't know about the change of name, but always calls him Jacob, the other one knew about the change of name and calls him Israel. But it is not the least bit consistent. In Gen.32.28, the J document, what they call the J document announces that Jacob's name is changed to Israel, But from there on, in what they give to the J document, sometimes you find Jacob used, and sometimes you find Israel used. In what they assign to P the change of name is announced in Gen.25.10, but And yet from there on, P, the document always uses the term Jacob except for one case. There is One case in the P document where it calls him Israel, but all the rest of it keeps on calling him

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Jacob. The so-called E document includes nothing about the change of Jacob's name, but it uses both names and it keeps on using both names right through. ~~Yes? (J.Gueiros: Sir, this is rather confusing, would you go a bit slower please, because I don't get finished.)~~ ~~Yes, well, the point is this, that~~ up to a certain point, Jacob is Jacob, just like Abram was Abram up to a certain point. Then after that point Abram became Abraham and he ~~was~~ is always called Abraham. ~~Well, now,~~ But you read in Genesis and you ~~find that~~ that doesn't happen with Jacob. Jacob is told ~~your~~ this name will be Israel, ~~he is told that~~ One of these, a couple of times, ~~The one time that he is told it~~ that, they say, is part of the J document, and one ~~time,~~ they say, is part of the P document. So you have parallels, he is told it in the J document, he is told it in the P document. But as you read on in Genesis you find he is sometimes called Jacob and sometimes called Israel. ~~And~~ Why is ~~it?~~ this? ~~Well,~~ I don't know of any reason, And I don't think anybody else knows of any reason. But if the argument is valid that when you have Jehovah it shows one document and when you have Elohim it shows another document, it would seem to be quite natural to think that when ~~you have~~ both Jacob and Israel are used, the same argument would apply, that one document knew that his name was changed and so they changed it and called it Israel from there on, while the other document didn't know his name was changed so they ~~accepted the same, they~~ called it Jacob. But as a matter of fact, it doesn't work out that way. You follows the division that the critics make in the J-E and P documents and you find that here their division does not accord with the change of the names, ~~in~~ Israel. (1) From Jacob to (2)

(3) All three of their documents call him Jacob sometimes and Israel sometimes ~~All three of them,~~ and that applies just as much to the document that doesn't mention the change of name as it does to the two which did. I have precise data about each one of them, but I can see that that would be confusing ~~to get~~ (2) unless I just dictated it (1) to you, (3) and you just put it down, I don't think there is any necessity of that, ~~so I give you the main point and I think that goes far enough. Mr. MacKeen? (6 3/4)~~ ~~Yes~~, The alleged E document does not mention his name being changed, But ~~It does not say that his name~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

~~was changed, but as to~~ after the point where the other documents say it was changed, the E document sometimes changes it, and sometimes doesn't. ~~In other words~~, The E document must have known it was changed, but it doesn't change it consistently, any more than the others do. ~~So that it is not--this which they apply to these names does not apply to the other~~ one. Now suppose that the Pentateuch had been written like the Odyssey was written, or like Virgil's Aeneid was written. The classical style of writing was, as probably many of you know, to start in the middle, ~~and they tell, for instance, in Aeneid about Aeneid down in Carthage in Athens, and they tell about how he landed there,~~ from the shipwreck, ~~and how he was taken care of there, and everything,~~ and then when you get in the ~~middle~~ of a situation, Then they have a big dinner and he tells them all about his previous experience, at the dinner. ~~So you get him telling all the battles,~~ so you start in the middle. ~~Well,~~ Many ancient books ~~used to do~~ did that, ~~quite regularly,~~ They would start in the middle, and then tell what preceded in the form of somebody telling it to us. ~~Well, now~~ Let's suppose the Bible had done that, ~~Suppose~~ it had started ~~in~~ with chapters that had Jacob all through a chapter and Israel all through a chapter. ~~Well, maybe~~ Then perhaps the critical theory would have started on that basis ~~of~~ instead of on the basis of Elohim and Jehovah. ~~But~~ If so, ~~you~~ they couldn't have divided the documents the way they divide them because the criteria would work an entirely different way. I think that is quite interesting argument against the general validity of this approach. ~~Well, we go on to #6.~~ Stop 3/2/91

Start 6, ~~That~~ There is a similar use of divine names in the Koran and in Ugaritic. Now let me say just a word about ~~both~~ each of these. Koran is an Arabic word related to the Hebrew word ~~K~~Qarah, to read. Koran is that which is read by Mohammedans. And the Koran is the Mohammedan Bible, but it is not made like our Bible. ~~It~~ is not ~~made~~ an account of the history of the world, showing God's dealings with men. ~~It is~~ It consists of the sermons of Mohammed and the revelation which Mohammed claims to have received. ~~And~~ After Mohammed's death these were arranged in the order of length, with the longest ones put first, and the shortest ones put last. ~~And that~~ This is pretty much the opposite order ~~than~~ from the order in which

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

he claims to have received them. But as you look at the Koran you find that Mohammed was a very great preacher, he was a remendous exhorter, and you have a glowing record that this very beautiful in many places. And he goes through exhorts people to turn away from their idols and turn away from their fire gods and follow Allah, this is his name for God. But he will call Him by various terms, various names, and by you will find that he used one term for God a ways for a while and then he uses another Arabic word for God, then he comes back and there is an alternation, back and forth. You cannot divide the Koran up into documents on the basis of the divine names. It is a rather common thing to use different words for variety, which mean exactly the same thing, or approximately the same thing, to use them for variety. And then of course it is very common today, as I mentioned before, the sports writers, if you read anything by them--I haven't read anything by them for 30 years, I guess but they used to be, 30 years ago, they were just what wrote was full of a variety of names, and unless the style is completely changed (I imagine it is the same now)--they just have variety of names which they think makes a more sprightly style. Well, in the --you can't say that something because it is done today, it used to be that way, but we do find them in the Koran, quite parallel to what we find in the Bible.

Dr. Robert Dick Wilson went all through the Koran and wrote an article in the Princeton Theological Review in which he listed every section, (11 1/4)* they call them, the chapters of the Koran, some of which may be three or four hundred verses long and some only two or three, he listed them all and told how many times the name God and how many times the name LORD occurred in each one, and it is interesting to see the tremendous variety and how they're mixed together in the Koran.

Now in Ugaritic, which is something which has not been known to us as long as the Koran has, in fact, the Ugaritic is the set of documents, clay tablets, discovered in the ancient city of Ugarit, which is in Northern Lebanon, on the seacoast, it is a set of tablets from a place at which excavation only began in 1928, and there has been found a great part of the literature of the ancient Canaanites, there and it has many interesting

*numbers correct now - Bible is working.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

myths and epics about their gods, and they will call their god by one term, another call him by another, alternate for variety's sake, and there is quite a similar variation to what was is in the Bible, and if you look in the psalms, often you will find a variety in parallel verses, one using one name, one using the other name. You find that with Jacob and Israel, even in Genesis. You will read that Jacob mourned and all his sons and daughters rode up to comfort Israel, who would not be comforted. That shows alternation, you find. So that this is not something that is unique in the Bible, it is also found in the Koran and in Ugaritic, Well that clock is moving fast, we have only 12 minutes left so I better give you your question rapidly. There are four parts to each question so that leaves you only about three minutes for each of them, but one of them may take six or seven, one of them only one or two, use your judgment.

The beginning of the question is the same for every one...

P.44. (1/4)

...really first, out of those two, and although soon they came to put it second, so that the order that today all scholars accept is J-E-D-P. Now of course, today, there is an absolute consensus on this and there has been for nearly sixty years. But during the twenty years after Kuenen first proposed it, there were all kinds of views, some thought E was earlier, some thought J was earlier, and so on. The consensus has been arrived at and is held by nearly all critical scholars, that doesn't mean (1) but there was tremendous interest in it for a while. Today very few are trying to prove it, they're just taking what was given them as established and accepted, so today you have a crystallized view, not I think that it can be proven right at all, but they simply cease arguing about it and accept it as a view that the larger number of them held.

#3 here says, is there any difference at all between the partition theory and Eichhorn's. Those are two entirely different things, the theory of partition means the idea that you can separate the Pentateuch into distinct documents, which existed, according to the theory, as complete and separate documents before they were united. Now that is what

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Eichhorn held, and that is what Hupfeld held in a different form. It has been held in many different forms, partition theory, or document theory. Of course partition theory has been applied even to the supplementary theory. Anything that divides it up into separate things that are supposed to have been interrelated, we will call a partition theory. I am using the term partition now for the matter of dividing into alleged separate productions, as distinct from the matter of development , which claims to show how these developed from simple to complex, and thus to show a progress in them.

Well, I hope that discussion of these three questions is of some clarification to you because this critical theory is very involved, which makes it all the more important that we do not simply leave all of the people who are not under our direct teaching, simply over in one group there, to believe this is what is ~~true~~ proven, and we over here believe it is not proven , and the two have no communication with each other. // Nothing is gained by that sort of a situation. We should understand what they believe and the bases upon which they rest, and it would be very silly to confuse people who know nothing about this business with trying to explain it to them, ~~very foolish~~. But, and In your work as ministers you ~~are going to~~ will meet comparatively few who know anything about this, but those few you meet will be among the most influential people. They will be people who have been fine Christians and have gone off to school to get training, and have been told this is what ~~is proven, what~~ all scholars believe, and have accepted it as fact, ~~and~~ today it is assumed in most of the books that ~~are~~ published, dealing with the origin of the Pentateuch, ~~in most of the books that are published in the Bible, assume this as fact~~. Very few books today ~~discuss it to~~ try to prove it, but a great many assume it as fact, and simply state certain features of it, ~~and~~ It is good to know upon what alleged evidence those arguments rest. ~~So that~~ What we have done these last few weeks is very important as foundation for examination of the eight different arguments, which we have started and ~~which~~ we will ~~carry on~~ continue from here on. /Stop 3/4/91

Start From here on you could completely miss the discussion of one of the arguments

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

and yet you could go right on and consider the other, but you can't consider any of them if you don't have an idea what it is they are dealing with, and that is why what we have done thus far is so tremendously important. And that is why I'm having these quizzes twice a week in order to give you a little extra spur to keep up with the material ~~it and to have it well~~ in mind. ~~I am very sorry but I do not yet have ready the odd numbered papers for a week ago today. Thought I would have them long before this but I do not have them.~~ I have ~~the even ones through last Thursday, Feb. 19, the even numbered. I have the odd ones through Feb. 15, will have the others very soon. But on the basis of these it is pretty easy to tell about how well~~ you are doing in it. ~~And on the basis of these~~ we can say that there ~~are, thus far, only two who~~ have missed three of these quizzes. ~~Those two who have missed three of these quizzzes~~ have the option ~~of taking the special voluntary quiz, this~~ week, if they desire, in which case the mark they get in it will be substituted for those three. If they do not take it they will simply receive a zero in those three, but what is far more important than that, will not have foundation to go on with what follows. Mr. Golin? (5 1/2) How will I grade them? According to the correctness of the material. (stu) I noticed you had a zero and I looked it over very carefully, your particular one, because I didn't expect you to get a zero , and I tried to convince my conscience I could give you a 1 on that question, but had to leave it a zero. Your other marks are usually much better, and if you'll speak to me personally, I'll be glad to explain just what was wrong with that particular question. But any of you, any time, please come and see me if you don't understand the reason for the marks, for that is the very purpose we have in mind, is to show you where you don't have something. Mr. MacKeen? (6 1/4) A brief statement is what we mean. (stu) No, it is very difficult to make questions that are foolproof, very difficult. I mean to say, you write a question and somebody can put the accent in a different place, and sometimes when you make a question in an examination, you are thinking of a certain accent, and then you later can realize that it would be most natural to put the accent in a different place.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Well I don't think anybody has ever made up examinations but occasionally has given one that has not expressed the meaning he desires. But I don't think any of these should, because I worked these questions very carefully, but it may still be--be glad to look at any particular ones. But I just want to say about that, that those who have missed three and as I say, I don't have the evidence before about these two of them(7 3/4)

(explanation about makeup test) to (13 1/4)

P.45. ~~...was the argument from Divine Names~~, and this Argument from Divine Names is the place where the whole discussion started, and ~~consequently it~~ therefore is a very important, ~~argument, it is however~~ but an argument which ~~now, you might say,~~ they can now afford to ignore. Now ~~they are apt to say because on the basis of this the claim was made~~ they are apt to say that this is only one of fifty different stylistic criteria, ~~on which the division is made. That claim is made, but the fact is that~~ that are used in making. Yet practically everyone who writes on it says very strongly that ~~this is~~ from the E document ~~is clear~~ will declare that one passage is clearly since it Elohim and ~~from the use of Elohim in it. That this is~~ something else is clearly since it from the J document ~~is clear from the use of~~ Jahve, it was on the ~~I here. I mean they make statements like that. And this is the~~ basis ~~on which~~ that the whole theory began ~~so that~~ and it is highly questionable whether anybody ever would have divided ~~as they are divided~~ documents this way if they had not started with this ~~material~~ criterion. Besides (2) (1) (3) for popular presentation of the theory, it is ~~perhaps~~ probably the most effective ~~thing~~ argument in the critics' hands. (4) They say just ~~Why~~ look at Gen. 1. God, God, God, God, God, over and over, Elohim, Elohim. Look at Gen. 2, 3, and 4, the LORD God, the LORD God, the LORD God, perfectly obvious, Then they will say, It is that the word God is inserted in chapters 2 and 3 to show that the LORD Jehovah mentioned in chapters 2 and 3 is the same one who is called God in chapter 1. We all agree to that, the early fathers suggested it. ~~But you take off the name God then from 2, 3 and 4 and return to the LORD God, and use God as just the LORD, and you~~ You have this remarkable fact of a whole chapter with one and then three chapters almost entirely with the other, and you ~~have~~ have occasionally a chapter with all one and all the other. That is a remarkable fact, And upon that fact the criticism began. ~~And so~~ But do not let people sidestep and say, oh well, it is just one of fifty criteria. Of course, if you have fifty different criteria,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Then if one is and if you disprove any of them, you say, Well, but look at all these other vital ones. It makes it very slippery and elusive and hard to get hold of.

But this is the criterion which was primary, which was first used, the one on the basis of which many of the steps took place in the development of the critical theory. So it is vital to have an understanding regarding this particular criteria, and we have noticed #1, its priority, and #2, how the Graf-Wellhausen Theory breaks it up. That is very important, many a seminary student who graduates, is taught this theory as the accepted result of modern scholarship, will be hazy in their minds on this point, and will have the impression that it is easy to divide Genesis, by just putting the Jehovist passages here, and the Elohist passages there. It has doubtless been mentioned in his classes that the E document is often very difficult to distinguish from the J document, in many places, the only way they can distinguish it is by the divine names. That has probably been mentioned but not greatly emphasized, and he will have the impression that on the basis of these material they can make the division, simply by names. It is important to realize that, while Astruc and Eichhorn built directly on this, Hupfeld's suggestion of a second Elohist breaks up the criterion, and the second Elohist, which they now call E, is recognized by all to be so much like the J document that in many places it is extremely difficult to separate them. The critics are almost unanimous as to what passages belong to the P document and what don't, but about the distinction between the J and E documents, there is very considerable difference of opinion among them, and yet this breaks up this criterion, quite definitely, as I stressed, This fact needs to be last time.

And then #3, this criterion is confined almost entirely to the book of Genesis. In the first four books, and then Joshua, too, because Deuteronomy is a separate category, in those five books, you find the term Jehovah used constantly, ~~I got back your papers on Genesis to you very soon, because I want you to have them before you to see the basis, to see the way it is done, and we will discuss that material quite considerably. The papers you handed in on Numbers I have not gotten back to you~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

yet, I have not rushed about them, because we will not use them. The reason I had you do Numbers was for you to see the difference. How in Genesis you have such a switch from one to the other, so frequently, while In Numbers the passages that use Elohim to any extent are very few. Jehovah is used almost constantly throught he last three-fourths of Exodus, through Leviticus and through Numbers and through Joshua. Then, in #4 I mentioned last time, that In Genesis this criterion is not used consistently, and that in many cases the names are mixed. There are cases with in each of the alleged documents where the wrong name occurs, so somebody immediately says, well then, why don't they just give that to the other document, but when they say that, they show simply a failure to realize what the nature of the whole critical theory is. It is not simply a matter of taking all the passages that say Elohim and putting them here and those that say Jehovah and putting them there, but it is the claim that you can disentangle out of the Pentateuch four different documents, each one existing separately, and they claim is you can put prove that they were separate not merely by the use of these names, but by the fact that they still duplicate each other, as a great Biblical scholar said to me once, now, he says, It is perfectly obvious, you go through Genesis and you find a series of duplicates; you find a story told, and told again, and told and told again, told and told again, you just have a series of duplicates going right through, And consequently on the basis that you have repetition which shows that these distinct documents, and that these differ in style from one another, and that each of them taken by itself would make a complete original document, the claim is that you can prove the existence of these different documents. And therefore when you badly need a passage in order to make one of them to have some appearance of being a complete document, or when you have two alleged duplicats, but instead of one using Jehovah and one using Elohim, they both use Jehovah and they both use Elohim, there the critics can't simply say well this belongs over there, they have to give some explanation for it. And there are a few cases, not a tremendous lot, but yet a fair number, where they say the redactor who combined them

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

changed the name, ~~he changed~~ it. Well, if he started changing things, how do we know that they're enough like the original ~~that they can~~ be disentangled at all? ~~But~~ their claim is that these documents are put together practically as they stand, ~~and~~ yet in dozens of cases they ~~will~~ say the redactor has made a change when he combined them. So we point out here that the criteria do not work out completely. there are cases where they ignore ~~this~~ criterion because they think another is more important, and then they say, there is some mistake, this was originally Elohim, ~~or~~ there are cases where they say ~~this~~ there is a reason for ~~it.~~ ~~Like~~ the critics all give Gen. 3 to J, that is all except the late professor Pfeiffer of Harvard, who said, no, this part of J is not really J , this is a different document, this ~~is~~ S document, ~~which~~ was written later than P, ~~instead~~ of J, the earlier. ~~And~~ that's what he says in his Introduction to the Old Testament, which many people think has replaced Driver as the standard critical work. He makes a new S document which ~~is the~~ very latest, ~~instead of~~ the earliest. ~~But~~ hardly anybody followed him in that, most still hold the standard form of the theory, that this is the J document. ~~But~~ whichever it is, J or S, it is marked by the use of the term Jehovah. But right in the beginning of chapter 3, the serpent says, "yes, has God said? Has God said that you mustn't eat of any of the trees of the garden," and Eve answered, ~~well, she said~~, no, God permits us to eat of the trees of the garden, but we must not touch this particular one." Well, the critics say, In this case, you have the serpent speaking and they wouldn't put the sacred name of God in the serpent's mouth, so they used Elohim, and then when Eve answered ~~to~~ the serpent, she won't use the sacred name Jehovah, so she uses Elohim." Well, once you say that, you have admitted that sometimes they don't show authorship, but that there is a difference in meaning, in use of the two names, And that is our 6th point, ~~to which we had come at the end of the last hour. Yes? (J. Gueiros: 10 1/4: Last test you made a statement that the critics say that Elohim is used when Jehovah didn't fit properly.) Yes, that is to say, that when the serpent speaks, they wouldn't put the sacred name of Jehovah into the mouth of the serpent, so the serpent says Elohim (10 1/2)~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

That is what they say. And that is our 7th point rather. Our 6th was similar use of divine names in the Koran and in Ugaritic. I didn't repeat the 5th one to you this morning. But the 7th, that it is admitted by all that the names sometimes are used with a special reason.

It has to be admitted by all, because otherwise you couldn't make the division. You have Elohim all through chapter 1 but in chapter 2,-4 ff. you have Jehovah usually, but occasionally you have Elohim, and so they had to admit that there are cases where there is a difference between the two names. And of course that is our contention.

Our contention is that while both of these terms come from the same individual, they both point to the LORD God, that there are certain circumstances in which it would be quite natural to use one term, and certain circumstances in which it would be quite natural to use another term. I might say to one of you, my wife would appreciate it if you would give her a phone call. Now that would be the natural way for me to speak to you about her. But if I were speaking to my little boy, I wouldn't say, my wife says for you to rush home from school. It would sound utterly silly. I would speak of her in a different way to him than I would to you, and yet both terms would refer to the same individual. We use different terms for the same individual in different connections, for different purposes. That is a common fact of life, And all the critics admit that, because they have to explain Satan not saying Jehovah, but Elohim, in the middle of the Jehovah document. And so they admit that there are times when one particular name is more appropriate than another particular name. Driver, for instance, says that Elohim is the God of creation and that Jehovah is the God of redemption. Well, once he admits that much, why then should they not use Elohim for God all through Genesis 1, which is impersonal creation, and why should you not use Jehovah all through all the Genesis 2, which is dealing with human beings? Why would that not be natural...

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

he says ~~actually one document is a precedent for this and the other for that,~~ so it shows different documents. Kuenen, who had such a tremendous part in the establishment of the whole theory, was ready to make very great concessions on this point. For instance, in chapter 43:29 and 44:16, the name Elohim occurs, and some say this proves that this is the E document. But Kuenen thought it was the J document, so Kuenen said, Elohim here is no evidence for E, since Joseph is (3) speaking and (2) spoken to (1) as a heathen. He is at the court of Pharaoh, (4) and he is spoken to and speaking as a heathen, therefore, he wouldn't use the sacred name, Jehovah, he'd use Elohim. ~~Yes ? (1 1/2) Those two refs. I just gave: Gen.43.29 and 44.16. Now I am goig~~

Now I am going to read ~~you~~ a rather long quotation from Kuenen, ~~and this quotation that I'm going to read~~ now is from his volume, The Hexateuch, pps.58 and 59, ~~and~~ I am not going to take time to let you copy down all the words of this long quotation, or even the Scripture references in it, but simply to ~~bring out to you the~~ show how much he is willing to concede. Kuenen says, "when the God of Israel is placed over against the gods of the heathen, He is naturally described by the proper name, Jawh. " But he says that when heathens are introduced as speaking, they use the word Elohim. So he says, the Israelites in speaking to heathen often use Elohim, as Joseph does, for instance, to Potiphar's wife, to the butler, the baker and to Pharaoh. And he says Abraham used Elohim to Abimelech. He says where a contrast between the divine and the human is in the mind of the author Elohim is ~~at any rate~~ Then the more suitable word. Now that is quite a confession for Kuenen to admit that there are so many different reasons why you might use one or the other of these names. People will say, ~~I have had it~~ as it has been said to me by scholars: why, when you ~~don't~~ find anything like that, a whole chapter with Elohim, three whole chapters with Jehovah, ~~three chapters, and then Elohim and Jehovah,~~ it must show that there are distinct documents. But everybody must admit, ~~if they examine~~ that is, almost anything that is written, ~~that~~ different names are used for the same person for different reasons. ~~And what~~ (3) is generally ignored ~~is~~ (not) (1) the fact (2) that after you use a certain name for a definite

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

reason you ~~may very well just~~ keep on using that name. ~~That is to say,~~ if I refer to an individual, under certain circumstances I ~~use one term, I~~ may refer to them ~~by their~~ first name; in other circumstances I might refer to ~~them~~ by ~~their~~ last name, and in other circumstances by a title. But ~~in the many circumstances where I wish to refer to an individual~~ and there is no particular reason why I use one term or the other, it is quite natural ~~to~~ just keep on using the one that ~~one~~ has been using. ~~It~~ is a very natural thing for me to do, ~~at least~~, and ~~I think~~ for many of you. There ~~would~~ be others ~~of you~~ who, like sports writers, would want to use a different term everytime you refer to ~~them~~. There are different fads in this regard; ~~but~~ it does not necessarily prove different documents. ~~So~~ this is a very, ~~very~~ vital point, that all of them, ~~(4 1/2)~~ ——— even those who are absolutely convinced that this is a ~~criter~~ criterion on which they may be divided into different distinct separate documents, that even ~~they~~ admit that there are cases where there is a special reason to use one or the other, because of the circumstance, And if there is a special reason, then there is no reason why there might not be alterations or changes, or constant use of one for a while and then switching to the other, without a necessary reason being found in each case. ~~I was much interested once in my professor~~ Dr. Robert Dick Wilson, with whom I studied for a number of years. He had a very close friend in Germany, ~~a~~ head of an institute for oriental languages, at the University of Berlin. And they used to correspond back and forth ~~with each other, and~~ each of them knew the other's language nearly as well as he did his own. ~~And~~ it was most interesting to read some of these letters, And to see how one of them would be writing along in English, and then all of a sudden he would refer to something he heard somebody say in German, Or ~~refer~~ to something that brought in a German word, and, having done that, he'd go right on writing in German for a while. ~~And~~ then he'd write German for a while, and then he 'd want to tell ~~him~~ what somebody said, ~~which they said in~~ English, ~~or something like that,~~ and he'd switch back to English. ~~And~~ you could not prove reasons in every case ~~why~~ they switched from one language to the other, but you could in many

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README5.htm

cases, and it certainly was not distinct documents. It is a natural ~~way of going along in one way, just~~ to continue going along in ~~that~~ way. ~~So that, this 7th point is extremely important, and our conclusion, #8, on this argument from the Divine Names is:~~

8, Conclusion: there are reasons in many cases why a particular name is used but ~~that~~ sometimes the use is merely arbitrary.

~~And~~ there may be a special reason why one ~~just~~ keeps on using the same name ~~they have,~~ or there may be a special reason to introduce variety by using the other. ~~As an argument for division, I feel that it is utterly (7)~~ ~~I feel that~~ it is quite inconclusive ~~evidence~~, argument for division, ~~that it does not stand in that regard,~~ but it was the first of the critical arguments given. It is the one that is most obvious and the ~~one~~ most often referred today. I question seriously whether the criticism could ever have developed the way it has, ~~if it~~ had not started on this material. ~~But~~ having ~~the~~ development it has, many a critic will say: oh forget this if you want, this is only one of ~~50~~ fifty different criteria on which the divisions are made. So having, I believe, completely and conclusively disproved this particular argument, we are still a long ways from having disproved the critical theory. ~~We have~~ other arguments to look at, which may not be quite as obvious as this one, but which are in reality much more important.

Now we go on to a second which is also not one of the most important. ~~Yes, Mr. Gregory? (8) We're going to go into that. I'm going to give an assignment on that. I will assign different people different chapters to investigate and various books to look into. The problem of course is, with a class like this, it doesn't come very often, and having enough books in the library for the particular assignment. So I have to give a variety of assignments, in giving different courses. For that reason I'd rather not mention any particular ones right now. I want to see just how many different books we have we can use, and try to divide up assignments so that everybody can have access to enough that we have covered, some good assignments. I will not announce any such till after the day of Prayer. Might be good if you look on the Bulletin Board the morning after the~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

~~day of Prayer and see if one should be posted there.~~

~~Well, the next argument we want to look at is~~ the Argument from Continuous Narrative, ~~and~~ it would be helpful ~~in~~ this Argument ~~from Continuous Narrative if you could have an idea just how the critics usually divide this. Well~~ I have ~~quite faithfully copied a statement of~~ how Driver divides Genesis, ~~and I did the best I could to be careful and I don't think there is a mistake in it, yet you might conceivably~~ find one. ~~But this is a~~ statement of how Driver ~~divided Genesis and~~ you won't find much variation ~~among others. There are places where you may find some. But it gives a good idea of the whole critical approach theory. Now if~~ some of you could ~~pass these~~ out for me, ~~so that everybody has a copy of this,~~ and this ~~will be~~ very useful for you in assignments yet to come. ~~I didn't have room on the page to get Exodus on it too, so it stops with Genesis, but this shows you the division as it is~~ usually ~~made~~ today. ~~The first part of~~ course you are largely ~~familiar with.~~ Gen.1.1-2.4a is considered to be part of the P document ~~as it was considered by Astruc originally.~~ And chapter 2: 4b to 4.26 ~~(~~ that is to the end of chapter 4~~)~~ is considered by nearly all scholars to be part of J document. ~~Some will say no that is~~ J2 rather than J1, and some ~~will~~ say it ~~is~~ S. ~~but~~ The division is pretty well agreed upon.

Everybody has one? Yes, and I have one and we've used every one we brought, well that was just excellent, wasn't it? Well this is ~~now~~ usually the division that has been but I fear it is now three after we'd better leave discussion of it till tomorrow. Bring it with you tomorrow and write on a piece of paper as quickly as possible, a bit sketchily perhaps, in 12 minutes that ought to be sufficient--put name and number of your seat, then under that, I have 3 verses for each one to discuss. Some of these verses may take very little time, some a little more, but discuss, mention whatever problem there is...

P.47. (2/27/62. (1/2)

...variations as between certain sections we put in J and put in E, but they have come to pretty much unanimity with occasional differences on certain points, and occasionally some will say well I know this is J but am not sure whether this is J or not. (3/4)

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

~~therefore~~ we are justified in ~~examining this unified view, and~~ seeing whether this widely accepted ~~v~~iew meets the test of the arguments which have been advanced for it, ~~the~~ 8th ~~argument that I gave you~~.

We have dealt to some extent with the argument from Divine Names, perhaps more than ~~it~~ warrant~~ed as a real strong argument~~, but much less than ~~it~~ warranted from the viewpoint of its great importance in the origination of the theory and also its great importance in the general discussion of the theory even up to this day. ~~But~~ We will ~~dis~~ touch on it occasionally from now on, because the arguments are all to some extent interrelated, whereas in dealing with others, you will occasionally notice matters of great importance regarding the argument from divine names. And when you do notice them I hope that you will in your mind connect them up with that so that later on, when I ask you about that, you can bring these in also, in connection with it. Matters about it that we take up in connection with other arguments.

~~The first argument then~~ we ~~looked and~~ were ready to look at the second argument, which is not one of the most important arguments, but which ~~a good deal~~ was ~~made of~~ by the critics in their original argument for the critical theory. Today they don't argue so much, but take it for granted, this is true or false, all scholars know ~~this~~ is a fact, ~~it's definite, so there is not a great deal of argument, consequently this argument~~ ~~from~~ continuous narrative, ~~you~~ don't hear ~~so~~ much ~~about~~ today, as an argument for the critical theory. ~~But the view that claims~~ a continuous document ~~is something that is~~ assumed by the critics in their discussion. ~~And~~ I 'll read you one or two quotations to show ~~why~~ that ~~is,~~ that to this day, though not so much dwelt on as an argument, it is very important in critical discussion, because they assume it ~~pretty much~~ to be a fact, that each of these documents is complete and ~~is~~ continuous narrative.

~~Now~~ Yesterday I gave each of you a copy of this statement showing the arrangement of the documents as Driver presented it in his Introduction. ~~Now~~ why ~~did it~~ take Driver, who wrote 60 years ago, instead of taking ~~Pfeiffer~~ who wrote about 20

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

years ago, ~~in his Introduction to the Old Testament?~~ Well because Pfeiffer advances his theory of ~~the~~ S document, and I don't know of any other outstanding scholar who accepts it. Pfeiffer of Harvard is considered as great authority ~~in this matter~~ and his view is in general just about the same as Driver's. There are very few differences, but where there are differences, the scholars follow Driver rather than ~~to follow~~ Pfeiffer. So ~~that~~ when we look at the theory we can consider it as a unit and can take the form Driver gave, which is the form in which it is held by most critical students today. ~~So I gave you these and yesterday I was rather disappointed to see one of them lying on a chair here somewhere. I hope that doesn't mean that one of you is without one this morning. Because it will~~ would be very difficult to follow our discussion ~~this morning~~ without having ~~this~~ before you. ~~In fact~~ I wish you could have about five things before you ~~as we do~~ this this morning, ~~that we cannot very well do~~ but it is not feasible, so we'll have to do the best we can. ~~But you all have this, I trust, and I want to look at~~ this argument from continuous documents, ~~and in looking at it~~, before we look at details of it, I want to remind you of ~~the~~ effect upon ~~this argument of~~ the developments of the latter part of the last century.

You remember that ~~the argument originally given was this:~~ Eichhorn and Astruc divided Genesis mainly into two documents. Each of these, they said gives a complete ~~full~~ story. They claimed that each of them can stand alone and doesn't need the other. They said the P document which has the series of covenants ~~which~~ that were made, and the P document ~~which~~ has the genealogies, ~~which~~ gives the main things in numerical order, ~~that is~~ They said it is absolutely complete, so we don't need the J document, ~~but~~ they said the J document is almost complete, though not quite as complete as the P document. That was their view. The J document--there are certain difficulties which keep it from being considered complete.

~~Well,~~ then, the supplementary theory came along, they said, no, the J document isn't complete at all, in fact, they said it isn't a document. The supplementary theory ~~did not hold to documents,~~ they held to one document, the foundation writing, the Elohist, and then to the insertion in it of supplementation by Jehovist writing at a later time.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

But when they swung back, at the time of Graf-Wellhausen, to the document theory, when they swung back to that, they took the Elohist and divided it up, you remember, and they took the greater part of the material from Genesis 20 on and considered it a second Elohist. Well, what does that do to the continuity of the Elohist? Originally considered to be the complete full story, one document which stands along. Now from 20 on, you take the material in Genesis that is given to the Elohist and you give that to the second Elohist, and what remains you call the P document. Well, no longer is it the most complete by any means. The most complete now is J, which previously was questioned as being a complete continuous document, J now is the most complete thing you've got. No more complete than it was before, but it's the most complete that you've got. And P and E are far less complete. Now P begins, as you know, as you have stated on here, and I must everybody knows, (because it is one of the very beginning points of the whole theory) that P begins with Genesis 1:1 to 2:4a. Now someone says, why on earth do they make it 2:4a, why don't they make it the one chapter? Well, blame the Archbishop for that! There is no question that chapter 1 ought to run through the first three or four verses of chapter 2. There is no such question to that. It is ridiculous, having our chapter division where we have it. We have six days in Genesis 1; then we have three verses telling of the 7th day; then we go back and start again with the specific account of the creation of man. This is really the first chapter, this includes the next three or four verses!

But this section is entirely given to P. It is continuous; it tells the story of creation rather fully, doesn't give much detail about the creation of man, but it deals with most of the major elements in the creation. Well, then, what does the P document do after that? It immediately jumps to chapter 5, and there in chapter 5, it gives you the whole practically of chapter 5, omitting only one verse (verse 29). Verse 29 of chapter 5 is given to J. All the rest of chapter 5 is given to P. Well, verse 5, I mean verse 29 of chapter 5 says, and he called his name Noah, saying this thing shall comfort us concerning our work and the toil of our hands, because of the ground which Jehovah has cursed. It

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

has got the name Jehovah in it, so ~~we~~ they give it to J document. Well, why not give the whole chapter to the J document, because you have the word Jehovah in it? Well, you have Elohim back in the first verse, ~~Elohim~~ and in verse 24, Elohim is quite prominent~~ly~~. ~~We would~~ You might ask, ~~somebody would ask us, well, why~~, if you have Elohim right along, ~~you have Elohim~~ in chapter 6, why ~~de~~sert Jehovah all at once in 29? We would ~~say~~ answer, this is a specific reference to redemption. You are here very specifically speaking of Noah who, God has ~~spoken that he~~ said will be the one through whom the promised deliverer will come. He specifically says (2) because of the ground which the Lord ~~has cursed, which~~ (Jehovah) has cursed, this ties right up with redemption and the general name of God seems much less appropriate right here than the specific name of Jehovah!

Of course, the critics say, no, we take ~~the~~ verse 29 out, that is a verse which belongs to J, ~~and that is~~ while the rest of the chapter is ~~the~~ genealogy, and P is interested in genealogy. But you notice what that does to the J document! The J document has 2.4 to 4.26. 4.26 ~~is~~ says that to Seth was born a son and ~~sh~~he called his name Enoch. Then began men to call on the name of Jehovah. ~~and~~ Then the next verse in the J document is, and he called his name Noah, saying this ~~thing~~ same shall comfort us. Certainly the J document is far from complete, jumping all of a sudden from Seth (2) ~~coming~~ (D) down to his great-great-great-great-great grand~~father~~ son, Noah. It is certainly quite a sharp jump, J ~~it~~ is not a continuous document. ~~in J.~~

Now P told about the creation of the world, Gen.1.1-2.4a, ~~and he~~ describes the creation and it was good. Everything God looked at, ~~it~~ was good. Then ~~he~~ told the list of all these men, and how they lived and how they died, doesn't ~~tell in~~ give detail except ~~the~~ in the case of Enoch ~~ones~~ who walked with God and was not because God took him. ~~But~~ It is a good picture except for ~~Seth there~~ death (2), ~~and~~ you wonder where does ~~Seth~~ death come from? There is no mention ~~of~~ (D) the reference to when God created man that he was going to die. ~~Well~~ If you have the J portion it tells about the fall of man, but the P portion just jumps ahead and tells about death, and doesn't mention the fall of man, which is how death came!

~~Then~~ (2) the P document, (D) after chapter 5, ~~you notice~~ (3) takes chapter 6.9-22.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

"These are the generations of Noah. Noah was a just man and perfect in his generation, and Noah walked with God and Noah begat three sons. The earth also was corrupt before God and the earth was filled with violence, and God looked upon the earth and behold it was corrupt." Well, how did this wonderful earth which God made, which he said was good, all of a sudden, God sees it and it is corrupt, and filled with violence and God decides to destroy it. What a sudden decision on the part of God! What a sudden change in the world. What reason is there for it? He doesn't tell us anything about any reason. But if you take the chapters that you take away and say belong to J, they tell us about the Fall of man, there you have the reason. In other words, though they say there is a continuous document, the very vital feature of the whole history is just taken out of one and given to the other, so that you do not have what is necessary to understand how this wonderful world God made, all of a sudden became filled with violence, in the P document, while in the J document, he jumps right down from Seth to Noah, with no account of the people in between. Just all of a sudden, that he called his name Noah. Who called whose name Noah? Neither of them is a t all complete at this point. Now I will not at this point take time to look at the next few chapters, here. We will look at them more later. But this --the next few chapters are given as one of the fine examples of a duplicate narrative--that's our next chapt argument. I merely call your attention to it here, that the next few chapters here are the account of the flood, and as you see on the list that I gave you, the...

P.48. (1/2)

...complete story of the Flood. Well, it is a question of whether it is a complete story or not, is one which we can examine later, I'm not going to take time for that. These two arguments interlace, they're duplicate narratives and the account is complete, they interlace. (3/4) but I want you to observe the relevance of each for both questions. But we'll skip on over the matter related to the flood now, and then we find that, let's see you come on to chapter 9, which is telling you about the Flood, still. That is the J document. In chapter 9, you have verses 1-17

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

After the story of the flood given to the J document and then you have verses 28-29 in the P document, and then chapter 10,1-7 which is God's covenant with Noah. Then comes Chapter 10 is the generation of Noah's sons, which they assign and there you have that given completely to the P document. They say that P is interested in lists, genealogies, enumerations, so naturally this goes to the P document. They assign Chapter 10, to P the greater part of chapter 10, though a section of it is given to the J document. Yes? (2) That would come under the first argument, wouldn't it? There That is a section which is given to J but the bulk of it is given to P. not That story in there (2) about Nimrod going out and becoming a mighty hunter before the Lord, that narrative (1) (4) is given to J, but the lists (3) of the nations are is given to P, which they say, P anyway is interested in enumerations and lists. J is interested in narrative, and this is that's an interesting narrative. Yes? (2 1/2) Well, the point is the second argument, and I have not given subdivisions under the second argument. Under the first I gave several subdivisions; under the second, instead of giving subdivisions, I am looking at the two documents. Capital B, thank you, the argument from continuous narrative.

Then we have after this genealogy, the generations of Shem and of Terah, and we find that it jumps then, in chapter 12. The first beginning of 12 goes to J, but 12.4b is given to P, "Now Abram was 75 years old when he went forth from Haran, and Abram took Sara his wife and Lot his brother's son, and all the substance they had gathered and the slaves they had acquired in Haran and they went forth on their journey to the land of Canaan and they came to the land of Canaan," and then it skips to 13.6, "but the land could not support them dwelling together, for their subjects to grow, so they could not dwell together," and not Then 11b-12a, "So they separated from each other, Abram dwelt in the land of Canaan and Lot dwelt in the city of the Jordan." You notice how it skips the account of all that about the trip down to Egypt and all about the division between them as Abram and Lot decided which part each of them would take of the land. Later on, in this book I have here, added on Addis the documents of the Hexateuch, Addis makes this statement, "it is an habitual practice of P, to ignore all scandal in the families of the patriarchs, who are to him men of ideal virtue, thus he is silent about the fall of Adam, Noah's drunkenness and the curse of Canaan, he knows

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

nothing of Sara's incredulous laugh or of Abraham's deceit. He represents the parting of Abraham and Lot as the result of a friendly agreement. He is silent about the expulsion of Hagar and her son, and on the contrary, speaks of Isaac and Ishmael as together bearing their father's burial. In P Jacob departs at the bidding of his father who, like Rebekah, has been vexed with Esau's marriage with Canaanite women, and is determined to save Jacob from the same mistake. Instead, of like J, representing Jacob as having defrauded Esau and fleeing from his vengeance. When they say P doesn't know anything of any dispute between Abraham and Lot, well naturally he does not, if you give those portions to J. But you see what it means, when they speak that way, the assumption is that each document is complete, and then you find the characteristic views of P and the characteristic views of J, they differ so, well they differ because you give some verses to one and some verses to the other, but neither document actually is complete, and when you come to (3) with chapter 20, then the E document begins. (4) There are some who give a portion of chapter 15 to the E document, but most would begin the E document with chapter 20. The E document then takes most of the Elohist material from 20 on, and the result is, you notice on the list, what there is in P from chapter 20 on, there are two or three fairly long chapters, but most of it is just an occasional verse here and there, just a tiny fragment that seems to sort of connect the thread by naming somebody, and that is about all there is in P until you get to the last very few chapters of Genesis. It is the tiniest little bit of a thread to connect the different chapters of J. To speak of it as a continuous narrative, you wonder, what kind of a book this ever was. Well, you could write a book that would be just a list of names, you can write a genealogy, a list of names, you can write a list of people, just the fact of where they went, but P is much more than that, P has this long account of creation; it has got a long account of the flood in it, it has got a long account of the burial of Sarah, and it has got just a few things like that given at length, well, what sort of a document would that be, that had these few things given at length, and then just a brief word to the rest. The continuous document pretty badly falls to pieces

3/9/91 Start P

(1) Takes the two together to give the whole picture! (2) The

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

pieces when you divide it up into the first and second Elohist. If you go through some of these others and notice how very slim is the material given to P, you just wonder why it should be given to P. Often the only reason we can see is, in order to connect it up, in order to try to make it look like a continuous document, through the whole thing, you just take a couple of words out of it and you've put it into the P document. Very interesting instance of this is chapter 21, where you find that chapter 21 begins with the words: And the Lord visited Sarah as He had said, and the Lord did unto Sarah as He had spoken, for Sarah conceived and bare Abraham a son in his old age, and at the set time of which God had spoken to him. Now you notice in your list, that in chapter 21, verse 1a and 2a they give to J, and 1b and 2b they give to P, so the J reads, and the Lord visited Sarah as He had said, and Sarah conceived and bare Abraham his son, a son in his old age. While the P document is said to be the last half of these two verses, and the Lord did unto Sarah as he had spoken at the set time at which God had spoken to him." Well, they divide the two verses up, give half to one and half to the other, and you have two complete parallel accounts, but Mr. Gueiros here has noticed a very serious problem and he raises his hand to call our attention to it. What is it, Mr. Gueiros? (9-3/4: My question right now is, is their contention by the use of Divine Names or is it now by the material involved in the chapter? How to divide?) Yes, well, that is exactly what I was going to say, that you, Mr. Gueiros sais, how can they divide one up and give it to the two parts when it says Jehovah in both halves of it? How can that be by divine names? And the answer is that in this case the divine names don't fit so we have to change the divine names. So that we find here that in Addis' presentation of what he calls the priestly history and law, he changes it, and God did to Sarah as he promised, at the appointed time which God had promised." You notice, you had God in the last half of verse 2, now in order to get the complete thing, you take the last half of verse 1 and Addis says "and God," the present text of the Pentateuch has Jehovah. The editor put together a fragment of the J and a fragment of P in one verse, verse 1, and naturally objected to

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

a change of divine name in such close connection, so the redactor (or the editor) changed it.

Well, as Mr. Gueiros points out, if you can follow Divine Names when it suits your purpose and throw it aside when it doesn't, why it makes a question on the whole matter. Mr. Kaufmann? (11 1/2) Addis. That is a good question because some might confuse him with Allis. There are two men who have written on the subject, Addis and Allis. Addis is very, very strongly convinced of the whole critical theory, Allis is very strongly convinced that it is entirely wrong, so the d and the l makes a big difference. Yes? (12) Yes, Mr. Downs is anticipating us a little, getting on to a third argument of duplicate narratives. He is pointing out that in Hebrew scholars it is quite common to have parallelism and say the same thing twice in slightly different language, so he said why does that have to mean there are two different documents? Well, that is a good argument, Mr. Downs, but just a little ahead of our present discussion. We will certainly be much interested in that when we get on to the duplicate documents. Mr. MacKeen? (12 3/4) I read that from Addis, but you will find it in almost any critical writing. (sic) Patriarchs. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. According to P they were not (13) they were P. Yes.

Well, the sheet that I have given you, I will give you a few assignments before we are through, in which you test each of these documents in certain places to see just how complete the story is. One very interesting illustration of it is found in connection with Joseph. You remember that Joseph begins in chapter...

P.49 (1/2)

...chapter 36, the genealogy of Esau is largely given to P but there are certain cases in it where there are words used that aren't characteristic of the P document, so those are a later redactor of the P document who inserted those particular verses. But now chapter 37 begins:

"Now Jacob dwelt in the land where his father had sojourned, in the land of Canaan, these are the generations of Jacob." That is chapter 37.1,2a. Now when you continue

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

in 37, you have that very interesting story of Moses as a boy, and of his life with his brothers and his finally being sold into Egypt, all of that is removed from the P document, and is divided up between the J and the E documents, so the next verse that we have from the P document is chapter 41-46. "Now Joseph was 30 years old when he stood before Pharaoh king of Egypt. So Joseph went out from the presence of Pharaoh and passed through all the land of Egypt." What sort of a continuous document is that? Joseph isn't even mentioned. Jacob is mentioned and all of a sudden we read that Joseph was 30 years old before he stood before Pharaoh! How did Joseph ever get down to Egypt and how did he ever come to stand before Pharaoh! It certainly is very, very far from a complete document. And there they only insert what I just read, in chapter 46 there, and then they jump on to verse 6: "so they took their cattle and their substance which they had gathered in the land of Canaan, and went to Egypt, Jacob, and all his seed with him."

Then you have most of the rest of that chapter because it lists the people who went down into Egypt. Well these are some of the most striking instances of the many that could be cited to show how the P document, according to the critical theory, now, so far from being complete, it is very full in the book of Leviticus, and Numbers, all with the tabernacle, how to build the tabernacle and how to do the sacrifice, all that, very full, and it is very full of the genealogies, but on the narrative, they have a little sentence here and a little sentence there, and that is all they have about them. Mr. Gregory? (3 1/4

Yes, there have been individuals who have said that each of these stories is originally absolutely complete, and that certain parts of one were selected and that certain parts of the other were selected. If you say that, of course, you are dropping the whole argument from continuous narrative, which was one of the four original arguments. If you hold to that line, then you expect that they have included everything from them, or practically everything, and therefore that what is there should be complete. Now when they came to (4)

You see the dilemma you are on? If you say, well here were certain books and the redactor took what he wanted from this, what he wanted from that,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

he found the story of Joseph as a boy in P and the story of Joseph as a boy in J, and he took the story from J rather than P. And he made his selection, which he was going to take, and he left out a lot of stuff in all of them. Well, if you say that, then you come along and find two stories and they contradict each other, ~~so they said~~. ~~And they said~~ and you say this proves that these were different documents. Well, what kind of a redactor was he, that would put in two stories that contradict each other? why wouldn't he correct one or the other? ~~That is to say, the attitude of~~ The critics ~~in the main~~ assume that these documents are included almost absolutely complete. That is the assumption on which they worked, occasionally they admit a little has been omitted. ~~But the assumption, and the assumption in their discussion is that, because like (5)~~ he knows ~~nothing of--he'll never say anything critical of Abraham, he'll never say anything critical of Jacob, he doesn't have Noah drunk, do an act critical of a great patriarch. Well, you know, if the redactor picked what he wanted, maybe he didn't pick those, but the~~ assumption on which they proceed is that we can tell the view held at these different times by what is here, and that ~~we, that~~ they simply put them together in a rather arbitrary fashion, anxious not to lose anything. ~~Yes? (5 3/4) Well, now, your question now is one which would be very valid if somebody took the thing and sat down and said I'm going to divide this into documents, here is what I have done. You would have the right to go and say on what criterion did you do it? But what we actually have is Eichhorn making a division on the criterion of the divine names, and then adding other divisions. Then we have other people arguing pro and con, in arguments that took place over 50-60 years, and in the end we have a consensus of opinion, and you have to find from what he says, for this or for that. And our contention is that when you find it, you find great contradictions in them too (6 3/4)~~ but you cannot say, arbitrarily, the critics do it on this position rather than that, unless you have a specific quotation. Because it is a composite thing that was worked out by a great many men over a long period. Yes? (7) Thank you for mentioning that. I intended before to mention to

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

you the Polychrome Bible. It is the tendency of scholars today, at least the ones with whom I come in contact--I do not come in contact with a great number, I mean the meetings of the society of Biblical literature, I rarely go to, because it is mostly junk that is given. The scholars that I have contact with are among the very best and so I can't speak for the attitude of the masses, but the ones with whom I have contact, ~~have a tendency~~ while holding firmly to the J,E,D,P, have a tendency to laugh at the Polychrome Bible, ~~and say it is a rather extreme (7 3/4).~~ but the Polychrome Bible ~~was gotten out~~ by Prof. Haupt of Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, ~~and~~ it was an attempt to print the Bible, some of the volumes in Hebrew, some in English, with the different documents in different types, so that ~~that way~~ you could see at a glance what they were. ~~And this~~, if properly done, such a thing could be an extremely useful tool for examining the basis of the theory and seeing whether it stands or falls. It's much harder to see it ~~if~~ when you just give one document by itself, another by itself, as they usually present it. Or ~~they~~ look in commentaries, ~~written~~ (8 1/4) they'll say, ~~now the~~ verse so-and-so here, we see ~~plain~~ signs of P, ~~give~~ the phrase, "male and female", ~~or the~~ use of the name Elohim, we see special interest in genealogies, ~~clear evidence of (8 3/4) in this verse,~~ and they speak that way about each verse separately, but you can't put it all together and examine critically as easily as you could with (8 3/4) something like the Polychrome Bible. I'm not sure just how well that particular job was done, but I think the idea was an excellent one, to give the material to test whether it is true or false, but people having reached the conclusion it is true are no longer interested in testing. Yes? ~~(9 1/4) Yes, we would say it must be something was amiss.~~ (stu.)

~~but that's the general idea. The general idea is not to be particularly impressed.~~ They are convinced of the theory. ~~And I mean it is true of~~ human nature. Whatever view you take, your tendency is to see the argument for your side very big and sort of minimize the arguments against, and not notice them much. ~~And~~ I feel that we advance the cause of the Lord in the end by getting an objective attitude

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

that can see the real strength of arguments we don't agree with, and then can try to find that there are really strong arguments we don't agree, but that we can find , we hope, stronger arguments to answer them, rather than to brush things aside, simply because we don't agree with them. I feel that in the end we serve the Lord more effectively if we try to get a reasonable objective attitude, but of course the liberals talk of the objective attitude, the open-minded attitude, but actually they are most of them extremely narrow, and on things like this, their minds are made up and they can't listen to anything else. Well, that is no reason we should take an attitude like that. I think we advance the Lord's cause by seeing exactly what the evidence is; and where you find some strong points, let's recognize them; and then let's see if we can find stronger points to show where they're wrong, but where they advance weak points, let's emphasize that too, that at that point the argument is very weak, and this argument of continuity and extent of the documents is one which will be given in an offhand way today, but one which anybody with whom you discuss it, who has been trained in a critical school, and most every seminary that is over 40 years old today teaches this as that which is established, and most universities in the world that have any work in Bible teach this as that which is accepted, which is established fact, they don't even question it.

But if you talk with one of their graduates and ask him "well now," what makes you think there are these different documents, why, he'll say, look at the difference in style. It's as great as between Chaucer and modern English. Some of them will say, "it is The teachers won't say that, but some of the students will say that. Nobody can say it is that great. But they'll say there is that difference in style, and then they will say, one of them uses one name for a style of writing, and one uses another, and you separate them out and you've got the complete story. You've got parallels giving the complete story. Well, it is good to have in mind just how incomplete the story is, and certain points at which it is particularly incomplete, and I would think pointing these out to a

person might very well raise serious difficulties, questions in his mind, whether the ~~Lord~~ whole thing wasn't worthy of a more careful examination than ~~you~~ he had ever given it as yet. ~~Well~~, I'd like to read you just a few statistics on this on the continuity of B. According to Driver's Analysis, out of the 1534 verses in Genesis, ~~out of the 1534 verses~~ about 780 Driver gives to J, and about 730 to P and E put together ~~in~~ other words, the original Elohist). And of the the 730 which are assigned to P and E, nearly 200 are in the first nineteen chapters, and practically all of these are given to P....

P.50. (1/2) (Break in text)

...these are assigned to E, these 550 remaining verses. Subtract 200 from 730 you get about 550. Out of those about two-thirds are given to E. ~~Yes? (3/4) I mentioned that there were about 1534 verses in Genesis~~. Driver gives just a little more than half of these to J, a little less than half to P and E put together. And of those in the P and E about a fourth of them are in Gen.1-19, so in Gen.20-50 there are about 550 verses given to E and P put together, with only one-third to P. So that here you have 30 chapters with only 175 verses in them given to P, in 30 chapters, the last 30 chapters. So P which originally was the foundation writing, and supposed to be the start of it which had a distinctive and unmistakable style, and the P and J supplements were added, now P has been reduced to be the smallest of the three documents. And most of the chapters, most of the material of P is in a few chapters, and the rest of it is in little tiny fragments scattered through the book. There will be several chapters with just a half a verse or a verse taken out and given to P.

If you go through either of these documents you will consistently find many places where the one assumes things told in the other either, without explaining, ~~and this just runs through~~, this little tiny thread, to make a complete P document, it raises serious question, is there evidence this is a document, or is it just an attempt to combine stuff to try to make something that will be continuous, as complete as possible. ~~Mr. MacKeen? (3)~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

...the view of Astruc and Eichhorn was that the E document was Genesis 1 and other sections throughout the book of Genesis. (stu.) Mainly. Astruc had ten other fragments, but mainly two. Mr. Gibin? (3 3/4) P and E together, but P is the framework. Mr. Gregory? (4) It is the claim that it has the characteristic mark of P, type of language, type of style, (4 1/2) (stu.) They're very consistent. Mr. Miller? (4 3/4) Yes, the view as held by Wellhausen that the last document written in the time of the exile, or shortly after, was the document which contains Gen.1, & Gen.5, parts of the story of the Flood, and so on. And includes all the extensive Levitical laws, that is the theory that they hold today. That which was the main backbone of the foundation writing, according to the view held for fifty years. Now it is the very end...(5 1/2-break in record, starting again at 6)

...and I did not give you subheads under that but gave you a general discussion of it, and I trust that the features of it are well in mind.

Now this morning we go on to the next argument, that will be :

C, The Argument from Parallel Passages, and this I'd like to say as #1 under that:

1, This Argument, if substantiated, is one of the strongest arguments for the critical theory. You can see at a glance how readily this argument lends itself to (7)

argument. For instance, you say to somebody , well the style of this section and this section is so different that I think two people must have written them, couldn't be written by the same person. Well, that is a very complex thing to say. One man says I think that these two people look very much alike, another one says, they look very different. There is a lot of personal idea that enters into it, you can add together lists of names, lists of words, lists of syntactical constructions, and all, and construct arguments on the basis of differences of style, but it is an involved complicated thing, but this argument can sound very simple. Why if the Bible begins with the story of creation and then you have another story of creation, if you have two different stories of the Flood, if you have three different stories of Abraham lying about his wife, if you have got a constant parallel of events

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

described, a list of events and then a parallel of them, and then another parallel of them, well what a tremendous argument it souonds like for three different continuous documents which have been fitted together into one by a redactor. It is an argument which sounds like a simple sortof a thing, like something which should be fairly obvious, which a person could find it rather easy to look at and see for themselves. And the arguments for it can be given in such a way that you look at the material and you say look at here, look at this parallel, look at this, look at this, and it appears very, very difficult to answer. And then there is this about it, their argument from continuous documents, from complete narrative, that argument, you might say, will prove if completely worked out, that you have three documents, but now suppose somebody says we don't have three complete documents, we have 40 small documents. Well if some of these small documents contain accounts of the same thing, but contradicting one another, and if these have simply been included without noting the contradiction, it proves, it goes a long way toward proving that we have here a hodgepodge of different things put together, even if you don't prove the complete long document. Therefore, the argument from parallel passages, is one which can ~~cease~~ seem to go very, very far against the integrity of the book, can go very, very far in that direction. And then another thing about it, is that this argument from parallel passages as presented by the critics, strikes at the very foundation of the accuracy and dependability of the Scriptures. The first two arguments might conceivably have been true of material which Moses combined. You might have one writer who preferred the name Jehovah and another writer who preferred the name God. You might have two different writers like this, who ~~went~~ one preferred one, one preferred the other, and Moses simply combined them in two. You might have two complete documents which were simply combined, but in giving these parallel passages you have the claim that in many points the parallels contradict one another, and that's the way that we can prove ~~their~~ they're distinct documents, they contradict one another. Well if they do, they're not both true, and the critical attitude as a rule is that neither of them is true, they are just a myth, legend, folklore, which

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

so this argument from parallel passages is one which is tremendously important that you examine carefully and find out just how much there is to it. It is worth a fair amount of time in looking at it. Now before doing so, I want to very briefly give a summary of the text parallels. So:

#2, we note three types of alleged parallels. a, Parallel sentences. I gave you an example of that last time where we read the verse the Lord visited Sarah as he had said and the Lord did to Sarah as He had promised. Now there are two distinct sentences: The Lord visited Sarah as He said. And the Lord did to her as He had promised. Is that simply a repetition for sake of emphasis , or is it two distinct statements which have simply been combined together. Very frequently a sentence is formed, or two, and a clause and another clause, and we're told look the same thing is told twice. There is the parallel, one of them is definitely from one document, one from another. Much more important than that is the second: b, Conflate Accounts. Now what do we mean by a conflate account? There are not a great many conflate accounts, but a few of them are very important. One of the most striking of them is the story of the flood. On this sheet which I trust you all have with you, of Driver's Analysis of Genesis.— You note that there are many cases where a few verses are given to one and a few verses to the other. This is particularly true when you get to the chapters from 6 through 9. There the material between 6 and 9 is all divided between two documents, P and J. You will have maybe 8 verses from P , then maybe 8 from J, maybe 3 more from P and 12 from J, then maybe half a verse from P and half a verse from J, but the claim that you take these portions, separate them and you have two complete accounts of the Flood . Thus in this case you have a conflate account, one account in the Bible as it stands today, but the claim is that this one account is made up of two accounts which ~~are~~ have been interlaced by a redactor who wanted to save everything that he had...

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

...and ~~he was~~ we were going to write a constitution for it and the constitution would have a purpose for the Seminary, and I sat down and dashed off a statement of purpose, and I put in it what struck me then as being quite important to have in the statement. Then a day or so later I sat down and struck off another statement of purpose, had quite a few things in I hadn't thought of before, and some were in it that werent' in the other, and then I looked at the two statements, and I couldn't quite figure out which one to use because each had something that I liked, and I ended up with taking a sentence or two from one, a sentence or two from the other, and the statement ~~has~~ as it appeared in our constitution, and in our catalog, is a conflation, of two different statements that I wrote, taking a little from one, a little from the other, and when I got through that way, I had something I liked much better than I liked either of them before. As a matter of fact, I don't think there was much I left out. I think I kept most of what was in both papers, but I would challenge any one of you to take the statement now and look at it and divide it up into two and show what the originals were. I don't think you could possibly do it. But that is the way in which it was done, and we often do that sort of thing, we combine things together.

Now if somebody combined two stories of the Flood together in this way, it would to my mind highly questionable if they could ever actually be separated. But of course the critics claim that when you do separate them, you find sharp contradictions at various points, showing that they can't both be true. They say neither (2 1/4) is true, they say it is a legend that they have in their history of fiction. But this is an example, this is the best kind of example of a conflate account. Perhaps the next most striking is the story of the spies (2 1/2) where they take that story of the spies in Numbers and they divide it up same way, ~~they did~~ (2 1/2), some from one document, some from another, and when they get through, they claim to have two contradictory accounts which have been combined. (2 3/4)

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

And then c, Separate Accounts. And this is much more common. Yes? (3) What I meant to say was, that according to the critical theory there are two original accounts of the Flood, each of which tells about the (3 1/2) within the Flood, Noah's building an Ark, going into the Ark, the Flood coming onto the earth, and then the end of it. But the redactor who put them together liked them both, and so he took one of them's account of the (3 3/4) of the flood, and then the other's account of the of the Flood, one of them's account of their going into the Ark, the other's account of their going into the Ark, one of them's account of the waters coming on the earth, the other's account. You see the difference, the one said it would rain, the other said the fountains of the deep would open. In the one the water comes up, in the other the water comes down, but there is a parallel in both accounts in regard to the Flood. ~~To translate it~~ The Conflate Account would be composed of distinct accounts of the different portions of it, but put together to make one long account. Now the case of Creation is entirely different, this comes under c, Separate Accounts. The critical theory is, not that a redactor took P's account of Creation and put it in, and took a sentence of two from it, and then took J's account, a little, P's account a little, J's account a little, but in the story of Creation, according to the critics, he found in the P document a very nice orderly statement, divided up into six (4 3/4) stages, and that made a good way to start the book, so he copied the account of creation. Then in J there was a different account of creation, so he copied J's account. And it remained for people in modern times to see how these two accounts (5)

I had the experience when I was a young fellow, when in school, I said to a man, I believe the Bible account of Creation. He said, which account do you believe? The one inthe first chapter or the one in the second chapter? That's a very baffling question (5 1/2)

Well according to the critics we have three accounts of Abraham's lying about his wife. One of these accounts he was in Egypt, in one of them he was in the land of

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

the Philistines, the third account is like the second, in the land of the Philistines, but in that account they got it mixed and got Isaac there instead of Abraham, so you have three distinct accounts of Abraham's lying about his wife, three parallels, only they can't make any one of them fit document P, so that they are, two of them are in the same document, one in J, two in E, and of course that makes further (6 1/4)

but you see how it fits under the alleged situation, you have three different accounts of the same thing. It would fit their argument much better if there were two different documents but they claim that there are many such parallels in Genesis. They claim more than fifty parallels between different documents, and to hear some of them taught, you'd think all the (6 3/4) told, two or three times over, so you had a complete document of all these parallels. It isn't nearly that (6 3/4)

sounds like a tremendously convincing argument. So we go on to #3, and we note one consideration about this,--

#3, we should note that in all literature it is common to find occasionally the use of a general summary statement followed by a fuller detailed account. Now that of course is particularly familiar to us today because it is commonly used in newspaper articles. It is a regular requirement of newspaper articles. It begins with a lead, and the first sentence in the newspaper article is supposed to tell the story, so that if we read the first sentence we've got the story. Then they go on and give you details about it. It doesn't prove two documents, the first sentence and the succeeding sentences are written usually by the same man. But we find that in other matters that are not newspaper stories, I just looked this morning at random at certain chapters in the Bible, further on , outside the Pentateuch, I happened, my eye happened to fall on Joshua the 7th chapter, and there in Joshua the 7th chapter I found that the first verse began this way: But the children of Israel committed a trespass in the accursed thing. That's the first sentence, now the second sentence which is inthe same paragraph is: For Achan the son of Carmi, the son of Zabdi, the son of Zerah, of the tribe of Judah, took of the accursed thing, and the anger

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

of the Lord was kindled against the children of Israel.

Here you have a statement, the children of Israel committed a trespass, then you have the details, Achan, who he is, and so on, he did it. The thing is told twice, once to give it in general, once to give it in more detail. I happened to look at Judges 18, just opened at random, looking at chapters there, my eye fell on Judges 18: In those days there was no king in Israel, and in those days the tribe of the Danites sought them an inheritance to dwell in; for unto that day all their inheritance had not fallen unto them among the tribes of Israel.

Now there is the statement, the tribe of the Danites sought an inheritance to dwell in. Now your next verse says, and the children of Dan sent of their family five men from their coasts, men of valous, from Zorah, and from Eshtaol, to spy out the land and to search it; and they said to them, go, search the land; --and then it describes how these men went and hunted and found another place for the tribe of Dan to move. The first verse tells of their decision, ~~then the~~ general summary; your second one tells of the details with which they carried out their decision. Then I hppened to open to Nehemiah, chapter 5: noticed the start of it: "And there was a great cry of the people and of their wives against their brethren the Jews." Now there there is a general statement. There was a great cry. Then the next verse goes on and tells how they cried together. "For there were that said, We, our sons, and our daughters, are many: therefore we take up corn for them, that we may eat, and live. Some also there were that said, We have mortgaged our lands, vineyards, and houses.." and so on, and then borrowed also they said, and it goes and tells of the different complaints of the Jews, but the first verse is a general summary of the whole thng, and it is quite common in literature for that to happen.

Now we find many cases of that in Genesis and very frequently these are alleged to belong to two different documents. We notice one or two instances now of it, in Gen. 28.5, it says Isaac sent away Jacob and he went to Padan-aram to Laban, son of Bethuel... the brother of Rebekah. Then in verses 10 through the rest of that chapter and then first

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

half of the 29th it describes how he went, tells about his journey. The first is the summary, he left home and went, where he stopped, (12 1/4) the next one tells the details about how he went.

The critics say that the general summary statement belongs to P, they say that the detailed account comes from J-E. You have the same thing when he comes back, you find in chapter 31.18 a summary statement of his leaving Padan-aram, to go to Isaac his father, and then we find from verse 20 on, through the next two chapters, all of which is given to J-E, a detailed account of his coming back. There are quite a few instances like this, where as it stands there is a general summary, and then a detailed account.

Well, it seemed all right to the redactor to have a general statement and then a detailed account...

P.52. (1/2) * Records from here on are not as clear as those before —

...(record unclear, 1 1/4)...now actually there would be no objection if the two accounts do not contradict each other. (stu) Well, the argument from parallel passages is one of the great arguments (1 3/4)

* Special Note

(2 1/4)...well then this third point as you know is: (repeats it).

Then #4, we should note that in all literature, and particularly in Hebrew writing, repetition for emphasis is found. Hebrew literature is characterized by parallelism. Take up the Psalms and you constantly have the same thing said and said again. Of course Briggs is consistent. Briggs is one of the men who introduced the system into America, if you look at his commentary on the Psalms you'll find he divides every one of the Psalms that I've looked at into two or three different original documents, that have been put together (3 3/4) to form the psalm. He carries it out consistently. But it certainly is-- even no matter how much you break it up you still have parallelism, and you tell any incident, and you will find that, if the thing is well told, there is repetition for the sake

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

of emphasis. Usually repetition in varying terminology, in which the same thing is said over. Now this doesn't occur in telling the whole story, although even that occurs, because we find that sometimes that someone is told to do something, we are given full detail, what he is supposed to do and then we're given full detail of what he did. There you have the thing repeated and of course it's pretty (4 1/4)

Other times we're told what someone is supposed to do, and it just says, and he did as he was told. Or sometimes we'll reverse that and say instructions were given to a man, and then we'll go ahead and tell what he did (4 1/2)

But for emphasis we will occasionally repeat the whole thing twice. That is particularly true in Hebrew literature. Repetition for the sake of emphasis then is prominent in any literature and more common in Hebrew than in just about any other kind, and therefore to claim that it is an evidence of different documents is going rather far, and then #5:

5, Sometimes the same event or fact is mentioned again for a distinct purpose. We have a good example of that in Gen.7 in the account of the Flood.

In the story of the Flood you have a great deal of repetition for the sake of emphasis, in order to impress us with the tremendous nature of the Flood, but here is an instance where we have a repetition for two different purposes. We read in Gen.7.7 that Noah went in and his sons and his wife and his sons wives with him into the Ark, because of the waters of the flood. It goes on and tells what he took in with him, as he went into the Ark. And then you read in verse 11 and 12 about the coming of the Flood, and in verse 13 you read in the selfsame day entered Noah and Shem and Ham and Japheth and the three wives of his sons with them into the ark. So it is told about the going in to the ark twice. We're told about it, about the manner of the going in once, then we're told again to emphasize the fact that God showed them just when to do it, that it was at the very time when the Flood came.

In Gen.1 we have an account of the creation of the animals, in Gen.2 we have the account of the creation of man and woman. But after it tells in Gen.2 of the creation

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

of man, it tells how God brought the animals before man to give a demonstration that no one of them was a proper helpmeet for man, that the woman should be created, and so in verse 19 we read, and out of the ground the LORD God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them. Now there is a mention here of the creation of the animals which had been told about in the previous chapter, but it is a mention for a different purpose, there we were told how they were created, here we are told how it is being demonstrated to Adam that he needs a helper similar to himself, so in mentioning the animals here there is repetition of the fact that God had created, had formed out of the ground, all of these animals, and brought them to Adam.

Now if you want to imagine that God created Adam and Adam was created and here was Adam there. Now God says well we ought to have a helper for Adam, let's make one, so He made a crocadile and brought the crocadile and no it wouldn't do for Adam, so He made a chimpanzee, no it wouldn't do, so then He made another animal, and He kept on, one after the other and He made all these animals simply in attempt to get a helpmeet for Adam, then when He found that no one of them worked, He decided to make a woman. Well, now, such a grotesque concept of the Creator as that is hardly reasonable to think of the alleged J writer, say in the time of Jehoshaphat as having. He would certainly have a more reasonable concept of God than that would suggest. And you go on through your J document and you find a picture of God which is far higher than that could possibly be. They say the J document abounds in anthropomorphism. The J document, they say, has God in more primitive terms than the P document, but certainly nothing like the grotesqueness of such a concept as that. The writer of this is referring to the creation of the animals for a distinct purpose, he is not saying this just happened then. In English we would translate it by a pluperfect, say and out of the ground the LORD God had formed every beast of the field and every fowl of the air. In Hebrew as you know there is no

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

pluperfect. And the perfect in Hebrew can be translated as pluperfect and be translated as ordinary perfect (10 1/4) we have other tenses that the Hebrew doesn't have, in English, and it would have been better if the King James had translated it into the pluperfect, but the reference to the fact doesn't mean (10 1/4)

but to demonstrate to man the need of a different sort of helper. So sometimes the same event or fact is mentioned again for a distinct purpose. Then #6:

6, Frequently the critics claim as parallels what are actually different events or different stories. Now rather than try to give you illustrations of this and carry this through under this heading C, this is so important I'm going to make a new heading, D, here:

D, Examination of Some Alleged Parallel Accounts. ~~Let~~ Let us say of some, if we had to look at all it would take us the rest of the year. We want to look at enough to give a good sample. I do not wish this morning to look at the account of the Flood with you, because as I told you, that after the Day of Prayer was over, the assignment due tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock sharp is to examine the account of the Flood and you will have it in mind so we can discuss it tomorrow, but today I want to discuss with you some others of which we will start with the very first.

1, The ~~Story~~ Account of Creation. Better say Account. Story is all right but it can suggest

(13) Now the statement that is contained in all of these books is, that we have a distinct story of creation in Gen.1 and...

P.53. (1/2)

...there is creation of man in Gen.1 and there is creation of man in Gen.2. There are two distinct accounts of the creation of man, one in Gen.1 and one in Gen.2. I might say to one of you, yesterday afternoon I went down to the Temple Hospital to visit Mr.

(1) I would give you the account

I might visit another, meet another one who knew him, and I might say yesterday afternoon I visited so-and-so, and so on, I might say what he said and what I said, and how long

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

we were there, and all about it. And these would be two distinct accounts given for a different purpose, one to give a brief account, the other a longer account (1 1/2)

We have two accounts of creation, but we do not have two accounts of the creation of the universe. I think that is very important. You might say, look at this newspaper, it has got two accounts of a wedding in it. Well, one of them may be an account of a society wedding in (1 3/4) and the other may be an account of a naval officer in Algeria. Two accounts of a wedding, but they're different weddings. Are these both accounts of the same ~~creat~~ creation? Well, they both do contain the creation of man, but it is absolutely incorrect to say that we have two accounts of the creation of the universe. We look at the beginning of Gen.1. It says that God created heaven and earth, created in other words the matter out of which they were all made. You find no such thing in Gen.2. Gen.1 says and he said let there be light. Gen.2 says nothing about (2 1/2) Gen.1 continues that God said let there be a firmament and he divided the waters above and below the firmament, no such statement as that in Gen.2. Gen.1 says that He said let the waters be gathered together in one place and let the dry land appear. No such statement in 2. Gen.1 says let the earth bring forth grass, the herb-yielding seed and the fruit-tree yielding fruit, and so on. Gen.2 , many books will tell you places the creation in a different order than Genesis 1. But actually Gen.2 doesn't give any creation of vegetation at all. All that Genesis 2 says, as far as the creation of vegetation is concerned is verse 8, and the LORD God planted a garden eastward in Eden, and verse 9, and out of the ground made the LORD God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, There is no mention in 2 of creation of grass or ~~earth~~ herbs or of trees anywhere except in the Garden of Eden. And it doesn't there say He created them, it merely says that He made them grow out of the ground, planted a garden in Eden. So that there is no account of creation of vegetation in chapter 2. The fourth day it says here, God made sun, moon and stars, there is no account in 2 of creation of sun, moon and stars. What kind of an account of the creation

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

of the universe do you have, with no creation of sun, moon, and stars, no creation of original matter, no ~~matter~~ creation of the firmament, no creation of the vegetation. It is very clear that, if you say there are two creation stories, well, like you might say the newspaper has two wedding stories, but if by creation story, you mean two stories of the creation of the universe, that is simply not true, ~~that~~ Gen.1 has the story of the creation of the universe, Gen.2 has an account of the creation of certain parts of the universe.

When I began seminary the professor of Old Testament made a statement that this was like an Atlas which might have a picture of North America in front, then a picture of the United States. Two maps. I think this statement falls far short of the facts. I would think it far better to say an atlas has a picture of the map of the world, followed by a map of the United States. Because on the map of the world, United States is a little tiny thing. And compared with the great sweep of creation in Gen.1, the creation of Gen.2 is comparatively a very, very small part of the whole creation. It is a big sweep picture of the creation of the universe as a whole, followed by certain section of that which is taken and looked at in more detail, and given in more detail. And the figure of two maps I think is a good figure to make it easier for us to see the relation between the two creation accounts, but one of them should be as big as the world and the other no bigger in relation to it than the United States. Now both of these maps might show New York. Both of them might show San Francisco. I doubt if the map of the world would show much more (5 3/4) while the map of the United States would show a great deal that wasn't on the map of the world. But there would be far more on the map of the world that was not on the map of the United States. Yes? (6 1/4) It is in order to explain it. God wanted to give us first a general idea of His creation. Then much more important to us in the matter, He wanted to give us an idea of our relation to it, and He gives us more detail in this section, in order to give more information about a certain section.

It is like the verse that I referred to a few minutes ago, where Isaac sent Jacob away to Padan-aram to his uncle Laban. Well, there is a general statement. Then it is

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

followed by a detailed account of how

but here your general statement covers a big thing and this just covers a little bit toward the end of it because that is the part that is important for us, because the Bible was not written to give us an understanding of the universe, but written to give us an understanding of man's relation to God and how man can be saved. Therefore we have the big general picture and then the greater detail on the small section of that big general picture, the section that relates to us. So that the statement that we have two creation accounts at the beginning of the Bible is very misleading because it implies that they are accounts of creation of the same thing.

We have an account of the creation of the universe followed by a more detailed account of the creation of man. That is actually what we have. Now Driver, in his Literature of the Old Testament begins as most of the critics do, the account of the division of documents with this matter of the two accounts. He says, thus in 1.1-2.4a and 2.4b -25, there is a double narrative of the origin of man on earth. It might no doubt be argued (8 1/4) that 2.4ff is intended simply as a more detailed account of what is described (8 1/4) in 1.26-30, and it is proved that probably the present position of this section is due to relation in which, generally speaking, it stands to the narrative of those verses. That is certainly, if the critics are right, with the idea of the redactor, but if the redactor had such an idea, why couldn't the original author have such an idea for his writing. He said, but upon oloser examination, differences revealed themselves which preproved the supposition that both sections are the work of the same man. In two 2.4b ff the order of creation is 1) man, 2) vegetation, 3) animals, 4) woman. See how different it is, in Gen.1 you have the vegetation, then the animals, then man and woman, but in 2, he says, the order is man, v.7, vegetation, v.9; animals, v.19; woman, v.21ff. The separation between the creation// of man and woman, if it stood alone, might indeed reasonably be explained on the suppositions just referred to, that this described in detail what was before.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

But the order in the other cases forms part of a progression evidently intentional on the part of the narrator here and is evidently opposed to the order indicated in chapter 1. Well, then he goes on to speak of alleged differences of style and so on. But this is the main argument for the difference between the two accounts. The two accounts are different accounts of creation. Well, that's true if you will say one is creation of the universe, the other a very small part of the universe. But then they say, the order of events is different, and they say the two start at different (10 1/4) One starts with a watery chaos, Gen.1.2, that the earth was without form and void and darkness was on the face of the deep and the Spirit of God moved on the face of the waters. A watery chaos.

The second account of creation starts with a dry desert situation, because we read that in the day the Lord made the earth and heaven and every plant of the field before it was in the earth, for the Lord has not caused it to rain on the earth and there was not a man to till the ground, a dry situation you have here, the other it is wet. What a complete difference there is in the two accounts. One starts with a watery chaos, the other with an arid (11) . Well there is a great difference in the two accounts in that regard. And if somebody tells you the story of my life, it will start with me weighing about ten pounds, but if somebody tells you the story of my (11 1/4) in connection with Faith Seminary, it will start with me weighing somewhere between 150 and 200 pounds, and there is a sharp contradiction between them. But the contradiction is resolved when you realize that they start at different places, and at different starting points, the situation is different, so once you recognize that the first is the whole universe and the second is a little bit at the end of it, only about a half or a third of the six days, out of the whole creation, you have there no reason to expect that the situation will be the same when the two start. They start at different points, and therefore there is a different situation. But now the order:

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Driver does here, many a book will tell you that the order is partly different because it has man, vegetation , animal , woman, instead of vegetation, animal, man and woman as in chapter 1. But there are quite a few critical books which have altered that and simply say the order is man, animal, woman, instead of animal, man and woman, and do not say that the order of vegetation is different, and that is because they have looked a little more closely at the passage and have recognized the fact ~~tha~~ as I pointed out to you a few minutes ago, that there is no attempt to say anything about the creation of vegetation in this chapter. It merely says God planted a garden, and to say that is an account of the creation of vegetation is just as senseless as when you read that a man got married and built a home for his wife and say that is the beginning of the building of houses. Just as senseless. It is speaking of a...

P.54. (1/2)

...vegetation, animal, if this was creation of vegetation, it is not reasonable. It has a picture of man which the most primitive savage would hardly think of. ~~V.4~~ Verse 7, the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul. Now God has made man, here he is a living soul. Now you say what w are we going to do with this man? So he puts him over here, to wait a few minutes and see what he is going to do. Well, we read on, the Lord planted the garden and out of the ground the Lord made to grow every tree that was pleasant to the sight. It doesn't say He said let there be great trees standing there, trees a hundred years old standing there. No, he planted a garden and made these trees grow out of the ground (1 1/4)

(1 1/2) that God made a man and then put him ~~aside~~ aside there to wait for fifty years till the trees of the garden grew up and he had a nice garden there, ready to (1 1/2)

Any sort of a sensible interpretation would take it that when it says that he planted a garden it doesn't mean after he created man, but he tells thing, the creation of man, and then He tells the preparation for man, and at least fifty or a hundred years before

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

the man was created He planted a garden, so the trees were all growing , ready to put the man there whom He had made. So any sensible reading of this has the planting of the garden, the making of the (2 1/4) trees to grow as something which occurred not after the trees had been planted, but long before the trees were planted so that it is all ready for man(2 1/4) You or I sometimes make a foolish mistake, by doing something and then we're not ready for the next step and the first has to wait (2 1/4) while we're waiting for the second. But we don't ordinarily. And it is ridiculous (2 1/2)

So this would be better in English, as a pluperfect, that the LORD God had planted a garden verse 8, eastward in Eden, and out of the ground the LORD God had made every tree to grow. It describes what He did before He created man, but the order is logical rather than chronological, and of course those books which don't mention vegetation because they recognize (3) but do insist on the creation of animals here, they say the order is man, animal, woman, but it is far more reasonable to translate (3 1/4)

it is perfectly reasonable even to use the perfect in (3 1/2)

We began Faith Seminary on October 1, 1937, in Wilmington, Delaware. We found a church which had rooms which were available, we put some ads inthe paper, we got 25 students for our first year, we accepted the students after going through their applications and so on, we could describe all that, after stating that we opened the Seminary on October 1, and anybody would know we didn't do those things after October 1. We continue that tomorrow...(4 1/4)--(starting again at 4 1/2)

...under that #1, The ~~True~~ Two Creation Accounts. We noticed the relationship of these, there are two creation accounts, but there are not two accounts of the creation of the universe, and consequently it is incorrect to say that there are two parallel accounts. They are different, and we notice exactly how they are different. Then we notice the two arguments that are made to show they are contradictory, the argument that they have an

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

entirely contradictory beginning, and this is true, the difference is very great at the beginning but we notice why, and when we see the reason why ~~and~~ then there is no contradiction at all. Then we notice the allegedly different order of events, which is one of the big arguments made on this point, and we notice that in answer to this, actually if you take the things that He created (5 1/4)

there is no difference in the order of events, but that there is no creation of vegetation here at all, and that a prior creation of animals (5 1/2)is concerned, it is referred to as having taken place at an earlier time, just as the planting of the garden.

The second of the series of alleged parallel passages is that which deals with the Flood. Between the beginning and the Flood, most of the material is given to J, and there is not any question about any duplicate at all. But when you come to the story of the Flood, there you are supposed to have a conflative story. It is pointed out in case after case, how you have a sentence in P and you have a sentence that gives you exactly the same meaning in J as the critics develop. And therefore it is said that you have a conflate account in which the redactor has simply taken the ~~data~~ J document and taken the P set and deals with what there is on one subject in one of them and then what there is on that same subject on the other, thus it goes back and forth. And you do have a great many (6 3/4)

which are parallel by statements in the other.

However, it is not maintained that you simply have two absolutely identical stories which were combined inthis way, but is held that these stories contradict one another, and the contradiction to a great extent rests upon the idea of continuous document, complete narrative. In other words, they tell you that the (7 1/4) is different, in one case there is sin, in the other case it is more or less just at a whim on the part of the deity. The reason for that of course is that the statements dealing with sin are given to one rather than to the other. While the other simply has statements about upheavals, chaos, violence, not so much directly about sin.

Then you are told that there is a contradiction between the two, because one of

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

them says that they took two of every type of animal, while the other says they took two of every unclean beast and took seven pairs of every clean beast, and this we are told is a contradiction, but of course the reason for this contradiction is that all the passages that speak of the unclean beasts are given to one of the writers, so that if they were divided between the two you'd have that in both, but they are given to the one writer, then they say the other writer (8 1/4)

As it stands then you have a contradiction, because one of them says in Hebrew, a pair of each type of animal, the other says, a pair of each type of unclean beast, but seven pairs of clean beasts. We do not see any contradiction in having these two statements in the same narrative. When you put them in two different narratives there seems to be a contradiction, but (8 3/4) is to put one in one and one ~~knt~~ in the other. Well, we don't think having them in the same narrative is any contradiction. Because our contention is that when God gave Noah the command to put in a pair of each, it started him on the path of finding a pair of each, it gave him a general idea of what was to be done, but when it came to the final detail, then the added (9 1/4) be given that of the clean beasts, most of which are domestic creatures, and quite easy to get access to, that of those a larger number would be put in. It is--there is not contradiction in giving a general order and then later enlarging the order somewhat in a specific statement. If ~~of~~ I were to say that we are going to have a meeting in Media a month from now, at which I wish every student to be present, that would be good for me to give you notice a month at least in advance. (10)

But then if a week before the time I were to say now I want to be sure that every student will be present at this meeting next week, and I hope that you will be able to take your families with you also, there would be no contradiction, there would be an enlargement of the original statement, ~~and be~~ (10 1/4) as we approached to it, and there is something which would be a valuable addition that didn't have to be mentioned

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

so far ahead. That is, we feel, a stipulation as far as this ~~particular~~ alleged contradiction is concerned. Then it is often said that one of the documents says that it came by rain, and the other says that it came by the coming of water up out of the ground, the great fountains of the deep being opened, and a great tidal wave produced the Flood. It is said in some books that you have a contradiction this way as to the cause of the Flood. However, most writers on it do not say that, they say that according to one of them it came by rain only, and according to the other, by rain and also by the fountains of the deep being opened. As you see, that is simply a matter of how you (11 1/4) what statements you're going to assign to each document. You might assign all the statements about rain to one and all the statements about the fountains of the deep being opened, to the other, and there you'd have a contradiction. But in order to do that you'd have to twist the division more than they like to do. That is, they have to do some twisting anyway, as for instance , where they tell us J always says, the man and his wife, even when he speaks of animals, there you translate it, one and his mate, but we do translate it simply male and female. He says that is what J always says, that where we read in Gen.2 that the man and his wife were naked and were not ashamed, he used the man and his wife. That in Gen.1 it says God created them male and female so they say male and female is a word of the document P, man and his wife is the corresponding phrase of J, and they claim about five cases where the J document says man and his wife, and two cases where the P document says male and female, but there are two other cases in what they give to the J document which say male and female and in those cases they simply put a footnote and say in this case the redactor has changed the P phrase to make it conform to J . And that kind of twisting, ~~we believe~~ you see, greatly weakens the whole argument, and they want to keep it to a minimum, and consequently as they are divided, most books will say, that according to one, it is only rain (13) and in the other it is rain and the coming of the waters, the opening of the fountains of the deep. But when you divide it that way, you see, there is much less contradiction. One just

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

mentions the most obvious

and it isn't necessarily a contradiction. Anyway, it is a matter of how you divide between the two alleged documents. The...

P.55 (1/2)

...while according to the P document, it lasted only a year. Others

J document has two periods of 40 days instead of one period (3/4)

(lots of static on record)--(skipped ahead to 3 1/2)

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Now I asked you to notice the events, and there is considerable difference in their approach to that, because you could take five or six verses of general events, preparation, making of the ark, or somebody might think that each stage of the making of the ark was a separate event. I trust though that you were able to work out in each case a reasonable approach to the problem of just how much detail is given. But in doing this, you doubtless noted, that while there is a great deal of overlapping between the material that is given in the J document and the material in the P document, there are a substantial number of things that are in one document and not in the other. And of course the critics say the P document never mentions sacrifice (4 1/2) God has definitely established at Jerusalem, it never mentions that, they give all sacrifice sections to the other document, and so they say P knows nothing in the early chapters, and the sacrifice is in the J document. On the other hand most covenants are given to the P document, so the covenants are given to the P document and we do not have a correspond- covenant in the J document. In both of them you have the statement of the upheaval in the world that leads to the Flood, in both of them you have the statement that man and all types of animals are to be preserved. In both of them you have a statement that they went into the ark, one of them says that the Lord shut them in. In one of them only do you have an account of the building of the ark. The other simply says they went into the ark, does not tell you how it was done, does not give figures, figures belong to P, they're typical of P, the dimensions of the ark. When the rising of the waters, you have both of them stressing the rising of the waters and the greatness of the Flood, that is stressed in both. Then you have the P document tells you that the ark landed on the top of Mt.Ararat, that is the P document tells you that, but then it's the J document tells how Noah looked out and how he sent out birds, three birds sent out in the J document, they did not feel the P document sent out one bird, J two; or J one, and P two. They put all the birds in the J document, but that means that you do not have a parallel, you don't have a duplicate, only the J document has the story of the birds, not the P document. And you have the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

coming out of the ark only in one of them, they don't both say they came out of the ark. One of them tells they came out of the ark and made a sacrifice, the other one simply tells how God gave a promise there wouldn't be another flood and said the (6 3/4)

So you have between them many duplications, but also a very substantial number defend-- some of them taking quite a few verses which are contained in one and not in the other, no parallel in the other. Now I wonder if any of you noticed this, that if you take the matters which are duplicates in J and P, if you take those, most of those you will find duplicated again in either one of the two documents.

You take--I have a book here that gives the J and P marks after each, so it makes it very easy to tell what is attributed to each document, and let me read you just a brief sentence here. Here we have the J document --and the waters increased and bare up the ark. Now, still in the J document, it says and it was lifted up above the earth, that's still the J document. Well, isn't that a duplicate? Maybe you should divide that into two different J documents. In fact that actually is done, not there, but in many places, where you have duplicates within a document. Now where does the P document take us, parallel to the J, the waters increased and bare up the ark, in P, and the waters prevailed and increased greatly upon the ark, and the ark went upon the face of the water. But now just listen to this, P says, and the waters prevailed, ~~the~~ one; and increased greatly upon the earth, two; and the ark went upon the fact of the water, and the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth, three. And all the high mountains that went unto the whole heaven were covered, four. And here all the mountains under the whole heavens were covered, and the next verse says fifteen cubits upward did the water prevail, and the mountains were covered. You have thus the same thing about how the waters increased, they multiplied, they prevailed, four times in the P document, and three times in the J. And in the J document you're twice told they lifted up the ark, and in the P document you are twice told that the mountains were covered, and I think that this is the key to the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

situation. You have duplicates, you have repetition, yes, but repetition is a good literary device for emphasis, and in the account you have the sort of--the violence upon the earth repeated several times to stress it. You have the story ~~tha~~ of the part that they are to take people into the earth, so that humanity and animals are to be saved, repeated several times. You have the coming of the Flood, told, stressed, about six times. And their going up over the mountains two or three times you have in the first part of the Flood story, you have each of these elements told, and said again, in slightly different words, and again, and again, and again, it is a rhetorical device if you are going to not merely tell a fact but to make a vivid impression, to repeat in the same language. And it is very easy to take on these matters, to take half of the repetition ~~from~~ one and put them in and put half in the ~~them in the~~ other but you could just as well divide them again into two or into three documents, because in the early part of the Flood story, these matters are repeated and stressed, and multiplied, but when you come to the end of the Flood, there part of the artistry of the ~~writer~~ writer is to show the tremendous increasing Flood that builds up so great, and lasts so long, and then it stops, and when it comes to the end, there you have difficulty in getting even two repetitions. And in the end it stops and they come out of the ark, these things are only said once, and consequently toward the end of it you have great difficulty in getting two repetitions to put one in one document and one in the other. While in the beginning of it, you have so many repetitions that it would prove five or six documents instead of one, and I think that its the important thing to keep in mind about this particular division into two alleged documents. The last part you can't divide into two complete documents. It is only told once, and the first part you could divide into five or six documents, because all these important things are told and stressed and repeated and stressed again and that is the way in which the artistry builds it up so as to give you the impression of the tremendous events that occurred. So that, I think, is the very vital consideration in understanding the real situation in relation to the Flood, and if you were with a person, a young person who was greatly bothered about this, who had

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

been given it dogmatically in courses he was taking, and just couldn't see how it could be answered. If you were to take a day with him, and to take the two documents, and go through ~~with~~ and note all the parallels and make this fact clear to him, step by step, of the many duplications in the early part, and then find there are practically none in the latter part, how it builds up in great climax, and then just stops, I would think that would make considerable impression on his mind, and ~~then~~ go quite a ways toward destroying his confidence in the dogmatic statements made about this by practically every man in almost any university in the world, who presents material dealing with the Bible. Yes? (12 3/4) That's right. The statement is made that you have two complete stories and you do have certain elements of it in both, but there are quite a few of them that you don't have in both. There are some matters in the beginning, the one tells you the dimensions of the ark, the other just says they ...

P.56. (1/2)

...but that he compresses them about the coming of the Flood and the building up of the waters, and and all that. That is told

Well now here is an added element about this, which I think you will find to be of considerable interest. And that is the claim that is made by Driver and by most other writers, the claim that is made, that the Biblical story of the Flood is taken from the Babylonian story of the Flood. Now that does not ~~etn~~ enter into this course directly, that should be discussed in Old Testament History, rather than in Introduction to Pentateuch. However, we have to refer to it and so I just want to say a few words about it. There is in cuneiform writing a story of the Flood, and this story has a remarkable similarity to the Biblical story. Now Driver and the other critical writers will say the Biblical story was derived from the Babylonian story. That ~~of the Flood~~ cannot be proved, that it was derived from it. There are many important differences in detail, but there are so many similarities that in my opinion it is impossible to say that there is no relationship between the Biblical story and the Babylonian story. Yes? (1 3/4)

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Exactly. A very excellent suggestion. I think that is entirely true. Now you will hear the statement made , that the creation story of the Bible is taken from the Babylonian(2 1/4) and I do not admit that for a minute. The relationship between the Biblical story of creation and the Babylonian are practically non-existent. They both are creation stories, when you say that, you've said it all. They give a list of them. In the Biblical story God creates sun, moon, and stars. In the Babylonian story Marduk creates ~~sun,~~ the moon and stars, it doesn't mention the sun. In the Biblical story God created man, in the Babylonian story the gods create man, and so on. Well, what kind of creation story would you have if you didn't have these things created?

In other words, there is no reason, in my opinion, to see any relation between the Biblical story and the creation, and the Babylonian story. Well, what ~~was~~ would the Babylonians know about God's creation of the world? It happened long before the Flood. People that put God out of their mind had completely forgotten. But as Mr. Gueiros mentioned, the Flood was much later, the Flood was a thing which had happened I would say thousands of years after the creation. The Flood was a thing which still was part of that, but which could have left a recollection of it even upon people which put God out of their mind, and they would recall a great deal of the detail. And therefore it is in my opinion exactly right, what Mr. Gueiros has said, that the similarity between the Biblical story and the Babylonian story is due to the fact that they both recall, that is , it has been passed on by tradition, in both cases. The story of the tremendous event, which was the last great world-shaking event that had occurred before their time. But the difference is that when Moses wrote under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, he omitted any details in it which had become corrupted ~~and~~ in the course of transmission and/or corrected any which were incorrect so that the story as he gives it represents not the best men could do in remembering, but the actual true event. I don't think it was necessary for God to reveal it all over again to Moses, I think he had tradition which told him most of it, but I think God enabled him to correct the tradition and to see what had been incorrectly preserved, and to

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

perhaps even ask details of importance . Where in the case of the Babylonians the tradition had become corrupted and yet the basic matters remains the same, and where ~~one of~~ the Babylonian story is a very polytheistic event, where the sacrifice is given, the Babylonian story says the gods gathered like flies around the sacrifice, they were so happy to be able to eat again material that men had sacrificed to the gods. It is a very polytheistic story and grotesque in its references to the gods. And in the Babylonian story the god Enmil simply takes a crazy whim to destroy mankind. And the god Ea tells his favorite among men how to escape, how to build a boat, but he doesn't tell him directly, he tells a reed hut, and Ea sleeps in the reed hut, and the reed hut tells the man, and then when Enmil who is disgusted that anybody would escape, when everybody is supposed to be killed, well Ea says I didn't tell anybody, and he hadn't, he had just told the reed hut, so the reed hut could tell the man. You see what a low sort of cunning that displays , so different from the picture of God in the Bible, but nevertheless though details are different, the great number of similarities is much too much to be an accident. The Babylonian story has a flood(6) well, there have been lots of floods in the world. Just cause they have a Flood story doesn't prove any relation, or even because they have a story of a universal flood, but each of them had an account of a man being told supernaturally there is going to be a Flood, each of them has a man building a boat, a man could have escaped ~~at~~ to the top of a high mountain, something else, some other way could have been used . Each of them tells of a man building a boat, each of them gives the details of the length and size of the boat. The Babylonians differ. The Biblical sounds like a real boat, the Babylonian is absolutely stupid, it could never float. But it does give the dimensions and the details, they're different from the Biblical. In the Babylonian story there are the--a man takes in his own family and also skilled artisans of various sort, we don't have that in the Bible. In the Babylonian story he looked out and saw people floating in the water like cord wood, and he wept that mankind was

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

destroyed. Prof. Delitsch, not the great Bible commentator, his son, the unbelieving scholar, he said the Biblical Noah shows no trace of compassion for the rest of men. He thinks the Babylonian is much higher th in that regard (7 1/4)

But in the Babylonian story the man sends out three birds, just like the Bible does, different birds. In the Bible you have two birds, the dove sent out twice. In the Babylonian you have three different birds, you have a swallow. The birds are different, but the idea of sending birds out to see how the earth was dried up, that wasn't something that would be in any flood story, that is an unusual sort of thing and you have it in both. In both of them they come out of the Flood and offer a sacrifice, and in both of them, the promise is made there won't be another Flood, so the similarities between the Biblical and the Babylonian story are very striking even though there are many differences.

But here is the interesting thing, in order to get the full similarity between the Biblical story and the Bablonian, you have to have the whole account as we have in Genesis. And the Babylonian story, as the critics then tell us, has many similarities to E and many similarities to J, and they say it is, really, actually , it has more with J than with P, but it has important elements of the parallels are found in only one of the two documents, the way the critics divide it, while you need the whole complete story to get the real parallel to the Babylonian book. I think that is a very, very interesting thing. Yes? (8 3/4) It is hard to tell. It is very easy for stories about a Flood to develop, because there are many Floods. Wherever there is a great river there is occasionally a great Flood, so it is easy for stories of floods to develop , and it is easy for people to imagine that it was this worldwide one. But if you examine the story and find similar things like the sending out of the birds, and the making of sacrifices as it was over, and the being supernaturally warned, and given just how to build the ark, if you find a number like that, you would have reason to say the two stories are probably related. If you do not find them then I would say that perhaps it was just a story such as can easily rise in any (9 1/2) Mr. Chen? (stu) There are a number of matters

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

in Chinese writings where I understand there are particular aspects of the symbols which have a similarity to various Biblical statements of Biblical subjects, and it is very interesting indeed. It is just unfortunate that the origin of those things are so far back and so little known that it is hard to trace how it came about, but there are quite a number of them and it may very well be some relationship we don't know. As a matter of fact, China is mentioned in the book of Isaiah, and there were relationships between China and the West at a very early date, and the earliest Chinese writing has certain similarities ~~ha~~ to ~~certain~~ earliest Egyptian and Mesopotamian writings, so there were relationships at a very early time, undoubtedly. But we don't know much about them so it is very hard to prove how it started.

Well, this I think is one of the most interesting facts about the Biblical, about the whole matter of the alleged J and P documents, this matter that the Babylonian story which most critics say is what the Biblical story was derived from, parallel the two together and not either one. Now if somebody took the Babylonian story and divided it up into J and P documents, and then later put them together to get the whole story is of course utterly fantastic. On the other hand, if the Babylonians had two stories, one like the J and one like the P, and they put them together, just the same way that the critics put these together, is equally fantastic. So, while some of the critical books definitely admit these facts, that it has similarities to P that aren't in J, similarities to J that aren't in P, they definitely admit those. The real force of the argument which is only brought out in definitely conservative books really would say.

Well, so much then for this second alleged conflation that we were going to look at, the case of the flood. Now there are a great many other events in Genesis, in which it is alleged that there is a conflation of documents. There are a great many of them. We will not have time to look at all of them by any means. What I am interested in is having you get the principles in mind, and see how we deal with the problem.

I want to read you a statement from the International Critical Commentary on

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Genesis by Skinner. And in this volume, page xliii, other words 43 in little Roman letters because it is an introduction, there is a statement that says that the E document doesn't seem to have embraced the primitive case. Of course all its relationships are between J and P, practically all, up to chapter 20. Some will say there is some of E in 15 but that's uncertain...

P.57. (1/2)

...but from the point where E strikes into the history at chapter 20, with a few earlier traces at chapter 15, there are few instances in the one document to which the other does not contain parallels. Now that is a tremendous statement. There are few incidents in either J or E, after chapter 20 of Genesis, to which the other does not contain a parallel. Now you prove that and you've gone a long ways, haven't you? But now look at the footnote. Skinner has a footnote. He says the precise extent to which this is true depends of course on the validity of the finer processes of analysis, with regard to which there is room for difference of opinion. On the analysis followed in this commentary, the only episodes in E to which there is no trace of a parallel in J from chapter 15 on, the sacrifice of Isaac, chapter 22; Esau's selling his birthright, chapter 25; the theophany of Mahanum, chapter 32; the purchase of land in Shechem, chapter 33; and the various (1 1/2) in 35. Those peculiar to J are, the theophacy of chapter 18; the destruction of Sodom, chapter 19; Lot and his daughters, chapter 19; the birth of Jacob and Esau, chapter 25; the Isaac narrative, chapter 26; Jacob's meeting with Rachel, chapter 29; Reuben and the (1 3/4) the incest of Reuben, chapter 35; Judah and Tamar, chapter 38; Joseph's temptation, chapter 39; the cup in Benjamin's sack, chapter 44; Joseph (2) 47; and the genealogies of 22 and 25. Now you see, the big sweeping things. Everything practically in E and J is parallel and there is hardly anything in one of them to which there is not a duplicate in the other. Then the footnote (2 1/4)

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

but it sounds to me like
/quite a considerable amount that were admitted in . Now we won't have time to go further today because it takes the whole ten-eleven minutes to answer the question. So take a piece of paper (instruction for test).

(2 3/4)...you still can divide each of them into two or three documents, in the first part, but in the last part you do not have a complete story in the two documents into which they divide them. We noticed also that the Babylonian story of the Flood, which the critics say is the basis from which this was taken, we do not admit that, but we do consider it as another preserved tradition of the same original event, that it is a story which has many parallels with this, but that you have to have the whole story to get all the parallels, and if you take either J or P alone, you only have about half or two-thirds of the parallel with the Babylonian story, and of course to think that the J and E story in Babylon ~~was~~ got combined in just the same way as in Israel would be ridiculous, and (3 3/4) on the other hand, to think the Babylonian story was the original and got divided up into two and then later combined is equally preposterous.

Well now we go on to glance at a few more of the many alleged parallels. #3 is one of those which is most commonly referred to, as an outstanding instance of a clear case of a parallel story. 3, Abraham's Lying. This is the one thing--just yesterday I heard a man saying that we should be absolutely sure of the fact of the original document, that this story, ~~it felt~~ itself, was sufficient proof to establish the whole business. And Driver makes this one of his very foundation matters, in presenting his argument in his Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. He mentions one story of Abraham's lying, and then he says, after he mentions the story in Genesis 20, which tells about Abraham with Abimelech, then he says that we find that in chapters 18 and 19, and the parallel story in chapter 12, we find the word Jehovah uniformly employed. Well, that is unfortunate that Driver expressed it that way, because I don't think it was intentionally dishonest, but that statement certainly gives a dishonest im-

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

pression. You say in the story of Abraham's lying in Genesis 20, you have Elohim used right along, and you notice that that is the case, that in Genesis 20 there in Abraham's journey south, he came to Gerazim, and he said of Sarah his wife she is my sister and Abimelech came to (5 1/2) and took Sarah, but God came to Abimelech in a dream by night. Now we might add why does it say God came rather than Jehovah came? But the critics themselves say that inthe Jehovah document you find the word God used in speaking of relations to foreigners, not of Israel. They say that in the document that give to J you find the word God used when it speaks of speaking with a foreigner , or of a foreigner speaking with God, or even of an Israelite speaking to a foreigner about God, that the term Elohim/ rather than Jehovah is the more natural one in those circumstances. So it says, but Elohim came to Abimelech in a dream by night, and then, But Abimelech had not come near her, and he said, Lord , wilt thou slay also a righteous nation? You might think here it is Jehovah used, but it is capital L, and small ord, so it is just the common word Lord, it is not the term Jehovah. Lord, wilt thou slay a righteous nation, which you would expect from Abimelech, not a member of Israel, not one who, so far as we know, knew the true God. Then verse 6 continues, And God said unto him in a dream, now therefore restore the man his wife for he is a prophet and he shall pray for thee, and thou shalt live. Now this is the first occurrence of the word prophet in the Bible. According to the law of first occurrence, if you want to know what a prophet is, you read Gen.27, where God said to Abimelech, restore the man his wife ~~and~~ for he is a prophet and he will pray for thee. Then ~~of~~ according to the law of first occurrence, if you want to know a prophet is, it is a man whose wife you'd better restore if you've taken her away from him wrongfully. Actually this ddesn't tell us anything about what the word prophet means. Of course, you know what that means, you have to take the law of second occurrence, and the second occurrence of the word prophet is over in Exodus. So that this is the only case of the word prophet in Genesis. That really is part of the prophets course rather than this one. I perhaps should not have

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

paused here. (stu.) No, this is But then he continues and tells how Abimelech said to Abraham, what sawest thou, that thou hast done this thing? And Abraham said surely the fear of God is not in this place, and verse 13, he said, it came to pass that whenGod caused me to wander from my father's house that I said to her, This is thy kindness which thou shalt shew unto me; at every place whither we shall come, say of me, He is my brother. And then you get down to verse 17, So Abraham prayed unto God and God healed Abimelech, and his wife, and his maidservants; and they bare children. But verse 18 said, For the LORD had fast closed up all the wombs of the house of Abimelech, because of Sarah Abraham's wife. So here we have the whole story told with the word God used of Abimelech's speaking to God, the word God used again where God speaks to Abimelech, the word God used where Abraham speaks about Abimelech. We have God healing Abimelech, but then in the last verse of it, we have the LORD , Jehovah, but it would seem quite natural. We have the term God used in a very natural sense, in this connection. It is easy to keep up. But when you speak of what God did to protect Abraham in the last verse, for the LORD had fast closed up all the wombs of the house of Abimelech, there it is natural to use the word Jehovah, the covenant God, God who was in special relation with Abraham, the redeeming God.

So we have the word Jehovah used once in this passage, in this last verse, and it is pretty hard to delete this verse from the rest of the passage. I forget whether that verse is given to J or not, can you see, chapter 20.18? (9 3/4)
Well, I guess it is in parenthesis because that was the redactor here changed it, the redactor here put in Jehovah because he thought Jehovah seemed more reasonable, but the original according to their theory would have had Elohim. But where it doesn't fit their theory and they have to take a redactor as an explanation of it, it shows a weakness actually in their theory. But now you notice then that in this story in chapter 20, you have the word God used about four or five times. We can see a reason why it would be God, a reason which the critics themselves admit when they in other cases find the word

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

God used in passages they give to the Jehovists. But in the last verse of that story, specifically referring to Abimelech it uses the word Jehovah, and we would say that is natural, because it is the emphasis which the word Jehovah normally gets, but they say the redactor must have changed it because this is E story.

Now as Driver presents it in his introduction where he is trying to show how you have the parallels and the stories are given in two different documents, after you get rid of J, the rest of the two different documents, he says here, p.13 in his Introduction to Literature of the Old Testament, thus in chapter 20.1-17 our attention is arrested by the use of the term God, notice he omits 18 which says Jehovah. But he said, in 20.1-17 our attention is arrested by the term God, while in chapter 18-19, except 19.29 which is part of the P document, and in the similar narrative, 12.10-20, the term Jehovah is uniformly employed. Well, he is making comparison between this (11 3/4) the first 17 uses God(about four times). He says look at these other chapters which have Jehovah all through. Well these other chapters are a different story altogether, that is aside from the present point. But he says in chapters 18 and 19, except for one verse of them which belongs to P, and a similar narrative, chapter 12.10-20, the term Jehovah is uniformly employed. Well, you then expect, don't you, that you're going to find in the story of Abraham's lying, in 12.10-20 the term Jehovah is used four or five times just as Elohim was used in this case. Well, let's look at it.

Chapter 12.10-20. We find that there was a famine in the land and Abram went down into Egypt to sojourn there; for the famine was grievous in the land. And it came to pass, when he was come near to enter into Egypt, that he said unto Sarai his wife, Behold now I know thou art a fair woman to look upon. Therefore it shall come to pass that the Egyptians when they shall see thee shall say, this is his wife and they will kill me, but they will save thee alive. Say, I pray thee, that thou art my sister; that it may be well with me for thy sake, and my soul shall live because of thee.

I read you the first four verses of it. Which was used, Jehovah or God? In these

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

four verses? He says Jehovah is used uniformly in that...

P.58. (1/2)

...and commended her before Pharaoh and the woman was taken into Pharaoh's house. And he entreated Abram well for her sake and he had sheep and oxen, and he asses and men servants and maidservants, and she asses and camels. Why does he say Jehovah here instead of Elohim.? Well he is speaking of God's protection over Abraham isn't he? God's relation with Abraham. ~~=Bturh~~ Either term is all right, but Jehovah ~~is~~ seems more ~~ntur=~~ natural, the God of redemption with His protecting care over Abraham, and where you have the same thing said inthe other narrative, it uses Jehovah too. He says the Lord plagued Pharaoh and his house with great plagues because of Sarai Abram's wife. And Pharaoh called Abram, and said, What is this thou hast done to me? why didst thou not tell me that she was thy wife? Why saidst thou, she is my sister? wo I might have taken her to me to wife, now therefore behold thy wife, take her and go thy way. And Pharaoh commanded his men concerning him, they sent him away and his wife and all that he had.

Now in this matter, you notice, the term Jehovah is uniformly employed. As Driver said, you see the sharp contrast. The other story of Abimelech has Elohim all through, this story of Abraham and Pharaoh Jehovah is uniformly employed. It occurs once and that once is in the verse which has an exact parallel in the other passage, which also uses Jehovah. And the other passage tells how Abimelech prays to God and God answers Abimelech, and various things which do not occur with Abraham, so that when he says it is uniformly employed, as far as the parallels are concerned, it only means one verse. Yes? (2 1/4) p.13, Driver's Introduction to the O. T.

Well, the argument then from divine names is not a very good one in this case, but of course we are at present, you can't look at one of these all by itself, without noticing others others as you come to them, but we are at present concerned not with the matter of divine names, but with the matter of parallels. Although we should say one

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

more word about divine names. The critics give the story of Abraham and Abimalech to E, but the story of Abraham and Pharaoh they give to J, verses 7-12 and the one in 26 of Isaac and Abimelech , that also is given to J. So that there are three parallels instead of two and two of these parallels come from the same passage. If a parallel is going to show different documents, this should break up the J document.

But now let's look at the two, one of which is in J, one in E. What do the critics say about the difference between these two? Well, Addis, the documents of the Hexateuch, which print these documents right straight along, to show you how complete it is, without the other, on the--have a footnote about the story of Abraham and Abimelech, in which , he says, the oldest book of Hebrew history has been chiefly compiled from two documents, that of the Jehovist and that of the Elohist. He says the Jahvist, they used to say Jehovist, came more to say Jahvist, because instead of saying Jehovah, they say Jahweh, and that of the Elohist. In this chapter we meet for the first time with a connected narrative from the Elohist hand, here all critics are at one: (4 1/4) Ilgin, Hupfeld, Noble, Ewald, Driver, Keiser, Wellhausen, Kuenen, Kittel, Delitsch. The Elohist speaks of God, Elohim, and does not use the personal name Jaweh, He says he does not use it. Well, let's see what he says about verse 18. For verse 18, he says Jahweh had closed every womb, then he has a footnote, this verse is an addition by the editor who united the Jahvist and Elohist documents. He says Jahweh instead of Elohim and misunderstands the Elohim documents, which he used. So this is Jahweh, so he continues here on this other note I started to read to you, the Elohist speaks of God, Elohim, and does not use the personal name Jahweh. This is no accident, for according to him, the personal name was first (5)

He says in Ex.3.13-15. We have already noticed that according to P it was first revealed in Ex.6.3, but according to E it was first revealed in Ex.3.13-15, while according to J they knew it from the very beginning. This mark of authorship is accompanied by others. Some of these are linguistic and will be found in any good commentary, for

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

instance, the first two or three words which (5 1/4)

but then he says again, it is only the Elohist who represents Abraham as a prophet, v.7. You see how to prove this is the Elohist, the Elohist is the only one of the two documents that represents Abraham as a prophet. Well, how often does the Elohist represent Abraham as a prophet? How do you know? Yes, I was surprised only one person seems to know it, because I mentioned it a few minutes ago. That the first occurrence of the word prophet was this one, in 20.7, and it does not occur again till Exodus. Then only once in the book of Genesis is Abraham called a prophet. How would that prove then that is is a sign of the Elohist document, if it came inthe other one it would be a sign of the other document, wouldn't it? If you had one of them which 12 times called Abraham a prophet and the other one never did, that would be a mark of difference , wouldn't it? But when one of them calls him a prophet once only, how is that a mark of anything, but you notice that is the argument which you get. Again it is only the Elohist who represents Abraham as a prophet. The term would suggests there are many such occurrences . Continues--it is the Elohist who in verse 13 makes Abraham agree with Sarai that they are to pass for brother and sister when they leave their original home, whereas according to the Jahvist, 12.11, Abraham forms his plan when about to visit Egypt. Notice the sharp contradiction there? In the one of them it is said that as he came into Egypt, he saw the people about there and he was afraid of them and he said to Sarai this is a kindness I want you to do for me, you say you're my sister. But according to the story of Abimelech, it says that Abraham said Abimelech before I left my homeland I said to Sarai when we get into a tight spot I want you to say you're my sister instead of saying you're my wife. Because, After all , he said, she is my half sister. Well, now isn't that a sharp contradiction between the two? How many think it is? Well, I 'm glad there is one that does. I wish you all did, because as a matter of fact my opinion of Abraham would be very much lower if he made a plan when he left Mesopotamia and then ten years later he didn't bother to repeat the plan. I would say

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

whether the plan is a good plan or a bad plan, if he's got any skill at all, if he is going to carry through a plan, he will not think of it at the last minute as he comes in, without having thought of it before. Nor will he think of it before without referring to it again. I might think better of Abraham if he hadn't thought of it when he came out of Mesopotamia if it was just a device he thought of all of a sudden, in the stress of fear, yes, but if he thought of it in the first place, it would be very foolish of him not to refer to it again, when the situation came where it was required.

You say to somebody else now whenever we get into this sort of a situation, I want you to do so-and-so, and then let ten years go by and you and they get into the situation, and you want them to do it, you better not depend on it that they will do it, unless you ask them again, because there are very few people who can be depended upon to remember a thing like that, and it is only common sense, if you make a plan, to mention it again at the proper time. There is no statement that he thought of it for the first time when he went into Egypt, none whatever, there is no contradiction between the two at all, there are two different facts mentioned, it is a parallel, yes. I might tell you, might say, in 1931 I took a boat from American to Hamburg and then took the train down to Berlin. I might say to you and there I went to the university. I might say in 1959 I took a plane from New York to Hamburg and then took another plane down to Berlin, and there went to the university. If you heard me say one of these things one day and one the other, you'd say how he does get his facts mixed, one day he said it was 1931 and the other day he said it was '59. One day he said he took a plane to Hamburg and a plane to Berlin, one time he said he took a boat to Hamburg and a train to Berlin, how he gets his facts mixed, look at the two parallels. Must be two parallel stories representing the same thing, only they contradict each other, the facts are mixed. Actually, the thing happened twice, what I just said about myself was exactly true. I could have gone on and said that in '31 I stayed four months in Berlin and in '59 I stayed four days in Berlin, then you'd be sure they were parallels because the number

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

four occurs in both cases. But this sort of argument has been used in dozens and dozens of books and articles and examining this verse and that and the other and today very little is done any more. But the students are just simply told this, what scholarship has proven, this is the fact, this is the final consensus of scholarship, about these four documents which were united to make the Pentateuch, and you go through almost any course in any university in the world, where anything is taught about the Bible and they will simply tell you this as fact, and you take the curricula that are being introduced into most of our large denominations, as required for the use of the different churches, and they will have this assumed and important parts of it specifically presented as fact, but the argument upon which it rests is exactly this type of argument. As I say, it was only yesterday that I heard a very noted professor give as absolute proof of it the two parallels, the parallels of Abraham and Abimelech and of Abraham and Pharaoh. I heard that given by one of the most brilliant men in the world yesterday, as absolute proof of the documentary theory. Yes? (11 1/2) That is a very interesting question which could be quickly (12) because I have added right here --and I don't have a commentary in Exodus, but I have added the giving of the whole Pentateuch according to their theory, and I'm not sure I think of the verse, was it chapter 7, think it is, and I don't --no, it's earlier than that, chapter 3 I believe--it is where Moses ~~Abraham~~ says to God, send whoever you will but don't send me, and God said I will give you Aaron to be your spokesman, he says you will be God to Pharaoh, and Aaron will be your prophet, and that is the second use of "prophet" and that is the case which shows so clearly what the word prophet means, because it means a spokesman, he is to be like a god to Pharaoh and Aaron is to be his prophet, Aaron is the one through whom he is to give his message. Yes? (13) ...

P.59. (1/2)

...you see, that's after chapter 6, the name Jehovah has already been revealed, and Jahweh said to Moses, see , I have made thee a god to Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

shall be thy prophet. So it is a verse that uses the term Jehovah in it, but it is a verse which they give to the P document, so they say the --wherever you find Abraham as a prophet is the Elohist, but you only find it once. So it doesn't prove a thing. But it is typical of a hundred arguments, many of which are much better than that, but it does make them seem weak when that sort of argument is combined with them. So much for Abraham's lying. Now let's look at a very interesting story, the story of the sending away of Jacob.

You all remember that story, of how Jacob was sent away by his father to go up to Mesopotamia, and there we have the story, according to the critics, told twice, we have the J story, Gen. 27.41-45; and the P story, Gen. 27.46 - 28.5, so they seem to go right along continuously, don't they? Now look at 27.41-45, and you read,

Now Esau persecuted Jacob because of the blessing wherewith his father blessed him, and Esau said to himself, the days of mourning for my father draw near, then I will kill my brother Jacob. But Rebekeh heard of the words of her elder son Esau and she sent for her younger son Jacob and said to him, behold, thy brother Esau will have revenge on thee by killing thee. Now I say, listen to my voice, arise, flee to Haran to my brother Laban and live with him a few days till thy brother's wrath passes away, till thy brother's anger passes away from thee and till he forgets what thou hast done to him, then I will send and bring thee from there, why should I be bereaved of two at one time, and then the J document skips over to 28.10 and takes the verse, and Jacob departed from Beersheba and went to Haran. But now the P document continues right on after verse 5 which I just read to you, she said, go there and stay till your brother's anger passes away, then I'll send and bring you from there. The P document now continues and Rebekeh said to Isaac, I am mortally troubled because of the Hittite women, if Jacob take a wife of such women as these Hittites, the women of the country, what have I to live for?
And Isaac called Jacob and blessed him, and commanded him, and said to him, Thou shalt not take a wife of the women of Canaan. Arise, go to Padan-aram, to the house of Bethuel

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

thy mother's father, and take a wife thence from the women of Laban thy mother's brother. And may God almighty bless thee and increase thee and make thee many so thou shalt be an assembly of nations, and may He give thee the blessing of Abraham to be in thy seed with thee, that thou mayest possess the land of thy sojourning which God gave to Abraham. And Isaac sent Jacob away and he went to Padan-aram, to Laban the son of Bethuel, the Aramean, Syrian, the brother of Rebekah, the mother of Jacob and Esau.

Now I read those to you, I believe it is word for word like in the King James, but I read them to you from this little book called the Old Testament from the Modern Point of View, by the Rev.L.W. Batten, Ph.D., who was at one time professor of Old Testament languages and literature at the Philadelphia Divinity School of the Episcopal Church, and in this book then, The Old Testament from the Modern Point of View, he prints these two side by side, and he asks this question, are these two independent stories or are they rather, as modern critics assert, two varying forms of the same original? These are certain facts which should be carefully noted. Each narrative distinctly states that Jacob was sent away, but there are two distinct reasons given for his departure. One of them says he went to escape the wrath of his enraged brother, the other says he went to procure a wife of his own kindred. So you see the contrast? He says, according to P Isaac ~~had to~~ blesses Jacob before his departure. In a way it is truly strange in view of the trick Jacob had played upon him, the source of which this is taken evidently knows nothing about Jacob's fraud in getting the blessing. Esau too is impressed with the blessing of Jacob as he would not have been if this writer had known of the trick, but there reading of the narrative reveals unmistakable signs of duplication. The natural conclusion, therefore, is that these two sources each contain an account of Jacob's departure for Syria, but each gives a different cause for the journey. Now I did not read some of the verses in which he said this word is a sign of the P document, this is sign of the J, because we'll look at those under our next head, the argument from style. But here we look at them as parallels, you notice, we have two parallel stories. In the one story

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Jacob went off in order to escape from Esau's killing him, it was--the reason he went was fear. In the other stories the reason he went was because if he stayed there he might marry one of these Hittite women. And that would make his mother feel very badly so she wanted him to marry some one from her own relatives, so she persuaded Isaac to send him up. Notice the parallel, two distinct stories, but this comes under the heading we had when the same thing is told for two different reasons. Now it is not exactly the same thing, because it is Rebekah talking to Isaac in one case, and in the other case talking to Jacob. Now if Rebekah is going to work out her plan, and get Jacob to go up there, she has got to talk to the two people, she has got to get Jacob to be willing to go and she has got to get Isaac to be willing to send him, and Isaac knew that he had gone against God's will in trying to give the blessing ~~to Esau~~ Esau that God had already said was to go to the younger, he knew he had been going against God's will in doing that, he had been ~~pushed~~ tricked into it, but he would have done it anyway because God had predicted in advance it was determined Jacob, in trying to get a thing he was entitled to anyway, was reprehensible but he would have had it anyway, because God had already promised him, and Isaac knew that, and Isaac sends his son away on a long, long journey and knows he may never come back it is quite natural to expect him to give a blessing. In the story of Rebekah's talking to Jacob, you don't expect there to read of Isaac's giving him a blessing. That's more apt to come inthe story where she is talking to Isaac, but you have two stories of Rebekah persuading somebody to bring it about that Jacob goes up to her old home. Two stories, one her dealing with Jacob, the other her dealing with Isaac, and they're both necessary for the story. If Jacob had just run off and said nothing to Isaac ~~you~~ he couldn't expect to inherit the blessings of the birthright and so on, he certainly had to leave with his father's blessing, in fact, it is unlikely that a man would have thought of such a thing with the strong parental control in those days.

And on the other hand, if Isaac had simply said to Jacob, I want you to go up to

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Padan-aram and get a wife up there, why Jacob I think would have put up resistance. Let's just suppose that the stories were reversed, suppose that Rebekah had come to Isaac and she had said, Isaac, I want you to send Jacob upto Padan-aram for a while, in the first place, Esau is very angry at him because he sold the birthright, Esau is going to kill him, send him up there, till Esau gets over his anger. Can't you imagine what Isaac would say. Isaac would say, why Esau, his favorite, Esau, that man of lofty character, wonderful qualities, can you imagine him killing Jacob, of course he wouldn't think of it, Esau is no murderer, Esau just loses his temper, gets excited of course, he is just a good sort of an amiable easy-going sort of a fellow, but he would never kill him, he might hurt him, he might rough him up a little, it would be good for Jacob, it would be very good for him after the way he acted. He deserves to be roughed up a bit, let him take his medicine, why send him flying off somewhere? Well, she doesn't even mention to Isaac fear of getting Jacob away for fear Esau would kill him, she doesn't do that, she presents to Isaac something that will influence Isaac to do what she wants.

Now we were saying supposed we reversed the story, suppose we have, suppose she went to Jacob, Jacob she says, my soul is vexed because of these Hittite wives that Esau has married, just makes me irritated, I want you to go up there to Padan-aram and get one of my relatives, marry one of them, can't you imagine Jacob, yes, she wants me to go up there and get some wife I've never seen before, but if these wives here good enough for Esau, why aren't these women good enough for me? I've been pretty busy lately, getting ahead in life and I haven't thought of marriage, but maybe I am getting old, come to think of it, why should I run way up there, why some of these girls are rather nice looking around here, I don't think it would have been the clever way of Rebekah to get Jacob to marry a woman she wanted for her to start talking to him that way. But the argument to him about Esau, he felt pretty shamefaced about the way he treated his father, he knew that Esau, that while Esau wasn't a murderer, and he probably wouldn't do this, yet he knew he was mighty angry and there was a possibility

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

that he might go further than he intended, and Jacob was always a man who thought that discretion was the better part of valor, the argument she used with Jacob was a good argument to get Jacob to go. The argument she used with Isaac was a good argument to get Isaac to send Jacob, and she meant them both, because she wanted Jacob to live, and she wanted Jacob to marry one of her relatives, so the story as it stands is a complete story, both elements of which are necessary, the story is incomplete with either of these left out, it is a complete necessary story, with both parts necessary, there is a repetition, yes, but the repetition is such as you will find in any story. The repetition has a reasonable purpose in it. And so the argument about two parallel documents here is not a very conclusive argument. Now there are many other instances we could look at, I'm going to lump seven of them together under #5:

5, Parallel Giving of Names. Now I don't think that will convey a lot of meaning --just that phrase--till I explain what I mean by it. But once I do you will see exactly what it means. Yes? (12 1/2) It isn't, we are under the third argument of Parallel Passages. Mr. Golin is right though that Continuous Narrative does enter into it, very considerably, because the theory that we have two complete documents which have parallels, you can't separate the two arguments. But we are at present...

P.60. (1/2)

...and now the parallel giving of names. Now you will find statements made --I don't have one right here to give you instantly, but it is easy to find, because there are many of them, and especially in popular lectures, it is very common, that there is a whole series of accounts of the name of different places. And that you have places and people named and that you have a different story of each one, a different story of why the name was given. The fact of the matter is that when you examine it you will find there are maybe thirty cases in Genesis where a man, probably more than that, and where we are given some explanation or reason for the name. And that in two or three at the very most, you have the account of the giving of the name stated more than once. In two or three

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

at the most. But what you do have, is you have occasionally, in passages they give to different narratives, something that is a play of words on one of these names. One of the most striking instances of that is the case of Isaac, in the case of Isaac, you have the account of how God came to Abraham and God said that He was going to give them a child, and Abraham could hardly believe it, that he could have a child through Sarah who was already a hundred years old, he couldn't believe it, and he laughed at the thought of it, and then Sarah said, shall I who am already so old, shall I again have these experiences, shall I have a child, and then she laughed, and when Isaac was born they both laughed for joy, and they called him Isaac which means laughter. And Addis says, in this volume which has the priestly history and then law, p.217, he has the statement: laugh, the name Isaac is derived from the Hebrew verb "to laugh." According to the Jahwist the name was given because Sarah laughed out of incredulity, chap.18.12, according to the Elohist because she laughed out of joy, 21.6, according to P because Abraham laughed out of wonder. Now did Abraham laugh not out of incredulity, nor out of joy, but out of wonder? Let me read you what the P document says. God says Sarah is going to have a son and there will be many nations come to (3 1/2) then Abraham fell on his face, and laughed and said (3 3/4) in his heart shall a son be born to one that is a hundred years old, and shall Sarah who is 90 years old, bear? You notice in this case he laughs out of wonder, not out of incredulity as Sarah, but wouldn't incredulity fit this every bit as well as that? Shall a child be born to one that is a hundred and his wife, already 90, wouldn't incredulity fit this every bit as well as wonder? How can you say there is a contrast if just the way they divide they have laughing three times? But why shouldn't there be, in such a striking tremendous event as this, why shouldn't there be a lot leading up to it, and why shouldn't they laugh all three times? Why shouldn't it be one document just as well as three, and what reason is there to say that the contrast had different reasons for it? Mr. Kaufmann? (4 3/4) The reference on Abraham's laughter was Gen.17.17. See, this is a footnote on that

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

where he refers to the other in the J and P documents. Yes? (stu.) J, E, and P. Well, suppose next Monday I refer to this again and give you precise references. I don't want to take longer because I don't want to cut down your time for writing, because you have a big question that really ought to have 15 minutes, and there are only nine left so you'll have to write real fast. But please write your name on a piece of paper, and as I say, I'm sorry this is a big question, so try to summarize it and ~~get~~ give the most important things. (5 1/2, ~~br~~ record skips a bit)

...now these arguments as we noticed are interlaced so that its very hard to deal with any one of them without touching to quite an extent on the others. They are interlaced, the first argument on the names is the place it all started, and the critics today try to say well that's just where it started, that's just one of a hundred different stylistic marks, but the fact is they're constantly building on it as a big main argument. Yes? (6.stu) Yes, that assignment is not due till 4:30 this afternoon, but I posted it last Friday morning. It's just a two-hour assignment, it's to look at the names of God that you find in certain passages of Genesis, and to note whether you see an obvious reason for the use of the name Jehovah or Elohim, or whether you think that its use there is a problem which is very difficult to answer. And put 2 hours and go as far as you get, as it says on the Bulletin Board. How many did see it Friday? Good, well most everybody saw it, so anybody who started Friday has had plenty of time to get 2 hours done on it by 4:30 this afternoon. Anyone who did not see it Friday, just write out on a paper, did not see it Friday, and get it in tomorrow morning. Yes? (7 1/4) Well, I mean, supposing now try to think of yourself as talking to a person who knows nothing about the subject: he is neither a Christian, nor a higher critic, but he is a man who sees a document and he looks at this document and sees here is says God and here it says LORD, and the higher critic says to him well now that must have been different documents put together, how would they have two different names? Well, do you have a sensible explanation which would satisfy such a person who knew nothing about the matter? I'm not asking you in a place

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

that strikes you as really difficult, to try to figure out some explanation, I'm asking you to take those in which the explanation is fairly obvious and put it down, and if it looks to you like one which would pose a real problem, simply think of it. That is, we're trying to cover quite a little material rather than spend a lot of time trying to explain any one or two particular cases, trying to see how many cases you'll note in the course of the material you look at, which you think you would have a little job explaining satisfactorily, to a third party, one who knows nothing about it and is looking at it in curiosity, ~~rather than~~ to try to make up his mind. (more about assignment, repetition.)

Now that first argument then is one which we recurs constantly and you can't get away from it, even though when you make a big argument people will say oh that is just one of a hundred stylistic points, but actually they use it as much more than that, and that is where the whole argument starts.

The second argument from Continuous Documents, has been--you don't hear much about it any more, but originally it was one of the big arguments, one of Hupfeld's big arguments. You can take these three documents and you trace them right through completely, through Genesis. Even though E doesn't start till Gen.20, you've got the whole story in all three, and that argument and the third interlace to quite an extent.

Now the third argument is one you hear about a great deal, and if the third argument can be proven , it is a tremendous argument, so we are taking quite a bit of time on the third argument. It is the Argument from Parallel Passages, or Duplicate Narratives, you can call it either of these titles you want. The second was Continuous Narrative, or Complete Documents, either title you want.

This one, we are looking at then, of Continuous Narrative, just at the end of the hour last time, I mentioned as one of the types of parallels which are alleged, I mentioned the matter of the giving of names, and this is one which is referred to a good bit in arguments today, and consequently I think that it is good to be sure you understand what it means, even though we won't take a great deal of time going into its details,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

speak of clean and unclean and put them in one document, and the others in the other, naturally one knows nothing of clean and unclean, but that there is no contradiction in telling Noah far ahead of time, you are to take in two of these animals, and then as it approaches nearer adding to it that of the clean animals which are a comparatively small part of the whole number, that of them...

P.66. (1/2)

...you divide it, you give the references to the fountain of the deep to one of the two, one story is a little larger than the other. Somebody might say that last week the storm did great damage down in New Jersey, and then a little later in speaking of it, they might say the storm and the tidal wave did great damage. The rising tides are a part of the storm, they were not mentioned first, God sent water, he sent rain, but He also sent it in another way. There is no contradiction in adding a further detail. What is the third? Reason for the Flood, the account of the wickedness of man was given to one, then to say this one has that reason. You give it to one , that one has the reason. The other one you don't give it to. The only contradiction is that, you take material of one type and give it to one rather than the other. But what's the fourth? The duration of the Flood, there are two places that speak of 40 days, and there's a statement that speaks of 150 days and there's a statement that speaks of the whole duration something over a year. Then there's the reference to sending out a bird two periods of seven days. You give some of the time periods to one, some to the other, naturally they differ, the contradiction there is an imported artificial one, quite clearly. There is no contradiction when you take it all of the same. What's the fifth? Yes, well that would be (2 1/4)

Well, now does anybody have any further point on the Flood ? Mr. MacKeen? (2 1/2) No, the other doesn't give the reason, so they say it is just a caprice of deity, because it doesn't give a reason. Other questions? (stu.2 3/4) Yes, thank you, that could be considered a contradiction. They say P knows no sacrifice. P never has any sacrifices until the order is given that sacrifice be at Jerusalem. P keeps sacrifice in

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

one place, Jerusalem. If you give all other sacrifices to somebody else, naturally you don't have any in P, but that is said over and over in the critical books, P recognizes no sacrifice prior to the establishment of the (3 1/4)

It is a contradiction by giving a statement to one and then saying it isn't in the other. It doesn't say the opposite, it merely doesn't say that. Any further questions about the Flood?

Well, that then covers these illustrations. Oh, I should say a word more this morning about the papers that you have turned in, most of you turned in yesterday afternoon. Those who did not see the announcement Friday it was all right to turn them in this morning. Haven't yet looked over this morning's, have looked over yesterday's, and they vary, but the point of my giving them to you was to bring out from your own observation the way in which these men ~~were using~~ . That there are many cases where it is very clear why a name should be used. There are many--Kuenen, I read you some time ago, how he said that a heathen naturally used the term God instead of Jehovah, an Israelite speaking to a heathen uses it, Elohim is used to express God's power and majesty. Jehovah is more his personal relation to His people, His redemptive power, and so on. He admits those. Now some go farther, some of them will admit very few, but every one admits that there are certain cases where there is a clear for the difference, and where even in the document which they say uses only one, another is used. And they admitting that, they question is , are there enough others to prove distinct necessity of distinct documents? To what they say, we can add the fact that it is natural when you use one term to keep on using it. You refer to someone in a certain way and it is easy to keep on using it. And then as over against that, there is the other thing that it is natural to keep a certain amount of variety. I just happened to open the Bible to 2 Cor.5, and it was interesting there to notice how the apostle Paul speaks about Jesus, he says in verse 6, that while we are at home inthe body we are absent from the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Lord, he is speaking of Jesus as the Lord, verse 8 again, to be present with the Lord. Verse 10 he says we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; verse 11, knowing therefore then the terror of the Lord; verse 14, the love of Christ constrains us. Then in verse 18, he says he has reconciled himself to us by Jesus Christ. Sometimes he calls Him Christ, sometimes Jesus Christ, and look up at the previous chapter, verse 14 of chapter 4: knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise up us also by Jesus, he calls Him the Lord Jesus, then he calls Him Jesus, then in the next chapter he calls Him Christ, he calls Him Lord, he calls Him Jesus Christ. Why? You might find a reason in each case, but the chances are, you couldn't in all the cases. One reason may be variety, you use a term and there is a tendency to use a different term if you know another that fits just as well and gives the same sense. This varies at different periods. The King James writers, when they translated, tried to get different terminology as much as they could, and they would use four or five different English words, for one Hebrew word, to get variety. The American Revised Version reacted violently against that, they said well the Hebrew has one word, let's use one word in English. Well, they introduced the same word in the English for the Hebrew. The style changes on them. And it is easy to see that a writer could be influenced by having used a term which is very appropriate for someone, he keeps on using the same term. Or he can be influenced by the feeling for variety and can make changes where the sense is just the same, simply using another term which fits equally well. If anything I write, it disgusts me, that I have to spend one-third of my time getting rid of duplication. And I have been so disgusted with it but I talked to a man who has written a number of books on secular subjects and he said to me, he said, that he finds that that takes him a tremendous amount of his time. He says that if he used the word, a marvelous event, something like that, well, he says, in speech you don't notice, but he says, in writing, next you know, if a page you use it again, it's awkward, and so you have to keep watching, that you use a different adjective, a different word to avoid unpleasant repetition

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

I find over and over, I write a letter and in the letter I use a certain phrase, maybe a phrase I haven't used for years, and the very next paragraph I use the same phrase again, I read the letter over and I change it, because it looks very awkward in a letter to have repetition. Well, you get the feeling of having lots of variety, and then again the natural tendency is, having used a term for something, to keep on using it. Some of that--if a sizeable number of them are explainable on a reason why this is more appropriate than the other, and in none of them is the particular one inappropriate, it is easy enough to see that natural desire for variety, and also the natural tendency to keep on using the one you started, that between the two of them it is quite natural to have them used the way they are, and you find parallels in for instance--Mohammed, the Koran, where he speaks of the Lord, he speaks of God, and he'll speak of the Lord, speak of God, of God, of the Lord, variety in this. And you find that in one period of his life he tended to use one thing more, and in another period tended to use the other much more. Well, now we have 17 minutes so it is hardly time enough to start another subject, our time is too short, so maybe we better start our little quiz right now. I planned it to be 15 minutes, so if you have another minute it won't hurt.

For the ODD people, put your name, your number, and the date. The first question for them: discuss the alleged parallel of the story of Abraham's lying.

For the EVEN, #1, we mentioned 3 types of parallels, just list them. Yes, you may use the English Bible.

Then #2, for the EVEN: discuss the sending away of Jacob.

#2 for the ODD, mention the 3 types of parallels, list them. That was in the outline of the beginning of our discussion of parallels. ...

P.67. (1/2)

...and did not take the previous test, or has missed 3 quizzes in addition to what was covered by the previous test,

why you will have a chance to make up three of them by this hour quiz. If you do not

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

take it they will simply stand as zero, in the/ term's mark, but whatever you get on the quiz, on the test, will be given for the quizzes, if you missed them. Now if anybody who took quizzes and wants to raise the mark and take the one-hour test, the one-hour test will substitute for your 3 lowest marks up to this point, so there is a chance to improve whatever you have done before by taking the test, it is entirely optional, no one has to take it, but it is highly recommended if you have been getting low marks on the quizzes, not only for the chance to raise the marks, but also because the review for it will help you to get the material well in mind, and in shape to get far more out of the rest of the semester, than if you didn't do it. Mr. Yuen? (1 1/2) No, I think that is a fair question but the test will not lower the marks, if you take the test and turn in a blank sheet of paper, it will not lower your mark in the slightest, but whatever you get in it will be substituted for your lowest mark unless it is lower than they are. Mr. MacKeen? (2) Very good question. Now I have found it difficult to keep the marking of the papers up to date, it is a big class. The last couple of weeks have been very busy weeks and the papers have fallen behind, and I'd like to get them caught right up immediately, if possible, so that I could let everybody know, by giving you back your paper.

So I was wondering whether this morning I couldn't ask if there was somebody who could give me some additional help to what I already have. I have some very excellent help but not with/quite sufficient time to keep up to date on it. So if there should be somebody here who has the time to put in the number of hours for which you would be paid in marking papers to get right up to date I would appreciate it. Now right at this time before exams I think it unlikely that anybody will have that much time, so I have an alternative suggestion, if there should be anybody here who got a mark of 85 or better in Introduction with me last semester, or with Mr. Taylor before, in other words, the top 60% of the class, anyone in that, who would like to make one question simply as a service to the class, it would take you approximately an hour, you might be able to do it in 45 minutes, because it is one question for half of the class, I would

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

give you a statement, exactly what would be included in that answer if it was perfect, and then you would simply have to compare the papers and give a mark, that would take approximately an hour of your time, and it would mean that after you had gone over that many papers you would know that particular material, so it is very excellent review, and I think you would receive a greater benefit from it than any pay for it would amount to. They say, if there is somebody whose work is 90 or above who could put in several hours, we would gladly take it, but if there should be a number who would do one question, why we could get it right up to date very quickly, and in such a case, if there are some who would like to do one question, I think that would be time that would help you in your own study, rather than be a hindrance to you at all, but who within the next three days, that is, by next Monday, could have one question done, if you would turn me in a note at the end of the hour, just turn in a note, giving your name, stating you could do one question before Monday, so I could have it Monday morning, and have time to check over them before giving them back, and then state what time today, anytime after chapel you could see me to get the papers and find out. I would appreciate it quite a few could do that, and get right straight up to date. Otherwise I might not know (5 1/4) till time for the test next week and as Mr. MacKeen says you wouldn't be sure whether it was necessary or not to take it. So if you can, please, if anybody who has a mark of 90 or above would like to put in a few hours, between now and Monday, I'd appreciate that greatly, but I think it unlikely there'll be anybody who can. So if you could put in one hour, if there would be several, that would be very helpful right now. I think that would help the whole class and I know that each one who did it would help your own work to benefit tremendously. Now to continue with our discussions, we are looking at D, the consideration of the argument on parallel passages.

And in our consideration of that, we looked last I believe it was #6, Joseph's Youth. And then we went back and reviewed the material on the Flood and I believe one of the others, that time. So that held us back, a bit, but I think it is very important to

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

have this well in mind, and well understood. You will all run up against these problems sometim sometime later, and one thing that makes me particularly anxious that you get this material well is the realization that if you leave here and take a little church somewhere with just a few very godly people in it, the chances are that the first five or six years you may not run onto this, you may get rather rusty in it, and then, if you do, I'm sure within six or seven years at the most, if your work is any good at all, you will then find yourself in a situation where it will be tremendously important to your witness in your ministry, to be able to help some very intelligent people who are really upset on these matters, because there is many a very , very godly consecrated person who has been completely befuddled by the presentation, the very skilful presentation that is found so widely of this critical material and eventually has entirely lost his zeal. And if you, at that time, are able to deal intelligently with him on it, it will be a tremendous help to him and maybe one of the greatest services to you the Lord will render in your life . I don't think it likely in most of your cases, unless you go directly into student work, that you will have that experience the first year or two after you graduate, but I think everybody will be in a situation within five or six years, if your service for the Lord is effective at all, where it will be tremendously important, so I want you to get the work well enough now, that you will be able to go back and refresh your mind and remember that with your notes well in mind, you'll be able to give such real help even with four or five years lapse in between your graduation and the time when it will prove of tremendous importance to you. So I want to be sure you understand it thoroughly and therefore AY I do not find having taken most of the last period really reviewing what we had gone over, but it is very important material and well worth it.

Now we're going to look at a very important alleged duplication, #7:

7, Origin of the name Jehovah. Now here it is alleged in most books that present the critical theory that this is one of the clear cases of Parallel Passage. The three different views that are held about the origin of the name Jehovah. Now according to the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

view, you have in document J which finds the name of Jehovah revealed--now I'm using Jehovah, as you know, as a familiar term. If you use it inthis sense, talking with people who are trained in critical schools, they would immediatdy think you are an ignoramus, because they say, of course , there never was a name Jehovah, that is the vowels of Adonnai combined with the consonants of (9 1/4) and they will say the is pronounced Jahweh, not Jehovah. The fact is, nobody knows how it was pronounced. We canbe quite certain it was not pronounced Jehovah, because we know how that combination was formed. Therefore, it is unlikely that this artificially formed combination represents the real original pronunciation. I'd say there is one chance in a hundred that it actually was called Jehovah. We don't know how it was. The chances are greater that it actually was called something like Jahweh, but we don't know, and actually sounds change so anyway, that nobody knows exactly how any word was pronounced, that long ago, and I am using the term as the representation which has occurred in the King James Version and in other versions since that time--a widely known representation. You understand. I don't mean that is what they said, Jehovah, but they used the name of God, which is represented by the Hebrew consonants Joh-heh-wau-heh, and it is never written with the vowels because the vowels were not introduced till about the fifth century A.D.(10 1/2) and long before that time they had stopped saying it and simply said, "the name," or else said, "the Lord," and the translation for LORD was taken over for the Septuagint, and the New Testament referred to under that term. It is very important to have those facts in mind. Otherwise you will seem to be an ignoramus when you use the term Jehovah. I don't see any objection to your using but be ready immediately when somebody questions it to show them that you know exactly what the situation is and you're using it simply as a convenient indication rather than as your idea of what the name really was pronounced. But they say, that, according to the J document, the revelation of the name Jehovah we find in Gen.4.25. Up to that time we find the narrator in the J document,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

using the word. Of course he was writing long after the event which he claimed to celebrate. He was writing mostly I would say in the time of Jehoshaphat. Some of the critics lately are becoming more conservative and think he lived in the time of David, rather than the time of Jehoshaphat, but the statement which we find in Gen.4.26 is and to Seth to him also there was born a son, and he called his name Enoch, then began men to call upon the name of Jehovah. So they say that is the J story of the revelation of the origin of the name Jehovah.

Now the J document is very consistent in this belief, because it not only...

P.68. (1/2)

...right in the time of Adam's sonor grandson, men had begun to call on the name of the Lord, long after that time, God used it. But long before the time of Jehoshaphat. And according to the J document it was known and used by Noah in Gen.9.26, where Noah said, blessed be Jehovah, God of Shem. And Cain shall be his servant. Elohim shall enlarge Japheth, but it is Jehovah that is the God of Shem. Noah refers to Him thus by that name. Abraham in chapter 15.2, Abram said, Jehovah God what will thou give me, seeing I go childless? So Abram used it in addressing God. In 18.31 Abram said, behold, now I have taken upon me to speak unto the Lord. It is not capitalized here in my King James Version, so perhaps that reference is not exactly the correct one given. But how about 22.14, Abraham called the name of that place Jehovah-jireh, as it is said to this day, In the mount of the LORD..." So Abraham used the name of God as part of the designation he gaVe to the place, according to the section the critics allege belongs to the J document.

In chapter 24.3, Abraham said to his servant, I will make thee swear by Jehovah, the God of heaven and the God of earth. And then in that same chapter, verse 12, the servant of Abraham prayed, O Jehovah, God of my master Abraham.

Similarly we find the name used later on by Isaac, By Esau, by Jacob, by Leah, and by Rachel. So according to the material the critics give to the J document, the name

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

J was known to all the patriarchs, was commonly, and men began to call upon the name of the Lord, in the time of the son, or at least of the grandson, of Adam. Well, now that is the J document. Now according to the critics the E document and the P document differ from the J. Yes? (3 1/2) No, that God spoke to Abraham and called Himself by that name, that God said to Abraham, I Am Jehovah. He did not wait till the time of Moses to reveal the name, He said to Abraham, I Am Jehovah.(stu.) According to the J document, surely Abraham must have known it before, because it says that inthe time of Seth and Enoch, then began men to call upon the name of Jehovah. It would seem very strange if he didn't know it. But here is clear proof that God did call Himself that to Abraham. Now of course Mr. Abbott has a very good point there, if you want to say, well now the J document contradicts itself, because it says here God revealed His name to Abraham, He said to Abraham, I Am Jehovah, and He said later to Jacob, I Am Jehovah, so He revealed Himself, according to one story to Abraham, and according to the other He didn't reveal it till Jacob, while according to still another part of the J document, in the time of Seth, men began to call on the name of the Lord. You must have three J's, J1, 2, and 3, which contradict each other. Well, the older critics, that is those of 40 years ago, did divide J into several documents, but whether they put these in the same one or not, I haven't checked. Mr. Gregory? (5) Gen.4.26, reference to Seth. Mr. Kaufmann? (stu) Yes, they do not think that God revealed the name first then, they think that according to J , men began to call on the Lord in the time of Seth. Thousands of years before ABraham. But the fact that they still knew the name was indicated by God's saying I Am Jehovah. They don't say this was an original revelation, but I say if you were to say this was an original revelation, then you have a contradiction within the J document, and I don't think they any of them allege there is one. They say, according to the J document the name was revealed in the time of Seth. That's the J document. But now, according to the critics, the E and the P documents contradict J, because, according to those documents, the name was not revealed until the time of

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Moses, and thus they say, that is many of them say, you have E's story of the revelation of the name in Exodus 3.16-18, where you find that God said to Moses, v.15, God said--well, you find back in 13, Moses said to God, Behold, when I come to the children of Israel, and say to them, The God of your fathers has sent me unto you, they'll say to me, What is his name? what shall Isay to them? And God said to Moses (7) Eshe, Esher, Esham, whichis roughly translated, I AM THAT I AM. I heard a wonderful sermon given by a modernist once saying that that term really, with the Hebrew imperfect, Eshe, Esher, ai, I will be what I will be, and shows the constant changing nature of Christianity, getting new truths all the time, and giving up the old false ideas. Well, it is the imperfect, but I hope that all of you realize that Hebrew imperfect is not necessarily a future, it can just as well be a (7 1/2) going back to constantly so, constantly occurs rather than that which occurs (7 3/4) The English translates it inthe King ~~Dam~~ James, I AM THAT I AM, but you see how similar it is, Escher, Eschia is similar to the (8) which would be from the verb to be, or to become, the verb really means "become" rather than be. I heard a professor at the University of Pennsylvania give a translation of the name Jehovah which struck me as very good, nobody knows (8) but he took it, he said this Jahweh means the one--you see, it would souond like a hithphael, wouldn't it, Jahweh, with a under it--he said it means the one who causes everything to happen, that impressed me as a very nice suggestion for the ~~order~~ origin, but nobody knows what the origin of it is, except it certainly looks as if it is connected in some way with Ayah, which does not mean to be, but means to become. But what we are looking at now is the theory of the critics that the name was, according to E, the name was given, was declared in the time of Moses, so it continues in verse 15, and God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, Jehovah God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, hath sent me to you. Go and gather the elders of Israel and say to them, Jehovah, God of your fathers, appeared to me saying I have

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

surely visited you, and so on. And then in verse 18, they were to go to Pharaoh, and were to say to him, Jehovah God of the Hebrews has met me. So you see how the stress is laid on the fact of an imperfect, that Jehovah God of your fathers, God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that's the name you are to use in talking to Israel, in talking to Pharaoh, in telling them who it is. Moses says what shall we use? He says use the name Jehovah, so they say this was the revelation of the name Jehovah, and therefore, according to the E document, you never have the name Jehovah known before that time, so naturally in the E document in Genesis, you have simply the word Elohim, not Jehovah.

Now if you have a suggested explanation of it, I'd rather hold it for a second, because I want to give the evidence first and then look at the explanation. If you have a question, elucidation, let's have it, but if it's just a suggestion for interpretation let's leave it for tomorrow, for there is quite a little material I'd like to get over here.

I want first just to present what they said, this is what they say in E's view. Well, now P's view, which we find in Ex.6.3, according to P, in Ex.6, Then Jehovah said to Moses, Now shalt thou see what I will do to Pharaoh, and God said to Moses, and spake to him. That is I imagine they'd give Ex.6.1 to J, but 6.2 says God said to Moses, God spake to Moses and said unto him, I am Jehovah, and I sppeared unto Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, by the name of El Shaddai, which is mistranslated in the King James Version as God Almighty. El Shaddai in the Hebrew and it is a name which shows God as the one who cares for the patriarchs and provides what they need. The ideas of God Almighty is an idea that developed in the Medieval Times, I mean, God is Almighty, but the idea that this word El Shaddai means God Almighty is not found in the early translations of Genesis. It is not certainly what this word El Shaddai means. But this name El Shaddai which is heard maybe seven or eight times in Genesis, and is usually either just translated God in the Septuagint, occurs many times in Job and it is through the book of Job that the idea of El Shaddai gradually came in, in early Medieval times as a translation. It is a name for God, El Shaddai. He says I appeared to Abraham,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Isaac and Jacob and then the name isn't there, but by may mean by the name of, El Shaddai...

P.69. (1/2)

...the alleged J duplicate of the story of the Revelation of the name of Jehovah, simply says, then began men to call upon the name of Jehovah. Well, now that's not a revelation of the name, it doesn't say it was revealed then. It says men knew it then, it doesn't say it was then revealed. It doesn't say that it wasn't already used in the time of Adam, it doesn't say that, it is misinterpreting the passage to say that this is saying that is when the name was revealed. It is exactly the same as if, when God said to Abraham, I am Jehovah, you would say that means he didn't know the name before, as being mentioned by some (1 1/4) Abraham previously addresses him as Jehovah, previous to that , in the J document. It is incorrect to say this is a story of the revelation of the name Jehovah. It is not, but you can make it look like one, by looking at it superficially. It merely says that, according to the J document, or according to the book as we have it, the name was already (1 1/2)

Now the same thing is true of the alleged E document, we'll call that c:

c, Examination of the alleged E duplicate. In fact the alleged E duplicate is so far short of being a new revelation of the name Jehovah, that many of the critics don't even say it is a duplicate, some even say that this chapter it is hard to tell what parts are E and what parts are J, but there are many critics who will say that E like P has a story of the revelation of the name Jehovah, differing from that of P by having it in a different place, but differing from that of J by having it thousands of years later, not until the time of Moses. Now the E, as we read it, looked at it very carefully, and I don't think it is necessary to go into much elaboration to prove to you the fact that it does not say it is now revealed for the first time. Moses says what name shall I tell them, God says, thus shall ye say, Jehovah the God of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, well suppose Moses went to them and said I want to prove to you that

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

If I am really sent by God, He said Jehovah the God of your fathers. Well, suppose they said who is this Jehovah, we never heard of Him , He is not the God of our fathers. It doesn't fit at all with the idea that this is a new revelation. It fits with the idea that the people already knew that was the name of God, so that it is a superficial interpretation of the passage to say that the new revelation just exactly as it would be when God said to Abraham, I am Jehovah, to say this is the first revelation of the name. It doesn't say that at all . But here more so, because He says, I am Jehovah the God of your Fathers, the God of Abraham, God of Isaac, the God of Jacob. It is not as you read the passage a revelation of a new name, that is reading something into the E statement. And if E does not believe that the name was revealed at this time then all that material, about a third of the book of Genesis, of E, that uses the name Elohim before, cannot be explained on this basis, that E claims the name wasn't revealed until the time of Moses. Question? (4, J. Gueiros: This would be then, that it wouldn't be known to Pharaoh since he was not a partaker of the covenant?) No, it wouldn't be known to Pharaoh, but he does say here, go to Pharaoh, and say Jehovah the God of the Hebrews, well now is he going to get the Hebrews all behind by going to Pharaoh with a name for the God of the Hebrews that the Hebrews had never heard of before? It doesn't sound very reasonable. But if the Hebrews, who called God by different names, call Him El Shaddai, call Him Elohim, call Him ElRoi, and call Him Jehovah, have perhaps haven't used the name Jehovah quite so much, but they all know that was a vital name that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob used, they hear Moses expressing that name, it rings a bell in their mind, it is a name they know, it is a great name in those days. It will mean something, rally them around Moses, but if it is a brand new name, it doesn't fit the requirements of the context particularly. And in addition to that a very interesting fact is that, though it is true that from Exodus on, all the documents use the name Jehovah most of the time, that is true, in Genesis we find the name Jehovah 146 times, and Elohim 164, in other times in Genesis they're (5 1/4) in their use. But in the rest of the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Hexateuch, in the other five books of what the critics call the Hexateuch, Jehovah occurs about 1800 times and Elohim only about 125. In other words, from after the early part of Exodus it is true the name of Jehovah is used overwhelmingly in all the documents. Now the critics say the reason is it hadn't been revealed before, but it is very interesting to notice that in Ex.18, fifteen chapters after the alleged revelation (5 3/4) in Exodus 18 we find the name, not only the name Jehovah used, but we find the name God used, the name Elohim, quite a number of times, in chapter 18, and the critics usually assign E , this chapter as a whole, to E, though it includes the word Jehovah five times, the word Elohim, without the article five times, and Elohim with the article five times, so that it includes both names. Now in Addis , The Documents of the Hexateuch, it is very interesting to note that in his discussion of chapter 18, he says, "chapter 18 is undoubtedly by Elohist, observe, #1, the frequent use of Elohim." He gives that as an argument to prove that 18 is by the Elohist, even though it is describing events which, according to the story, took place some years after the revelation of the name Jehovah to the Elohist, so it quite contradicts the theory that the name was not revealed until the time of Moses. They don't stop using it, they do use Jehovah mostly after that time, but they occasionally use Elohim.

Well, now , yes? (7 1/4) Yes, according to the theory of the critics, the reason that the E document does not use the name Jehovah in Genesis, is because the name, according to his belief, had not yet been revealed, but it is revealed to Moses in chapter 3, before he goes down into Egypt, and yet in the material they give to the E document, the 18th chapter which tells about events after they came out of Egypt, after all the plagues and everything, it contains the name Elohim ten times, and then Addis says, the frequent use of Elohim shows this belongs to the Elohist document. Well, if according to the Elohist he didn't use the name before it wasn't yet revealed, the name Jehovah, why doesn't he use it all the time after. It shows that the Elohist was not consistent. If he still used Elohim in a whole chapter some years after that,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

why are we sure that the reason he used it before was because he believed the name Jehovah wasn't known. It is contradictory. Well, that, I hope is clear to all of you but it is not a major point, so I'd rather not spend much time on it, but go on to a much more major point:

d, Examination of the alleged P duplicate. Now the story in P is in Exodus 6.2ff. And this one is the difficult one, as you will recognize. But you've all noticed that it is a closely parallel story to that of E in chapter 3, We believe that God told Moses, you go to the Israelites, you tell them Jehovah sent you, that He will deliver you. Moses, you remember, didn't want to do it, he made one excuse after another, he did everything he could to get out of this task. Moses is like so many folks today, when he wasn't ready, when he had no proper preparation for the task, he couldn't do it decently, he stepped out and declared he was going to deliver the Israelites, and when an Egyptian got in his way he killed him, in order to deliver the Israelites in the power of the flesh, and then he had to flee for his life, and then he had 40 years in the wilderness learning to know God and 40 years in the wilderness learning to know the wilderness and how people would survive in the wilderness, learning to know those things that would be vital in leading the Israelites out, and was ready to perform the task and then when God called on him to perform a task which he was competent to do, he refused and refused and refused and God practically had to force him into doing it. And as I say, that's the way with so many people today, when they have no preparation, no background to do a thing, they are ready to step out and do it, and then after they get some preparation and they realize the difficulties and the problems and the need, what abilities are needed to really do it right, then they have such an inferiority complex, or laziness, or something, that they just hold back and hold back and do not do the work that they are now competent to do and God has to see six people competent to do a task standing on the sidelines, not doing it, and pick up somebody who isn't prepared at all, and use them to do it because the people who could do it just aren't doing it. Well, in the case

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

of Moses, after God had wholly prepared him for the task, we have several chapters of how God just forced Moses into the task. Moses said I can't speak, I can't talk. Well, God said, we'll let Aaron do the talking. Well, after Moses started in , letting Aaron doing the talking, pretty soon he forgot about Aaron doing it and did it himself, because Moses was fully competent to do it better than Aaron, but God was just practically forcing him into the task and we have several chapters of the forcing. And it is not at all strange that in the course of it we have it twice told that Moses put up an excuse, the people won't believe me, they won't listen to me, what name will I give them? God says tell them Jehovah, the God of your fathers, has brought you. And again the same thing happened. Chapter 3, again the same thing happened, twice. And so we have a parallel, one of which they give to the E document and one to the P document. But the P document...

P.70. (1/2)

...and in Num.26.59. Ex.6.20 and Numb.26.59, that his mother's name was Jochabed. Now since he was 80 years old when he appeared before Pharaoh, this would imply that about a century before names combined with the word Jehovah were in use among the Israelites. Because Jochabed means Jehovah is the Lord. It is a very clear name, nobody questions that that is what the name means. Jehovah is glory. (1) So according to the P document, his mother a century before had a name which included the name of Jehovah. Well that is a comparatively minor point because it just rests on this one name. But we go on what I think is a very important point though it isn't much mentioned in books on the subject. I hate to break into this right at this point. Wonder if you'd mind if we skipped the quiz today? Well, if you don't mind, we'll continue . (2) is very important.

(2) The Alleged Redactor could hardly have understood this ~~thing~~ sentence as being a flat contradiction of such a clear fact of the other narrative.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Now just think of what the theory of the critics is. According to the critics, taking the point that practically all of them agree on, there was a J document written, most would have said a few years ago, the time of Jehoshaphat, someone today would say in the time of David, then about a century later there was another document here, the E document, then the J and the E documents are combined by one or more Redactors, they called it R, they put up the letter R with JE after it, that is the Redactor who combined J and E. Now there were other Redactors who combined J1 and J2, J3 into J , and so on, various redactors all along the way, but this is an important one, the redactor who combined J and E. Then later on there was the E document, written, and when there was the redactor who combined J , E and D. The D document written inthe time of Josiah or a little before. Sometime after the time of Josiah the J, E, and D were combined by a redactor, and so he made certain changes in order to harmonize, so then you had a document which was the J and the E and the D documents together, now that didn't affect J and E much because D was Deuteronomy, mostly, though there are a few sections in earlier books they say are by D. By the Deuteronomist, put together by this redactor. Now, they say, during the exile or shortly after, the P document was written, the Priestly document which tried to magnify the priests, and this priestly document which is written during the exile, or shortly afterward, this priestly story which gave the whole story, according to that, was combined with J, E, and D, which previously had been combined. So you have the new redactor, you have the redactor of J, E, P, and D, in other words the redactor who combined all these together. There are many places where they say, you will find the name Jehovah in an Elohist document, well the redactor of JE made it harmonize. You find places where even the P document, very few, but a few where it has the name Jehovah, redactor combined them. In the story of the Flood, in the P section, some places, a redactor changed the language to fit the language of J. Now then this redactor was not a child of 5 who simply took some stuff and simply stuck it together any old place. According to the critics he was a man of very great in-

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

telligence who made a very wonderful book. So wonderful that people way up until the time of Astruc thought it was one book by one man. And then they begin to see the evidence it wasn't. Well, now if this redactor then read that men began to call upon the name of Jehovah, in the time of Seth, in his documents which he had before him, which is J, E, add D together, and that the name Jehovah was used by Abraham, by Isaac, by Jacob, by Rachel, by Leah, by Noah, by all these people, and that God said to Abraham, and to Jacob, ~~and~~ I am Jehovah, and had all that in his manuscript which he was combining into P sections through, and he did all that work for Genesis, and combined this all through, now he gets up into Exodus, and he starts to combine P with the J, E and D combination that he already before and which had been circulating among the Israelites for a long time, and he stuck in a sentence which said I wasn't known by the name Jehovah to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, what kind of a fool would he have been? I mean a man like that wouldn't have the intelligence to make such a combination. He must have understood this sentence in some other way. He must have. He cannot have understood it as sharply contradicting a dozen clear statements and 200 inferences in material that he had already put together into his combination. So if the redactor understood this sentence as not contradicting the material in the previous section that he had already combined, if he understood it as not contradicting, why may not the original author have understood it as not contradicting? You see what I mean? You don't see it?

Well you take any sentence and you want to ask what does this sentence means? And the way to find what a sentence means is not to look in a dictionary, because the dictionary makers have listened to people, how people talk and try to give what it is, and the dictionary is a great help, but it is based on their having listened to how people talk, and when I hear a man, when I was brought up, if you would think something was just awful, and you couldn't stand it was so miserable, you would say it was terrific, and I was used to having everybody something was, oh, the storm just killed hundreds of people, it was terrific. And then about seven years ago I was aked to speak to a group

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

of students at the University of Pennsylvania, a group of Christian students, and when I talked with the fellow, the student, who was arranging the program, and I told him what I thought I'd deal with, the subject, he said, that's terrific. So I knew right away that he was using the word terrific in a sense very different from what it had been used by everybody who ever used it when I was a boy, and it was very ~~strange~~ plain that as he used the word terrific, he wasn't saying that it was a miserable disrupting thing, because if he had he wouldn't have proceeded to arrange for my transportation to the meeting at which I was to give the talk. It is perfectly obvious that he didn't understand terrific to mean what I had always understood it to mean. Now we had a sentence here which the critics say shows that the P document sharply contradicts the J, not merely in two obscure sentences a long ways apart, but in a statement made showing the tremendous change in the P document, using Elohim all the way up to here, and then change and use J almost entirely from here on, and the reason he does it is because the name was not known before,. Well, suppose the writer of the P document had that idea, when the redactor is going to combine them with the J, E , and D, which has already been circulating among the Israelites, according ~~the th~~ to the critical theory, and well-known to the people, and he is combining it, and as he goes through and combines and combines, he sees God, they call on Him in the name of Enoch, the name of Seth. Abraham says O Lord Jehovah, God says I Am Jehovah, Jacob calls him the servant of the (10 1/2) and then all of a sudden he comes to a sentence which says they didn't know the name Jehovah before this time.

Well, he would never have put it in that way. He would have changed it or omitted it or something, but would never make a combination into one document, a combination which was considered one complete document from one man, until within the last 200 years, if he thought there was such a sharp contradiction in the meaning of it as that. He did not take "terrific" as meaning disgusting, he took it as meaning (11) I mean the parallel. He evidently understood it in some very different

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

way. And when we read in the New Testament that the Law was given by Moses but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ, we don't take that as meaning that Moses had no truth in him whatever, truth only came through Christ, we don't take it as meaning that. And it is very clear that Jesus believed that Moses gave truth, and Moses had grace, tremendous grace, but when he says the law came by Moses, grace and truth by Jesus Christ, he doesn't mean grace and truth began by Jesus Christ, but he means there is an emphasis on it, there is a real origin (11 3/4) in eternity. He means something entirely different from what a superficial glance at it...

P.71. ~~(1/2)~~ (3/4)

...this will cover just what is handled here up till tomorrow, end of tomorrow's class. The emphasis will be on what since the last test, but there will also be questions on what preceded it, because after all the foundation work is vital, if you don't have that, you can't expect but the emphasis will be on since the last test. And I think any of you who take it will find that it strengthens your knowledge of the material, the review for it and the fact of writing it down will make you able to get that much more out of the course in the long run. It is entirely voluntary. Then we will not have the quiz today, I hate to disappoint about six or seven of you, but since there are so many who would like to have it tomorrow we will give them (1 3/4) at this time, and that is tomorrow and Thursday, for about the last half of the hour, and counting 15 points each.

Now in our discussion, we were on D7, Origin of the name Jehovah, and under that we had a small a, looking at the alleged duplicates; b, examined the alleged J duplicate and seen that Gen.4.25 doesn't say that is when the name was revealed, simply stresses that people call on the name. The alleged duplicate in E, Ex.3, does not stress it, that was c, either, does not say it was then first revealed, and in fact, what they say is the new document still uses it, then the Elohim after that, in Ex.18.

Then d, we began to look at examination of the alleged P document, which is

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

one of the big matters in the whole picture, of course. It affects various arguments, I could have discussed it under the first argument, I am discussing it under this one, because it is good to have the parallel material also when we discuss it, but its primary importance is as regards divine names, rather than parallel, but this is only one of many examples.

But we examined it and noticed (1) that it is taken as contradictory to J, and in E it contradicts itself. Now this is not a big point, because it doesn't contradict itself much. They get most of the names Jehovah out of the P document, they divide it in such a way that most of them are in J, or at least in J or E, and comparatively very few of them P, and those theysay are redactor (3 1/2) But there is this point worth noting, that in what the critics put in the P document, is mentioned the name of Moses' mother, as Jochabed, and that is a name which begins with the (3 3/4) that is a name which means Jehovah is Glory, and such a name could hardly be given to the mother of Moses, a hundred years , about, at least a hundred years before the time of Ex.6.3. It couldn't possibly have been done if the name wasn't known before that time. So that is a minor argument but nevertheless one worth noting. Now the major argument under this is given as (2), that the alleged redactor could hardly have understood this statement as being such a flat contradiction of a clear fact of the other narrative. It would be entirely possible, if you were to combine the two accounts of a certain event, for you to put them together and not to notice that there was a minor contradiction. That would be entirely possible, but if I had an account written by one of you, a certain event, and in the course of your mentioning this event, you mentioned thirty times that this event happened in Germany, and I had an account by another author of this event occurring, and he mentioned in it thirty times that the event happened in Japan, I could hardly take a little from one and a little from the other, and put them together and have them say, that morning, it was a very bright day that morning in Germany and three Japanese came out of the building, and objected to the presence of these

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Americans in Japan, and then Hitler answered and said so-and-so and go on talking about something in Germany, it just would be so absurd, that if you were to combine the two you would understand that one of them was wrong in the place, it happened in Germany or in Japan and you would change all the others to fit with it, unless you were just a complete idiot who just cut them to pieces and stuck them together, and the critics do think of the redactor as being that stupid. They claim many changes have been made by the redactor in order to harmonize. Now here would be the greatest incoherence you can imagine. ~~How~~ Not simply in one using one name and one using the other, that could well be, but for the one document after, the redactor has started in and combined all through Genesis, taken something from P and put it with the J, and E, which had already been combined, taken something more from P and put it together and combined these and has gone all through Genesis, and had all the patriarchs referring to God as Jehovah, and the Lord saying to some of them , I Am Jehovah. Then for them to include a statement by my name Jehovah I was not known to the patriarchs, he could not have so completely forgotten everything he had done in Genesis, as not to realize that this contradicted one statement, but many, many statements in Genesis. And therefore, we have to say, the man who combined it, what did he mean by it.? His meaning cannot be the exact opposite of what was said, he had said, in the earlier chapters. What did he mean by it?

You see, you can get contradictions in anything, if you are going to take a statement I make today and a statement I made a week ago, and insist on one definite interpretation of that, among various possibilities, you can (7 1/4)

contradictions to anybody, but you have to try to interpret a man in such a way that it fits together and gives you an idea of what he means, and so in this case, if the redactor combined them he clearly did not understand it as a contradiction. If, as we believe, Moses wrote it, Moses did not understand it as a contradiction, well, how did they understand it? Now if you can't find any possible way of understanding it, then of course that is a tremendous problem. But it would stand to reason there would be a way of understanding

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

it and we investigate it to see whether this is the only way in which it can possibly be understood. If you were to meet a man, for instance, if you were travelling in Germany, and somebody told you in Germany, there is a man who was just in here who came from America, and then if you were to go outside and meet the man, and you were to ask him which state do you come from, he'd say, I've never been in the United States. Well, you say, the man in there was lying, he told me this man came from America and he tells me he has never been in the United States. You wouldn't say that at all, you would say the statement he came from America must be, to be understood, not in the sense of coming from the particular country that uses the word America in its title, United States of America, but coming from somewhere in the whole continent, which as a continent goes by the name America. One day I went into a store in Germany and the man said to me, oh, you're from America, why there was a man just in here from America, I wonder, you probably know him. Well, I said, I may, I don't know, there are a lot of people in America. I said, do you remember what town he came from, because there is always a chance that you might know. Oh, he said, let's see, oh it was Buenos Aires. Well, I had never at that time been south of the Rio Grande, and I was able to assure him I did not know the man personally, even though we both came from America. But you see we use America in the sense of the only country , that I know of, that has the word America in the title of the country, and we also use America in the sense of the whole continent, to which it refers, the whole hemisphere, so one sentence may use it in the one sense and the one in the other, and you have no right to assume a contradiction. You try to see which fits together before you think somebody was lying.

Now in this case then the statement says that by my name Jehovah was I not know to the patriarchs, and there are two suggested answers that I know of to how the statement in Ex.6.3 should be interpreted.

I met a man who is a lecturer in Semitic philology in the University of Liverpool, and he told me of his interpretation, and his interpretation of it, which I do not

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

personally think is the right one, may nevertheless be. We give that as (a) under (2).

(a) The possibility of taking it as a question. And by name Jehovah was I not known to them? Just a little difference in accent. Is it a question, is it a declarative statement? Now in our English, you can put a question mark there and make it a question, and the King James did not put a question mark at the end, but in the Hebrew they do not have question marks. So that in the Hebrew the emphasis may carry.

Well, now, as a matter of fact, if you will look in Gesenius' Grammar, on p. 473 of Gesenius' Grammar, you will find a discussion of interrogative statement, and here is the way he introduces it: A question need not necessarily be introduced by a special interrogative pronoun or adverb. Frequently, at least 20 times, some would say many more, but there are 20 in which there is no question whatever, and there are many more which many think, cases where the natural emphasis on the word is of itself sufficient to indicate an interrogative sentence as such.

There is a case in Gen.27.24 where Jacob comes in, dressed up to try to be like Esau, and Isaac says, thou art my son Esau; translation of our English, art thou my son Esau, but there is nothing in the Hebrew to indicate that it is a question. The whole situation requires it to be a question. He says, Thou art my son Esau? Jacob says, yes. And if he had said, Thou art my son Esau, Jacob wouldn't have bothered to answer, because he'd know Isaac was sure of it, why bother to answer, but he asked a question, Thou art my son Esau, and in English we can ask a question simply by the tone of voice though we don't do it as a rule. In the Hebrew Bible there are quite a number of cases where there is no question of it, where the context very clearly implies, at least 20--most scholars would agree there are practically 40, some would think that there are many more, where it is a question without the ordinary indication of question. The ordinary indication of question, as I expect you all know, is to begin the sentence with que, just like in English huh, that's the sign of a question. Well in Hebrew you start with (13) before the first word of the sentence,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

and that is the usual way of indicating a question in Hebrew, but it is not a required question, and consequently this is a possibility to take it as a question, and if any critic were to say, no, we will not take it into the question, unless it has a heh on it, all you would have to do in answer, would be to say, look at the book of Isaiah, chapter 1, in any literal translation of the Bible, whether RSV or any other literal translation...

P.72. (3/4)

...they shall be as wool. They translate, though your sins be as scarlet, shall they be as wool? They make it a question, instead of a promise, And I think a good argument can be made, I don't say a conclusive one, but a good argument, fromthe context, of taking that verse that way. But there's no indication in Hebrew whatever, of it. But I don't believe any of the liberals question that it is possible to take that verse that way. If it is, it might be possible to take this one also. He says to them, I generally spoke to the (1 1/4) revealed myself to your fathers under the name El Shaddai, but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them? They knew me as Jehovah, Jehovah is the name I want you to use now. That is this interpretation of this verse, which is suggested by this very fine Christian man, with whom I was talking in England a few years ago. He feels very convinced that is the correct answer. Now it is not the answer you will find in most conservative books on the question, but it is a satisfactory answer, and if anybody says it has to be interpreted in such a way as to make the redactor out an utter fool who contradicts so many statements he put in before, you could say, it does not have to be, it can be this way. Now I think that more likely it is to be interpreted in the (2 1/4) but as between the two, either one can carry this particular argument.

Now the second way, which you will find in most conservative books, small b: b, To understand the word, know the name, as not simply meaning to be acquainted with a fact, but rather realize the full significance of(2 3/4) That is to say, it

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

is the interpretation of the word known. By my name Jehovah I was not known to them, understand that not as meaning they didn't know his name, but they did not heed the full significance of His name the way you are doing. (stu.) Yes, b, The statement that God was known by this name does not mean simply that people were familiar with the name, but that they realized to the full its significance. Now that is a matter of the word "know." The Hebrew word "know" does not mean like our ordinary English word "know," simply to gain a little information. As you look into the book of Hosea, you will find that Hosea exhorts people to follow along to know Jehovah. He says then will we come to know Jehovah, he says you should know Jehovah, he is constantly telling about the need of knowing Jehovah. Well, you say, Hosea, what on earth are you talking about, asking us to know Jehovah, why everybody in Israel knows Jehovah is the name of God, of course. Hosea doesn't mean simply to become aware of the fact, he means to get to really know God, that's what he means, the way he uses it , and the word is used that way constantly through the Bible. I think it is about the fourth chapter, isn't it, it says and Adam knew his wife, and she conceived and bore Cain. Adam ever knew Eve before this, he hadn't heard her name. No, it doesn't mean that at all, it means to know her in a different way. It means a fuller and deeper realization of somebody, or of something, than other. And when we are constantly told to know the Lord, why it means not just to know this is His name, and there are many cases, not merely Hosea, but there are many, many cases where people are exhorted to know the Lord. In the book of Exodus, we find five or six cases where it says that then the Israelites shall know that I am Jehovah. They knew that before He told them, why tell them repeatedly? Moses, you do this thing, I'll do this great (5 1/2) plague and the Israelites shall know that I am Jehovah. He says in three places that then the Egyptians will know that I am Jehovah. Do you have to have a great ~~flight~~ plague in order for the Egyptians to know that Jehovah is the name of the God of Israel ? It means that they will learn to know His character, His power, his redemptive interest in His people, it

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

means to understand the significance of the name. Twice we are told that God said that Pharaoh will then know that I am Jehovah. It is frequently used in this sense, In many parts of the Old Testament. In the book of Ezekiel it is used over and over. He wants the people of Israel to know that I am Jehovah. Everybody knows that is His name, it means to know the character, to know the significance, to know the meaning which this has of the character of God, and so the way that most conservatives interpret this and take this, which I personally think is correct in view of the use of the word throughout the Old Testament, is that what God says to Moses is that the patriarchs, as a rule, knew me as El Shaddai, that is a term used in a few important cases of God's revelation to the patriarchs. That I am El Shaddai, that is, He is the one --it is mistranslated as God Almighty in our English Bible, but it means He is the one who cares for, the one who nourishes, that is the meaning of El Shaddai. He was protecting and caring for them. But the name Jehovah is the covenant name of God as the Redeemer, He is the one who is going to bring them out of Egypt with a strong hand, He is the one who redeems us from sin, that is the central significance of this word Jehovah, that God is redemption, and consequently that when He said to him that I am now going to reveal an aspect of my character which people knew about before, but that they are now going to understand the full significance of, they're going to know it, just as the Egyptians are going to know that I am Jehovah, they will realize it, what Jehovah really means, that this name isn't just a sound, but an indication of the great redeeming God who delivers His people from the situation. Now that, as you see, is a much less obvious interpretation than the first. For ordinary debate or argument, the first might be an easier answer, we'll take it as a question. But I incline to think that on careful study, this one is what was really meant by the term. And in either case, it is not a contradiction of what

(8 1/4) Now one member of the class, three times, turned in a question to me asking to explain this contradiction, so now I have answered those three questions. I hope that all the rest of you had it in mind, because we had stressed

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

it before, it is very vital. I want you to be fully aware of the problem. And now these are two lines of answer to it, either of which I believe are satisfactory answers, but to my mind even more important is the fact that the redactor who combined these, if there was a redactor who combined them into one document, after having put down in his book a dozen times that people knew God as Jehovah in Genesis, could hardly simply include a statement that nobody knew Him as Jehovah before. He must have meant something else by the term. And these two offer suggestions as to what he meant.

Well, if that is clear we can go on to the next point then. It is a very important point, it really is a point of tremendous importance under the first argument, the Names. But I left the discussion of it till the third, because the matter of parallel enters in also, so I thought that when we had that data too, we would deal with it better than to deal with it first, though actually it is far more important ~~th~~ with the first argument than with the third, where it is merely one of a few hundred alleged parallels. Well, then, if that is clear we go on to 8.

8, Conclusion regarding the three types of Parallels. I asked you in a quiz recently to name the three types. I think it is good for you to have in mind, because you can follow the precise thing, can go into it much better, if you can classify it under these three types. But the first type, type 1, is parallel sentences, and of course a great deal of the critical division consists of taking a statement that something happened, and another sentence that says the same thing, or two halves of a sentence that say the same thing, and putting them as saying these are parallel, and of course that goes into , largely in combination, one will have a long story in one document, then they say there is just a mention of it in the other document. But this case of the individual sentences being similar, is something which occurs in any writing that you will find anywhere, unless a person is simply trying to give the most possible information in the smallest possible space, they're going to repeat themselves, you have to in order to get your thought across. There is hardly anything that I ever say of importance in class

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

that I don't say at least three times. It is a bit irritating after you say it the three times when somebody asks you to explain a certain thing that has been explained two or three times. I'm not the least bit irritated if I'm asked to explain it after giving it two times, because I know it takes the certain amount of time with all of us for a thought to come in to our minds, to understand it, so I do my best to repeat everything that is important at least twice, but that doesn't mean you could divide it up into parallels, and have two different professors who gave two different lectures, it doesn't mean that at all. It is very tedious, I think, if a person repeats in exactly the same words, I try to do it in different words, but I try to repeat the same ideas, and if it is something that is really difficult, I'm glad to do it three or four times. And of course, if I don't make it clear, I am always anxious for you to ask, because I want to be sure I make everything clear that I give. But you will find, in any writing, a certain amount of repetition, and particularly in Hebrew writing, because parallelism is a very common feature of Hebrew writing. Open the Psalms anywhere and you just find it full of parallels. Open the book of Proverbs anywhere and you just find that the thing is said and it is repeated, it is full of parallels. Any Hebrew poetry constantly has parallels in it. Now this is not, however, only true of poetry. In anything we give we are trying to get the thought across, to impress it on people's minds, and a certain amount of repetition is quite certain to occur. Now I just opened at random at 1 Cor.15, and opening there , I notice quite a few repetitions in it, that it repeats the same thing in many different sentences. The same thing is said over in order to stress the thought. In v.55...

P.73. (3/4)

...O death, where is thy sting, O grave, where is thy victory. The verse before, "so when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality," there is a difference between the two, but it is not such a great difference but what they could easily be said, "two different documents, one says "corruptible, incorruption," the other says "mortal and immortality." And, in a moment, in the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

twinkling of an eye at the last trump, there are three ways of saying the same thing, we find it stressed. The trumpet shall sound and the dead be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. Well, there are two different things, "the dead" and "we" still it is actually a repetition of the same fact. There is a change, change (1 1/2) Verse 43, It is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power. You notice anywhere, where somebody is really trying to get something a cross, and you find it is repeated. And when Moses wanted to stress the greatness of the flood, and the piling up of the waters, the tremendous things that occurred, why he just repeats and stresses five or six times, the various signs. Repetition for emphasis, repetition for getting the thought across, is very common. You don't expect to find it quite as much in narrative passages, as you do in others, but you do find it there too. I just opened to Esther 7 at random. I don't say you open anywhere and find parallels, but I would say if you open at three places I'm quite sure you will find a good bit of parallel in at least one, perhaps in two. I opened to Esther 7 and notice it begins that the king said to Esther on the second day at the banquet, what is thy petition , Queen Esther, and it shall be granted thee, and what is thy request and it shall be performed? What a repetition. Not two different documents, I don't think anybody holds it is two different documents. The king wanted to show his real friendliness and he repeated the thing twice, as any one of you might have done. Esther said, we are sold, I and my people, to be destroyed, to be slain, and to perish. Notice how she repeats? Then, there is of course the fact that often there is a parallel where we have a heading. We are told something in brief and then the thing is told at length, and that is very common in any language. Our newspapers are examples of this, but you will find it in any language, you will find a statement telling a thing and then you will find a full account. And very often they take a brief statement and give it to one document, and the full account to the other document. And of course there may be repetition for another purpose, as in Esther 5 right across the page from Esther 7 here. We read in verse 3, then said the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

king to her, What wilt thou, queen Esther? What is thy request? it shall be even given thee to the half of the kingdom. And then it says in verse 6, And the king said to Esther at the banquet of wine, What is thy petition? and it shall be granted thee, and what is thy request? ~~even to th~~ Now he said the same thing twice, three verses apart, once was when she came in to him to the audience chamber, the other was at the banquet that he gave shortly after. The same thing was said for two different purposes, two different occasions, right next to each other. Then in chapter 7, as you notice, he said the same thing again. Three almost exact parallels, he wanted to impress on her mind that she doesn't need to fear, he is ready to grant her request. Well, this repetition of sentences then is not a proof of ~~conclave~~ conflate structure, particularly in something like Hebrew which has a great many.

Now we go on to type two, under 8: b, The Conflate Parallel. And this we have noticed, in the story of the Flood, in the story of ~~Joseph~~ Jacob's being sent away, the story of Joseph's Youth, they take a few verses and give it to one document, a few to the other, a few to one, a few to the other, and they get two stories. We've looked at several of these. And then when they get the two stories, they say they contradict each other, and the contradictions are often simply because the thought is given to one, then it isn't in the other, so they say there is a contradiction. But it can sound very, very convincing. And I've known many a student from the most earnest Christian background, a man who is just on fire with loyalty to the Bible, who has gone into a school where this material has been presented and little by little, he has begun to question and to wonder, and then eventually he has taken it all over. It can be made to sound very, very convincing. And any of you who are going into graduate work later on, anywhere it is very important to get well grounded in this, and ~~many people~~ any of you who are going to deal with others in schools at all, it is very wise to get grounded. So we perhaps take more time on it than would be necessary to convince you people, but I want you to be well aware of the answer of the situation as a whole, just how strong the argument can be

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

made to seem, and what its actual weaknesses are. Now as to these alleged Conflate accounts, they actually never are really complete, because when they make them, they make the conflation, they take out those things that are repeated, and in most any story, there is some repetition, and they take out these that are repeated and put them into two different stories, but there are some things that aren't repeated, so that inevitably the ~~stories are~~ story is not complete, and not entirely full. Then when you take these conflate accounts, and quote them out that way, they allege there are contradictions. And I have read you illustrations of it. I think perhaps a good summary to give right at this point, is to say that that can be done with many different things. If it is something which can be done with many, it greatly reduces the proof of it in the cases where it is alleged. Now in William Henry Green's book on the higher criticism in the Pentateuch, he shows how you could do it with the story of the Prodigal Son. So he gives you the two parallel columns with the story of the Prodigal Son, that is Luke 15.11-32. Now if you like to follow that in your Bible, I can read you the sections that he gives to each of these two documents, showing how it could be done, which I don't think anybody does it. The Prodigal Son, he divides it into section A and B, and he inserts occasionally enough to make B a complete story. In A he inserts nothing, he just takes out certain sections. Now here is story A. Luke 15.11, A certain man had two sons. Now this verse, you have to understand,(8) . But from here on, everything is only in A. Verse 12, And the younger of them said to his father, give me the portion of thy substance that falleth to me. Now the rest of verse 12 is part of the B document, so we skip onto 13. And not many days after the younger son gathered all together, and we skip a little, and there he ~~took his journey into a far coun~~ wasted his substance with riotous living. Verse 14, last part, and he began to be in want. Verse 16, last part, and no man gave unto him. Verse 20, and he arose and came to his father--skip a few words in the other document--and he ran and fell on his neck and kissed him, and his son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son. But the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

father said to his servants, Bring forth the best robe, and put it on him, and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet. Then you skip to verse 24, for this my son was dead and is alive again. Then you skip a few words. And they began to be merry. Verse 25, Now his elder son was in the field, and as he came and drew nigh to the house, verse 28, he was angry, and would not go in. And his father came out and intreated him. But he answering said to his father, Lo, these many years do I serve thee, neither transgressed at a commandment of thine, and yet thou never gavest me a kid, that I might make merry with my friends. But when this thy son came, which hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou givest for him the fatted calf. And he said unto him, Son, thou ~~art~~ art ever with me, and all that is mine is thin, but it was meet to make merry and be glad, for this thy brother was dead and is alive again,

Now we read the passages that were skipped. That is, assuming that verse 11 was the same in both, a certain man had two sons. Then, skip to the end of 12, the words we skipped there, and he divided unto them his living, and then 13 b, and we supply "one of them", and one of them took his journey into a far country. Then verse 14, and when he had spent all, there arose a mighty famine in this country. Verse 15, and he went and joined himself to one of the citizens of that country, and sent him into his field to feed swine. And he would fain have been filled with the husks that the swine did eat; verse 17, but when he came to himself, he said, how many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare and I perish with hunger! I will arise and go to my father and will say to him, Father, I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight am no more wrothy to be called thy son. Make me as one of thy hired servants, and the latter part of v.20, but when he was yet far off, his father saw him and was moved with compassion. Verse 23, and said bring the fatted calf and kill it and let us eat and make merry; end of verse 24, he was lost and is found. End of verse 25 , that the other, you just had to supply the words "and the other son," then you put in,heard music and dancing. 26, and he called one of the servants and inquired what these things might

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

mean. And they said unto him, Thy brother has come, thy father has killed the fatted calf, because he has received him safe and sound. End of 32, and he was lost, and is found.

Now he says, you could say here are two complete narratives ~~aggre~~ agreeing in some points and disagreeing in others, and each of them having some special characteristics. The only deficiencies are enclosed in parentheses, I indicated them to you, there are only two or three little insertions, and may be readily explained as omissions by the redactor (11 1/4) combination. A clause must be supplied at the beginning of b, a subject is wanting in verse 13b and verse 25b, and the verb "said" is wanting in verse 22. As these omissions occur exclusively in b, it may be inferred the redactor placed a as the basis and incorporated b into it, with only such slight changes as were necessary for adaptory purposes. A// and B agree there were two sons, one of whom received a portion of his father's property and by his own fault was reduced to great destitution, in consequence of which he returned presently to his father, and addressed him in language which was nearly identical in both accounts. You // see, there is enough repetition that you could get it in both accounts. The father received him with great tenderness and demonstration of joy, which attracted the attention of the other son. The differences are quite as striking as the points of agreement, which is exactly what they say about these other parallels. Mr. MacKeen, what is the matter? (12) Yes, conflate accounts. He is taking a one account and saying it is a conflation, taking a few words from this , a few from that, a few from this, a few fromthat, and putting them together. I'd like to read you what he says, maybe you could conserve your question/ till a little bit later. He says, "The differences are quite as striking as the points of agreement. A distinguishes the sons as elder and younger, B makes no mention of their relative ages. In A the younger obtained his portion by solicitation and the father retained ~~his~~ the remainder in his own possession. In B, the father divided his property, because, you see, they have put the statement, "he divided his property" which only

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

occurs once, they gave to ~~B~~ B so you see there is a contradiction. The father divided his property between both his sons for his own motives. In A, the prodigal remained in his own neighborhood and reduced himself to penury by riotous living, in B, he went to a distant country and spent all his property, but there is no intimation in B that he indulged in unseemly excesses. It would rather appear that he was injudicious and to crown his misfortune there occurred a severe famine. His fault seems to have consisted in having gone so far away from his father, from the holy land, and engaging in the unseemly occupation of tending swine. In A, the destitution seems to have been chiefly one of clothing...

P.74. (3/4)

...one in one and one the other, then there is a contradiction. That is exactly what is done in many of these conflate accounts, the alleged contradictions. Hence in A, the father directed the best robe and ring and shoes to be brought, while in B the fatted calf was brought. In B the son came from a distant land, the father saw him afar off, in A he came from the neighborhood, and the father ran at once and fell on his neck and kissed him. In B he is engaged in menial occupations till he bethought himself of his father's hired servants. In A he has been living luxuriously, while confessing his unworthiness, makes no request to be put on the footing with the servants. In A the father speaks of his son as having been dead, because of his profligate life, in B as having been lost because of his absence in a distant land. In A, but not in B, the other son was displeased at the reception given to the prodigal, and he gives one or two other things like that. He mentions certain words typical of this style, certain of that, but the argument from style we go on to later. Yes? (1 1/4) That is page 121 of Wm. Henry Green. (stu.) Well, maybe, that isn't exactly what Wm. Henry Green said. ~~He~~They ~~did~~ do say this, the critics say this, that one document, which doesn't mention it, must have had a reference to it, since the redactor took merely the one rather than both of them. They do say that. Their claim is that each is practically complete, but

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

not entirely, and there are cases where they say, he takes the main basis of the one, which must have been though he doesn't go beyond . That's a good question. Mr. MacKeen, did you have any further question, or has it been clarified? (2 1/2) Well, by conflate we mean that there is what looks like one story, which the critics say, you can take a few verses and put here and a few and put there, and the next few here and the next few there, so that actually the two differ. It is like two hands that you put together, with the fingers coming between them, that would be conflate. It is not two stories, that you have one story and another story, but two stories that are so combined that it sounds like one. And many of their alleged parallels are like that. Not all. Yes? (3 1/4) stu) Yes, they say there are two stories of the same thing. That is true of all the parallels. Yes? (stu) No, according to the higher critics , the parallel is when you have two stories of the same thing. There are three types of those. One is two sentences. The second is a conflate account, where we had one account which they say you can divide up into two different accounts. The third is where we have two different accounts in the Bible, which they say are accounts of the same thing, but which we say are accounts of different things. That's the third. (stu. 3 3/4) Any other question?

I don't know whether we will have time to look at the other similar illustrations he gives, the Good Samaritan. I think we could if I read fast. You don't need to try to get all the details of this, to get the point of it. The Good Samaritan, he tries to do the same thing. The Good Samaritan, Luke 10.29-37. This he divides into one account: A. Number 29, but he, the lawyer, it is the lawyer as shown in a previous verse, but he, desiring to justify himself, said unto Jesus, and who is my neighbour? Jesus made answer and said, A certain man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho--skip a few words-- and they beat him==skip a few words--leaving him half dead. Verse 31, and by chance a certain priest was going down that way, and when he saw him he passed by on the other side. Verse 33, but a certain Samaritan as he journeyed came where he was--34, and

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

came to him and bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine, and took care of him. Verse 36, which of these thinkest thou proved neighbour unto him . The words "which of these three" but we'll assume the word "three" was put in by the redactor. Just "which of these" thinkest thou, proved neighbour unto him. And he said, he that showed mercy, Now that is the A account, here is the B account. Last part of verse 30, and a certain man fell among robbers which stripped him--skip a few words--and departed. Verse 32, ~~and~~ And in like manner--this "in like manner" was put in by the redactor, "a levite" also ~~put in~~ put in by the redactor, when he came to the place--skip to 33 last part--and when he saw him, was moved by compassion; end of 34, and he set him on his own beast and brought him to an inn; 35, and on the morrow he took out two pence, gave them to the host, and said take care of him, and whatsoever thou spendest more, I when I come again, will repay thee. 37, last part, And Jesus said unto him, well then the last part is (6 1/4)

He says both these narratives are complete, only a subject must be supplied, in B, verse 30 b, the omission being rendered necessary on being combined with A. "Three" is substituted in A, verse 36, by the redactor for like reason. The redactor has tampered with the text and materially altered the sense in verse 32, in his desire to put the levite on the same plane with the priest, verse 31, the language of which he has borrowed. The genuine text of B will be restored by omitting the insertions by the redactor, and so on. These changes naturally result by making A the basis, ~~and~~ modifying what he has inserted from B in accordance with it. Both narratives agree a man grievously abused by certain parties, and treated with generous kindness by a stranger, and that Jesus deduced a practical lesson from it. But they differ materially in detail. A relates his story to the parable of Jesus in answer to a lawyer's question. B makes no mention of the lawyer ~~in~~ or his question, but seems to be relating a real account. The spirit of the two is quite different. A is anti-Jewish, B is pro-Jewish. In A, the aggressors are Jews, people of Jerusalem or Jericho, or both, and a priest (7 1/4) pitilessly

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

leaves the sufferer to his fate, while the Samaritan, with whom the Jews were takes pity on him. In B the aggressors or robbers' nationality is not defined, and it is a Levite who shows mercy. Both the maltreatment and the acts of generosity are given. In A the sufferer is beaten and half killed, needs to have his wounds bound up and linament supplied, which is done by his benefactor on the spot. In B he was stripped of all he had and left destitute, but no personal injury was inflicted. Accordingly he was taken to an inn, and his wants there provided for, at the expense of the Levite, who befriended him. Now this one seems a little more extreme than the others, but it doesn't go beyond what is actually done in some of these cases of alleged parallel accounts, where you separate out different places, and then you get two that contradict each other, and you will be told, you will read in the critics' books, that this manuscript, that J knows nothing of a certain type of thing, or that P knows nothing, and the reason (8 1/4) is because those verses are given to the other one. And you get the main event in almost any story, you can enough words to make two accounts of a main event, because there is repetition in most (8 1/2)

But there are also important things that are only said once. And when you give these to one or the other, you can easily get a contradiction. And there are many cases where this is alleged by the ~~Scripture by~~ critics in the Pentateuch, and as presented in classes they sound very, very convincing. And you will find them now getting to be presented in Sunday School literature, and presented in books that are put out by some of our large denominational presses. But when you get in to the facts of it, you will find that as far as the Conflate accounts are concerned, this is the sort of thing that is there. I have mentioned a couple of times in this class before, how I stepped into a church in Charlottesville, Virginia, and heard the minister saying how he was sure we would be confused by the contradictions in the story of the Flood, putting the P and J versions together so he was just going to read us the J story. If is sifting out that way, being pushed, and sifting out among the people more and more.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

But as given, they don't give the grounds for it, they simply give the conclusion, and people accept the conclusion as being the work of the Spirit of God, but our graduates ought to be able to get behind the conclusions , down to the facts, and see just how much basis there really is or isn't. (9 3/4, end of class.)

(starting again at 10) ...clear, I wish you would ask, anything that I haven't made clear, why I 'll certainly be glad to do in class, anything that any individual would like further light on, I'll be glad to give you individually. But this, the origin of the name Jehovah, is a big subject, and we cannot cover fully any of these subjects. We would take several years. ~~Our~~ We are anxious to have you get the main points, and get them clearly, so I am glad to review the main points and get them clear. Anyone who wants to go further beyond the main points on any of these, I can give you suggestions or can suggest places to read. But I want to be sure you have the main points.

Now 7, here was Origin of the name Jehovah. And that term can be misleading. Because it is not, the subject is not simply the origin of the name Jehovah. 7 is under D, Consideration of Alleged Parallels. So this subject is, The Alleged Parallels regarding the name of Jehovah. If you're going to look for the real origin of the name, scholars differ tremendously among themselves and there are many theories as to what the origin of the name was, some tracing it to this source, some to that, some giving it this etymology, some that, the fact is you can't prove where it came from. I believe the Lord revealed it and that is all we know about it. The Lord revealed it. But as He used it, it is perfectly evident, I think all agree on this, that as ~~he~~ used, the name Jehovah, indicates the God of Israel who redeemed them out of Egypt. It is a name for the redemptive God, the God which saves His people, and is the emphasis in the name Jehovah. Now of course there is one God, but He reveals Himself in different aspects, and the name Elohim has the stress on His power over nature. You say, God Almighty, Elohim would be more like God Almighty, than El Shaddai. El Shaddai is the God who cares for His people, nourishes them, that watches over them as He did over the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

patriarchs. But Jehovah is the name of God as the God of redemption, and specifically as the God of Israel in the Old Testament.

Now, the #7, I was dealing with the alleged parallels about the origin of the name Jehovah. The critics say that according to J the name Jehovah became known very early and according to P and E not until the time of Moses. And most of the critics will say, that specifically we have, ~~that~~ in Gen.4.26, the origin, the first giving of the name, according to the J writer, that according to E, we have it in Ex.3.16-18, and according to P in Ex.6.3. (stu.) Gen.4.26, according to J, Ex.3.16-18 according to E, and Ex.6.3 according to P. I gave all of these before, except if somebody missed one of them. I mean I'm glad to give them over rapidly, because somebody might have missed a verse but I'm not giving them over slowly so you can write them all out, now, because if you need to write them all out now, it means you weren't here last time, and--I mean mentally--but of course anybody could have missed one, so I'm very glad to repeat them. I pointed out that...

P.75. (3/4)

...Ex.3.16-18 does not say God revealed the name of Jehovah. It says that when Moses said what name will I give them, who am I to tell them is the name of God? He said I am Jehovah, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob. Well, that doesn't ~~means~~ imply their fathers didn't know the name, it implies the opposite. He says I am Jehovah, the God of your fathers. Mr. Howell, you had a question? (1) Well, it is the whole section. I think 16 is the key verse, but I think 16-18 is more precise. But it is right along there. But 13-18 if you want to. The reason we can't pinpoint it is because the critics are wrong in saying it is a parallel. They point to the general passage. There is no precise parallel there. So if you say 13-18 you will have what they say. But in that section they say there is a parallel but they can't point to one, because it doesn't say (1 3/4)

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

They are simply wrong in their interpretation, and therefore some of the critics don't give this interpretation but many of them do. And then the third which they all give is Ex.6.3, P. And that is the real problem because a superficial reading of Ex.6.3 seems to say that Moses says what name shall I tell them ~~that~~ is the God who is calling, who I am going for, to save the people, and you have a lot of repetition along here, but it is perfectly clear in the narrative that Moses is making every excuse he can to get out of going. And God is pushing them back one by one, till finally he has to. But here God says to him, I am Jehovah, I am the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. I was known to your fathers as El Shaddai. But by my name Jehovah was I not known to them. That was the English translation in our King James version, and reading that superficially it seemed to contradict the statements in J and E that the name was revealed before, of course they don't really say it was revealed before. But it does contradict the fact that J uses it constantly, before, not merely the writer, but he quotes the patriarchs, and he represents God as saying to patriarch after patriarch, I am Jehovah. And therefore, if J says, I am Jehovah, in case after case, where it says that the patriarch prayed, O Lord Jehovah, and then P says, by my name Jehovah was I not known to them, there is verbally in our English a contradiction. And so from that point on, we are really not discussing our present third argument, but our first argument, about the Divine Names. But I left it till this point, because we needed a study of parallels as background to properly understand it. As far as parallels are concerned, we have shown there are no parallels actually, but having gotten that, we're interested in going further into it, to see its relation to the first problem, the one of Divine Names, and there you should discuss it, if you're asked to discuss that, Divine Names, you should certainly cover this, which is so vital in that connection, the First Argument.

So we're interested to know what this statement that the critics give to P really means, this statement in Exodus 6.3. And when we look at it, we find that superficially it seems to contradict, not one statement, but many statements in Genesis

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

and Exodus up to this point, which the critics assign to the J document. But we say, not only does it contradict that, it contradicts one thing which they give to the P document, because the critics give to the P document the statement that Moses' Mother's name was Jochabed. In other words, that his mother, a hundred years before Exodus 3 had a name which included the name Jehovah, which meant Jehovah is Glory, and ~~the~~ nobody questions that that is what that name means. It is perfectly obvious. Yes? (5) Yes, it is possible, but I don't know of any critic who says it. (stu.) You are right. It is an interesting fact that neither in J nor in P do we have many names of an earlier time included. But that applies to J as well as P. They don't have them, but when we do find one we find it in what they give to P. Well, now, of course, if they felt this was a tremendous obstacle, they could say, well, that name wasn't her real name, that name was assigned in Moses' old age, to honor his mother, he gave her a name she had never had. They could say that, only I don't know of anybody who has said it. I don't know of anybody who has. As they divide, they recognize the name is Jochabed. Now this is a comparatively minor item, but nevertheless we mention it. It does contradict P itself to that extent. But the more important thing is, to me an extremely important thing is, that according to the critical theory, J and E have been combined, by a redactor and have circulated in Israel for a long time. And then they were combined with D and that circulated in Israel for a long time, and P was developed as a separate document. And then a redactor took P and combined it with J- E, making P the main outline of the whole thing. These are the generations of, those statements, the outline was taken from P for the whole setup. Well now taking the outline from P and fitting the others in, and going through Genesis and fitting in half a verse here, another verse there and all that, they say that time and again, little changes are made by the redactor in order to make the two harmonize. They will give that argument, time and again, where things are difficult for their theory. Well now then if the redactor went through Genesis and combined the J-E with the P document, combined it straight through, page after page after page,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

over and over, you read, God said I am Jehovah, God said I will show them that I am Jehovah, they will know that I am Jehovah, Abraham said O Lord Jehovah, repeatedly has this, then he comes along, and he is combining it, this redactor is, and he comes to a statement in P that says they never knew my name before. Well, if he made all these little changes for harmonizing, and when he came to a thing like that, he certainly would have either left out or made some changes to keep it from flatly contradicting so much that he had included before in the book, and making the (7 1/2)

Therefore, whether as we believe, Moses wrote the whole business, or whether as the critics believe, the redactor combined the two at that point, it is simply inconceivable that either the writer or the redactor understood this verse to contradict what was before. So we ask ourselves is it possible a typographical error has come in in copying this verse in later years, to introduce a contradiction which wasn't there before? That could have happened, just one verse. But we don't say that, that could have happened, but what we say is, as it stands we believe it is perfectly possible to interpret it in such a way as to have no contradiction and I don't care who writes anything of some length, you are going to find a sentence somewhere that can contradict things before if you insist on interpreting in the most literal way. You have to consider that what he means fits together, and to interpret things in a way to fit together and make sense, I gave you several illustrations of that last time. So he said, looking at this verse and seeing whether you have to interpret it in a way to make it contradictory, I pointed out to you that a friend of mine in England suggests a way of interpreting it, which I don't think most (8 3/4) but which is certainly a possibility, that is to take it as a question. You r ancestors knew me as El Shaddai and by my name Jehovah I was known to them. In other words, the name which was most stressed in the immediate revelation between God and the patriarchs was El Shaddai, but they also knew this. By my name Jehovah was I not known to them? A question. And we notice that when you write in cold print, unless you put in a question mark, you can't

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

tell whether it is a question or not, and there are about thirty cases in the Old Testament where all agree it must be interpreted as a question though there is no heh there, which is the ordinary sign of its being a question. So that that is a definite possibility, and far more sensible than that actually the redactor, if there was a redactor, put something in that just sharply contradicts. It is not one little verse, but verse after verse and statement after statement , of what he what (9 3/4)

The other interpretation of it which at first sight does not appear as good as this, but which on careful examination I believe is best is the interpretation that takes the word "know" and says what does this word "know?" mean? And in order to do that examines the use of the word through the Old Testament, and that is what we should do. Don't grab a word and just arbitrarily say this word means what it would mean in my language, ask what it means the way the Bible uses it. The word in English means one whom a man has begotten or who has been born of a particular woman, that is son in English, but that is not son in the Old Testament or New Testament. In them the word "son" is one who is a man's descendant, and Jesus Christ was the son of David, and nobody says he was the man who was the direct child of David. He was descended from David, but the word "son" means descendant in the Hebrew, and is so used repeatedly over and over. So we take this word know and ask what this word know means and we find that God says to Moses, the people will see my plagues and will know that I am Jehovah. Well, why didn't they know He was Jehovah long before? Did they have to wait for some great plagues to know He was Jehovah? It is very clear that what He means is not that they will be acquainted with the fact, but that they will realize the significance of something. And Hosea has at least 7 or 8 verses where they exhort people to know the Lord, it says follow on to know the Lord, to know Jehovah. Well, we know His name is Jehovah, why do we need to follow on to know Jehovah? Why do we need to do so much to try to know Him, if "know" is much more than merely become acquainted with? There are many clear instances of that. Ezekiel said, maybe

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

twenty times, this will happen and the people will know that I am Jehovah, they will come to know Thee as the Redeeming God, to understand the real significance of this. We ask people to come to know Christ, we don't mean just to read in a book that there was somebody named Christ, we mean to become really to understand what it really means to have Him have the place in your life He should. So when He says that the patriarchs knew me ~~as~~ by the name of El Shaddai, but as Jehovah I was not known to them, He means that the great display of the character of Jehovah, the redemptive charagter of God is now to come and they are to be brought out of Egypt, and that the patriarchs were acquainted with that and had some understanding but that their emphasis was on a different aspect of His character. Now that is the interpretation which most conservative writers give to it. It is an interpretation which I hold is required by examination of the meaning of the word Jahvah, through the Old Testament, and by the many other cases where it speaks of knowing Jehovah. But I don't say that one has to take this interpretation. I say whatever interpretation you take, we must recognize that there must be an interpretation which does not contradict the fact that God revealed Himself as Jehovah to the patriarchs, that they knew that name or else whoever combined them, if there was a redactor, would have been such an utter fool, he couldn't have done the many clever...

P.76. (3/4)

...and I doubt if the time was wasted for anybody even if you understood it quite well, it probably made it clearer to you, so I'm glad I was asked to take the time for this, I want to make sure these main points are clear, and it may be better ~~to do~~ on some of it like this, ~~then~~ to review them later, after we've done the whole thing, rather than right through it, to have a lot of ~~r-v~~ going over it.

Now we only have a couple of more minutes, but I was talking last time about the conclusion regarding the three types of parallels, and I want to be sure you understand what the three are, I named the three at the very beginning of our consideration

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

of parallels, and if it wasn't clear then what they were, I wish somebody had stopped me than and asked, because we've been discussing the three right straight along, but I'm going to very rapidly summarize again the three types:

Type one is Parallel Sentences, two sentences that say approximately the same thing, and we discussed that at some length the other time.

Type two is really made up of sections which come under type one. In other words, type two is conflate, it is taking sentences in one narrative which are parallel to each other, the same thing said twice, and putting one over here and one here, and saying we have two stories. Conflate is assuming that there once were two separate stories of the same thing, which became united like I put my two hands together here, and which we can separate and get the two stories. That is the Conflate, and we examined that rather carefully last time, and showed as a final argument about it, that what the critics do with the Flood story and with various other stories could just as well be done withthe Prodigal Son or the Good Samaritan, or with any one of many stories, because if a story is well told there is repetition of a good many (2 3/4) elements and if you take the repeated elements and put them on the two sides, and then the other elements and divide them between the two you can have two more or less complete stories, but when you do, there is some of it that can be only one or the other and B can appear like contradiction. So they say there are contradictions betweent he two, but the contradictions are artificial, made contradictions, because part of the story is given to one and part to the other. Not really contradictions. If it said, for instance, that the prodigal son had plenty to eat, but was in rags, in one verse, and another verse said, the prodigal son, for all his wonderful clothes, was hungry, there you would have a contradiction. But if one verse says he was very hungry, and the other verse he was in rags there is no contradiction. But when you put them in two stories you can say one story says the trouble was lack of clothing, the other says it was lack of food. See, these contradictions are mostly artifically made, but much is made of them in the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

critical books and anybody whom you have in your church or in your missionary work or wherever you're working who studies in almost any university today and takes any course in Bible is going to become convinced that some of these stories are Conflate, and that there are contradictions in them, and if you can take one or two of them and show him that it is not necessary to take it that way, you may go a long way toward destroying his faith in that which is tearing down his belief in the Bible. So it is very important to understand that, that's the conflate.

Now the third type is different from the Conflate, the third type is the claim that two different stories in the Bible, which as they stand in the Bible are distinct events, are really accounts of the same event, that when it says Abraham lied to Pharoah, and Abraham lied to Abimelech, these are two accounts of the same event, contradicting minor points but agreeing on the major, that's the third type, which I expected to take twenty minutes discussing this morning, but will have to leave it till Thursday morning, because it is now time to start writing rapidly, in order to finish the questions that we have for today. Now the questions for today, you have now left 28 minutes, so if you write real fast you can finish. (5 1/4)...

(starting again at 5 3/4)...parallel passages and we properly should've been through with that question two or three hours ago, but it is a very important one, and some of the questions that were asked showed me that there was need of explaining further and clarifying --I'd like to be sure that everybody understands it and has it well in mind. It is a problem you are going to come up against, and the amazing thing is I find even in advanced courses in some of the best universities in the country, that a learned professor will simply make a statement like that that settles the whole thing. Why look at the parallel of the story of Abraham and Isaac lying. There evidence absolutely in the documents, no question about it. And they are so convinced of it that two or three statements like that simply seem to settle the matter, and the average student in ~~the~~ a university, when a professor speaks as dogmatically as that, it settles it. And one

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

thing that I am particularly anxious for you to learn here in this Ø Seminary is not to take anything that somebody says dogmatically and accept without examining it, if the liberals say it, or if the conservatives say it. I don't want you to take anything I say as true, I want you to search the Scripture, because it is God's Word that is true, and not any man's word and I may be mistaken on any particular/ point. But I want to lead/ you in learning methods of studying Scripture in order to see what it really says, and then to stand firmly on what you find in it. But I think that one thing perhaps that is good in these days, is that the leading professors in the liberal seminaries, and in the universities where they deal with the subject at all, are so convinced of this that they don't think it needs much proof, and the result is that they simply dogmatically make a statement, why these parallels prove it, and that settles it, and it does for most of their students, but the result is that when the student comes out, he may be a hundred per cent convinced of it but if he has to make a good argument for it, he is not very well prepared for it, and if you can get him to make two or three dogmatic statements on it, and then if you can show him by fact and evidence that those dogmatic statements just have nothing to them, why you shake his confidence in the whole business, and you'll get a lot further with him than if you were to try to go into eveything and examine detail after detail. I think that is good in presenting any matter to people. You come to somebody with an argument, they can immediately think of an answer, you come with another argument, they can immediately think of an answer. And no matter how many arguments you give, a person can always think of some answer even if it is no good at all, he can (8 1/4) but if you get him to speak, to give/ you evidence for his position, then you are in a position to show that it is not well founded and make much more of a dent in his mind. I think, for instance, with Roman Catholics, if somebody says to a Roman Catholic here is a Roman Catholic book with the imprimatur of the bishop that says some of the popes have been wicked, why he will immediately think of a good excuse for an answer, but

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

if you say to him, why I've heard these popes did this and this and this, he'd say why of course not, how could the vicar of Christ do such things, that's wicked and lying Protestant propaganda, then after he has said that then you bring him the book with the imprimatur of the Bishop, which says these very same things about some of the popes, why you shake his confidence in the thing that he had felt was true. ~~were untrue.~~

Well, now here discussing this third argument, on this third argument, I hope you clearly have in mind the three different types of parallels, and the first one can very easily be said also of (9 1/2) parallels. You take two sentences that are repetition, put one in one case, one in the other, and you can show that a great many of the alleged cases are simply that, or that they're headings, or that they're summaries. You take the second one, and we say they're not conflations, when we separate them out, they're not com--neither one is complete anyway. The contradictions are important by the separating, there is no actual contradiction there, but when you come to the third test, the situation is quite different, because in the third case, the claim is, look here you have this story and here you have this story, and these two are very plainly the same thing, why can you imagine such a thing, Abraham going down into Egypt and telling a lie and getting into trouble about it, and then going and doing the same thing with Abimelech? And then Isaac going and doing it with Abimelech? Why how could such a thing happen, and it is very easy to take two similar events and make it look as if they're identical, and it is not just a superficial argument either, because if you live very long you will have the experience of telling an incident to some friend, and having them repeat the incident, that you had a certain experience in your life, and you've told a group of friends about it, and two of them tell their wives about it, and they tell friends of theirs and they tell friends of theirs, and eventually you hear the story from two different sources and it is so utterly different you can't believe it ever was originally the same story. Little changes take place, and yet you can see how basically it is the same thing. Stories do get corrupted.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

I have no doubt that the Babylonian story of the Flood rests back upon tradition, coming from the original story of the Flood, original manuscript. And I don't think anybody intentionally falsified it. Of course they did imagine a lot of things about their Babylonian gods in connection with it, but the basic facts I don't think anybody falsified intentionally. And I believe that among the Hebrews it was preserved and probably also errors came in, but that God enabled Moses to keep those elements that were true and correct, those that were erroneous, so what he put in the Bible is the true account of what happened, but you compare what Moses put in the Bible with what the Babylonians said, and while you have got many very striking similarities, so I have no doubt it is the same event, yet you have got some very, very sharp differences between the two of them. The Biblical, it is done to punish man for his sins, or to wipe out man for his sin, in the Babylonian, Enmil the god takes a whim, he wants to get rid of mankind. In the Babylonian they gather like flies around the sacrifice to gods, to show rejoicing that they give sacrifices (12 1/2)

In the Biblical there is nothing like that. In each case there are three birds sent out, but they are different birds. I think two of the three are the same, but they are in a different order, and the instance of the birds is changed, but yet it is enough similar --three birds sent out like that, is something that a person wouldn't naturally think of in a Flood story, unless of course it just automatically (12 3/4)

You have a great similarity and then very sharp difference. So when they say, look at these two stories which appear similar, which have so much in common, they must be the story of the same thing, and yet they've gotten corrupted, and then whoever put them together, wanted to keep everything he could from both documents, and he simply thought they were two different stories, so he put them both in as two distinct events. That is our third type of...

P.77. (1)

...they will say, for instance, that you've got duplicate accounts of the naming of

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

all these places. Actually you have very few places where both tell of we already noticed how that was explained. Yet they're not actually naming it, they are saying how appropriate the name is. But there are very few you've even got two, very few. And in many instances the name is given where they're only given once. Actually the number of duplicates in this class is comparatively small, but when you examine them you do find a few cases like this of Abraham's lying, which are so similar that it is very easy for a person to become convinced that it must be the same story simply with these variations, and I believe the answer to that is to look at our own lives and history and to see from it what you can find out about similarities that actually exist in life, that things do happen which are very similar, which are so similar that it almost doesn't seem that they really could be two distinct events, and yet that they do exist.

I remember one day when we heard tremendous excitement, a man had gotten into a plane and had flown clear across the ocean, all alone, and he landed in Paris and was welcomed with great acclamation, he came back to this country, went to Washington, was received by the Congress, went to New York, went up Fifth Avenue, ticker tape thrown all over, nobody had ever had such a reception before, and the most remarkable thing was , how wonderfully Lindy behaved himself inthe whole situation, what everybody said, he answered just the right thing, very humble, very modest, very attractive in every way, made himself a great national hero. Then you redd in a book, and that happened shortly after the world war I, and of course at that day, they didn't number the war, theysaid just shortly after the world war. Well, now you will read and they will say, instedd of just shortly after the World War, they say, a few years after World War II, but they will say that a man got into something and flew , well look how it is exaggerated by this time, instead of saying he flew across the ocean , now they will say he went three times around the world, see the contradiction?

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

They say he went three times around the world but you notice it is the same direction, from west to east both times. And he went three times around the world, he landed, he was welcomed by congress, welcomed by the president, he went up to New York, up Fifth Avenue, such a pouring out of ticker tape as you never saw before, but most remarkable is the wonderful way in which he spoke, fine modest way in which he took everything which was said, and the way that he handled himself. They called the first one Colonel Lindbergh, the second one they called Colonel Glenn. And there is a little change in the names and one is greatly exaggerated, around the world instead of across the ocean, but look how many elements there are in common in the two stories. Well, I remember vaguely at the beginning of the first world war how there was a German fleet off the coast of South America and this fleet was attacked by British warships and the British outnumbered these German ships, and the commander of the German fleet was an admiral named Graf Spee, and Graf Spee the admiral of the German ships resisted these British ships so that it took quite a number of British ships to sink these ships but finally Graf Spee went down with his ship to the bottom of the ocean.

Now I don't suppose anybody here except myself remembers back that far. I don't how many of you remember many years later, early in the Second World War, but early in the Second World War they made a great commotion in this country, the account of how there were ships--I see Mr. Curry does remember, he is nodding--there was great publicity in our country about the German pocket battleship was sighted off the coast of South America, and about 7 or 8 British warships attacked it and they had a big battle against this battleship which was named the Graf Spee, the very name of the admiral I mentioned before, and the battle took place off the coast of South America and in the end the Graf Spee was sunk by its own men off the coast of South America. What a striking coincidence, at the beginning of one war, the Graf Spee goes down with his boat, the second war, the boat Graf Spee goes down, both happened off the coast of South America, both were greatly outnumbered by the British

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

ships that attacked them, and yet no one of which was alone equal to the power of the German ships, which they faced. How many similarities there were in time and in place, even the very name "Graf Spee." If that was in the Bible I'm sure it would be conclusive proof that we had two different documents because after all the difference is very, very plain between the two. And it is interesting, if you keep your eyes open for it, how many similarities you will find. I don't imagine anybody else, I know, in fact, anybody in this room except myself remembers, because I remember it rather vaguely, those days when Theodore Roosevelt was president of the United States. And when Theodore Roosevelt was pictured in our papers as a great Trust-breaker. And E. H. Harriman the president of the Union Pacific Railroad and also of the New York Central and the five or six other railroads, E. H. Harriman wanted to see him, and he refused to see him, and denounced him as an undesirable citizen, and he was denounced throughout the country, as a great progressive leader, the great trust-baiter ~~maker~~ that was going to put these industrialists in their place. Then they had a big campaign and Theodore Roosevelt ran for a third term, but he was defeated. Well, probably a good many more remember the day when Roosevelt, only this time his name was Franklin D., instead of Theodore, was president, and when he called in the presidents of the leading American corporations, and when they came out the reporters asked them what kind of interview they had, and they gave out a statement how they thought conditions had been improved and benefitted by their conversation, and so on, it had been prepared beforehand, but it leaked out a littlelater. He had simply gotten them in his office and told them about poor white people way up in the mountains of the south, who didn't have any running water in their homes, and spent half an hour haranguing these men about the condition of these poor people, and that's all he said, harangued them about that and dismissed them. And he was renowned through the country as a man who was putting these men of business in their place. Harriman was there too, and this time Harriman, instead of being ~~th~~ one of the men, he was denouncing the--the son of

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

the former Harriman was one of his trusted associates who was at his side most of the time. He also ran for a third term, only in this case he got elected, and also for a fourth term, but you have so many similarities there. The first seven presidents of the United States, I believe, all had two terms in office, except two. All but two had two terms of office. There were two of them who had one term in office, the second and sixth president, had one term in office and then they were defeated. Both of these men who had one term in office and then were defeated were named Adams, in fact, both were John Adams, one was John Quincy Adams, and both of them were from Massachusetts. And four out of the five who had two terms were also Virginians. I mean coincidences, similarities, you find them over and over. The second president of the United States, John Adams, and the third president of the United States, Thomas Jefferson, when Adams finished his term, they were bitter enemies, would hardly speak to each other at the inauguration. And years later, they both died on the same day. Many years later. They had both been leaders in the American War of Independence, and the day on which they died was the Fourth of July. Now you can see this is a made-up story, when the second and third presidents of the United States die on the 4th of July. What a cooincidence. Surely it is artificial. But it actually did happen. And you can go to history, to your own life, you can find incident after incident like this. And don't simply tell somebody these parallels don't prove anything because coincidences happen, look at this. Get them to give you one case where they say it couldn't happen, it is too similar, and then after they have done that, show them one of these cases like this, which is more similar, and which actually did happen. So that the fact of repetitions, of similarities, is something that we do find over and over in life, though we don't notice it until we get into the mood to look for it. Once you start looking for them you see them on every hand. And with a person who hasn't noticed them, who has not paid much attention to them, has not thought much about them, the argument that these must be similar stories ~~becomes~~ sounds tremendous, as nearly every one

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

of us has the experience of having the same story get so twisted that we actually see two different accounts of the same story, we know it can happen, but the other can also. Now I mentioned one thing about these, is the fact of the numbers being grossly exaggerated. The critics will say that everything, practically, in one of these documents is repeated in the other, or repeated in all three. I remember when I was in Palestine and one of the great scholars of the world, a man who has done a tremendous amount to advance conservative views by his being much more conservative than most of the scholars, he said to me why how can you question the fact of the different documents, you just see the long periods of them, how these events parallel each other right straight along, well, I didn't have the facts to answer him, I was shaken by it, I knew it wasn't true, my faith in Scripture was complete on this point, but I didn't know how to answer him, but to know the fact that it is tremendously exaggerated if I had known a third as much then as I know now, I would have asked him simply to list them for me, and just ask him to list, and just point out in a few cases, it would be very easy to show that a few that he listed were so remote that he would have to say well maybe that isn't really a parallel, maybe that one really doesn't belong in the list, and when you get through with that and get down to the ones that he would insist did belong, you would find that the number was so much less than the general impression given.

I read you a quotation from a footnote in Skinner and it is worth reading again. Because Skinner was one of the most pronounced advocates of the critical theory, and he has written some commentaries which are good thorough pieces of work, and have much in them of real value. His commentary on Genesis, in the International Critical Commentary Series, his commentary on Isaiah, in the Cambridge Bible Series, both of them have a great deal of valuable material in them, but here in this one, I read to you the footnote on page xliii, in the Introduction, where...

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

...in outline and content. The only important difference is that E's narrative does not seem to have embraced the primitive period, but to have commenced with Abraham. But from the point where E strikes into the current of the history, there are few incidents in the one document to which the other does not contain a parallel. What is much more remarkable, indeed surprising, is that the manner of narration changes in the two documents at the same places, thus the transition from the loose connection of the Abraham legend to the more consecutive biography of Abraham, and then to the artistic unity of the Joseph stories is equally noticeable in J and E. It is the extraordinarily close parallelism , both in matter and form, which proves that both documents drew from a common body of tradition, and even suggest that that tradition had already been partly reduced to writing. Footnote there, that says, "One is almost tempted to go further and say that the facts can be best explained by the hypothesis of literary dependance of one document on the other. That is a tremendous admission as to the great similarity between the two, a similarity which you'd expect if you're actually taking one thing and cutting it apart into two.

But now for the number of parallels in it, he says there are few incidents in the one document to which the other does not contain a parallel. There is the footnote I read to you before. The footnote says, "The precise extent to which this is true depends of course on the validity of the finer processes of analogy, in regard to which there is room for difference of opinion. On the analogies followed in this commentary, the only episodes in E to which there is no trace of a parallel in J, after chapter 15, are The Sacrifice of Isaac, Esau's selling his birthright, the (2 1/2) of Mahanahim, the purchase of land at Shechem, and the various incidents in chapter 35. Those peculiar to J are, the theophany at Mamre, the destruction of Sodom, Lot and his daughters, the birth of Jacob and Esau, the Isaac narrative, Jacob's meeting with Rachel, Reuben and (2 3/4) the incest of Reuben, Judah and Tamar, Joseph's temptation, the cup in Benjamin's sack, Joseph's agrarian policy,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

and the genealogies in chapters 23 and 25, now except for these incidents, everything has a parallel, the way he says it at the top there is hardly an incident that doesn't have a parallel. Then he gives you the ones that don't, makes you wonder how many there are that do. And it is good to have an idea of these facts and not be easily swept away by broad general statements, but more important ~~than~~ than that is to have a knowledge of it, so that when you do find somebody who is swept away, tremendously affected by it, you can help him to come to see the fact that these arguments have been tremendously over-exaggerated. Yes? (stu. 3 1/2: Our main argument against their position is that they leave out the time element and the name of place... to make their point work. In other words, if they considered the time element involved in one narrative and the other, this argument wouldn't be valid at all. There are certain things that happen in the meantime.) Well, that could enter in, but I think the more important is the fact that the number of parallels is not nearly as great as claimed, ~~in the Penta-~~ and that those ~~teuch~~ they do claim, for instance they say the children, the birth of children to Jacob, you have parallel accounts in J and E, examine them and what do you find, they give nine children to one and three to the other. Well, they each have the account of birth of children, yes. One has nine and one has three, and yet both of them say there were twelve sons, so there is no parallel there, they're simply dividing the story up and giving part to one and part to the other. Now I see that we have only... (4 1/2) (starting again at 4 3/4)

...the matter that if you have two styles so distinct that you can easily recognize they have two different authors in two books, that's pretty good evidence that they are distinct books, but if you have two books which simply differ on one point, that would not necessarily prove that they are two distinct books, for some reason there might be a reprinting of the books, with the change of one particular feature. So that this argument, if it can be sustained, would be a far more important argument ~~than~~ than the first argument on the Names. The Divine Names is the most

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

used here would divide up any book that ever was written.

Now you take our presidential addresses and addresses of most of our statesmen and politicians, and they are written by a lot of different men. They get a group of men together and one man writes a rough draft and another man makes suggestions, and another man writes a paragraph here and they represent the work of many different men. But to divide them up into these men later, without knowing these men, or even if you did know them, to say which part came from this and which from that would be extremely difficult. Very few people would even attempt it. Some of Shakespeare's works were written in collaboration with others, and there is much argument about which parts are by Shakespeare and which parts are not by him, but you can't prove it. You can say this sounds unworthy of Shakespeare, this must be by somebody else. But if you have a whole section which seemed to be unworthy of Shakespeare, then you feel on fairly solid ground, throwing out that section. But you can find individual parts anywhere that are inferior to other parts, and it is very difficult to make such a division with certainty. Similar methods could divide almost any book into diverse documents.

3, The Method Applied here, cannot stop with a few main documents--Logically each of them proves in turn by the application of the same method to require subdivision into a number of smaller documents. This particular point does not impress me right now, nearly as much as it did when I first lectured on this subject about thirty years ago. It does not for the reason that the scholars with whom I have had most connection in recent years have been those who are working in positive archeological investigation, in order to determine facts about the history of ancient times, and these men, while every one of them accepts--that is, practically every one of them, apcepts--the JE, D and P documents as having been distinct entities which were combined, as the Graf-Wellhausen theory attests, they ridicule the idea of dividing them up, in turn, into smaller documents, and feel that that is proven to be quite erroneous. That is what they feel, but there are many other scholars today who are not working in direct archeological work, who probably

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

continue the attitude that was so common thirty years ago of, in discussing these documents, dividing each of them into many subdivisions. I have often referred in this class to Driver's Literature of the Old Testament, because it was for many years the standard work in the English-speaking world on the subject, and it is very well done, he was a very great scholar, and did an excellent piece of clear presentation of what he thought. But it is pretty old now, and the introduction to the literature of the Old Testament from a critical view which would come nearer to replacing it than any other, would be by Prof. Pfeiffer of Harvard, which appeared about 15 or 20 years ago. But then Prof. Pfeiffer in his book replaces Driver, he subdivides considerably more than Driver does. He divides J up into S, S and J, and he puts it at the end as the latest instead of the earliest, whereas Driver had called it J. But Driver himself recognizes J1 and J2. Prof. Morgenstern who was President of the Hebrew-Union College in Cincinnati until within the last ten years, Prof. Morgenstern divided up into great detail, he would find eight or ten different hands in eachof these manuscripts. He would say P1, P2 and P3 were combined, P4 and 5 were combined, P6 and 7 were combined, and then two of these were combined, this one was combined, he has written most extensively on working out all these little details of this sort of thing. And a great many of the works which you will find today will refer to P1, P2, P3, J1, J2, and so on. Nearly all admit some of these subdivisions. It is logical to do so, because onee you start on this procedure there is no end to it. The same argument exactly that you use to make the division into the main documents will divide each of them up into other supporting ones. And that is an argument against the reliability of the major principle. If the principle is true, it should not too far, but to have a logical stopping place in it. So this is probably a much more important argument than it seems to be because of the fact that the particular scholars with whom I have had more contact in recent years, than with others .

4, The Assumption of Work of various redactors puts an end to certainty regarding any criteria whatever. (A very important point.) I mentioned to you yesterday that one book on the critical theory

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

thirteen times cuts the name of Aaron out of the J document, because it says J doesn't know anything about Aaron, so this is put in by a redactor. We find that both male and female, used in Gen.1.27 , which is part of the P document, Gen.5.2 part of the P document. Gen.6.19 part of the P document, but when you get to the story of the Flood, you find this phrase "male and female" in Gen.7.3 and 7.9 both of which they give to the J document, so they say there the phrase was changed, by the redactor, it was the redactor who harmonized by leaving it there. Well, if you can say...

P.85. (1/2)

...a redactor has combined them. This verse is mainly E but has elements of J in it. This verse ~~ha~~ is mainly P but it has elements of E in it. Well if your verses are combined with elements of the different points, what have we got left to prove the real theory in the first place. The assumption of the redactor tremendously cuts down any certainty as far as the basic principles are concerned. That was 4.~~= A very important point.~~

5, The Alleged Consensus of Scholarship is not a Valid Argument: For,

That is to say, I'm going to give certain reasons why it isn't because that of course is an argument that carries more weight with people than almost any other. All scholars agree on this, well, who are you to differ from them, if all scholars agree, that something is true, and the fact, and it is a very, very hard thing to resist. A person goes into a school where everybody holds a certain view and they look on him as a (2 1/4)
if he doesn't hold that view. They rather ridicule him, rather look down on him, if he holds a different view, what is the matter with him, doesn't he have sense enough to see this. Well, that attitude is very, very powerful, in its effect on people, and probably more people have been won to different views on different matters by that, than by any other other source of knowledge. And here it is very easy to say, all scholars agree, and of course it is true, that you take almost anybody who teaches any Bible subject in a university anywhere in the world, almost any, and you take almost anybody who holds a position dealing with the H Old Testament in almost any theological seminary, over 40

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

years old, or maybe we could say 30, in the world today, and he will say that the existence of the J, E, D, and P documents, and their developments is absolutely unquestionable, but all scholars agree. There was a man who was on our faculty about 15 years ago, who was talking with a professor in a Jewish school, and he was a very good friend of this man, and this man fromour faculty was talking with this fellow of the Jewish school, who had quite a reputation as a scholar, he ridiculed the documentary theory and he ridiculed it and pointed out flaws in it, and this Jewish scholar, who did a lot of work in archeology, had some very good theories, some rather unusual ones in archeology, he was greatly impressed, and he began knocking the Graf-Wellhausen theory, and then he told, the fellow from our school who told me about it, that he was at a meeting of scholars, and he gave a paper in which he ridiculed one feature of the critical theory, and he said that the professor from Princeton Theological Seminary got him apart afterward and says, look at here, he says, you want to be careful of your scholarly standing. He said, if you go criticizing the Graf-Wellhausen theory people will begin to get the idea you are a fundamentalist, and the Jewish scholar has been very careful of what he said, most of the time since, on that. It carries tremendous weight on people's attitudes, when you tell them that everybody agrees on someting, and it is true, in general , when everybody becomes convinced of something, there is usually pretty good ground for it, but it is not always true, there are many things which everybody believed at one period and which they find to be completely false, and which is completely given up a little later. But this alleged consensus of scholarship is something you are bound to come against, if you have any contact with people who work in the critical direction, and so there are certain things to mention against it that it is good to be familiar with, and one of these, small a is: a, This Agreement, though widespread, is not complete. And if you get into detailed discussion with someone, with a background of a critical study some time, and you want to try to influence them, it will be worth your while to become familiar with a few of the differences, because when they recognize some individual as a very great scholar, then

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

you show that on some basic point of this he differs, it can have quite an influence, in showing that the consensus is not as complete as it is generally considered to be. For instance, in the latter part of the last century, one of the greatest of German Old Testament scholars, was a man named Dillaman, and Prof. Dillaman's books are still read by Old Testament scholars, and considered to have much very excellent and valuable material in them. Now Prof. Dillaman// accepted the division into the documents substantially as they are today, but he did not accept the Graf-Wellhausen Theory. He never accepted the arraggement of them as held today, so that while accepting much of the theory, on some of the major points he never accepted. I've already mentioned that that was true of some of the greatest critical scholars of the last century, it was the young fellows who accepted the Graf-Wellhausen theory, and these older fellows to whom they looked up with great regard as great scholars, men who were thorough-going critical scholars, did not accept the peculiar features of the Graf-Wellhausen but held the earlier theories of their day, but their death, their views died out. However, in the present century, there has been an occasional critical scholar, who has advanced views of entirely new arrangements or a re-arrangement and one I mentionned to you was Prof. Pfeiffer of Harvard, whose introduction to the literature of the Old Testament is probably very widely used today among critical schools. A man who has been Professor of Old Testament in the Pacific, the Episcopal school, in Berkeley, California, and who is this coming year to be a professor in the department in religion in the University of Pennsylvania, a man who has quite a high reputation as an archeologist, he told me when Pfeiffer's book came out, he thought it was such a tremendously outstanding work, he said it is so easy to read and so interesting, and so full of vital material in this area, Pfeiffer's Introduction to the Old Testament has been very highly regarded among critical scholars. But as I have mentioned to you, one of the main starting points of the Graf-Wellhausen theory is Gen.1 is P, Gen.2 is J. Gen.2 is the early anthropomorphic view, Gen.1 is the lofty view of P, dry and unromantic and not interesting like the other, but much more lofty and advanced religiously,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

instead of God's making, God's causing this to happen, God speaks and it is done. Well, that is the view the Graf-Wellhausen holds, Pfeiffer says Gen.2-4 is not J at all, it is S and later than P instead of being at the very beginning. Well, that is hitting at the very foundation of the whole theory , and yet that is what he holds in his introduction to the Old Testament, which is probably the major book in its field today among the critical theories, to quite an extent replacing Driver. So that this small a, then, is very important. Then b:

Don't know whether I ought to take time for b, there is only 3 minutes , only time for a very brief quiz, so let's have a very brief one today, only count as five points. First for the odd numbers: Discuss the claim that all scholars agree on the Graf-Wellhausen theory. For the even numbers: Discuss the styles of J, E, and P. In three minutes give a brief summary of the main theme.

P.86 4/5/62 (3/4)

...conclusion regarding the arguments for Partition, and under that we had come down to #5 I believe, that the alleged consensus of scholarship is not a valid argument, because a, the agreement was never perfect, and is not now, though among the bulk of scholars today who take the critical view, it is my impression that they simply follow Driver. I don't know how many have followed Pfeiffer's idea of the S document, but it is my impression that most still follow Driver pretty closely, but there are individuals and some are outstanding individuals like Pfeiffer who advance theories of the detailed points differing widely from it, and yet holding to many of its points.

b, This consensus shows, not the proof of the hypothesis, but its most defensible form, That is an interesting point, not one of the main ones, but one of ~~the points~~ importance. About sixty years ago, between 1875 and 1920, let us say, in that period of about half a century, there were dozens of very able men who were carefully studying the Pentateuch, asking the question, does this verse belong to D, does it belong to J, does it belong to E?

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

They were not arguing, is the critical theory right or wrong. They were arguing to which document does this particular verse belong? And in the course of that great amount of study and discussion, arguments against a certain verse belonging to J would be presented and if the arguments against its belonging to J were stronger than those against its belonging to E, there would come a consensus that it belonged to E. The theory has been developed into perhaps its most defensible form. Now, as you see, to get the most defensible form implies the balancing of a lot of factors. For one thing you want to ~~have~~ follow divine names as much as you can. Now they don't follow them strictly, there are places where they say that the redactor has changed them. But not a great many. That is where the theory started and they try to stick to the names, and so you will read well this is of course an E section, because look at the name Elohim, you'll read that sort of thing repeatedly, and yet there are places where they say the redactor has changed the name, but they're trying to keep following the names as much as they can, while trying to get as complete a document as possible. So in the effort to get as complete a document as possible, the question is which will you follow in the case of a certain verse. Are you going to have the P document just jump with no complete break? Well, if you can get a half a verse which just mentions an important character, or something, it makes it much more complete, so they say, P of course knew something about this, here is a verse, yes, but that verse has got the name Jehovah. Well, the redactor must have changed it. Well, they don't like to do that, so rather than do that they'll take another half verse, if possible. What I mean is they are balancing things to get the most defensible form they can of the theory. That is not practically their purpose, their purpose is to decide which document they belong to. They are convinced the theory is true, the theory being true, to which document does a particular verse belong? But when you argue that fact of course you have reached the most defensible form of the theory, then the question is, having gotten the most defensible form of the theory, ~~it is~~ is it good enough to prove the theory? And we think it is not.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

But you see you balance from the names of God evidence as to getting a complete story in each document, evidence as to parallels, those who have, as far as possible, parallels in each one, and others who state that the J and E documents, from Genesis 1 on, parallel, almost everything contained in one is in the other. Yet I read you a statement, J has everything in E except, and then it gives quite a list. E has everything in J except, and it gives quite a list. So they fall far short of having parallels for everything, but they try to get as many as they can, and they think they have a great many, and they talk as if they had many more than they are able to make a claim of.

And then of course the argument from style implies ideas, the idea is that J is very primitive. God is thought of as just a big man. E is a little less primitive, God feels, He pities, He has thoughts like a man, but there isn't so much reference to His body, to His face, to His back, and or to His outstretched arms, that sort of thing. He is less anthropomorphic to an extent, than J.

And P of course, God is just doesn't make a man, God speaks and it is done, it is supposed to be a very advanced level in this regard. Well, these different ideas, and then words, the word "male and female" shows P, the word "male and female" shows J, all this sort of thing. The attempt is made to put the verses in such a way as to fit the different criteria as far as possible. So the result is that the theory is certainly in its most defensible form. No one man, no matter how brilliant could work up as good a theory as this, with the material. And no ordinary man could work up one-half as good. But many people have worked on it and studied all the different factors, to argue as to whether this verse goes here or this verse goes here, and they have produced something that has very many elements of strength. Then, having done so, the bulk of the scholars simply accept it, they look in the book, Driver's book or some other leader, to see is it part of the J document, is it part of the E document? There is very little taught today on the part of the ordinary scholar as making any read answer.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

A man like Pfeiffer of Harvard, who writes an introduction to the Old Testament, he makes a bold new idea about S, that part of J being the last instead of the first, but comparatively few accept this, most simply take it. Here is what scholars agree on. Therefore you have a consensus of scholars. Now when you find great numbers of people believing that something is true, you don't just say they're all crazy, you just can't do that. Anything that great numbers of believe to be true is worthy of examination, worthy of careful investigation. But the argument that everybody agrees on this, while perhaps the most effective argument in the world to produce conviction is, after all, not the strongest argument to prove it. All great discoveries have at one time been held by only one person, and everybody else thought that such an idea was rather crazy.

When the Wrights began flying, everybody in the United States knew that flying was impossible, so five years after the Wrights had made their airplane go in the air, they were in Ohio just a few miles out of one of the big cities where a streetcar passed by all the time and they were flying as much as half a mile and a mile there repeatedly, in their planes, and people didnt' even bother to look at them, and it was stated in our papers in the United States, that it was impossible, of course you couldn t fly, everybody knew it was impossible, so they didn't believe what the Wrights did, even if you could go out there and look at them, and when they tried to sell the planes to the United States Government, the Government actually ignored them, it was impossible of course, and for three or four years, while they were trying to get Government Agencies to take some interest, in getting a plane for the United States Government, the Government would pay no attention to them, till finally the British Government decided there might be something to it and made them a sizeable offer for it, and they refused the offer because they wanted to have their own government have it rather than a foreign nation. But people just knew you couldn't fly so even though they could see the plane fly they didn't believe it. Now of course we have a little trend today. The trend today is to believe that anything that any scientist says is true, and if the Russians say that they do, some-

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

thing, send a man around the moon, or something, we immediately believe it, because our tendency is, not because we're ready to believe everything the Russians say, but because we are ready to believe anything scientists say. That's the tendency today, is to think that anything whatever that any scientist says is true, because there have been so many wonderful things they have discovered. But there are plenty of things that scientists think that simply aren't true. And it is one of the most irritating things when you get into study of the Bible, to find how many things are written in which they make a study of a passage and they will say, well, look, all the commentators agree on this, and you trace it through and you may find 40 commentators to express a certain view, and you will find that they've all copied from one, one man with a great reputation, writing hurriedly, dealing with parts of the book. He has done a great deal of work, very thorough work, but, wanting to make a complete work on the book, has superficially and hastily dealt with certain parts of it, and then others scholars in view of his great reputation, have somply uncritically copied what he said, so if you say to me well 30 commentators say this and 10 say this, I'm not the least bit interested in what the majority says, I'm interested in what the evidence is. But the human tendency is to go by what people say, and if you get a group of people this large and they all say well of course it is true, it is very, very difficult for one individual in the group, to hold to a different view. He is almost always simply converted by the force of the consensus of the group in which, among which he is. It is a strong influence on most of us, we don't like to feel that we are trying to hold something that everybody else thinks is wrong. So that is one of the great forces which has spread the theory of evolution, and which has spread the higher criticism. All scholars agree. Well, who are you to put yourself out against all scholars? The fact of the matter is that all scholars may be right and they may be wrong. What determines is not what a great number of people say, but what are the evidences, what are the facts? And we've been trying to look objectively and carefully at the facts, and to give full recognition to the arguments that

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

are presented, but I believe that the arguments presented come far, far short of proving what the critics claim. But at this moment we are talking about this point of the consensus which is, I won't say it is necessarily one of the big arguments, but it is an argument that has been used a lot, but I will say it is one of the big forces in the acceptance of the theory. You let a Jew who has been raised in an orthodox Jewish group that perhaps doesn't know a great deal about the Bible, but that perhaps does think that the Bible was simply, all of it, dictated to Moses--the first part, and the rest dictated to the different ones, and there is no question of it. You put them in a class in a great university with other students, most of them more advanced than he is, where the professor simply says well of course you can easily see the difference between these two chapters, they contradict each other, naturally, one is from the J document, and one is from the P document, and he says, look at the different stories of Abraham's lying, why of course he didn't lie two times, it is just different documents, different stories of the same event. And the argument doesn't carry as much weight with these folks as the fact that everybody else in the class agrees with it and the great scholar says it is the case. And it has a tremendous effect. And what people think that everybody believes or everybody in their circle, everybody in their group, is very, very hard for them to resist. And one thing that some people have perhaps not been so happy about at Faith Seminary...

P.87. (3/4)

...professors are the greatest scholars in the world, whatever they say is the truth, and their views are the true Reformed Faith, and on any subject, anyone, if they heard any one of us say that, they held to tenaciously. One student said to me once, he said, I listen very closely when Dr. Machen prays so that I won't use any words in my prayers that he doesn't use. Ø I don't want to take any attitude that isn't the right attitude.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Well, I reacted--it results in tremendous morale for the students. They go to the greatest school in the world, and these professors are the greatest professors in the world, but I never liked that attitude, and when I left I reacted rather stroggly against it, and ever since Faith Seminary started, I have constantly been urging not to follow me in anything unless you are convinced I am right, but to examine the evidence, and I am not half so interested in getting people to believe what I think is right, as in getting them to be able to think things through and examine the evidence and see for themselves what the facts are and come to the proper conclusion as the facts warrant, and it does not develop the same sort of a united morale and a united attitude of absolute agreement on everything, but the attitude you find in most institutions does, it does not do that, but in my opinion it develops people who can think for themselves and who as new issues new points arise in the future, will be able to think them through in the light of the Scriptures, and to lead the people of God aright, so that has always been my idea from the time of the foundation of the Seminary.

The other is very, very easy to do, but I do think that--I think youhave to do ~~do~~ it, if you're going to have a movement, you can expect the bulk of people to just follow you in lockstep, and whatever you say that is OK, but we're not interested here in training followers of the movement we're in, we're training leaders to lead for God in the days to come, and if the movement for the acceptance of the higher criticism, the movement of ~~the~~ modernism, the movement of --the ecumenical movement, has just got such a tremendous preponderance today that great numbers of people are simply following in ~~line~~ lockstep, because that is what everybody believes, and I am hoping that we will have people opposing, not because they're following another group in lockstep, but because they are thinking things through for themselves, and seeing where it is ~~tak~~ going. So this argument for the criticism , that it is the consensus of scholarship, that all scholarship agrees, we should be familiar with and able to deal with, but I hope

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

that we will get away from taking that attitude in general. Well now that was b. Yes? (3 1/2.stu., J.Guetros: I was talking to a fellow from Princeton Seminary last week and I tried to use your argument of the reliance of their argument on and he said that that is old fashioned, and today what we believe is what has already been proved, that there were two original documents, and he feels that he felt that this had developed from Astruc's theory, he felt that later it developed into the four documents, like you said, that Astruc's school is old-fashioned, because today we believe that there were four, and I was sort of in a problem how to put him down, as far as his argument, because he denied that argument right from the beginning.) They will all say that the names of God are just one of a hundred different stylistic differences, they will all say that, but the fact is that if you take any critical commentary and you look under discussion, you will find point after point where they say it is obvious that this belongs to the E document rather than J because here is the name Elohim, they use it as one of their main arguments. And you will find it in the book, you will find it used as one of the main arguments, constantly used, and historically that is the way it developed. Astruc divided this way, later when Hupfeld divided the E document, he cut the force of the argument in half, but it is highly questionable whether it would have developed into anything like this way if it hadn't started there. It probably would have developed in an entirely different way if it ever developed today. But now seeing Hupfeld's division does tremendously weaken Astruc 's theory, the claim that is made now--well that is just one of a hundred stylistic arguments, but the fact is that more stress is laid on it than on any other today. Now they won't say that, they might not admit it but you look through their commentary, and see how this is shown to be from the E document from the use of the term Elohim, shown to be from the J document by use of the term Jehovah. Yes? (stu.5 1/2) Yes, I think that Mr. McComas has made a very excellent point. I have seen it over and over. Where I taught before --the last year I taught there, the brightest fellow in the class, one who was acclaimed

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

as perhaps the most brilliant student there, graduated from an outstanding evangelical college, three years in that Seminary where he had the highest standing, he knew and he could argue and give the proof for just about anything, they gave him the fellowship to go over to Europe and study for three years, and while he was over there he adopted neo-orthodox views, and he came back and they had to drop him from their church because of the views he had adopted, and today he is teaching the higher criticism in a liberal school, and as Ahab said, ordinarily Ahab isn't the best authority, but as Ahab said, let him that thinketh he standeth take heed, lest he fall. And I have seen, when I was in college, there was a fellow there who went through a fine Christian school and came out and he knew the Bible was right and he knew evolution was wrong, and I saw him in a class in geology there and thought oh he is going to convert that professor right away, so we used to go on geology trips and all along the way he was arguing with him, he would argue with him in class, and he was going to prove that evolution to that professor. And the professor was very cagey and very (7 1/2)
and he encouraged the fellow, let him go ahead with his arguments, let him move ahead, and then he, the professor, would know how ~~far~~ the argument--it was a good argument the fellow had, the professor knew it was a good argument and if it was well presented might have had difficulty answering it, but I would see the way he did, instead of helping the fellow to put the argument in the strongest way and then try to show him that there were still stronger arguments against, in his opinion, he would lead the fellow on so the fellow would get a little twisted in the argument, get it over here into a place and then he would ask him questions, the fellow would dogmatically say it's this way, this way. And of course evolution is wrong because of this fact, this fact. Then the professor would just bring out some facts that showed that what the student had said was absolutely wrong. And it wasn't that his argument was wrong but it was that he thought he knew so much, that he thought he could confuse people who had studied many more years than he had on the subject, and he was just going to go in and convert them, and the result was

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

that he got converted, today he is a modernist leader. This fellow who was one of the most ardent, earnest Christian workers I ever knew, when he went in there. I would say let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall, definitely, and don't you think that with two hours through one semester on this, what may be a year's study on your own, that you're going to go in and take somebody who has spent ten years in the study of it, and you're just going to prove him a fool, don't think you'll do it, you'll be the one who is probably proven a fool, but what I say is this: my purpose here is, as Mr. McComas suggested, in the first place, to ground you. Now if you're going to graduate here and think that you're going to go into a modernist school and confuse the professors there, then my time has been wasted, because the chances are you'll be converted rather than they. But I think conceit leads more people into the devil's hands than anything else. But you are going to, in the years to come, to meet some of these arguments that are pretty strong, and if you can be grounded it will help you to stay close to the Lord. But that is not my only purpose here, I feel that if you are in Christian work, in any country in the world, if you are in Christian work and are successful and effective, you are going to have young people in your group who are going to go on for education, and are going to get into schools where they are going to have the higher criticism simply given to them as a fact, and they are going to find the consensus of attitudes very, very hard to resist, and if you know enough about it to show your young person that you actually know more than that teacher he studied under, who probably isn't a real master of that subject anyway, if you can do that, it is going to be tremendously helpful in holding him, it might even be what is necessary to get him out of that school, where his faith is going to be wrecked, to prove to him that on some things those people don't know quite as much as they think they do. It can be a tremendously helpful thing in dealing with your young people. And then, it is altogether likely that you will sometime come into contact with sincere people, sincerely attracted to real Christianity, who profess to have had a real experience with the Lord, and who want to know further but who have had

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

their mind filled with the higher criticism, and they don't want to believe it, but they feel that the evidence is that way and they can't help themselves, and if you have an idea and understanding of its development, you ~~must~~ may be able to tremendously help those people. So I feel that without you're ever thinking you're going to take the great leaders of the higher criticism and convert them, that you can accomplish a great deal for the Lord by having a good solid grounding in it, and the time may come, may very easily come, with any one of you, when you'll be in a town and some minister in the town, or maybe some high school professor, or perhaps even a divinity professor, will be very, very blatant in his discussion on the TV and on the radio, and in his attacks on the Bible, and when it will be easy for you to see how it could be shown that he is utterly wrong, and where you can help with a good bit of further study by yourself, you can have a public debate with him and can tremendously cut down his influence. And if you had the proper foundation and basis for it, you will know where to study and what to do in order to get the material that will refute it. And incidentally I would say when you argue with somebody on these points, I think it is very important that you don't simply go to them, if they're convinced of this, don't you go to them and give them your arguments simply, and think that you're going to win that way. Try to get them to talk and get them to tell you what they think, and if you know the subject fairly well, it won't be long before you'll find that they are very dogmatically convinced, at some of the basic things in support of the theory, they are very dogmatically convinced of certain things that aren't true. Like for instance if somebody says the style of J and E is as different as Chaucer from Modern English, well then it would be quite simple for you, if they were to say that, if they said J and P you might have a little difficulty convincing them, but they're just as apt to say J and E as J and P, and if they say J and E, it would be quite easy for you then to get a book by a critical scholar in whom they would have tremendous confidence, who would say that the disentangling of J and E is very difficult because their styles are so very close, and if you give them that first, they

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

won't be a bit influenced by it, but if they dogmatically state the contrary, and take a stand on it you can begin to shake their confidence...

P.88. (3/4)

...if you have the main essentials thoroughly in mind now. I wish we had a longer time so that we could give three or four times as long as we have to this, but I do feel for Christian work, exegesis of the Scripture, careful examination of a passage to know exactly what they mean is the most important by far, and so we give the greater part of our study to that, and we have only these two hours on this very, very vital subject. And we've got an awful lot yet to cover so we'll have to move on as fast as we can, and by about the consensus, we have dealt with, now small c:

c, Critical Positions Vary Widely until 1878. It is a summary of something we have already said, but it is so important I want to stress it. When Wellhausen developed the theory it was fixed in no definite form. Now that is something that we took considerable time going through, and it was important that you should realize it. Of course 1878 now seems like a long time ago, and the attitude of many people today is anything anybody thought before twenty years ago is just old-fashioned, but the fact is that the great scholars who worked on this and developed the theory were very convinced of the supplementary theory, and very convinced of the two-document theory, and very convinced of these different attitudes until finally it was the union with the development theory that fixed it in its present form, in 1878. Now that we have gone over, already quoted, about the importance of its place in the outline. Now d is more new, and d is something that we could spend a considerable amount of time on, but we will not be able to now.

d, That Recent Archeological Studies have forced such changes as to threaten violently to disrupt the former unity. Now I have changed that point from what I used to give it. I have not taught this course now for a number of years, but I've given it a number of times before and I always gave this point as, Recent archeological studies

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

conspicuous clue with which the whole business started, but no one will maintain in a detailed argument that upon that alone could be done. It would be maintained that that was one of many stylistic points. So you see, the importance of this argument in relation to the ~~third~~ first. Now the second also. Do you have a complete document in each of them? Well, it is already admitted that E doesn't start till Gen.20, ~~It is not complete,~~ but they say it is complete from there on. ~~that is,~~ they may start at different times, they may end at different times. Why would you have to have the whole thing covered to have a complete document? Well, for the area you cover, you could have two entirely different documents, and not have them completely cover the same ground. It seems very strange that they do completely cover things like that. So that the second argument is not as important as the fourth one. Are there two distinct styles, or three or four distinct styles which clearly would have to be by different authors?

Now we come to the third ~~one~~, the argument from parallel passages. ~~and~~ that ~~can~~ be a big argument for a distinct document, If ~~you have~~ the same thing told twice and told in such a way that the author didn't realize it ~~is~~ the same ~~thing~~, and if they contradict each other, ~~it~~ would suggest that it could ~~be~~ come from two different sources, but it ~~doesn't~~ prove two ~~extensive~~ long documents. ~~It is a great~~ argument ~~for breaking~~ up the argument from ~~parallel passages~~, but unless you ~~have a~~ long series of parallels, it would in itself not prove it. ~~But~~ if you ~~can~~ say, here are three or four styles which are so different that there is no question different people wrote them, ~~if so~~ one man said to a friend of mine, ~~why he said~~ the difference between the styles of J and E is just as great as the difference between Chaucer and modern English, if you can make a statement like that why you have got a tremendous big argument. ~~So that this is~~ an argument, which, if it ~~can~~ be proven is ~~much~~ more important than any of the other three. ~~And if you cannot prove this~~, it would be ~~pretty~~ hard to say that any of the other three would really stand up as evidence that there were originally

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

several distinct documents. So ~~this argument~~ is a tremendously important argument, the claim that there are such differences of style and of viewpoint as to prove that these must have been separate documents originally, ~~that~~ having these differences

Now #2 is, I think, a very important point:

2, There is no solid basis for establishing a style of distinct writers since no separate document by the alleged writer has been preserved. This is I think a very important point. Perhaps I should put a statement in between about the absurdity of the statement regarding Chaucer. I don't think that will be necessary, though we should remind you of the fact that any such statement is ridiculous, that nobody could simply look at a section of Genesis, or Exodus, and simply say this is as different as the English of Chaucer and today. The language is the same language. They are not distinct dialects, no real scholar will maintain that. But they do maintain that there are distinct features of style which show you that you are dealing with a different writer. Now if I were to write, if you were to take a 300-page book which I had written and you were to take a book of 300 pages which Mr. Faucette had written and you were to go through the two and say here are two books dealing with a similar subject, you notice that Dr. MacRae shows a strong tendency to use this type of sentence, while Mr. Faucette has a tendency to use this type of sentence, Dr. MacRae always seems to prefer to use this sort of terminology, Mr. Faucette a different type. Here is a word that you find many times in Dr. MacRae'e book, that word could have fitted in very nicely in Mr. Faucette's book but we don't find it there at all. Here is a word he uses a great deal which could have fit in Dr. MacRae's well and we don't find it at all. Here we find distinctive features of their preference for types of sentences, types of language, particular words, one is always saying look at all those houses, the other is always saying look at all those buildings. One ~~says~~ has a habit of using the word house, the other has the habit of using the word building. But when it comes to boats and ships, both of them use both words, they don't have a tendency there. You could

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

show certain things on which they agree, and certain on which they differ, certain preferences of style, certain things that are characteristic of one than the other. Having done that with two books of 300 pages each, then you would pick up four pages, and say who wrote these? Did Dr. MacRae or Mr. Faucette write these? Well, you look at them and say I notice the type of sentences, there are only a few of the type Mr. Faucette tends to use largely but a great many of the type MacRae uses. It uses the word houses a great deal and buildings we hardly find at all. You see certain things, you say this is by this writer rather than by that. You see, what I mean is you would have a solid basis for determining style, with a book the authorship of which was unquestionable. But now in the case of the Pentateuch, aside from the matter of Deuteronomy, as far as the other three documents are concerned, you do not have long documents, which it can be said, this is all of it from P, or this is all of it from J. It is purely an imaginery thing that there were once documents of that type. Therefore you don't have a basis on which to establish their peculiarities. you go through what you have and try to divide into different sections on the difference of Divine names or on Parallel Passages, and so on. Then, having divided, you try to prove there is a distinct style, then proving, you think, a distinct style in certain parts, you try to divide the rest according to that style. There is a tremendous danger of arguing in a circle. If you put all the passages using a certain word over here, and all the passages using a certain word over there, and you say look this word only occurs in this, this word only occurs in that, it is distinctive in this. Well, you have put it that way. There is a tremendous danger of arguing in a circle, in that sort of thing, because there is no solid basis on which it can rest. Now that is a tremendously important point on this whole matter of the claim that the stylistic differences are sufficient to divide up the three documents of Genesis, and of, well, the three documents into which they claim that most of...

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

...so this second point is a very important point, and the third which is almost as important is: #3, The Alleged criteria are not carried through consistently. Now that is a very important point and that is one which you would have to prove. The average person who has had any work in this in a liberal school, but has not gone extensively into it, as very few have any more, that the (1 1/2) a student in a liberal school might be expected to spend a great deal of time studying the evidences for P and J. Today it is taken for granted, and the students come out with absolutely no question as to fact, but not knowing a great deal about its detail. But I am sure that the impression that they have is that you can divide up Genesis into these three different documents which go through long sessions running quite parallel to each other, as they say, and having made the division, and having the distinct document, you find that the stylistic material goes through quite consistently, and if that could be proven it would be quite a point for the whole argument. It would be a strong argument. If you could take all these sections that use Elohim, put them over here, all the sections that use Jehovah, put them over here, and you would say in the sections that use Jehovah, he always speaks of a maidservant as ammah, and in the sections that use Elohim he always speaks of a maidservant as Shiphsah , not as ammah. In the section that uses Elohim, he always says male and female, animals --male or female; made human beings, male and female created He them, but in the section that uses Jehovah, he always says the man and his wife. Noah brought into the ark all of these animals, the man and his wife, while the other says male and female. If you would carry those through consistently why that would be a most remarkable thing, and it would be a very strong argument for the theory. And your graduates of liberal schools, I am sure, are convinced of the fact that it can be carried through. And therefore, if you were to spend some time, a considerable amount of time with a person who had work in this in a liberal school, but who was beginning to have doubts about the matter, if you would simply take the word that he would say, or that his source would say are consistent of one document, and trace

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

them through, I don't believe you would have much difficulty in showing them that the criteria are not applied consistently. Yes? (3 3/4) No, definitely not. This is because there never were any such documents. (stu.4) From their point of view they say there are distinct documents and they say that these distinct documents had different styles, and you say what is the evidence they are of different style? Now they don't try to prove evidence of different styles, they try to prove which verses go in this document, which go in this, which in this. And they will say here is a statement that has the word shiphzah for maidservant instead of the more common ammah, well that's a typical J word, that must be part of the J document. Here is one which says male and female, that's a typical P expression, that must be part of the P document. This one says a man and his wife, that's a typical J expression, and so on. They say this is proof that this verse goes there, and this proves that this verse goes there. Well, then, they having divided it, then we look at it to see if the criteria on the basis of which they say they have divided it, are carried out consistently, and we find that they are not. That is what it amounts to. Now of course if they could simply take every case of certain words and put them here and every case of certain words and put them there, and then say look the words are there, that would be a wonderful proof of reasoning in a circle, but you can't do that, because they claim to have each document complete. They claim to have full stories which read intelligently, and in order to do that, they can't simply take two words and two here and one there and one there and one there, they have to take full sentences or at least sizeable portions of sentences, and they have ordinarily to take sections of several sentences, or else their argument would just prove nothing. There wouldn't be enough to prove it, unless you can say that at least in general there are fairly long passages taken from it. And our objection to them is that they don't--now they take Gen.1.1-2.4 P document, Gen.2.4 to almost the end of chapter 4, J document. Well, that sounds beautiful, here is a big section taken from this, here is a big section taken from this. All right. If you go on with a big section from this, a big section from that, that looks

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

like quite logical, but when you start taking a verse and putting it here and a verse and putting it there, it makes the whole thing begin to look rather weak. But then even after they take a verse and put it here and a verse and put it there, and half a verse and put it here and half a verse and put it there, then we say, yes but look, you say this is a distinctive word in this section, and here it is here. You say this is a distinctive word on this side and here it is over here. Well, they say, there the redactor changed it. There the redactor, when he put them together, in order to make them fit together better, used the word from the other document, but when they start // saying that, they weaken the argument to the point where there is not much strength left in it. But when you get into that sort of argument, // you get into such a complicated thing of comparing words, that it is very easy for anybody to get lost, and so it is much easier for most of the students to sit in the class and listen to the liberal professor say, why the distinctive marks of style show clearly they are ~~two~~ distinct documents and go out and think that, or for you to sit here and listen to me and say, why (7 1/4)

and go out and take that. It is much easier to do that than for either group to examine it for yourself and look into these evidences and see what they prove. And for that reason there are very few people who know much in detail about them. Now there are a few books written which take some of these points of style, and try to look at them extensively, but if I would take a half a page of one of those books, and try to make it clear, in a class of this size, it would take me twenty minutes to do it. And you by yourself, just the writing, would probably take you 15 minutes, so you see, you don't get far in this sort of an argument, unless you take a great deal of time. But I think it is an important thing to say, that if the evidence was clear for distinct documents, it wouldn't take so long to prove it. That the fact that, when you look into it, you have to have so many exceptions, and so many questions, and so many cases, is an argument against the theory, rather than for the theory. I don't see any point in my taking time to give you a lot of illustrations. You would write them down rapidly and that would be all there

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

would be to it, because if we stopped and tried to discuss them, it would take too much time. I want to give you two or three though, and take a bit of time on them. So you'll just have a couple of illustrations. Yes? (8 3/4.J.Gueiros: Dr. MacRae, it seems to me strange to base an argument of style only on independent or separate words instead of sentence construction and dialectics, because that is a better argument than independent words.) Yes, Mr. Gueiros is absolutely right there, that the part of the argument which they base upon types of sentences is much stronger thanthe part which they base on individual words. Individual words is a pretty poor base for an argument.

Now I heard a man come back who had been a chaplain in World War I, and I heard him give, right after the war, I heard him give a lecture on his experiences, and he said, we went out here in this part of the battlefield and there was shrapnel flying and shells and all that sort of thing, then he said, we went into the hospital there, there were men with broken legs, arms, and all that sort of thing, then he told how when they came out they had a big victory celebration and he said, they had banners and flags and people marching and all that sort of thing, and every third sentence he said"all that sort of thing." Well, you say what a distinctive feature of style. But I wouldn't be a bit surprised if everybody who heard him talk for an hour, in the course of which he probably used that phrase 40 or 50 times, in the course of the next three or four days used it at least once or twice themselves. That would be my guess, it would impress it on your minds, and you would find it used by others just from hearing him, and then again, I wouldn't be a bit surprised if after he had given about 35 lectures like that and people had sat there and much as they enjoyed the lecture found it very tiresome to have repetition this way, somebody said, made him a mortal enemy for life, by going to him afterwards and telling him how disagreeable it was. But if he was a man of a certain amount of sense he may have taken the thing to heart and maybe never used the phrase again as long as he lived. You can break yourself of a

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

habit like that, it is hard to do but you can do it, and all of us that do much speaking fall into habits like that if we're not careful, and we should be thankful when somebody fa
points them out so we can get away from it. But that is a pretty poor, as you see, a pretty poor basis for style, because you can change in it, you go to an extremen in it, then you may quit it altogether, and the fact that one person does it a lot doesn't mean that other people don't do it at all. The argument from words like that to prove distinct style has to be used with very great caution if they are going to really be valid. But even taking them as the critics ~~say they are,~~ try to do ~~my point here is that~~ they do not carry them through specifically, ~~and that is to say,~~ that these points, ~~which in any critical book~~ they will tell you in one chapter ~~they will say this~~ is clearly P style, ~~look he uses this~~ it used
certain
phrase, which is a typical phrase for P, ~~and~~ then you will find that in almost every case where they make that statement there will be some other thing in a J passage, where they will have a footnote and say here the redactor has inserted P's word about that same word. They do not carry them through consistently. That is a thing which you can easily examine for yourself and get details if you want to go into extensive argument. It might be worth our giving an assignment for each of you to take ten hours to do something of this kind, but I don't think I will this time. Yes? (12 1/2) I wouldn't think so, there might be some cases, but I don't think in most cases the redactor accounts for it. (stu: In other words, their main argument then is that it has been changed by the redactor?) They simply state it, simply dogmatically state it, it has been changed by the redactor. Now here is Driver's Introduction to...

P.80. (3/4)

...for many years it was the standard Old Testament Introduction, and actually the critics don't depart much from it today, most of them. In it, on page 14 where he is discussing the division of Genesis, he says here that in the account of the Flood the main narrative is that of P which has been enlarged by the addition of elements derived

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

from that of J. Here however these elements form a solidly complete narrative, though there are omissions, and he has a footnote here, I want to find the exact thing the footnote refers to, but, oh yes, the footnote is where he says, "J has Gen.7.1-5 and 7-10 (in the main)." Now "in the main" that is J. Here is the footnote. Verses 7-9 include two or three expressions. Why does he say two or three, when there actually are three, one of them is "two and two" , one of them is "male and female", and one of them is "Elohim." In these three verses which he gives to J, there occurs "two and two" which he says is a distinctive P phrase. The phrase "male and female" which he says is a distinctive P phrase, and the word "Elohim," in these three verses, and he says that these three are mainly from J, that is, the redactor has put in three phrases here which really are P phrases. Why would the redactor do that? If he is going to take three verses and change three different expressions in them, to fit with P, so why didn't he change the whole thing throughout so that you couldn't possibly distinguish the documents? Yes? (2 1/2) The reference is to Gen.6, chapter 7.7-10. Driver, Literature of the Old Testament takes (3)

358→

But there aren't many cases where they will say that the redactor has changed three phrases in two verses, but there are a great many where they will say, he has changed one phrase. In that story of the Flood, male and female is a typical P phrase, because it occurs in Gen.1. Man and his wife is a typical J phrase, sometimes translated male and female, in the King James Version. Because, you see, in the Hebrew, you say the man and his wife, you use it as a phrase to mean not necessarily human beings, but any pair, man and his wife. Well, we don't do that so the King James translates it "male and female," man and his wife. But there are two cases where male and female is used in two distinct verses about six verses apart, which they give to a J passage, but it uses actually "male and female", they say here the redactor has changed it.

Prof. Alders , the late Prof.Alders, of the Free University in his book, A Short Introduction to the Pentateuch, has quite a discussion of Gen.33. I would like, if I can,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

in just a minute, give you the main points of this discussion. As he points out, chapter 33 is ordinarily ascribed to J, except for its last 2 or 2½ verses. Why should they ascribe it to J? Because in verses 1, 2 and 6, it uses J's words for female slave, rather than E's word for female slave. But in the chapter the name Elohim is used, Jehovah doesn't occur in it at all, it only uses Elohim. And yet they give it to J. Well, they give it to J because it has got in it this name for a female slave, but it's got Elohim in it several times, so that some other critics will say that this Elohim has been changed by the redactor. It must originally have been Jehovah. They say that these words for female slave are characteristic for J and E, but that in Gen.20, which is the first continuous excerpt from E you have both words used. One in verse 14, one in verse 16. So they say the case in verse 14 must be an insertion by the redactor. Those are two illustrations. Many could be given of the ways that the criteria are not applied consistently. I don't think I better take time to go into these precise details again I just gave. You could easily look them up, the main point is what I want you to get. That here is chapter 33, on the basis of Divine Names it is one way, on the basis of the name for female slave, the other way. But it makes a better continuous document to put it that way, so we put it that way, that means the redactor put this in. If you put it this way, you'd have to say the redactor put that in. Every time you say a redactor has changed it, you are weakening your argument, it would seem to me. But the number of times where they say the redactor changed it are a great many. There are books, for instance, which will say, there is a book by an author named Brightman on the sources of the Pentateuch, which gives you the J document and the E document the way Brightman divides them. Well, now, in Brightman's division, Brightman says the name "Aaron" is typical of the P document, Aaron does not belong in the J document at all. And there are 13 times in the J document, as given in this book, where the word Aaron occurs, but in each time they cut it out because they say it was inserted by a redactor. Thirteen times, in the sections they give to the J document. Because Aaron is a typical word for the P document. The argument would not be a

http://www.macfarlib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

conclusive argument for the document, this argument from words, if it could be carried out, but my point is it does not carry out consistently, and it sounds very strong as it is given, but if you will examine the details, the details, the redactor has changed them, or you pick out four words inthe middle of a verse and say "taken from the other document," but once you do that you are destroying the basis of that type of argument. ~~Well~~

Well, now, a fourth point to mention here is: ~~that as *6)~~

(4) As held, the theory does not generally maintain individual writers, but schools. So, many individual styles would enter each document. We haven't said so much about this but, if you take particularly the critical books, written forty years ago, you will find that practically all of them hold to J1, J2, J3, J4, P1, P2, P3, P4, and so on. Today, there are some who say that J was a very brilliant writer, J was a writer of the time of David, was a very, very brilliant stylist, but most will say that P represents a school, a priestly school. I don't think anybody holds that P is an individual, and this priestly school of men gathered stuff and wrote it up and put it together, well how are you going to have one distinctive style if you have a lot of people entering into it? You might have a tendency in this school, to favor certain words, certain types of expressions, rather than another, you might have a tendency, it does not destroy the argument, but it does, it seems to me, weaken it very specifically. Now #5:

(5) As regards J and E, there is much disagreement among critical scholars. You take Driver's statement I gave you is perhaps as near generally accepted as any, but most others will differ somewhat as to divisions of J and E, and Pfeiffer of Harvard who wrote an Introduction of the Old Testament, which ~~the~~ in liberal school has, to quite an extent, replaced Driver, being much more recent, in his school he takes J and divides it up between S and J, and he takes all of the first part of Genesis and puts it in what he calls S and, instead of considering that the earliest document, he makes it the latest document of all. There is considerable disagreement of the style of J and E. Now carrying that back to an earlier time, you recall that Eichorn and the others felt

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

originally that the Elohistic document was one unit in which the style was uniform and the J document had a distinct style, and then Hupfeld said that, what he called the second Elohist was more ~~or less~~ like J than like E. Before that, it had all been practically one Elohistic document, now he divided it up and said that the E document is so near J that often it is very difficult to tell the two apart. On stylistic grounds the differences between J and E are very, very difficult to separate out. Now there is one place where the critics are almost unanimous and that is about P. So we want to go on speaking about P.

(6) The Division of P, and J-E, on which there is great unanimity among critical scholars, is really a division of two types of subject matter...

P.81. (3/4)

...but very little disagreement among scholars on that, what is J and what is E, there may be great difference, but as to what is P there is very great unanimity, and as we have noticed P has long sections in the first part of Genesis, the middle part of Genesis, most of it has been given to E and there is just ~~a~~ some brief sections given to P, occasionally only a verse of half a verse. But there is a great unanimity, as to what makes up P, a very great unanimity. Now this would seem to be a strong argument for the critical theory, at least for the existence of P as a separate document, this unanimity on it. So it is vital that we notice this fact, that the difference is a difference of subject matter, and you will get a difference of style inevitably when you have a different subject matter. I asked you to learn the four principle types of material, from a literary viewpoint, in the Pentateuch, and one of those was law, remember, and one was narrative, and one was enumeration, statistics, and so on. Now much law is very similar to enumerations and statistics and that sort of thing, and when you get that sort of thing you are quite certain to have a different sort of style than you have when you are telling a story, so that if you will go through Genesis, you will find that most of the stories are given to either J or E, the overwhelming bulk of the stories are given to J or E, of the narrative. The one

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

outstanding instance where one is not, happens to be right at the very beginning, and that is Gen.1. But when you look at Gen.1, you can easily ask the question, do we here have a story or do we have a list, a tabulation? Because Gen.1 says that God said, let there be light and there was light, and God saw what was made and it was good, and it was evening and it was morning, one day. And that is repeated, different things made, but a tabulation. There was--God said something, the thing was done, God saw that it was good, it doesn't say that every time but several times, and there was evening and there was morning, a certain day, there is enumeration which is repeated steadily through six days. And so they say that is the distinctive style of P, it is repetitive, it is monotonous. It is statistical, it is enumerative, that is the monotonous tiresome style of P, as contrasted to the brilliant narrative style of J. That is what is said and the critical books agree that the style of P is so distinctive, that there is no question about its having to be a distinct writing. Well, actually, most of the material, as you say, is a distinctive type of subject matter, rather than a distinctive type of style. The subject matter calls for a different style, and a different style is natural to a different subject. If you will take Luther's great address to the German nobility, in which he pointed out how much money was going to Rome, how much was being taken away to Rome from what should belong to Germany, and goes through and shows the oppression of economical life in Germany, by Rome, and if you will take his essay written the same year, on the Babylonian captivity of the church, in which he shows how the influence of the Roman curate is destroying the ability of the German church to show people how they can be saved, and how they have built a line around people with the seven sacraments to keep them away from the knowledge of salvation, these two fiery polemic articles which Luther wrote in that year, would immediately be seen to be a very similar style, you would have no question but what Martin Luther wrote both of them, but in that very same year, he wrote an essay on Christian Liberty in which he tries in the beautiful winsome attractive manner to show the privilege which the Christian has in his liberty from the fears of punishment and guilt which is due

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

to him, his ability to be free from this, our Christian liberty through the grace of Christ, and as you read this beautiful presentation of the freedom and rights of the Christian, the style is utterly different from the fiery polemic fighting style of these two other essays he wrote in that very same year. He was dealing with different subjects. I don't know whether any of you today have ever heard of Ray Stannard Baker, he was quite a well-known ~~political~~ writer on political matters some thirty years ago. He issued the Letters and State Papers of Woodrow Wilson, and he wrote on political and economic matters and his books were very widely received, but at the same time there was a series of books which some of you perhaps may have come across which were called by David Grayson. One was called "The Friendly Road," one was called "Adventures in Contentment." They were books telling about a man's interesting experiences as he'd walk around different parts of the country, and met different people; there were four or five of these books by David Grayson. And then it was discovered that David Grayson and Ray Stannard Baker were the same man. Ray Stannard Baker who wrote these political and economic treatises also enjoyed this other sort of private life and wrote books about it which had a wide reading. But the person who liked one side might not be interested in the other. Some people would be interested in both. But many were amazed to think that Ray Stannard Baker the writer of the political and economic treatises could be the author of The Friendly Road, and Adventures in Contentment. It was a different material he dealt with, ~~wrote,~~ and the style of it would naturally be different. About 25 years ago, I got a new Remington typewriter, and I went to the office of the Remington Typewriters in Wilmington where we were then, and I said to them, the man there, I would like to get a new typewriter and I'd like to have some special signs on the keyboard. Well, he says, that is easy, anything we have a matrix already made for, you can get with no extra charge, when you get your typewriter, so I arranged for the standard keyboard but where you have the extra marks, the punctuation marks and all that sort of thing, I had special marks for the writing of Babylonian and transliteration and other subjects that entered into my special study. And I worked out the keyboard I wanted, we had a list of

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

all the things that they had matrixes for. But there were one or two--you have to have on a matrix your capital and your small, which of course don't have to be a capital and a small, for instance, you could have a semi-colon and a colon on one, something like that, but your matrix has the two on of the combination I wanted, and he didn't have it, and he said well you can get the matrix made for $10, they'll make you a matrix and then anybody else who wants it can get it. Well I said maybe somebody else has gotten this, and it is there, well, he says, as far as we know, all they have are in this book, Well, I said, if that book is dated four years ago, maybe somebody else has gotten the one I want since. Then I said, I'd like this line. Well, he said I'll write to Buffalo to the factory. So he wrote to Buffalo, and I got to thinking and thought say maybe I'll write to Buffalo too. So I wrote to Buffalo, and asked them if there couldn't be such a thing. Well, you know, I got a letter back, it was the nicest letter you ever saw. And this man said, Dear Dr. MacRae, he said, we received your request for this matrix in your typewriter, to get this particular thing. We are very sorry but we just don't have any matrix of that type, if you'd like to spend ten dollars extra we could get a matrix made, but we hope in the book there in the office you'll find something that you can use, and we hope you will be well satisfied, very nice, friendly letter. Well, you know, I went down to the office and saw the man in there, and the minute he saw me , he said, oh, Dr. MacRae, he says, I got a letter from Buffalo about your request, I says is that so? He says, yes, here it is, he pulled it out and it was signed by the same who signed my letter, but he wasn't writing to a customer , he was writing to a fellow employee, and he said, Dear Mr. so-and-so, why don't you tell this fellow that this all the matrixes we have are in the book, hurry up and get the sale finished and get the thing over with. The style of the two was utterly different even though the same man wrote them, but the signature was the same.

So there is a difference in purpose, there can be a difference in the purpose of writing. Now ~~you take~~ the style of Deuteronomy, no question, is different from the style of J, there is no question of that. But like in the case of P, it is a difference of

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

purpose. In J, the material they give to J, they tell about Abraham and what he did, about his experiences, it's narrative. But in Deuteronomy, Moses is addressing the people shortly before his death and exhorting them to obey the law, and to follow God who has done all these wonderful things for them for them, and it has got a (11 1/4) style, a style which is just filled with exhortations, with pleas to follow the Lord with declarations of the misery that will come to them if they turn away from Him, and all that, it is a very distinctive style, the style of Deuteronomy. But it was a distinctive occasion, it was a distinctive situation, it was a thing that most men had to do over and over during those forty years, and now in his final farewell address, he pours out his soul to the people, you wouldn't expect him to do that when he is writing the marriage of Rebecca and Isaac, or telling about the departure from home of Joseph. It is a different subject, a different purpose, and the style is different, but a different purpose, a different subject matter doesn't necessarily mean a different author. When you are dealing with a different subject, you will use a different sort of style.

Now if you write a list of specifications for the building of something, something like that, of technical nature, your style is bound to be different from if you're telling a story, or if you're giving an exhortation. So the style of P, the great bulk of P is different from the other style, yes, because the purpose of it is enumeration, statistics, listing, genealogies, giving detailed laws of the type which are not given, in order to exhort people to obey, but which are giving the regulations for the priests for the application of the law, for the decision of how to carry on the work of the tabernacle, and how to deal with particular matters of law, when they arise. So that P is a distinctive style from J-E, but it is a distinctive style because it is a different sort of material, with a different purpose, and the same is true of D. That is a tremendously important point of argument.

To say there is no difference in style between what they give to P and what they give to J-E is absurd. But to say, that the difference in style is such as is necessary

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

implies a different writer is not true, when you recognize the different sort of material, the different sort of purpose. Mr. MacKeen, another question? (stu)...

P.82. (3/4)

...and I think it is very nice to read The Christian Beacon, but I feel we are dealing with extremely important matters recently and have not time to read The Beacon because there is an awful lot of ground to cover. This course , really, it would be better if we could have six or seven hours and really get a thorough grasp of this material. We don't know when it is going to be of tremendous importance. But we have only a few hours, so it is very vital to pay attention all through the hour. The material yesterday, I'm not giving so many illustrations of as I did the previous material, therefore, the principles given and the illustrations given on it are particularly important to read again, to really understand.

On one of the questions which some of you took, which some of you of course didn't have to take, and others did, there was a little confusion on, and it is so important that I'm going to take just a minute on it now. This question was to name the various stages in the critical theory of the development of the Pentateuch as we have it, and to describe what happened in each one of them. This was not a question of the stages in the development of the critical theory, not the views of the critics in different theories, but what do the critics today hold happened, that is, what have most of them, since 1878, held? (2) And a very simply outline of that is tremendously important, I remember one year that a fellow in a make-up exam at the end of this course, I asked to describe the J document and he gave me a most beautiful description in absolute completeness and correctness of the contents of the P document, calling it the J document. Well, of course everything in it was absolutely one hundred per cent wrong. Nothing else you coul d do. Because the basic, if you don't' know which document is which, you haven't got the foundation at all. So it is very important to be sure that we have that. According to the theory as held today by practically all the scholars who accept the critical theories at all, the J document was the first document written. And most of

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

them would hold it was about the time of Jehoshaphat it was written. Some today are becoming more conservative, putting it back as far as David's time. In fact, I heard one great scholar saying the other day how interesting it would be if you could only know whether the writer of the J document at the time of David, the brilliant writer who wrote it, was personally acquainted with the man who wrote the court history of David, in the (3 1/4) because they were two of the greatest writers in history, and he feels quite sure they lived at the same time. But most critics would differ from him, they would put it later, but they all would, I believe practically everybody, that is, that it is the earliest document.

Now their theory is that this J document was written and circulated as a complete unit, and then that probably in the other kingdom, probably in the northern kingdom, some even say, instead of speaking of J and E as standing for Jehovah and Elohim, think of them as standing for Judah and Ephraim, southern and northern kingdoms, And they think that the E document was written in the northern kingdom, but it parallels the same material as it covers in the J document. But from the viewpoint of the northern kingdom, and they notice the places where the E document speaks of places in the northern kingdom, they say , see, look at the proof it comes from the northern kingdom, it tells what happened up in the section of the northern kingdom. Then they come to places where it tells what happened in the southern kingdom and they say notice the marvelous power and breadth of feeling of the writer of the E document in the northern kingdom, he also tells of events that took place in the area that later became the southern kingdom. But the E document, they hold, was written a little after the J document, and the two circulated separately. Then they hold that a redactor combined the two into one, and so you have a work called J-E, that is to say, that is the term they give it, a document combined of the two, and including both of them almost completely, and this J-E then circulated . Then about the time of Josiah, somebody wrote a document to urge people to centralize the worship at Jerusalem, and this document, which they call D, for Deuteronomy, included most of Deuteronomy and a certain amount, though a small

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

amount of additional material. And then there was a redactor who combined D with JE, they call him the redactor of JED, and so this JED then was combined and circulated. Maybe this combination took place during the exile, or at the early part of it. But then probably during the exile, another writer, this time a whole school of writers, connected with the priesthood, wrote a document to glorify the priesthood and exalt their importance, so we call it the P document, the priestly document. And this document gave a complete history and paralleled the others to a very large extent. And then this P document, after it circulated for a time was combined with JED by another redactor, the redactor of JE-DP and so this redactor combined them together with the others, and made the Pentateuch as we have it.

Now those are the stages which are held by practically all the critics, now of course most of them would say also that J was made up of J1, J2, J3, J4, and there were various redactors who combined them, and they do the same with E and with P. Some would say that is not true of JE but only of P. But they all have, as you see, quite a series of redactors, but the essence of the series of documents is that they were complete distinct documents, which circulated ~~in the~~ independently before being combined. They were not merely supplementation. Mr. Kaufmann? (6 3/4) Most of them hold that E was written in Ephraim , the northern kingdom, not in Judah at all, but in the northern kingdom and perhaps a century or so after this. But I don't know as they (7 1/4)

but about a century after this, yes. Yes? (7 1/4) No, J and E were combined by a redactor, and then the combined JE circulated independently, for a long time, but another document P was written, and it circulated independently, and then a redactor combined it with JE. See there is a whole series of redactors , and then eventually a redactor combined P with JED. Now they nearly all hold there were several divisions of P which were combined over a period of time by various redactors, but eventually you have P complete and you have JED complete, and then the two were combined together. Mr. MacKeen? (8) Sometime during the exile. (stu) (8 1/4) was

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

about 648,I think. D document. Now the D document they used to hold was written by ~~Jo~~ Hilkiah the priest in the time of Josiah and hidden in the Temple, so it could be found, but that is given up by these today. They hold it was written sometime in the previous century, by someone else. They do not believe, many of them any more,that Hilkiah was lying/this was when he said an old document, they thnk he was deceived about the matter, but that it is sometime within that century. And there is a great discussion whether it was written inthe northern or southern kingdom. Lately they tend to think the northern. That doesn't matter. The main phases/are of it what are absolutely necessary if the matter is to be understood.

And then as to the features, the characteristics of each of these documents, Driver's Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, spends several pages describing the characteristics of each of these. Now, in the discussions, in speaking of the words they use quite a bit, because those are the arguments on which they largely say whether a verse is from J or from E or what it is from, but they describe the characteristics of the three, very fully. I'll just read you a couple of words to show you the way they deal with it. Driver has several pages, for instance, he says, J, if he dwells less than E on concrete particulars, excells in the power of delineating life and character. His touch is singularly light, with a few strokes he paints the scene which before he is finished, he has impressed indelibly upon his readers' memory. In ease and grace, his narratives are unsurpassed. Everything is told with precisely the amount of detail, that is required. And then he goes on and tells/about these characteristics of J. Now E, on the other hand, the standpoint of E is prophetical, though this not brought so prominently forward as in J. And in general the narrative is more objective, less consciously tinged by ethical and theological reflection than that of J. Though E mentions the local sanctuaries, and alludes to the pillars without offence, he lends no promise to unspiritual service, the putting away of strange gods is noted by him with manifest approval. Abraham is styled by him as a prophet, and so on. He describes, now here is

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

a peculiarity of J, that his representations of the deity are highly anthrpomorphic. You all know what anthropomorphic means, I trust. Anthropos, Greek for man, Morphus, a form, that is he represents God in the form of a man. He refers to God as coming down through the power built by man, ~~meaning~~ meeting Moses, taking off the chariot wheels of the Egyptians, being grieved, repentent, angry, and so on. ~~We use~~ He used anthropomorphic terms about God. E he says is more anthropo(m)athic than anthropomorphic. In other words, E doesn't so often speak of God as speaking to somebody, he'll have Him give them a message in a dream. E will speak of God being grieved, and so on, but not apt to speak of God as coming down or meeting man, and so on. While P, the priestly narrative, they say that P's representations of God are less anthropomorphic than those of J or E. No angels or dreams are mentioned by him. Certainly he speaks of God as appearing to men, as going up from men at important moments of their history, but gives no further description of His appearance. Usually the revelation of God to men takes with him only the form of simple speaking to them. So he goes on for two or three pages telling the characteristics of the views of each of these writers. Literary style of P is strongly marked with JE and especially J, is free, flowing and picturesque, P is stereotyped, measured and prosaic, the narrative flows like a (12 1/4) is articulated systematically, the beginning and closing enumerations are regularly marked by stated formula. As was mentioned yesterday P is the enumeration, the genealogy, the statistics, all that sort of thing. Then he goes on and tells how dry and repetitious is the style of P as compared with the interesting style of J. Now D he doesn't discuss so much here, because it largely deals with a different book, the book of Deuteronomy, but D, as you all know, is the exhortatory book,, the book of exhortation. Now in Exodus we have ~~the~~ the first law given at ~~Sai~~ Sinai, the Ten Commandments, ~~and~~ then the Judgments, following three chapters, which they call the book of the covenant, and that ends with a section exhorting people to obey these laws, that...

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

...presentation of an incident, a law is given, or a few laws are given, in the J or E. In D you have the exhortation to obey the Law, with long flowing oratorical sentences. And in P you have the Law given in great detail with all kinds of little details given, which is important for the priest as he administers the Law , and for the Judges. So that they all contain laws, but the great bulk of the Law is P and the next largest amount is D. Now those are background matters that are tremendously important in connection with what we've had and with what we're going on to have. Yes? [J. Gueiros. 1 1/4]: it seems to me that whenever we discuss the development or the theory, as far as studying the supplement, modified, and Graf-Wellhausen Theories, these cases will come out eventually, especially Graf-Wellhausen (1 1/2)

and I feel that the question was a little bit ambiguous, as far as that goes, because you wouldn't know whether to discuss the theories as part of the (1 3/4)

Yes, I can see how the sentence could have been not quite clear in that regard. So we will take it into account if it develops that way. But I want both to be mind, ~~I mean~~ I want you to know the stages of development of the theory, and then the stages in the theory as held, and I'll try in the final exam to state either or both in such a way that there will be no question. [J. Gueiros, 2 1/4: I wish you also could give us a word regarding the origin of the name Jehovah, because one day here in class we were discussing that passage and you said He was not known by His name Jehovah , and then you said that that was not the origin of the name Jehovah at all, but the origin was that the word was a (2 1/2) Tetragram.] Well, now the name Jehovah is the Tetragram . Tetragram is a Greek word containing four letters. And the Tetragram is the four letters which represent the name of God. Sometimes we call it the Tetragram rather than to simply be using the name of God in a just a technical way of discussing a name. But the Tetragram is these four letters. Now how these letters were pronounced in ancient times, nobody knows, and what the origin of the term was, nobody knows. So I didn't mean in class to try to discuss where the name came from, I would say God revealed this name, and that's the origin.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

The critics have ~~many~~ various theories as to where it came from, there are many different ~~theories~~, there is no one on which they agree because there is just no evidence, on which to build a theory of the origin of names. But under that discussion I didn't mean the origin of the name but I meant the alleged parallel regarding the origin of the name. They claim that in J it said, then began men to call upon the name of Jehovah, In other words, that ~~that~~ is when they started to use the name, in the time of Seth and Enoch. Then they say that E says that God said to Moses, Jehovah, the God of your fathers, is telling you to go to them, and that is when the name began to be used. But then they say that P says that Moses says, well, what should I tell them is your name? And that He said, my name is Jehovah. I was known to your fathers as El Shaddai, but by my name Jehovah I was not known. And we have these various theories, and then I discuss them, the specific events, the relation between them. Yes, Mr. MacKeen? (4 1/4) Yes, I did not give a specific title. (stu.) How will I remember it if I give one now? I don't have it written down. (stu.) Yes, well, let's try to get the idea in mind, rather than the word.

There are two distinct things which are very important, one of them is to know how the critical theory developed, through certain stages. The other is to know what a present theory is, according to which the Pentateuch came into existence, through certain stages. Those are the two matters. Now I will try to state my question in such a way that you can figure out which of the two I mean. But I can't just take a technical term for one or the other, because (stu.5 1/2) Yes, good.

Well, I think now, we perhaps are ready to go on with our point that we were speaking of. I won't say much more about that point, but I do want to stress again the ~~six~~ th point, which was that the division of E and JE on which there is great unanimity among critical scholars, is really a division of two types of subject matter, that we want to stress, because that is where you find unanimity. The distinction between P and the rest, and the principal idea is : narrative goes to JE, lists go to P, and it isn't so

Fifth point

http://www.macarchlib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

hard to make a division along that line. It is not particularly difficult, and of course the thing has been discussed by many, many, many. That this verse belongs to J, that this verse belongs to P or to J, and they have come up with an arraggement on which they agree as to what belongs to P, pretty thoroughly, but I say that in the type of subject matter, whereas that between J and E, both of which are narratives, but one uses one name of God and one the other, there is great disagreement on the details of that division. And of course this point, also , perhaps should have included the division between D and the others, is also a division of subject matter, but of course there it is most of the book of Deuteronomy is hortatory, exhorting, and there are a few passages earlier, which are exhortation. Well, exhortation is very easy to recognize. I discussed to you this material, then I say a few words about how important it is, and how vital it is you get it. Well, naturally the style is different in that sort of case, than it is in explanation or narration. So it is quite easy to pick out certain sections and say that these are not. Except you get into a little more difficulty when they take out an occasional narrative and say it is. There are one or two of those I want to get to but I'll have to move a little faster or we won't. Because it will be the last week when we get to them.

There have been years when I've only had the last day or two on the book of Deuteronomy, and I would like to have a little more time on Deuteronomy, because while the same principles apply, yet Deuteronomy is very important and it is good to have a little more time, not have to talk quite so fast on that. But this matter of subject matter, though I'm discussing it with P, because they are united in this way in Genesis and Exodus, yet P might very well be mentioned at that same place.

Now (7) Actually distinction of various styles within a document is extremely difficult. How do you get a style? You are not born with a certain style different from everybody else. You develop your manner of speaking from hearing your parents, and you imitate them , and as you get older you associate with other people and you imitate them, and you are an individual and you select certain things to imitate and you ignore

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

other things. And you may even branch out to certain original ways of your own, though there is comparatively little of that. Most of what you do is imitation. Therefore, the thing of a style as being actually unique with an individual is a very rare thing. Our styles are mostly made up of what we've heard and we hear lots of things, and if we hear a good many different things, if you hear a lot of one person, or one group, you tend to come to speak like that. And so our styles are always in a state of flux, and if you have as we said at the beginning of this section, if you have a book of 300 pages written by one man and a book of 300 pages written by another, you can go through them and see what their styles are, and then you have something that they have written together, you might be able to pick out, this sounds like that fellow, this sounds like that fellow, and to go through and do quite a bit of deciding which belongs to which, ~~thank~~ you. But you need a definite basis to see what the styles are, because the styles are like two colors, red and blue. A style is a mixture of all the different influences that have come upon a person. And consequently to select things out of a document of a distinct style without having a definite pattern as to what these styles are is very, very difficult. And even if you have two books that you have selected from, it would be very, very difficult, then you could do a good deal, but you couldn't do it all by any means.

About 150 years ago in Germany there was a large movement ~~of thinking~~ that styles could be separated out this way. They didn't just do it with the Bible, they did it with many other books, and it is very interesting the way that it was done toward the writing of the German poet, Goethe. You all have heard of him, I believe, one of the great geniuses of literature, ~~Goethe~~. His most famous work is his Faust, ~~and this work of his,~~ which has been translated into many languages, ~~this~~ a long epic poem ~~that he wrote~~, ~~and~~ which has had a tremendous influence on many literary and philosophical leaders in ~~others countries and Germany~~ and throughout the world, his work has been studied and discussed at great length, so it came about that, though Goethe was early in the last century, ~~about 1820 (I think, I forget the exact year, that~~ within the next few years people were studying it and analyzing its

style. ~~And~~ There was a great German scholar in the field of style analysis named Shoerr, who wrote a work on the study of the style of Goethe's Faust. ~~And~~ He took up the Prologue, the Introduction to Goethe's Faust--~~this work of Goethe's, Faust, he was~~ working on more or less all his life, and he issued different parts at different times. ~~And~~ Shortly before his death, he issued the complete book of Faust. He lived ~~till way along~~ in his 80's, and he issued this work of Faust in its completeness, ~~and this man took up the Prologue~~. ~~And~~ he said it is very interesting in the Prologue of Faust he sees the effect of the different parts of Goethe's life. ~~Now~~ he says, ~~you~~ look at these lines, 110 to 125, and ~~he said~~ you see the exuberance of youth and you see the optimistic outlook of a man starting in life and he had the world before him, this is the part that Goethe wrote when he was a young fellow ~~when he first got into it~~. Then he says you ~~look~~ down ~~here~~ to line 140 ~~an~~ to 160 and there you see the tiredness and disillusionment of old age, and these are the parts that he wrote toward the end of his life. So he divided up the Prologue into the parts that he wrote...

P.84. (3/4) Later it was discovered that in a ~~to a~~ place where Goethe had once lived, where he hadn't lived since he was in his early twenties, ~~and they found~~ there was a manuscript there which had been forgotten ~~and had gotten~~ in ~~with~~ and was a pile of stuff that had been left ~~lying around~~ there. A new tenant ~~some new person~~ bought the house and went through this garret, ~~seeing what was there,~~ and they came across ~~this~~ these which was clearly in Goethe's handwriting and was soon accepted by all scholars ~~and a~~ It was a version of the Prologue that Goethe wrote when he was in his early twenties, and it proved that though other parts of it were worked over and over through his life, he wrote the Prologue practically in its final form when he was in his early twenties. These parts which Shearer had said showed the style of his old age, disillusioned, were found to have been written in his early twenties. It was I think a very good illustration of the fact that it is easy to think that one can separate various styles, various men, ~~variants (P. 3/4)~~ ~~with each~~ from other, but actually it is a very difficult thing to do, and in that case it fell through

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

to a complete loss. It is very difficult to separate the styles out, as the critics claim to do in the Bible, 100 or 150 years ago they were doing that with practically every book. Today it is practically given, that method of approach, to almost anything except the Bible. So we go on to Capital F:

F, Conclusion regarding Arguments for Partition. And under this #1 is:

1, There is no solid basis for partition.--There is no historical evidence of the existence of these alleged separate books or these particular writings. We have no mention anywhere of JE circulating as a separate manuscript, or of P circulating as a separate manuscript. We have no evidence of anybody who might be said to have written these. There is no evidence about them whatever. I heard this man speaking about the writer J, well, it is purely imaginary, You read 2 Samuel, there is no mention of any writer J, it tells about the great people that they fought. That doesnt prove that there wasn't such a man, but I say there is no evidence there was. There is no evidence that these ever existed as separate documents whatever. That we have said before but it is so important that it is worth stressing in the conclusion, and a second point that is very much worth stressing in the conclusion, is this, that similar methods could divide almost any book into diverse documents. Somebody did, 50 years ago they took the book of Romans and published a book showing how you might assume that Romans was combined of three different documents taking a few verses of one, a few of the other, and made it so it read along quite smoothly. Each one of them, because there is repetition in Romans as there is in anything that ever was written. We have to drive ~~that~~ thoughts home, and we repeat ~~this~~ them in other languages, and they try to divide it this way. You can take the Koran which Mohammed wrote. Mohammed gave his Koran as a series of (5) and alleged revelations from God by Mohammed. But Mohammed would speak for a while about the Lord, the Lord, the Lord, then he'd speak for a while about God, God, God, and then he might speak of God and the Lord, and the Lord and God, and you could take and divide up the Lord section, and the God section, and say these were different books, different documents. The method

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

have forced such changes as violently to disrupt the former unity. That was true thirty years, Today you say, "as to threaten to disrupt former unity." Not that they have not disrupted the unity. Thirty years they had, thirty years ago, as archeological evidence was coming in and fitting with the Bible as it stands, and not fitting with the Bible as rearranged by criticism, scholars were running back and forth wondering what to do, and at that time it looked as if they would turn to some entirely different theory, if they would refuse to accept the Scripture as it stands. It looked that way, but during the past thirty years they have found no other theory, other than accepting the Bible as that is half as good as this one, so today, I don't see any evidence of critical scholars' abandoning the Graf-Wellhausen theory, I don't see any evidence of it. Most interesting thing was an article--I may have mentioned it here, but it is worth mentioning again, an article by Prof. Albright of Johns Hopkins University in The American Scholar, "On Archeological Evidence regarding Moses," and in this article he gave evidence after evidence from archeology on the accuracy of the Bible as it stands. And after he had given this, very eminently, then he concluded, what is the conclusion? The conclusion is that we must never forget the great debt we owe to Graf, Wellhausen, and these other great masters who did so much to enable us to understand the Pentateuch correctly. And Professor Pfeiffer of Harvard spoke down here in Crozier Seminary and he was introduced by Dr. Pritchard, who is going to be teaching religion at University of Pennsylvania next year, and Dr, Pritchard in introducing him said that Dr. Pfeiffer, you will be very much at home, everybody here accepts the Graf-Wellhausen theory, and then Pfeiffer proceeded to give evidence after evidence from archeological of the dependability of the truth of Old Testament, and finished up with saying, "However, this does not mean we can accept everything in the Bible as true," and then gave one or two rather small sections of certain statements from Scripture, and then went on with that after all the important thing is to realize about the J, E, P and D documents and their great importance in the understanding of the Scriptures. So you have people tenaciously holding to the theory in the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

face of new evidence, and making a little twist here and there. I was most interested just a year ago, quite recently, when I sat in a class and heard a man with a worldwide reputation who is convinced of the greatness of the J writer, and of the distinctness of the P writer, and so on, and I heard him say this, he is a great archeologist, a man of great learning, and he said as he was talking about it, now he said, you read in, I didn't bring the records with me this morning, but I think you're all familiar with it, you read how when Jacob was married, and it tells about his marriage to Leah, and it says that Laban gave her ~~a bulla up~~ Bilhah, as her maid, to Leah when she married Jacob and then goes on and tells about it, and then ~~goes on and~~ it tells about he married Rachel and that Laban gave Zilcah to Rachel as her maid, and then goes on and tells about it. And he said all critics agree unanimously that though this is part of the J document, the statement that Laban gave Bilhah the maid, and that he gave Zilah the maid to his daughter when she was married, is from P. All critics agree unanimously on this, any critical book you take will say, this is from the P document, because P is the one who is interested in statistics, he is interested in minor facts, he is interested in such a thing. I mean this is what he says, this is the fact (7 1/2) P is the one who would be interested inthe name of the maid. Why would J be interested in a thing like that? So this is from P. But he said all critics agree unanimously this is from P, but he said here is a case in which all critics are wrong, because he said we have recently discovered in Mesopotamia wills from the very area around which Laban lived, and he said in these wills, when they tell, --no not wills, marriage contracts--in these marriage contracts, when they tell about the marriage of a woman of an important family, it always states after mentioning the details of the marriage, that the father gave so-and-so, and gives the name, as maid to his daughter. So he says, in that section of Mesopotamia, at that time, this was standard practice to name the maid who was given to the daughter, so these two half verses here, about half a chapter apart, which all critics unanimously agree are from P, are not from P at all, they are from J, and J has copied a corrupt statement of the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

marriage contract, the way it would be in that place at that time. Well, now you see, I would say there is a thing that all the critics agree on and argheology proves it is wrong, I would say it is strong evidence that the whole critical theory is wrong, but, you see, he simply says it shows they're wrong about this section belonging to P, it belongs to J, with the rest of the section. And that is the attitude of the critical scholars ~~attitude~~ today. You never know, when you gather these materials together, and you show them, it makes, for the person who isn't working right in the critical theory, it makes a very strong argument. I had the experience about ten ~~gt~~ fifteen years ago, of being President of the Oriental Club of Philadelphia, which included the professors from most of the universities and seminaries in this whole area, in the field of Biblical study, and particularly of oriental study, and also professors of Sanskrit, and of Persian narrative, and that sort of thing, and as President I ~~have~~ had to give a presidential address, so I took for my subject, "The Scientific Approach to the Old Testament," and I first told about the critical theory , and so on, (9 3/4) and then I gave quite a large number of evidences from archeology of the accuracy and dependability of the Scripture and showing the futility of that approach. And most of those professors sat there entranced. They were tremendously interested and so impressed that some of the leading modernists who were there in the group, when it came to the discussion addressed me in the courteous terms, raising some little minor point. I heard that one of them told somebody a couple of days later, oh it's just a waste of time, nothing of great importance there. But that's not the attitude they took in the meeting, because the professors in these various fields who were not strongly prejudiced for the critical theory, were so impressed by the evidence I gave that they were most courteous to me and very small were ~~and that they were~~ the little points of objection, which they there raised to my paper, ~~attention~~ And it was a former orthodox Jew who lost his faith and who is a curator of a museum, and a professor of Sanskrit, they were the two who were strongest against it, and except for those two, everybody was tremendously impressed.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

And then one time when I was speaking to an Invervarsity meeting in Ohio State, a member of the group was in the classics department about ten years ago, and spoke to the head of the Classics Department there, and asked him if he'd like to have me speak to their classics club, so he said he would, so she wrote and asked if I could speak on archeology to their classes, while I was there. So I sent a group of subjects, one of them was,"What has Babylonian study added to our knowledge of the Past?"and a few subjects like that, but among them I put one in,"The Relation of Archeology to Biblical Study," and the head of the classics department picked that one, so I took that one, and I got there and they were the Greek graduate students, there were maybe twenty of them, they sat around, smoked while I was talking, and I gave them evidence after evidence from archeology, on the truth of the Scripture and they sat there tremendously interested and asked questions that showed they were greatly interested, they'd never heard it, and we had dinner afterwards, and the head of the classics department said, my , he says, you must be in great demand with this information, from the universities, to give them. Well, the universities are asking liberals to come, as a rule, it was quite incidental that I got that opportunity. But the material is there. If you can get opportunities like that, you can have quite an influence with those people, because while the teachers of the critical theory, the Old Testament professors, and the people like that mostly are so convinced of the critical theory that (12 1/2) just goes off like water off a duck's back, yet the people who aren't directly in that field of the critical theory, are people who if they hear this material will be tremendously interested, and can be tremendously affected by it. But today we cannot say that archeological study have forced such changes as violently to disrupt the former unity, the unity which started to disrupt and then came together again pretty definitely, but they are such that they threaten to disrupt, they are such that they can be...

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

...the alleged consensus of scholarship. #6 is a sort of a summary:

6, Each of the Four Arguments has been Examined in Detail. No one stands the Test. No one is adequate to prove the hypothesis. Nor do all together prove it. That is just a summary of our examination of the four arguments, and I might ask you a question, I might say if none of the partition arguments are upholding, why has it still (1 1/2) We're going to answer that in another session. Yes, each of the four arguments has been examined.

#7 does not give the answer to that, but it is an important thing:

7, Divisive Criticism of the Bible arose as part of a widespread attitude that was applied to many books, but that is now almost entirely abandoned, except with regard to the Bible.

In the centuries from 1700 to 1800, the 18th century, the general tendency was to think that anything classical was wonderful and the great influence of the classics, Greek and Roman classics, that was the last word on everything, that was the general tendency in that century. Now toward the end of that century, there was a reaction against that, and perhaps the leader in the reaction was Friedrich Augustus Woll. F. A. Woll, a German professor, led the movement against tremendous adoration of the classics. And he took the attitude that when it came to ancient things we couldn't know anything unless we had complete proof, that a lot of these books/were things that came together by the gradual process. In 1795 he wrote his introduction to the study of Homer. You see, this was before Eichhorn's work was getting much underway. He wrote his introduction to the study of Homer and he said there never was a poet like Homer, he said the book of the Iliad and the Odyssey represent many different stories which came together by a sort of a gradual process, and so on, he developed the study of (4 1/2)
and for a long time great attention was paid to dividing up the Iliad and the Odyssey into sections, and they did that with most ancient writings. I told you how they did it with Goethe and then how what they did with his prologue was found to be without warrant.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

There are many illustrations that could be given of the way it was carried to a great extreme in study of all the classical writers, but it was given up, and today the bulk I believe of practical scholars hold that there was a man who was called Homer, now, a man, at least that the Iliad and the Odyssey show such signs, each of them, show such tremendous signs of unity, that one mind was at work fashioning this great epic. Some of them differ as to whether one man wrote both of them or whether it was a different man wrote the Iliad and the Odyssey, some think a woman wrote the Odyssey, but as to that there are different views, but there is a pretty good agreement that these books were unified productions, and show a genius that doesn't come from a hundred people writing. Thus with Shakespeare's work, you can point to the material Shakespeare(5 1/2) but Shakespeare's genius was lacking, and to compare what he wrote with what he is most illuminating, to see what one great mind has done.

Well, this was given up to the extent that today if we find an ancient epic, nobody starts in to say let's divide this up into the different documents from which it originally came. That approach is not used any more. But with the Bible it has been preserved, and the reason it has been preserved is the union with the theory of evolution, or the developmental attitude, the developmental theory. That is what made it last. My personal guess is that if it were not for Graf and Wellhausen, the tendency would have disappeared by the end of the last century, and people would have decided that all this attempt to divide up into documents after all were insecure and unsatisfactory. But Graf and Wellhausen united it with the developmental theory that you could show a development and see thus how these religious ideas came into existence, and it is this union with the developmental theory which crystallized it and solidified it and made it hold. But the attitude of dividing up documents that way, thinking you could prove several original documents out of which they came, you don't hear anybody doing that sort of thing today, trying to divide up newly discovered documents this way, but they were doing it with everything, so it became established , and then it was union with

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

the development theory that crystallized it. You can easily get some illustrations in William Henry Green's book on about p.129, he gives a few illustrations of how they did this with certain classical writings, and decided this wasn't genuine, this wasn't genuine, and so on, and then how they found proof that they were wrong in so many cases, so that the method is largely given up.

8, In the case of the Bible, Union with the Development Hypothesis, has solidified and preserved the Claim of Partition. Now I wish we had as much time to discuss the development hypothesis as we spent discussing the Partition, those two aspects of it. We have much less time so we have to go rather rapidly through it.

But now we have six minutes left which isn't enough for a long quiz but is enough for a little quiz, so all who are in odd numbers write this down, please listen, let me give it once and get it. Discuss the comparison of the styles of J and P, that is oddnumbers. Even numbers, please write this, discuss the comparison of the style of J and E. ...

P.90. (3/4) IV. Developmental Hypotheses (Evolutionary Theory)

...and under that A, Introductory. We have already noticed how the discussion proceeded for a period of three-quarters of a century, with different views held about the different documents, and finally became crystallized about 1878, and we noticed how the division was made on literary grounds, that these were different styles, and that from these different styles these different documents (1 1/4)

Yes, after 8, was IV, and A under that Introductory. We are starting IV with point A, which is really the same as 8 practically, that is the beginning of it is. We have noticed in II and III, in other words, the development of the critical theory, the arguments for partition and the fact that they claim to have these distinct documents, but that this is part of an attitude of dividing books up into documents which was done to all classical work a century and a half ago. Which was practically discarded now, except in the case of the Bible. You rarely see it with anything else, but with this it is tenaciously held. We noticed under 8 there the reason it is tenaciously held is because it is united with the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

theory of evolution, the theory of development, and being united with that, it became part of the new trend that was sweeping over the world in the end of the last century. Which considers everything as a natural development, and here we have Judaism and Christianity, here we have the Pentateuch with lofty ideas in it, with long historical accounts in it, with much in it that has had tremendous influence in the world, where did it come from? Well, the evolutionary theory says it came by natural development, and this natural development is claimed to be proved by showing how these various documents go from one to the other. Now for this point we have been noticing the alleged emphasis that there are different documents, and we have seen that all four of the main arguments, no one of them really stands when carefully examined. And that they do not prove that these were distinct documents, but the thing that crystallized and made it come to be tenaciously held to, was that it fit into a theory of the documents, which seemed to show where the Pentateuch came from, how it came into existence by a natural evolutionary sort of a process, a natural development, and that is what crystallized it and made it continue, and now if we had these four distinct documents and knew they were distinct documents, that was proven, then it would be a very interesting question to compare them and see whether we can find that they prove an evolution, a development, from the primitive, the very primitive rude beginning, upto the very advanced ideas contained in the P document, that would be an interesting investigation to make. Now we, believe we have proven that there was not--I won't say that, there is not sufficient evidence to establish that there ever were such four distinct documents written at different times. Nevertheless the argument that, assuming there are these documents, they show a natural development and show how the Pentateuch came into existence is a phase of the argument which must be examined, and if it can be proven it will go quite a distance, toward strengthening belief that the document actually did exist. And so it is well to have a fair idea of its main features. What the main features of it are, and what the main features of the answer to it are.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

It is most probable today that, if in discussion, you will find arguments will be based on the arguments for partition with which we have already dealt. That is most likely today. The other is sort of taken for granted. But the other has got some points in it which are not extremely easy to answer, and some points which may be so presented as to make a tremendous influence upon the person to whom they are given. So it is important that we are familiar with this other aspect of the theory.

Now from a viewpoint strictly from logic it would have been reasonable for us to have gone faster on our partition part, so as to have about half of our semester on each. But from a viewpoint of practical importance, I think we have been right in taking the amount of time we have to try to be sure that the situation as regards the partition arguments is absolutely clear. That is vital to accomplish, but this other is very important. And so this matter of the Development Hypothesis, we already in the end of our survey of the critical theories, we already at that time, mentioned to you the four arguments for it. I have not asked you for them again I believe on a quiz since, but I stressed at that time that there were the eight arguments, the four for partition and the four for development. Now these four for development which I gave to you then, the first of them was Discrepancies; the second, Logical Thought; the third, Violation of Laws as Evidence of non-existence--that is the hardest thing by far to answer; and fourth, the Appropriateness of sections to particular Periods. Those four arguments I gave you some time ago. We merely mentioned them then, showing how the Graf-Wellhausen Theory twists around the whole idea of the arrangement of documents in intelligent order, in order to fit them in with a Developmental Theory. And then we mentioned these four arguments for development. We are now ready to take up the examination of these four arguments.

So we go on to B, The Argument from Alleged Discrepancies. Now this argument from alleged discrepancies, at least in general, is a matter which would suggest, if proven, that there are different documents written either in different places or at different

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

times. It would not in itself prove an order of development. And consequently a great part of the material which would be considered under this is material which we have already touched upon incidentally in our examination of the arguments for partition. We have noticed for instance the claim that according to one document, Jacob left home for a certain reason, according to the other document he left home for a different reason. Now that is of course a definite discrepancy which is claimed. But even if the discrepancy were true, it would be pretty hard to prove which document came first and which was written later. It would go,--much of the argument from alleged discrepancies would help to establish that there were distinct documents, that they would be written by different people with different ideas, but wouldn't prove much about their order, so that as far as development is concerned, this is not really as important as the next two, and yet this is an argument which inevitably comes in in the discussion and which is bound to be advanced in connection with either the argument for partition or the argument for development, the claim that we have contradiction, discrepancies between sections, and therefore, they must be not merely different documents as if two men in this class were to write an account of the events of the year, maybe if they did they'd be in different language, they'd be in different order perhaps, different stress on particular things, but we would not expect discrepancies. But if we had two students writing accounts of "My Experiences in Faith Seminary in the year 1961-62," and one of them said the Seminary was in Elkins Park and the other said it was in Wilmington, Delaware, that would be a pretty bad discrepancy, and that would suggest very strongly that these were written actually at different times and one of them probably meant '51-52, rather than '61-62, because then it was in Delaware. A discrepancy like that is pretty hard to explain away. However, if two fellows were to write an account of events here, say you were to write a hundred pages each, describing your experiences in Faith Seminary, it would be very strange if at first sight there would not be some rather severe discrepancies between them, even if on major points they agreed. One would tell of something that

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

happened and he'd perhaps put it in my class and someone else might put it in Mr. Eppard's class. The memory of one of the other would be apt to fail. Or perhaps a similar event happened in both. There are--when you get accounts of things at any length , there are quite sure to be discrepancies of terminology, which have to be examined in order to see if the memory of one is in error, or if perhaps they'd be worded in a slightly different way. Thus we find that one of the alleged discrepancies is that the critics claimthat according to the early documents Moses had a tent which he called The Tent of Meeting, where they met with God, which was outside of the camp. While, they say, according to the P document, Moses was commanded to build a sanctuary in the middle of the camp. With the people all around it. Well, they say, here is a stark discrepancy. Of course, their theory is, the whole idea of the tabernacle was invented by the priestly writers, in order to glorify the whole idea of the tabernacle in the wilderness, and consequently he made up for all this, about this beautiful tabernacle in the midst of the camp. But we find one statement where it says that, Moses after the people built the golden calf, Moses took the tent of meeting and pitched it ~~used~~ outside the camp, we find that statement. Now right away, let me ask you this question: How could Moses take that big beautiful tabernacle and all the stuff in it, and so on, and move it outside the camp, and pitch it out there? How could that be done? Does that sound reasonable? Is not that a sharp discrepancy between the two documents?

Well, you examine the way they stand in the Scripture, and you see that this is given in Exodus after he comes down from the mountain, after the incident of the Golden Calf. Now at that time had the tabernacle yet been built? It had not yet been built. Consequently when it says he took the tent of meeting, and moved it outside ~~outside~~ the camp, it is quite evident that it is referrring not to the tabernacle but to something else which preceded the tabernacle. Evidently a tent to which Moses used to go for receiving revelation from God, or meeting with God, and learning God's will under particular circumstances. Well, you find that later on, after the tabernacle has been built, we

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

read in one case that Moses called 70 elders and they came to him to the Tent of Meeting, and you read that there in the Tent of Meeting that the Holy Spirit...

P.91. (3/4)

...one document, assuming that the tent is outside the camp, while according to the P document, they have already built that beautiful tabernacle and have declared that it is to be put up right in the middle of the camp. Do you have such a contradiction here? Well, immediately we can say you don't necessarily have to take it as a contradiction. They were in the Tent with him, the 70 were, one of them was still in the camp. You can use the language "in the camp" referring to the whole area of the encampment as compared to the place outside to which Moses moved the Tent of Meeting as a punishment, after the Golden Calf, or you can say "in the camp" as referring to the place where the people camped as compared with the Tent of Meeting, even if they're all around it and it is in the Middle. So this can be a matter of terminology. There was still a man "in the camp" not in the Tabernacle in the middle of the camp, but in the camp namely the place where the people are, where the tents are, as compared to that specialized part in the MIddle of the Camp where the Tabernacle was. So you can easily have what seems to be a verbal contradiction in this way, without it being a real contradiction.

So the matter of discrepancy is one which it is very easy in any two accounts of anything to grab two or three sentences and make them look as if they are real sharp contradictions, but they have to be examined to find out if they are. In any kind of an investigation, we examine things to find contradiction, that if we find real contradiction, then we say that one of them is wrong, but we're going to find apparent contradiction, things that at first sight seem to be contradiction, in any ~~true~~ two accounts that are written by two different people. We had it , fifty years ago, we had two men, Cook and Peary, who claimed to have visited the North Pole. The claim was made by both of them, they had visited the North Pole. But in their accounts of it there were contradictory statements as to the condition, as to the situation. The statements were so contradictory that it

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

was quite apparent that they had not both been there. Now of course one might be there on a rainy and one on a clear day. One might be there in a month when there has been a great deal of melting and the other when there was more ice, but there are all sorts of things that might be explained away, they would be contradictory. But there were contradictions in this case which impressed the investigators, as proving that only one could be true. And so though Cooke claimed to have been there first, Admiral Peary was decided to be the original first man to visit the North Pole, and given great honor for it , while Cooke was branded as a liar and an imposter, on the ground of the discrepancy between his account and the account of Peary. There have been many cases in history where things have been proven to be an imposter because of discrepancy, but (3 3/4) there will be ----- apparent discrepancies get into account, so we have to examine it, we can't jump to conclusions, we have to prove it.

Well, now the critics have a great many alleged discrepancies between the different documents, which we believe on examination prove to be entirely capable of being explained without their being any real contradiction that proves that one or the other is erroneous. We have noticed of course in connection with Genesis 1 and Genesis 2, they say one story of creation begins with a watery chaos, one begins with an arid wilderness, and that is a sharp contradiction, if they are both stories, complete stories, of creation. But if one of them is an account of the last part of it, they start at different times, there is no contradiction whatever in their starting in different ways. A man might say I visited Faith Seminary and went to their Commencement which was held out on the lawn in front, another man might say I went to Faith Seminary and visited, and Commencement was held in the Chapel, and it was terribly crowded in the chapel. Two statements made, they are contradictory, but if they were different years there is no contradiction. And so when it comes to alleged discrepancies, in most cases you can find that there is a matter of a word impossible, or a statement impossible to interpret two different ways, or of two different times being involved, two different

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

aspects of the thing being spoken of, and more important than that, even, you will find that in a great many of the alleged discrepancies they really rest entirely upon a matter of silence, like where it says in one of the Gospels, that one of the disciples came to the tomb of Christ and looking in, he saw an angel, and the other one said that the first man who got there looked in and saw three angels. Well, is that a sharp contradiction between the two? Not at all. If he saw three angels, he certainly saw one angel. There is no contradiction there. You say you saw an angel, you look in, and you easily notice an angel, then you look a little more closely, you notice there are three angels. You tell one person about it, you say, I got there and looked in and saw an angel, and then you go right on to tell the more important thing, what about Christ. But with the other person, you're telling it more in detail, you say, when I got there I found that there were two angels at the head of the sepulchre and one at the foot, describing it more in detail, not giving your first immediate observation. That is a matter of silence, because three angels does not contradict one angel. If you say I saw only one angel, that would be a contradiction, but we have to examine alleged contradictions like that, to see whether there is a part of it that is simply an argument from silence. Now an argument from silence can be an important argument, but it has to be examined with great care to be sure that it is, and very frequently arguments from silence are arguments that are not real arguments at all. So this matter of discrepancy, alleged discrepancy, is an argument which applies to all parts of the documents, because it is alleged that there are discrepancies in the ideas, in the statements about Jacob and about Abraham, and so on. Where did Abraham lie about his wife, was it in Egypt, or in Philistia? That is an alleged discrepancy, alleged contradiction. If those are accounts of the same thing, it is a contradiction, if they are two events it is not a contradiction. They will be found, alleged discrepancies, in every book of the Pentateuch. We find them throughout, but the greater part of the arguments for order are confined to the Law, the greater part by far. When it comes to the Arguments for Partition, the place where

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

most stress is laid is in the Narrative, in Genesis and the early part of Exodus. That is where most stress is laid in the arguments for partition. But in the arguments for development, most stress is laid upon the Law, where it is claimed that in the course of the Law we see a natural development.

This matter then of discrepancy, much of the material we have already looked at could be considered under this head, and there will be other material we will look at later under this head. But I'm not going to spend so much time on this argument because after all, most of the alleged discrepancies do not prove development, but merely prove that one or other was wrong. But the development rests more upon our second argument, logical process, so I'm going to go on now to capital C, and that we will call:

C, Summary of Arguments for Logical Progress in Contents of Documents.

Now these arguments while most say strongest ones relate to Law, yet logically the first does not deal with Law. So under C, #1:

1, Development within the Documents as regards religious ideas. And this relates particularly to the idea of God. Now if you look for instance at Genesis 1, what kind of an idea of God do you get from Genesis 1? God spoke, let there be light, and there was light. God said, let the waters be gathered together, and it was so. God speaks and it is done. God sees what He has made and He sees that it is good. But when you go on to Gen.2.4ff, you find a great many words used which are words that would normally be used of a human being, and consequently the critics speak of the great number of anthropomorphism in the J document. The anthropomorphism. Anyone who knows Greek of course immediately anthropus, man; morphe, form--in the form of a man. To represent God in the form of a man.

In verse 7 we find the Lord God formed man, of the dust of the ground. He breathed into his nostrils, the breath of life. In the next verse, the Lord God planted a garden, in verse 8 and continuing, there he placed a man whom he had formed. In verse 15 the Lord God took the man and put him in the Garden of Eden. In verse 19 He brought

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

the animals to Adam. In verse 21 the Lord caused a deep sleep to fall on Adam and He took one of his ribs, and he closed up the flesh instead of it. And this rib He made into a woman, brought her to Adam, and in chapter 3.8 they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the Garden in the cool of the day. What a great number of words we have in different parts of the J document which refer to God ~~which express~~ with expressions which we would use of a man. Use anthropomorphic phrases about God's ~~being,~~ seeing, God's making, God's placing, God calls, they hear His voice, walking inthe Garden. There are many anthropomorphic expressions in these first chapters of Genesis, and there are a considerable number further on. In Gen.7-8, 8.21 he smelled a sweet savor of the sacrifice, in 11.5...

P.92. (3/4)

...came down to see what the situation was, He saw whether it was as bad as the report was. He came and visited with Abraham and Abraham entertained Him. In Ex.4.24 we read that Jehovah met Moses and sought to slay him. He met him "in the inn" and He sought to slay him. Ex.4.24. This is a section which according to Addis is one of those precious remnants in the Bible, one of those precious little remnants from the very original early material that shows us what kind of a god Jahweh originally was. Because we read here in Ex.4, the account of God that it came to pass by the way in the inn, that the LORD met him, and sought to kill him. Then Zipporah took a sharp stone, and cut off the foreskin of her son, and cast it at his feet, and said, Surely a bloody husband art thou to me. So he let him go: then she said, A bloody husband thou art, because of the circumcision." He met him and sought to kill him. Well, they say this shows that Jahweh originally was a sort of a thunder God of Sinai who every once in a while ~~was born~~ would go on a tear, and anybody who got in his way he would just destroy. So he met Moses on his way back to Egypt and he met Moses in the inn, and there when he met him in the inn, we read, he sought to kill him. Happened to come on Moses and sought to kill him. And Zipporah saw the situation, was about to lose Moses, tothe

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

wrath of this wild thundergod that was tearing around, and she thought maybe blood would appease him, so she made a sacrifice, took a sharp stone, cut off the foreskin of her son, cast it at his feet, and he let Moses go, so she saved Moses' life by the sacrifice. Well, the critics say this is one of these precious sections which preserve something of the origin of the idea of Jahweh, Well, personally I don't interpret it that way. I admit that at first sight it sounds that way. It came to pass by the way in the inn, that the Lord met him and sought to kill him. Then Zipporah took a sharp stone, cut off the foreskin of her son and cast it at his feet, saying, surely a bloody husband art thou to me. Why did she blame Moses for it, when it was Jahweh who was trying to kill him? So she let him go, then she said a bloody husband thou art, because of the circumcision. In an account like this, you have words, you have sentences, but as in reading anything, you have to make an interpretation. And the most obvious interpretation ~~of~~ of it is the interpretation that the critics give, the interpretation that this shows you the character of Jahweh, ~~a wild~~ a wild thundergod on a tear, about to kill anybody who gets in His way. So Zipporah makes a sacrifice and He sees the blood and it satisfied Him, He has had his blood lust satisfied for the moment, and lets him go. Well, that is the ~~most~~ most obvious interpretation but it doesn't fit with the rest of the Pentateuch. ~~Now we~~

Now we have ~~enough~~ not given statements to have another interpretation, but --------- if we're not going to accept the critics we have to at least have a credible interpretation ~~which~~ which we suggest as an alternative thing, and most Christians feel that that is not the correct interpretation of the passage, that when Zipporah acted she acted not simply on a wild impulse but she acted as a result of discussion which she had had with Moses before, and that she did it in rather poor grace, she said, surely a bloody husband art thou to me, she did it in rather poor grace, because she didn't like to do it, didn't want to do it, but under the circumstances it was either give in or lose Moses, so she gave in, but not very happily, and that this means that there had been big arguments between the two in the past, and that Zipporah had had

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

her way, up to this point, that Moses had talked to Zipporah about circumcizing the boy, and that Zipporah had said, why/ he is just a little infant, what does he know, why should we circumcize him, wait till he gets older and he can make up his own mind, and he can decide whether he wants to be circumcized or not, but Moses said, no it is God's command that he should be circumcized, and he said we should carry out God's commands, we are believers in the Lord, the Lord has commanded that he be circumcized and we should carry out the command of the Lord. Zipporah said the poor little thing, she said, what a cruel bloody thing to do when he is this age, and what will it mean to him anyway, he doesn't understand it, why don't you wait till he is older and let him make up his own mind? So consequently when God didn't interfere with them, they were good earnest believers, following the Lord in a quiet way, not doing anything outstanding for him, but God ordered Moses to come and do a great work for God, to go to Egypt, and in this situation, where Moses should take a position of real leadership in the Lord's work, it was vital that Moses should carry out God's command to the full, and therefore, that when Moses took Zipporah and the child and they started for Egypt, that God could not use Moses while Moses was disregarding one of God's commands. And therefore, on the way, we read here the Lord met him and sought to kill him, we don't think that means that a wild thunder-god came in through the window and began to threaten him, we believe that Moses was taken with some sudden illness or something, but that as it happened, Zipporah understood what it meant, she understood that Moses not carrying out to the full God's command, was yet trying to go forward to do God's will, and she understood that in a situation like that there was serious danger, and she saw the situation and gave in but with poor grace, because she quickly performed the circumcision but she said surely a bloody husband art thou to me. And then we read, so he let him go, that Moses immediately recovered from the situation which seemed to threaten his death and that Moses and Zipporah both understood that if a person was going to follow

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

the Lord effectively, and be used of Him, he must follow out His commands as He gives them and not try to explain them away, or to (7 1/2)

Now as between the two interpretations of the passage, this one and the critics' interpretation, I know of no third interpretation of it, have never heard a third interpretation on it, but of these two, the critical interpretation is the most obvious. Take the words as they stand, it is the easiest way to take, but it contradicts the general impression ~~effect~~ of the Pentateuch as a whole. Well, the critics say naturally, it is a remnant from an early edition, and it has been preserved by a fortunate (8 1/4)

We would have many such if only a lot of the original material hadn't been lost. We do not believe it, we believe the Pentateuch is God's Word to us, and consequently we believe// we have to see if there is a way to explain this that makes sense, and fits with the contents and does not explain away or do violence to any of the word, but simply assumes certain facts on a reasonable basis which are not clearly stated here. So we believe that is the correct interpretation. But now that is the situation as regards the critics' argument. They say the J document is a primitive document because it has all the anthropomorphism in it, like his meeting and seeking to kill him in the way. We say that those anthropomorphisms are not primitive expressions but they are expressions which are perfectly proper, but we say that we cannot see God, but we cannot understand God except by using human statements about Him, and to how great an extent these statements correspond to something that is literal fact, and to how great an extent they are figurative expressions that convey a true meaning about God, it is hard for us to say, but we believe they are entirely right and proper or they would not be in the Bible. Yes? (9 3/4) Well, there are some of them who would divide into J1 and J2, and J3, and they might say that one of them was in some regards more primitive than the other, but they don't go to any great length on that, but they all claim that J is more primitive, more anthropomorphic than E. E is more anthropopathic than anthropomorphic, that is J will have God speak to a man, but in

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

E He'll give the man a dream

He gives him a dream, he gives him a vision, rather than to speak directly to him, in J God brings the people out of Egypt with His outstretched arm, phrase used over and over, with His outstretched arm He brings them out of Egypt. But in E, God hears their suffering, His ear is open to their cry, He sees the need, He uses expressions corresponding to man's feeling, but not so much expressions corresponding to man's actions, as He did in J, that is their claim.

Well, now that is the claim of the critics about the development in the idea of God between J and E, and as regards P, we have in Driver's literature of --Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, on pages 128-9, we have a statement showing the attitude of P on this matter, Driver says, his representations of God are less anthropomorphic than those of J or even of E. No angels or dreams are mentioned by him. Isn't that a strong argument. No angels or dreams are mentioned by P. But of course if you want to find out what is P, if a section has an angel or a dream in it, just put it in E. Then you find there are no angels or dreams in P. Mr. MacKeen? (12) J or E, yes, and now we're looking at P. (stu.) Yes, well, anthropomorphic and anthropopathic. E is only anthropopathic, not much anthropomorphism in P--in I, I should say, but P, he says his representations of God are less anthropomorphic than those of J or even of E. No angels or dreams are mentioned by him. Certainly he speaks of God as appearing to men, as going up from them, at important moments of history, but it gives no further description of His appearance. Usually the revelation of God to men with Him takes the form of simply speaking to them. Only in the supreme revelation of Sinai and when He is present in the Tent of Meeting does he describe Him as manifesting Himself as light and fire...

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

... he avoids scrupulously, even anthropomorphic expressions are rare, so that a purpose is here unmistakable. It may be (3/4) that as a priest he was accustomed to think and speak of God more strictly and circumspectly than other writers, even those who were (3/4) On the other hand he nowhere touches on the deeper problems of theology, on such subjects as the divine judgment of the world, on the origin of sin and evil, the insufficiency of all human righteousness, he does not (1)

The Israelitish theocracy is the writer's idea, and the culminating promise is, that in Ex.29.43-46, comparing the abiding presence of God with(1 1/2)

Now that is the claim of the critics about the development of the idea of God. They usually say the development of religious ideas, but when you examine it it is pretty much narrowed down to this, the idea of God and His revelation. That is the claim there of the development between the documents. Yes? (2)

Now the E is less anthropomorphic, they say, it is more anthropopathic. That is to say, more showing the feeling rather than his actions. He hears, he feels, he depends, he is used, rather than he looks, or makes, or pull off the chariot wheels, it says in Exodus that God pulled off the chariot wheels. Now do they think the original writer thought God came down and like a man went up and pulled off the chariot wheels, one after the other, or do they interpret it in line with the rest (2 1/2)
Yes? They claim that they are both in J, only anthropopathic ó in E, while in P there is a little anthropomorphism , practically no anthropopathism. Document J had a very primitive idea of God, God meets Moses in the way, tries to kill him. Then you have E who, instead of God meeting him or talking with him, God gives him a dream, gives him a vision. Then you have P where God simply speaks and it is done. That is the idea of the development inthe documents which they claim.

Well, now I have headed this simply Summary of Arguments, rather than, I want

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

to discuss in general the arguments later, but this one I think perhaps we might discuss right at this point. This is a much simpler fact, in my opinion, though perhaps a more obvious ~~fact~~ pattern than the next part of the argument. But this part I think it is better to get out of the way ~~rather than to get~~ before we get into far greater complexity of the next of their arguments, the one which is a far stronger argument, actually, than this. Because this argument while it readily admitted that J as the priests divide it, has far more anthropomorphism than E or P, and that P has ~~m~~ far more than either J or E. It is readily admitted, yet we would maintain that it is exactly what we would expect as far as P is concerned, in view of the fact that P consists mostly of tabulation, lists, genealogy, detailed laws, that being the case, how much opportunity for anthropomorphism do you have, in that sort of thing? We claim that the J and E are narratives, that in the narrative you would naturally have more of anthropomorphism than you would in lengthy detailed laws or lists, genealogies, and wherever they find anything like that, they're apt to say this verse comes from the other document. Of course, chapter 1 is a rather unique chapter, chapter 1 is really a tabulation, one day, two days, three days, it is a tabulation at the beginning, giving in very brief styled form a quick summary of the creation of the physical universe, and then it goes on to give more detail on those events which are of direct interest to us, the life of man and his relation to God. And consequently in this tabulation in chapter 1, God simply gives commands and they are done, ~~so th~~ though there is one place where He says, let us make man, but then it says He created man, it does not speak of His forming man out of the dust of the earth (6) where there is more detail. This is the difference between ~~J and E,~~ J and P which we find, the difference of subject matter which we claim is the real vital difference between JE and P. It is a difference which would naturally carry with it, giving most of the anthropomorphisms, and anthropopathisms to JE rather than to P, so that this particular argument, we think, is really arguing in circles, very largely. You separate the types of material, and then when you separate the types of material, you find that the anthropo-

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

morphic and anthropopathic expressions are naturally with the narrative type, rather than with the enumeration, statistical type of material. Well, then how about J and E? Well, that sounds like a real development, doesn't it? J to E. If J is more anthropomorphic, then E is more simply anthropopathic. But you ask yourself, where does J begin? J begins with the creation of man, which involves certain references to the creation of the universe. And what is the next great tremendous incident in J, after the creation of man, and the fall of man. It is the Flood. Take E, where does it E start? It doesn't start till Gen.20. E in other words deals with the history of the patriarchs, not with the creation of the universe, nor with the universal flood. Now where will you naturally find more anthropomorphism? Will you find it in accounts of the history of the patriarchs, or will you find them in the great tremendous things that God did in creating the universe, in first establishing man onthe earth, and in carrying out the great Flood? That is where you would expect anthropomorphism isn't it? You don't expect (8 1/4)
the great events which God is immediately doing than in God's relation with a family which He leads out, and with the greater part of the events in Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob's life are events inthe natural world, with God's intervening only occasionally. So you would expect far more anthropomorphism in ~~the~~ a document which started with creation and includes the Flood than in one which didn't start till about the middle of the history of Abraham, and from there on, in dividing them you have a far smaller number of anthropomorphisms and it is quite simple to assign the great bulk of them to J, from there on. So that actually this argument which can be made to sound very, very strong, when you examine it, it proves to be to quite an extent simply arguing in a circle, and I think this is then, while it is not one of the most important of the arguments, because it is not one of the strongest of the arguments, it is perhaps one of the most important for you to be well familiar with, because it should be fairly easy when you have a student from your church who has studied and is all confused with this argument, and he is very apt to strike it, even perhaps in high school, it is apt to be there, but when

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

he comes home and he is filled with this argument and his parents come to you for help, it should be quite easy for you to deal withthis particular argument, it is not really such a strong argument, but it sounds like a very strong argument. This is so important from a ~~para~~ practical viewpoint I'd hate to take comparatively little time on it, but I think we have dealt with the major aspects of it. (10)

and I think we can go on with the arguments that are much stronger arguments, actually, though more difficult to present, somewhat more complex. So this was #1, development within the document as regards religious ideas, and then #2 is the real crux of the argument: 2, Development within the documents as ~~reg~~gards Religious Institutions. And this is where the critics have some very strong arguments.

Now these arguments, as they give them, they give many different aspects, and they make it sound as if you have in J very, very primitive religious institutions, the father does what he thinks is wise with his family, he sacrifices wherever he thinks ~~can~~ wise, he carries out the religious life that seems good to him, in J and E. Then you get into D and you get a much more organized system, a carefully worked out system of ritual and service. And then you get into P and have an extremely complicated system of ritual and service and extremely complicated laws, now that is the view which they claim and they will give you many, many illustrations under it. But most of their illustrations, with a little bit of examination, prove to be not very strong. Most of them are very complicated and when you examine them they're so complex that when some great scholar declares to you that the festivals are very simple in J, somewhat more complex in D, very complicated in P, it is very easy for you to be impressed with his authority, and ~~neg~~ not go into the detail that is necessary to examine the claim, but there are two of the points which are very simple points on which their arguments can sound very strong, and need very careful examination, and those two, both relate to what is one of the most ~~extensive~~ essential elements of religious life in the ancient (12 1/.2)

that is sacrifice. So the question is, where shall we sacrifice, and who shall do the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

sacrificing? And on those two points they claim that there is a development which shows a progress and that this progress fits with the history as contained in the historical books, and that is a very, very strong argument, and we want to go into it sufficiently to make clear exactly what it is.

Now on this particular point, at present, all I'm asking you to do is to remember what it is, so if at the beginning of the hour tomorrow, I should ask you, what are the most important arguments regarding...

P.94. (3/4)

...this was #1, development within the documents as regards religious ideas, I want you to make #2, Discussion of this alleged development. Now we did discuss it yesterday, so that three-fourths of what I give you now will just be a resume, we won't take long on it, so I have decided to make three points on the material I gave you yesterday in the discussion of it, and to make one more, in addition, that will take us a minute or two. The first of these then, under 2, Discussion of the alleged development, small a is:

a, The seeming difference as to ideas of God between J, E, and P is normal in view of the difference in the type of material. Now that I discussed rather fully yesterday. But I think it is good to make a heading.

b, The seeming difference between J and E (we discussed J, E & P, remember, once, now b is JE) is quite natural since E has no account of great cosmic events such as creation and the Flood. I discussed both of those rather fully yesterday, but I think it is helpful to put them in specific headings, a and b.

c, Properly interpreted, the view of God in J is really very lofty. I think that is very important. The critical attitude as expressed in some of the books is J has very primitive idea of God, He has His outstretched arms, He comes down, He takes off the chariot wheels, He meets him in the cool of the day. Yes? (3 1/2) They don't start E until Ex.20, and your anthropomorphism, most of them would naturally come in those great cosmic events rather than in dealings with the patriarchs, and it is quite simple to have the bulk of them in the patriarchs be assigned to J.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

c, Properly interpreted, the view of God in J is really very lofty. The attitude that you will find many people believing is that J has this very primitive idea, God takes off the wheels of the chariots, in J, Jehovah takes off the wheels of the chariots. Jehovah comes down and talks with Adam, Jehovah makes man out of the dust of the earth, forms him out of the dust of the earth. Jehovah performs an operatioon on Adam, takes Eve out of his side. Jehovah has all things ascribed to him, as if it was a man acting, man doing it, anthropomorphic. Now while they say E is somewhat loftier, because it does not very much picture God as doing things like a man, though it does picture him as feeling, as repenting that he had made man, as being sorrowful, as (4 3/4) using anthropopathic expressions, but P is this lofty conception of God, this lofty monotheism, that God speaks and it is done, He is a spiritual being, He is so remote, that no physical figures will represent Him. Well, if you're going to take that view of J you can interpret these words in that way. You can interpret individual sentences as presenting you a very primitive childish idea of God, you can take an individual sentence and interpret it that way. But if you take all the material and put in J together and read it, you have a picture of a lofty, powerful sovereign God, dealing in goodness with the men whom He has created. You do not have anything that has the primitive attitude of the Greek gods who seduce young women and who fight among themselves over the silliest things, and who enter into all that sort of thing that is utterly unworthy of a divine being. You have the Greek gods full of that sort of thing, you have the Babylonian gods constantly doing that sort of thing, you have nothing like that in the Bible. The nearest you get to it anywhere is Exodus 4, and as we noticed in Ex.4, God ~~met~~ met him on the way and sought to kill him, and if you want to you can take that as a very primitive statement, this wild thundergod of Sinai that happened to hit on Moses, and would have killed him if his wife hadn't thought of this device of attracting his attention by the sight of blood.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

That is a very primitive idea, you can interpret those words that way if you want, but it is just as reasonable in the light of the J document as a whole, in the light of the Bible as a whole to interpret it that the righteous God who has saved Abraham and Moses, as Paul says in Romans, giving them circumcision as a sign and seal of the faith which they had, yet being uncircumcized, and ordered them to circumcize their children, that He was here making it clear ~~at~~ to Moses that Moses could not take the place of leadership God wanted him to take , if he did not follow the whole Bible and not just parts. Of course then they didn't have the whole Bible, I mean the whole of what they did have. It is as lofty a conception of God as you will find anywhere in the Bible, if you interpret it in line with the rest of theBible. So There are these two ways I know of interpreting that passage, and the critical way is an entirely proper way if you just take the words by themselves. But you can do that with any book if you just take words by themselves. But you can do that with any book if you just take the words by themselves. In the light of context the picture given of Jehovah is not a primitive idea, nothing like the pictures that we have in the Greek and Roman stories of their gods ~~during~~ or in the Babylonian stories of their gods. Nothing like them at all. It is not a thundergod going on a tear killing whoever gets in his way, but it is a lofty sovereign God rebuking him for failing to carry out the order which God has given to Abraham, and expects His people to carry out. And so this is one illustration.

You could look at many and see how the picture of God in J is just as lofty a picture as the picture in P, the only difference is that P is more for geneaology, statistics, detailed laws, in which there is little narrative, little occasion for using anthropomorphic terminology. Well, now ~~P=1~~ ^{d} did not give you before but ^{d} is also , -- ^{d} is the counterpart of c . d is:

d, Even though it is plain that anthropomorphisms are rare in P some are found there.

The critics try to divide on the basis of all the different criteria in order to get the original documents, and then having gotten them on the basis of criteria, they see

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

how the criteria work out consistently and P has this lofty view of God, compared with the primitive attitude that J has toward Him. But yet you look at the very first chapter of Genesis in which as they say God speaks and it is done, it is that great spiritual view of God who is untouched with human emotions or human feelings, and cannot be compared with humanity at all. He says let there be light and there is light, so they say. We say it is a tabulation manner of presenting the great main fact of the creation of the world, and inthis tabulation there is no special call for having anthropomorphic expressions as there is in chapter 2 -4, but we find even there, in verse 26, there we read, and God said let us make man in our image, after our likeness. Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, Now what can be more anthropomorphic than that? Let us make man. God doesn't simply speak and it is done, He says let us make man. He says let <u>us</u> make man. Who is the "us"? Is He addressing the angel? Is He joining with other divine being in this action? Is He using an editorial "we" speaking of himself, the "we" of majesty, the critics say that is utterly inconceivable if that is what it is. In fact, Addis, in his book, The Documents of the Hexateuch, of which I've read you the footnotes from time to time, he says underneath, that "probably this verse retains something of the original polytheism of the story, which has still been maintained in spite of the efforts of the editor to get rid of it all, as they were making the P documents./ Well, J, the primitive early document, yes, according to their view, maybe you have the polytheism retained in that, but here you have the theories, J and then E and then D and P, P the lofty, advanced, monotheistic document, and even there, they say the polytheism of the original story has probably been retained in this verse. Now we don't interpret this as polytheism at all, we think that God is here speaking, the great sovereign God just as He does in J, but if they're going to say that J is primitive, they have to say also of this verse 22 completely, you couldn't take that verse out of P, without disrupting the whole context, it is impossible. It is part of P, from any viewpoint, but they say

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

it has slipped through, this polytheism, "let us make man." And God's image, God is going to make and God has an image, has a likeness. That's just as anthropomorphic as anything you'll find in J. Yes? (11 3/4) Not J. In J they say the polytheism has mostly been eliminated by the editor before assuming its present form, but they say it is a primitive document with a very rudimentary idea of God, they don't claim there is any actual polytheism there, but they will say that there perhaps are statements that have still been kept, that retain traces of the original polytheism. But if you're going to interpret anything in J that retains traces of the original polytheism, you have more reason here right in P, which they say is the most advanced of all. And then another example, there aren't a great many , because in statistics and detail, in law, and that sort of thing, there isn't much opportunity for anthropomorphic statements, but in Numbers 6.22, in the midst of the P document, in the laws for the priests which could only be in P, because the others don't know anything about a specially appointed priest, you have, according to the critical theory, you have in verse 22, "and the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, speak...

P.95. (3/4)

...but here, speak unto Aaron and unto his sons, saying on this wise you shall bless the children of Israel, saying unto them. This is definitely P according to all the critics. What are they to say? The Lord bless thee and keep thee, the Lord make his face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee. The Lord lift up his countenance on him, because countenance is exactly the same Hebrew word as translated face a couple of words before, literally , the Lord lift up His face upon you and give you peace. The Lord make his face shine upon thee, the Lord lift up His face upon thee, what could be more anthropomorphic than that? You thought about God as having an eye, as walking in the garden in the cool of the day, God as seeking to kill Moses, but none of these are a bit more anthropomorphic, if as much so, as to speak of God's face, here right in the midst of the P document. You have this given, which twice uses

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

a very anthropomorphic expression, the Lord make His face to shine upon you, the Lord lift up His face upon you. Addis has a footnote that this very beautiful poem here has certain aspects which are hard to fit together with the rest of the P document, so we can't help wondering whether P has incorporated something from a much earlier date. You can take anything out and say it is incorporated by the redactor, why naturally, you can make anything you want, but here are two clear instances of anthropomorphism in P, just as anthropomorphic as anything you'll ever get in J. So much then for #2, discussion of the alleged development. Now #3:

#3 is the more important from viewpoint of logic, though perhaps from a practical viewpoint what we have just dealt with is as important as anything in the whole discussion. #3, Development as regards religious institutions. Yes, Mr. Golin?

(3) No, you werent' late but I did explain that instead of going right on to development in regard to religious institutions, I decided that I was going to first take the discussion of yesterday, and make it into a separate head, calling it #2, and giving three, the material I gave yesterday, and the fourth one I hadn't gotten to yesterday. Well, anyway, #3, we cannot spend time discussing what is enumeration, that is limited to P document. We have to deal with J and E. So #3, the most important from logic? The critics held many views about the documents, and comparatively adopted Hupfeld's theory, but it was Graf and Wellhausen showed that by adopting Hupfeld's view you could arrange the documents in a way that fit with the theory of development, to show an evolution from early ideas to more advanced ideas, that then it came to be accepted in that form. So they based their argument more than anything else upon religious institutions and that argument can be made to sound extremely strong, and it is vital that we be familiar with it. So #3 is development as regards religious institutions. Small a, the view of three Mosaic sacrifices.

What do the different documents hold about sacrifice before the time of Moses? Well, Carpenter, in his book on the composition of the Hexateuch, Carpenter

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

says on page 82, the sketch of primeval history in Gen.4 depicts sacrifice as the earliest form of religious homage. What document is Gen.4? Everybody knows that, don't they? Mr. Downs? J. P is Gen.1; 2, 3 and 4 is J. The sketch of primeval history in Gen.4 , he says, depicts ~~th~~ sacrifice as the earliest form of religious homage. Cain and Abel both bring their offerings to Jahweh. When Noah and his family had left the ark his first act was to build an alter to Jahweh. ~~And~~ On Abraham's arrival at Shechem, he offers his first sacrifice to Jahweh, in the land of Promise, and repeats ~~it~~ this worship at various places. Abraham builds altars, Jacob offers sacrifices, builds an altar at Bethel. Both J and E then freely attribute the rite of sacrifice to the patriarchs, to heads of families. Jethro takes a burnt offering for Elohim, and Aaron and the elders of Israel (6 1/4) so that we have sacrifice frequently in J and E, in the early accounts , but when you come to P, you find that P has no sacrifice before the time of Moses. Driver brings this out very clearly in his discussion. Carpenter here says, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob moved through the land but they never commemorate by the ritual of the altar, the place where El Shaddai appears. Naturally not, because all those accounts are given to J or E. But in P there is left no statement of their making any (6 3/4)

The critics say no sacrifice is legitimate which was not offered according to the divine command. The purpose of P is not the spontaneous offering of man to his maker, over the human race, it is the express order of God Himself. It must be peformed by the persons whom He chooses and at the spot which He selects. Not till the dwelling was reared was the place prepared, not till Aaron and his sons were consecrated could sacrifice properly begin. So this a is a view of pre-Mosaic sacrifice, J and E have the thought of the patriarchs performing sacrifice, at many places, but in P there is no sacrifice before the Tabernacle is built , the proper place for sacrifice. Well, now this is not one of the major things under 3, chronologically, it comes first, so we mention it first, we go on to one of the major things: small b:

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

b, The Place of Sacrifice. Now that we have already touched upon, here, in J and E Abraham built altars in various places in Palestine, Moses built altars in various places in the wilderness. What is the place of sacrifice, according to J and E? Well, we find it in the accounts of how they offered sacrifice at many places, but when you come to Exodus 20.24, you have the law. Here is the book of the covenant, which as you know is the law of E. The law is given to E, starting with the Ten Commandments, and following with three chapters of judgment, and here is what God says, in verse 24 of chapter 2, ~~and also~~ an altar of earth thou shalt make unto me and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offering, and thy peace offering, 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 an altar of stone, thou shalt not build of hewn stone, for if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it. Here is the law of sacrifice, you can make this certain type of altar ~~wi~~ in all places where I record my name. I will come unto thee and I will bless thee.

So, they say, according to J and E, altars can be made wherever God records His name, and so you can have altars in many place, so they say, during the history of Israel, up till the time of Josiah, the people offered in many, many different places, and in the Deuteronomic additions to 1 Kings it is stated repeatedly that the high places were not redeemed but the people kept offering sacrifices on these high places, then you come to the next document in the order inwhich the critics arrange them, which is the D document, and in the D document, they say, the basic thing, they say, in Deuteronomy is a command that sacrifice is to be restricted to one place. So we have it in Deut., the 12th chapter, after Moses had recounted the history to the people, then he starts in, these are the statutes and judgments you shall observe to do, what are they? V.5, But unto the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put his name there, even unto his habitation shall ye seek, and thither shalt thou come, and thither ye shall bring your burnt offerings, and your

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

sacrifices, and your tithes, and heave offerings, --and we have several times in this chapter, and occasionally afterwards in Deuteronomy we have mentioned that they are not to sacrifice in the various places in the land. But that sacrifice is to be performed only at the place which God shall choose, and as you know the theory of (11) was that the priest in Jerusalem wrote the book of Deuteronomy in order to do away with the other shrines which were competing with the shrine in Jerusalem, for the gifts and offerings of the people, and to force the people to do all their sacrifices in Jerusalem and that that was why this book of Deuteronomy was written, and we read in 2 Kings how when Josiah saw the book and read it, he proceeded to destroy the high places, and to stop all sacrifice in other places, but priests who were carrying on worship of the Lord in other high places were permitted to come to Jerusalem and have menial service in connection with the Tabernacle. But that the high places were stopped and put an end to by Josiah after he read this book which Hilkiah the priest found in the Temple. So they say you have J and E , sacrifice wherever God puts His name, altars built in many places. Then you have Deuteronomy, sacrifice in one place, restricted to Jerusalem. And the Jews got this idea so thoroughly in their heads that sacrifice was restricted to the Temple in Jerusalem, that after the destruction of the Temple the Jews ceased to sacrifice, and although ever since 70 A.D. the Jews have maintained throughout the world that the 39 books of the O.T. were God's word , their law which they should follow, and a tremendous part of that is taken up with the description of sacrifice, and the statement is made that without shedding of blood there is no remission of sin, the Jews have had no sacrifice because Deuteronomy says you must not sacrifice except in the place which the Lord your God shall choose. They understand that to have been Jerusalem, so you have a problem, a change, from JE with sacrifice wherever God puts His name, to Deuteronomy which says sacrifice only...

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

...and with the little group of Jews it was not necessary to stress the law of Deuteronomy but it is assumed throughout in P, and that certainly is true. That is, you read the ordinance for sacrifice in Leviticus, it is everywhere stated you bring them to the Temple, or to the place where God (1 1/4) - chooses, to bring them to that place, it is assumed that there is one place where the high priest, and priests offering sacrifices are at the Temple. So they say, here you have a progress, a movement, from J and E, sacrifice anywhere God appears, D sacrifice in the one place, Jerusalem; P assuming the continuance of the condition established by D, So you have an evolutionary development, a progress (1 3/4)

Now that is b, and that is one of the two most important of the alleged evidence of development. c is not one of the most important, but logically comes after this, I call c, Two alleged results of this centralization.

(#1) The Law of Assylum. Assylum means protection, means a place where you can go and be safe. And we find that in Ex.21.14 it is well to read the context a little in verse 12, he that smiteth a man so that he die shall surely be put to death. And if a man lie not in wait--see this is part of the book of the covenant--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, 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.

So, you see, according to JE , they say, there were--if a man had accidentally killed someone else, he could get safety from the avenger of blood, by fleeing to God's altar, and there were God's altars throughout the land where the people worshipped and did their sacrifices, so a man could flee to the altar and he would be safe, that, they say, is the law of JE as far as assylum is concerned.

Now we're not going to discuss this now, we're going to take discussion later, I just wanted to get what the claims were. Is it clear , Mr. MacKeen, or not? (3 3/4) Well, then that is the view of JE. Then when it comes to D, the priests in

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Jerusalem, or the people at least who controlled the Temple in Jerusalem, why they get all the income from sacrifices so they got this book to be found in the Temple, pretending to be a book by Moses, which said that all sacrifice was to be done in Jerusalem. Well, that being the case, taking away all the altars from the rest of the land, what would people do when they needed assylum? A man goes out to chop wood, and he starts to chop wood and the axe flies off his handle and hits the other man in the head and kills him. Well, the other man's relatives, they weren't there to see it, all they know is the other man has been killed with an axe and this fellow was with him, they aren't going to stop to argue about it, they're going to kill him, they are going to get revenge. What is he going to do? Well, he can flee to God's altar. But Josiah's going to take away all the altars, so now he has got to run a hundred miles down to Jerusalem, to get to the altar, well, that's impossible. So the writer of Deuteronomy makes allowance for that and he provides that there shall be the means of escape for such a person. So Deuteronomy after giving the law that sacrifice is only to be at Jerusalem proceeds to lay down a law that gives an opportunity of assylum to a man in a situation like this. So in Deut.19 you have as much as 13 verses going into details about what they are going to do about a man who had killed somebody and had not been intending to kill him. When the Lord thy God hath cut off the nation whose land the Lord thy God giveth thee and thou succeedeth them and dwelleth in their cities and their houses, thou shalt separate three cities for thee in the midst of thy land, which the Lord thy God giveth thee to possess it. Thou shalt prepare thee a way and divide the borders of thy land which the Lord thy God giveth thee to inherit, into three parts, that every slayer may flee hither. This is the case of the slayer who shall flee thither that he may live. Whoso killeth his neighbor ignorantly, whom he hateth not in the past, as when a man goeth into the woods with his neighbor, to hew wood, and his hand fetches a stroke with the axe to cut down a tree, and the head slippeth from the helm and lighteth upon his neighbor that he die, he shall flee

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

unto one of these cities ~~that he~~ and live, lest ~~thus~~ the avenger of blood pursue the slayer while his heart is hot and overtake him, and so on. So you see, there are three cities to be set apart for this purpose, and in verse 8 he says, and if the Lord thy God enlarge thy coast, as he has sworn unto thy fathers, and gives thee all the land which he has promised to give to thy fathers, if thou keep all these commandments to do them, which I command thee this day, to love the Lord thy God, to walk ever in his way, then shall thou add three cities more besides these three. So they say, in the time of Josiah, they said, well, we had better take away the altars, make a provision for assylum, take the place of the altars. So there are these three cities, one in the north, one in the middle, one in the south. And, they said, suppose we reconquered some of the territory that David is supposed to have held over in Transjordan, there is provision put in that in such a case that the land shall spread again, and Israel retake this territory, that Israel formerly had had, that then three more cities can be established to be cities of refuge so that the slayer can flee there and can be given a fair trial instead of being killed when he might actually have been innocent.

So you have this command given in Deuteronomy to take the place of the assylum, and then in Numbers, when we come to the priestly document, in Num.35, you have, verses 9-34, you have another account, and they say this other account uses quite different terminology. But says exactly the same thing, it says in it, he shall give three cities on this side Jordan, and three cities ~~on that~~ in the land of Canaan, which shall be cities of refuge. These six cities shall be a refuge, both for the children of Israel, and for the stranger, for the sojourner among them, that everyone that killeth any person unawares, may flee thither. And they say, look at the difference. According to JE it was a place to flee for anyone who killed when he had not hated him, but God delivered him into his hand. According to Deuteronomy, it was a place to flee if a man killed another unintentionally, when there had not been hatred between them before. In Numbers it is a place for a man to flee if he kills a person

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

unawares, it is a difference in terminology between the three documents, and here there are, specifically, going to be six cities. And then there is a long discussion here of all the details of it. But you see the problems then, on the law of assylum?

Now when you get to Joshua 20, there in the book of Joshua it tells how the six cities were set apart, and names the six cities. And there the critics run into a little difficulty, because the statements in Joshua combines phraseology from Numbers and from Deuteronomy, and they say it is possible of course that the Deuteronomist could have written it and had before him P phraseology to use, so therefore the one in Deuteronomy and Joshua must be from the P document, but a redactor has inserted statements in it, like the D document. It is a combination of the two and tells of the establishing. They say perhaps it was after the Pentateuch was written, that someone wanted to show how these commands were actually carried out, so in Joshua he put in a chapter combining from the three. But that's incidental, the main thing is the threefold development: in the JE, flee to God's altar; in D cities of refuge appointed, in P the cities of refuge again explained in different language than in D. Then #2:

(2) A Change in the regulations about permanent enslavement. Now this is mentioned in some of the critical books, not in others, there are a great many suggestions, of course, which they mention in different places, I'm giving you a selection, though, including from two which are the outstanding ones, the two which are most (11) in all the books, but the books stress two particular ones and then different books touch different other ones. So I'm giving you a few examples, but giving you the two main ones. But this is one more example here, change in regulations about permanent enslavement. We read here on page 91 of Carpenter, 91-92, the Judgment book, Ex. ~~21-6.21~~ 21.6, remember, and 20-24 is the book of the covenant, which says these are the judges which the Lord thy God gives. There we read in 21.6 a possibility of permanent enslavement of a man who has lost his freedom because of inability to pay his debt, and after 7 years he is to be

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

permitted to go free. But we read here, now these are the judges thou shalt set before them. If thou buy a Hebrew servant six years he shall serve and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing. If he came in by himself, he will go out by himself, if he were married then his wife shall go out with him, if his master has given him a wife, and she has borne him sons or daughters, his wife and her children shall be her master's and he shall go out by himself. And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife and my children, I will not go out free, then his master shall bring him unto God. The English says, unto the judges, but the Hebrew word is Elohim--shall bring him unto God. He shall bring him unto the door, or unto the door-post, and his master shall bore his ears through with an awl, and he shall serve him forever. So , Carpenter says, a master shall bring his slave to God, there at the door of the sanctuary, the center of he administration of justice, the master shall bore his ear through with an awl, affixing it momentarily to the doorpost, so that under the authority of religion, he becomes a slave forever. Now the corresponding law of Deuteronomy 12...

P.97. (3/4)

...Deut.15, after the law has been given to do away with the altars throughout the land, and to centralize worship in Jerusalem, then we read, in Deut.15, and if thy--verse 12--brother, an Hebrew man, or an Hebrew woman, be sold unto thee, and serve thee six years; then in the seventh year thou shalt let him go free from thee. And when thou sendest him out free from thee, thou shalt not let him go away empty. Thou shalt furnish him liberally out of thy flock, and out of thy floor, and so on, remember thou wast a bondman in Egypt, and so on, verse 16, and it shall be, if he say unto thee, I will not go away from thee; because he loveth thee and thine house, because he is well with thee; then thou shalt tkae an aul, and thrust it through his ear unto the door, he shall be thy servant for ever, and also unto thy maidservant thou shalt do likewise.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

So Carpenter says, that the corresponding law here introduced some interesting modifications. It is extended to women, it lays emphatic stress on generous recognition of the six years forced labor, and ~~it concludes~~ in conclusion, it retains its symbolic action with the awl, but it omits all reference to God. The doorpost to which the slave is attached is that of the householder's own dwelling. The public and official ceremony is converted into a private and domestic incident. The meaning of this change is not obscure. The law of exodus belongs to the code which admits a plurality of sanctuary, the Deuteronomic principle recognized but once. Trust that is clear. That is #2 under c.

Now we go on to d, which is the other of the two most important claims as regards religious institutions. One is c, the other is d. d, The Priesthood. What is the view of the priesthood in J and E? Well, in J and E, as we've noticed, Abraham sacrificed, Isaac, Jacob. There is no particular priesthood, they say, in J and E. Sacrifice can be performed by any head of a family, according to J and E, but when you come to E, in the book of Deuteronomy, you frequently find the phrase, the priest, the Levite. I think the Levitical priesthood would perhaps be the best way to translate that, the Priest, the Levite, the Levitical priesthood. They constantly refer, in Deuteronomy , to the Levitical priesthood, now that is a phrase in Deuteronomy. So that, they say, that the priesthood , which was any head of a family, could perform sacrifices, according to J and E. According to D, it is only the members of the tribe of Levi, who can perform sacrifices, the Levitical priesthood. But then they say, when you come to P, the priestly document, the priesthood has been narrowed down, and it is restricted to one family, and therefore in P, you read that Aaron the brother of Moses, is made high priest, and that he and his sons are to be the priests, to be set apart to be priests , and their descendants forever, and so that this was an idea of a group of people in the time during the exile, to centralize the priesthood into one group and to keep it in that group permanently, and so this is the advantage of P. So you see the progress, priesthood, anybody, J and E, any head of a family; d, restricted to tribe of

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Levi; P, restricted to the family of Aaron. Now these two are the two most important, b and d, the reason I say they are the most important, is they are the ones that are talked of most in the critical books, theyare the ones most attention is paid to, the ones that are brought in connection with the history more closely, in them you see a progress of development, according to the critical theory. And it shows order of the documents, from the more primitive J and E, where anybody can sacrifice, anyplace that God puts His name, to D which restricts sacrifice to Jerusalem, and any Levite can perform it, to P which still restricts it to Jerusalem, ~~and you have~~ but it can be performed only by members of the descendants of Aaron, and the idea of high priest was invented in order to give a special leadership to the head of that family. Yes? (5 3/4) Yes, according to the critical theory, that idea was an idea developed at the time of the exodus, and has never actually had (6 1/4)

That is their view and that view I think you will find taught in the ~~non-Christian~~ denominational literature of most of our great denominations today. They don't go into details to explain how they get them or anything, but they will make a statement that assumes it, or that presents a certain thing. Yes? (6 1/2) Yes, that's right. The principle difference was, that the first one said, he shall bring them to God, Elohim. Our English translates Elohim as the judges, bring them to the judges, well it certainly doesn't mean judges, "God" doesn't mean judges. But what it would certainly mean would be some phrase which was particularly thought of as bringing them to the religious center, to bring them before God, bring them to God, and that word is omitted in the second, so that it does not say anything about bringing them to God, so they say the reason is ~~they~~ there were ~~all~~ altars all through the land, so it was very easy to bring the slaves to the religious center, but when the religious centers are confined to Jerusalem, then there was not a religious center here to which to bring them, and consequently it was performed as a purely civil ceremony, not a religious ceremony, that is their concept. Yes? (8) D is the Levite tribe. The Levite tribe contains thousands of people who were not in the family of

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Aaron. The family of Aaron is just one family and to them the priesthood is restricted, to that family, according to the book of Leviticus. Aaron is set apart, and his son, to be priest, Aaron is succeeded by his son Eleazer, and they go right on with the high priest from the family of Aaron, and when in the New Testament, you have the father of John the Baptist acting as priest, it is because he is a descendant of that family.

Well, that is the survey of the claim regarding religious institutions. I'd like to take some time discussing their claims, before we go on to its very important relation to history, I'd like to take some time discussing their claim and looking into some of these verses. I read you the verses and read you what they said about them. Some of those verses I have looked at a little more closely than some of the critics seem to look at them, and those are points which are very important, we want to look at. But before we do that we only have five minutes left today, so you'll have to write awfully fast. Everybody is disappointed we didn't have the quiz yesterday? Well, if you write real fast you can get through today, I think. Odd numbers write this down: Discuss the argument from discrepancy. That is the odd number seats.

The even numbers, discuss the claim that all scholars agree on the Graf-Wellhausen theory. ...

P.98. ((1 1/4)

...we looked at certain important instances, we didn't look at nearly all that are alleged, but of course there are some that are alleged in all the books, and there are some that are alleged pretty strongly in one book and not touched upon in another. I tried to pick principally those which are widely given in the critical books on the subject, and those which seem to me to have more strength to them than others. If you ever hear one that seems to you to have as much strength or more than one of the ones I have given you, I wish you would bring it to my attention in some way, because it is my impression that all other instances are much weaker than the ones that I have given you. I have tried to pick strong ones. It is very easy in ~~dealing~~ debating or arguing

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

to pick the weak arguments has and then tear that to pieces and make it look as if you have destroyed his attack, and that may have its place in a debate, but certainly among careful students one should pick the strongest arguments and see how much strength there is to them. I believe that these are the strongest and also the ones that are most commonly dealt with, particularly the two that I stressed. Those two you find in all the books, the others of them, you find to some extent in most of the books, some of them more at length than others.

Now we are taking #4 ~~then, Examination for the~~ Examination of the evidence for development within the documents. (e, I barely mentioned, Many other claims that are thought of as evidence--I didn't give you instances of it, they're easy to find.) Now under 4, small a:

a, Resume of the prima facie--this is half Latin, half French--view. The prima facie view of anything is that which is most obvious, that, the way in which (3 1/2) and in connection with the Bible, we believe the prima facie view to be the correct one. It is important that as we look at the critical theory that we constantly keep in mind, what is our opinion about the subject, what is the manner, the view that has been held by the Christian Church right down until the rise of the Graf-Wellhausen theory. Now, according to this view, as you know, the book of Genesis is written by Moses, telling the history of the world briefly, and then of the families of the patriarchs, more at length, previous to this time. Exodus tells about the coming of the Israelites out of Egypt, then in chapter 20-24, you have the book of the covenant, which is a very proper name for it, because it explicitly says that God declared that He would make a covenant with the people, and they said they would become party with this covenant, and then He proclaimed the covenant. First He gave the Ten Commandments, then He gave to Moses the judgments, He said these are the judgments, that thou shalt declare to the children of Israel, and then after He gave the judgments, then in chapter 24, the leaders of the people went with Moses and had a sacrificial meal at which they formally enacted the covenant. So the book of the covenant is a proper term to use for

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

the first law of any length that was given to Israel, the book of the covenant. Now the critics hold that this is the earliest law, this is the law of JE. Some of them used to think it was J, some used to think it was E. ~~that it was JE~~. Today I believe they are all unanimous that this was E. But J, some of them used to argue is in Ex.34ff where there is a repetition of the law after the Moses pact, some even said you had an earlier form of the Ten Commandments there, but that is not much stressed, so for our purpose we deal with the arguments they stress, the ones they put emphasis on, which is that this is the earliest law, the law of JE and we certainly agree with them , this is the earliest law, this is the earliest set of laws of any length that the Bible records as having been given to man, of much length. (5 3/4) And this group of laws was given to the Israelites soon after the beginning of their wilderness journey. Now the critics say these laws were given perhaps in the time of Jehoshaphat. Some have become so conservative in recent years they will even put it back as far as the time of David, but most think it was at the time of Jehoshaphat when these laws were given, the laws of JE, the book of the covenant. Now according to our view this law was given after they had gone through the wilderness a brief distance, it would be within the first two years, at least, of the 40 years they spent in the wilderness. So from our viewpoint these laws would be thinking of the Israelites as in the wilderness, thinking of them there, but not thinking of them as intending to stay there permanently, God would know that they were going to be there 40 years. As far as Moses knew when the law was given, they would head right on for Canaan, and within a few days or weeks at the most would be entering the promised land, God knew they would have 40 years in the wilderness, Moses knew they'd have a few weeks in the wilderness, but everybody knew practically that before very long they would be in the land of Canaan, so that to us affects the nature of these laws, very definitely. These laws that were given in the wilderness. It is not a complete law code, that would take volumes, you can't give a complete law code for a nation in a few chapters, ~~if we mean~~ it would be those things which it seemed important to stress to the people

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

at that particular time. Now then, according to our viewpoint, after that, the Israelites were given the command from God how to build the tabernacle, Moses spent 40 days up in the mountains, he was told how to build the Tabernacle, he was given laws for the priesthood, he was given all the details, regulations for the carrying on of the religious rites and (7 3/4) of the secular rites of the people. These laws were given, not to be memorized, not to be in everybody's mind like the book of the covenant, but given for a long detailed law that would be in the hands of the ~~lead~~leaders of the people, for applying to situations as their law. It would be silly to ~~have~~ ask everybody memorize the laws of the time of Jubilee, for instance, which comes every fifty years. You get a whole generation to memorize that and before the time comes, most of them ~~would forget~~ are dead, and the few that ~~remembered~~ remained would be arguing over what the law really was. Enough for everybody to know there is to be a Jubilee, but the law needs to be given in detail so that ~~ev~~ as the time approaches the leaders can read the detailed law and can (8 3/4) But these detailed laws contained in the last part of Exodus, contained in Numbers, and contained in Leviticus, they, we believe, were given to Moses there, near the beginning of the wilderness journey, intended to be part of the law, checked for the distant future. According to the critics these are the most detailed of the laws, the most elaborate, the most complex and therefore the latest, and are the latest stage of the coming of the law, that which came at the time of the exile, and laid down the law which the priestly leaders desired their people to adopt, but ~~came~~ dates after the exile. Then according to our view, according to what you read as it stands in the Bible, when they were in the plains of Moab and were expecting soon to enter the promised land, Moses realized that he would not be allowed to enter the promised land with them, his work was done, he must turn it over to others, and before he left them , he gave them several great addresses on the Plains of Moab and these addresses make up practically all of the book of Deuteronomy. The first , Moses reminded them of God's dealings with them, how ~~w~~ he brought them out of Egypt, how

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

he protected them through the wilderness, how he gave them the Ten Commandments, then starting in ~~verse~~ chapter 12, Moses reiterated to them the law, stressing to them the matters that it was important for them to have in mind for the future, so we have another giving of the law correctly called Deuteronomy, the second law, not a different law, but a repetition of the law, given for the purpose of urging the people to remember it and to obey it and to follow it, so we have Moses' exhortation to the people, contained in the book of Deuteronomy, which has in mind the soon-entering into the Promised Land, and we would naturally expect there might be some changes.-- In a law given to people about to enter the promised land, from the law they had given to them when they had 38 years of wilderness wandering ahead, even though they didn't know that. We would naturally expect some adaptation to the new conditions just ahead in this law Moses gives.

Now the critics today all believe that this book ~~is~~ of Deuteronomy is the book that was found in the Temple by Hilkiah the high priest who brought it to Josiah, and we do not dispute that Deuteronomy was found there in the Temple. There are many of us who think the book which was found was probably not just Deuteronomy, that it may have been the whole of the Pentateuch, but whatever it contained we have no doubt that they are right , that it did contain Deuteronomy, and that the book of Deuteronomy had tremendous influence upon Josiah, as ~~w~~ he read these exhortations and proceeded to ~~d~~ endeavor to carry them out among the people, so we have Deuteronomy then, which had a great influence at the time of Josiah, and which the critics say, was secreted in the Temple in order to be found there, to have this influence on the king, and was written shortly before that time.

It used to be, when the ~~d~~ theories ~~were~~ first came out, they believed Hilkiah himself forged the book, in order to increase the importance (12 1/4)
Hardly anyone would say that today. Some think it was written a century before. Some think it got in there by accident, and he really thought he had found an old book when he found it. There are all kinds of theories, but there is agreement that it was found

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

there and we agree with that, but where we disagree, and all the critics agree on, is they believe that sometime within the previous century, perhaps a hundred years before, perhaps fifty, perhaps twenty, perhaps that very year, but sometime during that century, t his book was written, and so they say the book of Deuteronomy represents a stage in between the law of JE and the law of P and you see a development from JE to D/// and to P. Now this is the important framework of our whole discussion. If you don't have this in mind, any other part of it is of no help.

But this is the framework, to know what they think and to know what the prima facie view is, the view of the Bible, as it stands.

Now we have noticed...

P.99. (3/4)

...expressions which we consider to be of a figurative nature but necessary in order to present the ideas that are ~~desirable~~ desired. We have examined that. Then we have gone on to the stronger portions that are the arguments upon the law, the arguments based upon ~~teh~~ development or change of religious institutions. And as I discussed with you, points a, b, c, d, four. Under c there were two, so there were five aspects in which they claim there is progress. JE has a certain law, D has another, and P has a different one. And they will always say there are changes in phraseology, there is increase in complexity, something like that, which we know of. But , as you doubtless noticed, that in most cases the difference was principally between two of them, there was only one case where they really alleged a vital difference in three stages. In all the other cases there is really only an allegation of two stages. That is, the allegation of a third stage, whether the first or the last, is very vague and general. Difficult to see. But there is a difference either between JE or between D and P, according to their theory, a real difference--in all but one of the five I gave you. In that one, there are three rather than simply two stages.

Now if you have reviewed your notes thoroughly on last class for today, you

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

probably have well in mind exactly which one that was, and if this was the end of the hour instead of the beginning I might ask you to discuss the one of the institutions where there were three stages, that we discussed, instead of two. However, being rather early in the hour, instead of that, we will begin our examination of it together.

So after a, Resume of the Prima Facie view, we will go on to b, which will be an examination of what we called a last time: b, The View of Pre-Mosaic Sacrifice.

Now this is certainly the simplest of all, from our viewpoint, and it is not the one that the critics put the greatest stress on, at all. But all their books say, according to the JE they could sacrifice anywhere, heads of families did the sacrificing, they sacrifieed wherever God put His name, so you find them sacrificing in many places. Well, no one can deny that is what we find in Genesis. Abraham sacrificed at many places, so did Isaac, so did Jacob. Sacrifice is found at many places, heads of families normally used it, in early Exodus we find Jethro performing sacrifices, we find sacrifice thus at different places, and conducted by different people, but now the persons and the place involved really are two of the later subjects, the present subject is the view of pre-Mosaic sacrifice. And according to the critics J and E hold that this was done, that the patriarch, any head of family, could sacrifice anywhere that he thought. Now of course they hold that continued until the time of Josiah, but that we are not arguing under this particular point. But they hold that according to the view of what happened before Moses, that's what J and E say happened and we have no dispute with them on that. It certainly is the picture J and E gives. But, they say, that is not the view of P. P knows no sacrifice before it is explicitly given to Moses and commanded.

Noah comes out of the ark, and offers no sacrifice. Abraham and Isaac go up and down through the land, offer no sacrifice. P knows of no sacrifice prior to its command by Moses. Now I trust in view of the previous discussion we have had on other points that little discussion is needed at this point. (5)

That the nature of P being what it is, lists, genealogies, detailed laws, there is little

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

occasion for mention ~~of~~ in P, of how the patriarchs performed sacrifices. There are lists of journies made, that sort of thing, there are lists of genealogies. But it is a simple matter in making the division to give all the sacrifice to J and E, and then say P knows no (5 1/2) It would be more correct to say, no sacrifice has been put in the sections that are considered to be written by P. But in this case it is not necessarily simply a case of taking all the sacrifice and putting it over here, then say look there is no sacrifice over here, you put the narrative practically all over here, and your sacrifice will almost naturally go with the narrative, because it is the account of the events that occurred. And the accounts of events in J is very slight, mostly in the form of enumeration or tabulation. So that this particular argument --it is very well that we understand how it is. Personally, I think it is one of the very weakest of the critical arguments, but one that is contained in all the books, so it is important that you fully understand. Any question regard it? Mr. Gregory? (6 1/4) No, I would not want to do that at this moment, for this reason, that that enters into the discussion of the place, so I'd rather leave that till just a little till we come to that head. As far as this head, What was Pre-Mosaic Sacrifice (6 1/2) I think it is better to leave. Mr. Abbott? (6 3/4) Yes, that is the critics' point. There is no sacrifice before Moses in P and they wax eloquent about it. I read you a selection last time from one of their books, and you'll find it in many books. J and E show the patriarchs sacrificing here and there. P tells how they go up and down through the land, but have no sacrifice. P knows nothing of sacrifice. Noah comes out of the ark, no sacrifice. Well, there is only one account of the sacrifice and they give that to J, so naturally P doesn't have it. It is the division between P and JE is in the main a division of a type of material, in which most of the narration goes to J, and the sacrifice would naturally be part of narration, rather than lists, Now it would have been possible for somebody to have made a list of Abraham's altars, Abraham built an altar in this place, and there he sacrificed while he was there, then he built one in this place and

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

there he sacrificed--that could have occurred and that would be the P style, but we do not happen to have any such list, there is no reason we should have, but it is convenient for them that we don't. Mr. Gregory? (8) No, it is the sections given to narrative are automatically given to J. And the performance of sacrifice by an ancient patriarch would be part of a story, rather than a list under enumeration. Unless there happened to be such a list, which there doesn't. Yes? (8 1/2) No, the big point that I have as to difference of style between JE and P is that they put all of the enumeration, statistical sort of material in P. That is the primary fact that there is difference of style between P and J. They originally divided --those that have the name of Jehovah were over here in J, then they said look at those that have the name of Elohim, what a different style. Wwell, youlook at the stuff that doesn't have the name Jehovah, and you find most of the enumerations don't have the name of Jehovah in, don't have any name of God--most of that material they had in the Elohist document. Now they divided the Elohist document and have taken out of it all the narration which they say has a style almost identical with J, and they put that over here with J, then what's left is enumeration. They say thestyle of P is verbose, repetitive. There was evening and morning one day, there was evening and morning two days, there was evening and morning a the third day. Thou shalt take this animal and treat it this way, cut up this way and this way and this way, and all these details. That is the typical thing of the style of P as they divided it. Though my argument is, dividing it that way, laws, detailed laws go into P, but accounts of what people did, long before Moses, unless they're lists, were tending to go into J or E, and in fact, practically all the narrative is doubtless only a stringing together of the sentences (10 1/4) that make up the P portion, in those. Except they'll have a longer section on the account of the Dukes of Edom, or something like that, which is enumeration. Yes, Mr. Golin? (10 1/2) No, that's not the argument at all. (stu) Before Moses, P doesn't have laws at all, before Moses.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

P has the detailed laws given to it, but before Moses P has the genealogical lists, the tabulations of the Dukes of Edom, the lists of what happened on the six days of creation, the details, well, there are detailed laws as to the type of animals to put into the ark, but that's about the only thing in the nature of laws that you find before. But that being the case, your narration, if it isn't a matter of a law for the sacrifice, but a statement of what they did in the sacrifice, that would come under narration, under JE. Yes. After Moses, you have the detailed laws as to how they are to sacrifice, and you have these laws contained in all three. After Moses, at the very beginning in JE, Moses declares how you are to sacrifice in the future. Then in the detailed law given to him, he is told how the animals are to be divided up and what is to be sacrificed for this and what for that, and what for the other, and then in the final declaration in this last oration in Deuteronomy, he exhorts them to obey the laws regarding the festivals and the sacrifices. So you have detailed laws for sacrifice in all three. Yes, Mr. MacKeen? (12) No, I'm not discussing now the laws given to Moses, as to Moses' time and later, where they are to sacrifice or who is to sacrifice. I am discussing now the picture that is given of the situation in the time of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the various documents, and in the documents/ Deuteronomy we have no such picture because Deuteronomy says nothing about Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. And in P we have very little such picture, because all P had to do with those things is to give a list of the dukes of Edom, the list of the genealogies, the particular lists of statistics and the matters of what happened first day, second day, third day, and that sort of thing. I simply say that the account of what happened in the days of the patriarchs would naturally be in the document that records what happened then, and they give practically all the narrative of those days to J or to E...

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

(stu) Under capttal C we had point 1, 2, and 3, and have now begun 4, and under4, we discussed small a , and are now discussing small b. The big point of C has nothing practically to do with the period of the patriarchs, the big point of C was the argument of development within the documents, that would be the whole point of C, the three documents developed in this way, and now we've been discussing small b, the view of pre-Mosaic sacrifice, and we want to go on to c, which is the discussion of what was small b, under 3: C, The Place of Sacrifice. I stressed yesterday at the end of the hour that if you had yesterday's lecture well in mind, it won't take long to have the discussion of today. If you don't have yesterday's lecture in mind, we can only take the whole hour to give the lecture over again, but we can get nothing out of what follows unless we keep these lectures thoroughly in mind, because today is discussing Tuesday's lecture, and Tuesday's lecture is perhaps the most important thing in the whole theory of development, the theory that the laws proceed from simple to complex by definite stages, and if you have it thoroughly in mind please listen closely, if you don't please just try to write down what you can get and study it later. Because we are too near the end of this semester to repeat these lectures.

But 3 was development as regards religious institutions;, a the view of ~~the~~ pre-Mosaic Sacrifice;, small b, the place of sacrifice . And we noticed Tuesday that the critics say that the law of J and E permits that they sacrifice anywhere that God hears. That the law of D restricts ~~that~~ sacrifice to one place, and that the law of P assumes that sacrifice is carried on only at one place. Now as I mentioned at the beginning today, I did not mention it yesterday, you notice that while they say there are three stages here, there actually are only two. The first stage J and E, sacrifice anywhere God appears. Well, we now readily admit that is what the patriarchs did, but this is not a question of what the patriarchs did, this is a question of what is the law given as to what Israel is to do in the future. And adcording to J and E they say, they are to continue as the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

patriarchs had done, to sacrifice anywhere that God had ever appeared. But they say, according to D, according to Deuteronomy, they are to sacrifice only in Jerusalem. And then they say that P assumes the sacrifice is only at Jerusalem. Now the word Jerusalem does not occur in any of these laws, none of them say they are to sacrifice only in Jerusalem. But D stresses that they are to sacrifice only in the place that God designated for them, so that we readily agree that Deuteronomy differs from the practice of the patriarchs, we readily agree with that. But then when they say that P assumes sacrifice at one place, they're not making a third stage at all, they're simply saying that P has the same as D, aren't they? So they really only have two stages, even though when they talk about detailed wording of P or something like that, actually, as far as any real change is concerned there are only two stages.

Now the law given in D is very emphatic. We find it beginning in Deut. 12.5, where we read that, unto the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes, to put his name there, even unto his habitation shall seek and thither shalt thou come and thither shalt thou bring thy burnt offerings, sacrifice and tithe and heave offerings, and there shall ye eat before the Lord your God and ye shall rejoice in all that ye put your hand unto. Verse 8, Ye shall not do after all the things that we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes. But when ye go over Jordan, and dwell in the land which the Lord your God giveth you to inherit, and when he giveth you rest from all your enemies round about, then there shall be a place which the Lord your God shall choose to cause his name to dwell there, thither shall ye bring all that I command you, your burnt offerings, and your sacrifices, your tithes, your heave offering of your hand--this is repeated several times inDeuteronomy, this law, and so Deuteronomy says a change is to be made. There is no question that between the practice of the patriarchs and the law of Deuteronomy there is a change, no question of that. But what the critics say is not simply that, what the critics say is between the law of JE and the law of Deuteronomy there is a

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

change, that's what they say, and that is where we are justified in taking sharp issue with them. Because, as I pointed out to you yesterday, and I hope you all have it thoroughly in mind today, they rest their argument upon Ex.20.24, and in Exodus 20.24, we have the chapter which I trust everyone here knows, is a chapter which contains the Ten Commandments, and after the giving of the Ten Commandments in chapter 20, then God speaks to Moses and gives the further law in the next three chapters, that is to be given to them, the book of the covenant, and in this law he says, in verse 24, I'll start with 23, Ye shall not make ~~unto~~ with me gods of silver, neither shall ye make unto you gods of gold, ~~and~~ An altar of earth thou shalt make unto me, and shall sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings, and thy peace offerings, 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 an altar of stone, thou shalt not built it of hewn stone, for if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it. Neither shalt thou go up by steps unto mine altar, ~~an~~ that thy nakedness be not discovered thereon.

Now this is the law of JE regarding sacrifice. All further detailed laws of sacrifice are either in P or D. Mr. Gregory, in this law, does it say they are to sacrifice only in one place? In the one I just read. (8 1/2) You can't? Didn't it say here very explicity that wherever I record my name, He says, in all places where I record my name, I will come unto thee and will bless thee. Do you think it was God's intention when the people were gathered at Sinai that from that time on they should never sacrifice except at Jerusalem? Do you think it was His intention that from that time on they could only sacrifice in one place. This explicitly avoids saying it's in one place and very strongly suggests it could be in various places. And what else could you do if you had a wilderness journey ahead? How could you sacrifice in just one place and spend 40 years wandering inthe wilderness? Or if you didn't wander in the wilderness, if you went right to Canaan, if you only took three weeks

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

to travel on the way, would you just not sacrifice at all for the three weeks. Suppose it took you five years to conquer Canaan, would you do no sacrifice during the five years? The law of JE is a law given to the people at the beginning of the wilderness journey, according to the view which the Bible holds, the prima facie view, and it would be absurd at that time to lay down the law, there is only one place in the world, where (10)

And Deuteronomy explicity says after you come in, after you cross the Jordan--I read it to you a minute ago--after you've crossed the Jordan, after you've come into the land, that I have promised to give you, after the Lord gives you peace from all your enemies, and you are established, then, he says, I will select the place out of your tribes and that is the place to which you are to bring your sacrifices, and there you are to perform it. Deuteronomy says the law is to be changed, the law is to be changed, after they conquer Canaan and are established in peace. From that time there is to be one place where they are to perform sacrifice. But before that, when they are in the wilderness, whether individuals are to be allowed to sacrifice here and there , or not, Moses certainly couldn't do all his sacrificing in one place. They moved their camp, they went here, they went there, they went the other place, the whole implication is that the law of the one place for sacrifice comes into existence after Canaan is conquered and not before. So you have two stages, as the critics say, you have a change in Deuteronomy, but the change is a natural change with the conquest of the land, one which could not have been introduced before. But Mr. Gregory was to a certain extent right when he said, it is hard to say, "I cannot say," that is to say, in what I just said, it does not say you will sacrifice in many different places, it doesn't say that, you gather an implication from that, when he says in every place where I put my name, there I will appear to you and bless you. There is a certain implication there are going to be many places, but there is no direct authorization to sacrifice in many places. The place of sacrifice varies before the land is

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

conquered, but most probably it was all under Moses' protection, done at any one time at one place, but that place might vary from week to week, and from month to month. So that the argument that there is a progress of law between JE, D and P, as far as the place of sacrifice is concerned, there is no ground of any difference between J and E. You put them together and call E,JE. You have then in JE what was the practice of the patriarchs. You have no statement it is not to continue for the present, the practice of the patriarchs, that the head of the family is to perform the sacrifice at the place God designates, wherever God has put His name. But when you come to D, just before going into the land, you have explicit commands, they are to change their practice, as soon as they have conquered the land and are settled in one place. And in P which is the detailed law given to the priest, in the wilderness, the laws which are given are mostly for the time after they go into the land and they assume that there is one place to sacrifice. They do not assume that they are to sacrifice here and there, the sacrifice is all under the central direction of the High Priest and his men at the place where the headquarters of the religion is. That is assumed throughout P, which is what you would expect if P was written in the wilderness...

P.101. (3/4)

...(stu) (1 1/4) we don't believe there is any JE or D. Well, let's go on to the next point. d is consideration of what was c yesterday. I hope you all have in mind thoroughly what was c yesterday. d, Two alleged results of this centralization. Now the critics, some of them, give separately as differences ~~between~~ in the law, some stress one, some stress the other, but you will find these things given one way or another in practically all the critical books, and under c, which we are now discussing under d, I mentioned number (1), the Law of Assylum, and I trust you all recall that what the critics said was, before the time of Josiah, when a man felt that he was being unjustly accused of murder, it had really been an accident, not a murder, that man, then, would run to God's altar where he would be safe, because surely nobody

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

would be so sacriligious as to grab a man right hanging onto the altar of God, and kill him, therefore they would run to the altar where they would be safe. So there was always a place of safety, just as today there is in any country where there is revolution, the people are apt to run to the embassies of other neutral countries. Cardinal Mindzenty, in Hungary, six years ago, when the Hungarians revolted against Russia, they released the Cardinal from prison where he had been five or six years. When the Russians again seized the power, Cardinal Mindzenty fled to the American Embassy, and there in the home of the American Ambassador, Cardinal Mindzenty has lived for the last six years, that is his place of Assylum. He dare not go out onthe street, if he did the Communist government would seize him, and put him in prison. He cannot get out of the country, there is no way to get from there to any other country, without passing into the power of the Communists, but as long as he stays in the American Embassy, it is a place of assylum, and unless the Communist government of Hungary is ready to make war with the United States, it will not touch him as long as he stays there in the American Embassy. That is his place of assylum.

Now the critics say, as long as there were altars all through the land up to the time of Josiah, they had altars everywhere, in every main section, if a man was chopping wood and the head of the axe came off and hit the other fellow and killed him and there is nobody there to see it and for all the people know, he murdered the other man, he thinks the other man's relatives naturally would want to kill him, who had killed their father. He ~~was~~ would rush to the altar and there find safety.

But now they say, when in Deuteronomy, the priests ~~man is~~ manage to switch the law, so that Josiah ordered that hereafter all sacrifice is to be at the altar at Jerusalem, if a person was falsely accused of murder, 150 miles north of Jerusalem it would be impossible for him to run to Jerusalem to get to the altar, and therefore they say Deuteronomy realizing the problem, made a provision for it, and said that there would be cities set aside which would be a place of refuge for the man who was

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

accused of murder when really he was only guilty of an accident.

So they point out then quite frankly and truly that in Deuteronomy 19.1-13 there are extensive details given, on the cities which are to be prepared for --set aside, so that a man can flee to them in case he was falsely accused of murder, and there if they find that he was really innocent of murder they will let him stay there and keep him safe. That is given in Deuteronomy, that takes the place of the altar, and then in Numbers, they say, in Numbers 35, as we looked at yesterday, from vss. 9-34, you have the same laws given in P except that it is with more detail, where one says he kills him unawares, the other says he kills him unintentionally, and they use different terminology. They say that the terminology is quite different, but they admit the law is identical. And Deuteronomy says cities are to be set aside for this, Numbers says, cities of refuge are to be set aside, so they say you have a new term, in P, cities of refuge. Well, now, actually, I mentioned also yesterday that in Joshua 20, we have the acoount of how this was actually done, when they conquered the land, they set it up with cities of refuge, and Joshua // 20 they ~~said was~~ say is a combination of P and D, because the style has features of both. But as just pointed out, I trust that everyone has observed whether there are three stages in this law, or two, and I think everyone will readily see that there are two stages, they say the language is different, one calls them cities, the other cities of refuge. What difference does that make. One says he does it unwittingly, the other says he does it without hating him in advance. It is the same idea, in slightly different language. But the law of D and the law of P is identical. And they say the law of JE is different, because JE has no provision for cities of refuge, but instead the altar is the place of assylum. Well, now, that's what they say, and there are two features of that I'd like to glance at, first is this. According to the prima facie view, what is the point of establishing cities of refuge while they are going through the wilderness?

You don't need cities of refuge till after you've conquered Canaan, The

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

people are one big group, centering around the tabernacle, they may be scattered as much as ten or fifteen miles, they're not scattered over an area as big as Canaan certainly. They may be moving about some, with their flocks, but they always have a central headquarters where Moses is, and if a man is falsely accused, he can flee to where Moses is. So why do you need cities of refuge before you go into the land? Why should it be necessary, when God gives the law at the beginning of the wilderness wanderings, that He then tell about cities of refuge? When He gives the detailed laws to the priests it is natural to include this which was to be part of their provision for the distribution. And when Moses gives his declaration to the people, just before they conquer Canaan, that is a natural place for him to stress this message. A change has come into the land.

The critics say it is the change which came about when Josiah's reformation was forcing them to do all their sacrificing at one place. But now the second thing that is very vital to note about it is the fact as to the law of JE. We notice in connection with the place of sacrifice that they say that JE says you can sacrifice anywhere that God puts his name. That's not quite what it says, when we look at it. The implication is that where God leads Moses to have a place of sacrifice in different places (9 1/4) but it doesn't ~~say that~~ mean just any head of a family, it doesn't say so, that's reading into it.

Well, now, in this case, it is based, as I pointed out to you yesterday, upon Ex.21.14. It would be good for you to memorize some of the most important of these references, but I would like for you to be able to find all of them quickly, if necessary, in the Bible, to know where they are at least. Now in Gen.21.14 which, as you all immediately recognize, is part of the law of the covenant code, the book of the law. Yes? (10) Ex.21.14, not Gen.21.14, thank you very much. In Ex.21.14, which is the book of the law, which is the book of the covenant, in the book of the covenant, we read, starting with verse 12, he that smiteth a man so that he die shall be surely put

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

to death, and if a man lie not in wait but God doth deliver him into his hand--now they say here is a difference, JE says God delivers him into his hand, one of the others says he unwittingly killed him, one of the others says he killed him without having hated him before. Well, it is a difference of terminology, but if it ~~is~~ any difference of meaning? God delivers into his hand. Then I will appoint thee a place whither he shall flee, and if a man comes presumptuously upon his neighbor, to slay him with guile, thou shalt take him from mine altar, that he may die. Now, does this say, that the place of assylum is the altar? It does not say. You can draw that implication from it, but you certainly are not required to. Another interpretation is a more natural one. When he says I will appoint thee a place whither he shall flee, does not mention (11 1/4) that after they go into the land and are scattered over the land, God will appoint places. And consequently gives the law of the cities of refuge in brief, there is no need of going into detail 38 years before (11 1/2)

But I will appoint thee a place where he shall go. It doesn't say he shall flee to my altar. Of course you read on, and he says that if a man come presumptuously upon his neighbor to slay him with guile, thou shalt take him from mine altar, that he may die. Does that mean that they always flee to the altar? Does that mean that if a man--here are these altars scattered through the land. Somebody accidentally kills somebody else. He is in danger of being killed by the relatives. All right he goes and grabs God's altar and hangs onto it for the next 30 years, so as to be safe, because they won't attack ~~them~~ him as long as he is hanging onto the altar, not a reasonable thing at all. The thing is that a person in terrible fear is apt to run to the most sacred thing of he can think of, and grabs ahold of it and the altar would be that, and he runs and grabs the altar, and Moses says that this man is a real murderer, even if he grabs the altar of God and clings to it. You don't have to get a guide and say let's wait. In a few hours you'll get so tired of hanging onto the altar you'll have to leave it and ~~you~~ we can grab you. You don't have to do that,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

you can just grab him away from the altar, and take him, because God's altar won't protect a murderer. A murderer is to die, according to the law of God. Many of our people today think that it is wrong to kill a murderer, but they certainly are not following the Scriptures. Scripture says, thou shalt take him from mine altar, that he die. That does not mean that the altar is the prescribed place of assylum. What he says is, I will appoint thee a place whither he shall flee, and this is one of the most important of all the critical arguments, of a development between the documents, and as you see, its basic foundation in the statement, the alleged statement of JE, does not say what they maintain it does. So I...

P.102 (4/16/62) (3/4)

...on the basis of JE and the D and P documents, and so on, and he is quite puzzled by it. It just simply shows how widespread this teaching is. We find it today in any college and university class where anything is taught about the Bible, and in practically every theological seminary more than 30 years old, we find this taught as a sure fact. So it is good for us to know what the real situation is as regarding these alleged facts. Now we were speaking last time about the discussion of the alleged developments, that was IV, D, ~~4d,~~ and under that we look at #4, the examination of for development the evidence within the documents. And we noticed c, the place of sacrifice, and saw just how shaky what is claimed as to what the law presented in JE is. Then we looked at d, the laws of assylum and of permanent enslavement, and we saw this, that the critical theories resulted from reading something into the book of the covenant law, which is not necessarily there. When it says , you shall take him from my altar, it does not say that they can flee to the altar if they desire. Question? (2) I thought I had, I may have just barely said a word about it. You remember that the second of these laws under this head, the one relating to permanent enslavement, the statement in the book of the covenant here, that when a man who has become a slave for a temporary period, desires to continue in this permanent relationship to his master, rather than leave the wife

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

whom the master has provided for him, that he shall express his desire to do so, and then it says they shall take him to God, the word is Elohim. The King James Version translates it, take him to the judges. But Elohim certainly does not mean judges. To take him to God, it says. And it would be a way of saying, take him to the religious center, and there it says that he put his ear against the doorpost, and they drive the awl through the ear, as a sign of this permanent relationship which he has voluntarily entered into, That, the critical claim, you notice, was that that was the law during all the year when they said altars were all through the land. And they could worship in every portionof the land, wherever God had put His name. And consequently that when the new law, they say, was made in the time of Josiah, that there should only be one offering in Jerusalem, then that it would be inconvenient to come to Jerusalem, everytime this happened. And consequently, this law, when we find it in Deuteronomy, does not say he shall come to God. That is a miss. There he says that he put his ear against the doorpost of the house, and consequently, they say, that this is a development fitting in with the centralization at the one altar. This is the critical claim. We notice that, as one of the two that they say comes from the change in the place of sacrifice. Now I thought I had pointed out last time that the name Elohim there, going to the religious center, would be entirely reasonable inthe wilderness journey. The center was there where Moses, where the tabernacle was, it was the religious center,in an important thing like this it would be altogether reasonable that they should come to the religious center, but when they went into the land, then the religious center would be in the one place that God should designate. They would have it in the one place then and consequently it would be a long journey to come to that place and so the regulation is made that the local officials should take care of this on a secular basis, without the need of their coming to the religious center. There is a change in the law, a definite change in the law. The critics say there is a definite change in the law.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

But they say the change corresponds to the development between--of the situation before Josiah's time and the situation after, We point out that the change would just as well apply to the change from the time when they were in the wilderness, gathered around the tabernacle. Possibly being sometimes quite a distance away from it for weeks at a time as they cared for their flocks and their herds, but always getting back at least once in every two months, --between that situation and the situation when they were settled in Canaan and spread out over the whole land of Canaan, so that this is a different situation from the case of the law, of the place of sacrifice, where we say they are reading into the statement of E. Here we don't think ~~say~~ they are reading into it, but we think the situation is fully explained by the change of condition right in Moses' own day. It does not need (6 1/4)

Mr. Gueiros? (6 1/2: stu: we have noticed there is a marked distinction between JE and D, but not much between D and P, why then make this difference between D and P when we see that it is almost a repetition of the law? There is not much of a change.) On the particular points we have looked at, yes. On the particular points we've looked at there is very little difference between the law of D and P, but there are a great many differences in detail between the law of P and D, and those differences are mostly, we can fully assume, by the fact that D is Moses' address to the people, in which he is exhorting the people to obey the law and stressing the matters that it is vital for the people to have in mind. While P differs in having a tremendous amount of detail which there would be no particular point in Moses' giving to the people, they wouldn't remember it anyway, but it is detail which was available in the law book for the study of the priests, and ~~th~~ for the application. For instance, suppose Moses, in his address in the Plains of Moab, were to say, now be sure you remember, 50 years after you get into the land you are to have the Jubilee, 50 years after you get into the land. There is a year in which all the land is to lie fallow for a year, in which there is a Moratorium on debt, and so on, he'd explain all that, how many would remember it

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

fifty years later? Wouldn't be any point. But in P, the law for the priests, comprising the greater part of the last part of Exodus, of Leviticus, and a great deal of Numbers, you have the book which the priests are to study and to apply when the time comes. So that you have much more detail in P, there is a difference in that regard. But as to whether there is a difference, most of their claims to differences are, as we pointed out, hardly true. Now --yes? (8 1/2) Yes, we are under main point, IV, under that capital C, under that 3 was the argument for development within the documents, stated, 4 is the examination of these documents. And under 4 we looked at c, the place of sacrifice, and then d, the laws of assylum and of permanent enslavement. And Mr. Curry said I had only covered ~~a part of it~~ assylum and not yet covered permanent enslavement. Consequently, I went into permanent enslavement now, before going on to a much more important one, small e, The Law Regarding the Priesthood. And this particular law answers to some extent the question that Mr. Gueiros just asked. Because, as Mr. Gueiros pointed out, most of these alleged developments we have looked at, have been developments as between what they call the oldest one, JE, the law of the covenant, and the Law of Deuteronomy, but in this case, as we have already seen, when we've noticed what the law was, you had three stages , they claim, in the law. You have three stages in the law, according to--in the book of the covenant, Ex.20-23, you have nowhere there a statement that only the Levites are to perform sacrifices. Nor do you have a statement there, that only Aaron and his family are to perform the sacrifice. The law of the covenant does not go into who was to perform sacrifice. And in the next chapter it simply says, when they named, promulgated the covenant, and Moses and the elders of the people sat down to a feast together, as an observer of the festivities connected with the establishment of the covenant, it says that Moses had young men bring in the sacrifice, and offer the sacrifice. It does not say who these young men were. There is no mention in the book of the covenant of who the priesthood is to be referring to. But then they say when you get to Deuteronomy

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

you'll find that the book of Deuteronomy repeatedly refers to, literally in Hebrew it is, the priest, the Levite, which we translate the Levitical priest. In other words, the priest of the family of Levi, and in Deuteronomy, the people are exhorted to observe a certain relationship to the priest, the Levite, to bring their sacrifice to the Priest, the Levite, to do certain things in relation to the Priest, the Levite. That occurs a number of times in Deuteronomy, and so they say at the time of Josiah, the Priesthood which formerly the sacrifice they say could be performed by any head of a family, which certainly was true at the time of Abraham. Abraham performed sacrifices, Isaac, and Jacob, sacrifices were performed by any pious individual, particularly a head of a family in the days of Genesis. But they say that is not in the Document Theory, they say that is only J and E, but then they say that the book of the covenant continues the same practice. It certainly does not deny it.

Then they say that Deuteronomy restricts it to the tribe of Levi, that the tribe of Levi which had come into existence, they would say, as a group during the days before Josiah became king, that they had now managed to get sufficient control that the law of Deuteronomy restricts to them. But then, they say, when you get to the P document, at the time of the exile, there you'll find the priesthood further restricted, and you'll find there that the priest is Aaron, Moses' brother, that Aaron was made priest and that Aaron's sons after him are to be priests, and that the high priests, the leaders of the priests, and the others who performed the sacrifices...

P.103. (3/4)

...of the group which can perform sacrifices, from first all the families in JE to the tribe of Levi in D, and then to the family of Aaron in P. Now we noticed that under 3, when we noticed what their claim was, as to the developments within the documents, and this, and the Place of Sacrifice, are the two features that they stressed most, they are the two features that are contained in all books on the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

subject. Other features, some have certain one in , some have others, they vary, some emphasize some, some others, but the Place of Sacrifice and the persons who perform the sacrifice are the two which are most stressed, and in this case, as we see, they claim the three stages of development, a change from JE to D, and then from D to P. Now that is the claim which they make. And under 4 here we are examining the evidence for the document within the document, and our observation regarding this would be, now if you only had the document, you don't, of course, you have the book of history too, that was a greater argument, that is one we must go ~~in~~ into in considerable detail, but if you only had the documents themselves, here we do not feel that this argument is as valid as they claim that it is. We do not feel that way because we feel that the emphasis fits the situation in the time of Moses. We readily admit that inthe time of Abraham it did not have to be a descendant of Aaron or even a descendant of Levi to perform sacrifices. It was--sacrifice was something which was not restricted at that time, the head of a family would do it, and as a matter of fact, there were very few who were rendering sacrifice to the Lord, but many who were rendering sacrifice to false deities at that time. But when the children of Israel were established as a nation, and a law of Judah which it was the Lord's will to maintain as a center in which ~~the people~~ he could keep alive (3)the knowledge of himself, and through which he could give His Word to the world, and through which He could prepare the way for the coming of His Son, the Lord Jesus Christ to be the Saviour of the world, it was important that regulations and systems be established to keep the Word of God alive within that people through the years until the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. And consequently it was necessary for certain regulations to be established, to be endeavored to be maintained during the history of the nation of Israel, and some of these we find promulgated by Moses, or through Moses at the very beginning, when the book of the covenant was given , but there would be no point in trying to give every ~~little thing~~ thing there. If you tried, ~~in trying~~ to condense this whole portion into

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

the first week, everybody would be quite busy by the end of the week. Maybe (3 3/4) when we try to do it in the course of a semester. I remember that when I first began to teach Hebrew, I was in Europe at the time, and had thought that I would not come back this year, I wanted to study another year, at the University of Berlin, but Dr. Robert Dick Wilson was anxious to have me come immediately, and sent me a wire for me to come right away. So when I got his ~~wife~~ wire, I came. School had already been going two weeks, and I got there, and he said well, you don't need to start teaching right away, take a couple ~~fo~~ of days, I can teach the courses a couple of days more while you get settled, so I came and sat in the back while he was teaching the course, and I found that he had the students at the board, after two weeks, writing the (4 1/2) verbs with accusative suffixes on the end and they were writing these forms on the board, ~~and~~ after two weeks. Well, I began to think, at this rate, another week and they'll know more than I know. But on after another couple of days, he turned the class over to me, I found that he, to whom the material was so simple, he could read it just as easily as he could English, it seemed so simple to him, he had gone so rapidly through it, he hadn't taught Beginning Hebrew for 30 years, he had gone so rapidly that I had to start at the very first principles, had to go back, didn't have to take what you take in the first two days, but had to take most of the rest, right from the start. I think there is always a danger in anything you're introducing. You have to take what is vital and give it right away. You cannot give something that you have to change, to reverse later, but you have to leave out whatever is not ~~urgent,~~ essential, even though it may be very important, until you get the essentials, and then ~~get~~ give the other later on. Well, in the covenant code, withthe giving of the Ten Commandments, and the giving ~~fo~~ of the fundamental law, there were two essential features, one was to give the basic principle, which would be important for all time, and another one to give the laws which must be observed immediately. You could not have the people wait there a few

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

years until they get the details of the law, they have to get the basic principles and those details of immediate validity, immediate importance. But as much of the details as could be postponed, it is better to postpone and get your main features across, and some of your main features you can only give in bare outline at the beginning, so we have these matters of the place of sacrifice and the person to sacrifice, very important if the knowledge of God is to be kept true, through this long period of years, until the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, it was very important that there be an orderly conduct of the worship ~~for~~ of the people, and in those days withvery little of --none of rapid transportation, no telegraph, no telephone, no means of rapid communication, such as we have today, no newspaper which could tell the people of northern Palestine what would happen in southern Palestine, it would be very easy if you had all sorts of religious centers through the land for great divergences to enter. It was easy enough for the people to go off into apostasy. Under the circumstances it was necessary that the religious life, as far as possible, be kept under a close direction right from the center, and the best way to do that was to restrict the sacrifice, the most vital feature of the life, that would look forward most directly to the coming of Christ, to restrict that to one place under one direction, at the place where the original copies of the book of the law would be, and where it would be easier to have it kept intact and kept correctly, and consequently these laws are very important in the plan of God for the nation of the religion among the children of Israel, but they are not great principles like the Ten Commandments, of moral validity. They are matters which are important but they are important but their importance is of a different kind And as long as they were in the wilderness and were all centered around the hea quarters anyway, even though they might go off with their flocks and herds f weeks at a time they would always be coming back, they were centered headquarters, Moses was in active direction of the people. They ~~we~~ woul have a one center where the sacrifices can be made. And they would aut

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

have the religion under one central direction, and it was not necessary to make these (8 3/4)

When you come to the law of Deuteronomy, that is given by Moses to the people just before they begin their great conquest of Canaan, and the conquest of Canaan would knock a great many things out of their head. There again, for Moses to give too much detail would be rather silly. His purpose was to give the things that are vital to them to have in their minds now, and as far as possible that which it would be important for them to recall, for later times, for the people as a whole to recall. Well, now it was not extremely important for the people as a whole to recall just how the priests were to be selected. Just how they were to know who the priests were. That was not tremendously important. But by this time it had been made clear that the care of the sanctuary and the direction of the religion was to be carried on by the Levites, and the work of the Levites scattered throughout the land. So under these circumstances it was very vital that the people be urged to recognize the fact that just anybody couldn't rise up and say I'm going to represent the Lord ~~in front of~~ among you, and say I'm going to direct how the sacrifices are--but the Levites were in charge of this, who were scattered through the land. And when they would come up to the main headquarters for their big sacrifices, they wouldn't have any particular part in deciding who was going to conduct them, that would have been already determined then. But the fact that the religious life was in the direction of the tribe of Levi, was a vital thing for Moses to stress in his talks to the people in his farewell address. When it came to this matter of the supreme leader in the priesthood and the actual carrying on of the sacrifice, as the principal center, that was a thing which could be prescribed inthis book of the Law. I read the other day that Teddy Kennedy had just crossed one of the great hurdles in the way of his becoming United States Senator. He crossed this hurdle in that he reached his 30th birthday, and according to the Constitution of the United States, nobody can become a United States Senator without having become 30 years of age, so you see, he is way ahead of a lot of

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

you as far as becoming United States Senator is determined. But I wonder how many of you who have been brought up in the United States and studied something about American civil law in various schools, how many could have told me if I asked you, what age does a man have to be, to be a United States Senator. If you had asked me a week ago, I don't think I would have remembered just what it was. I would say the Constitution prescribes a certain age, but I would not be at all sure that I remembered what the age was. There is a certain age that a man has to be before he can be president, a different age to be senator, I don't remember whether there is an age for congressman, for house of representatives, or not. Those things are written in the Constitution, and when it comes to matters involving them , it does not ~~not~~ occur often, it isn't necessary to know, and we don't try to remember. I was just talking with Mr. Faucette about the details of the Commencement program, and I didn't say put so-and-so, and so-and-so, and so-and-so on the program, I said look over the programs of the last two years and see who was on the programs then, and try to rotate it so that we have other people have a place on the program, rather than to have the same ones. I don't remember who was on the program last year, I have no idea who was on it the year before. There would be no point in my trying to remember. I look a thing like that up. But there are other matters which we need to have before us all the time, and which we should have in mind. So the law book for the priest can set down exactly how the priests are elected, who the high priest is, and so on, and that is...

P.104. (3/4)

...these differences are fully explained on the basis of the situation in the time of Moses without its being necessary to assume a historical development to explain the differences between the three main law codes in the Pentateuch. Mr. MacKeen? (1) It is a thing that could be, but I don't think it was, because we have at the beginning of the wilderness journey, we have great numbers of Levites, and you remember, the Levites stood with Moses in the great crisis and God was going to reward the Levites

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

for that by setting them apart for Himself. And then you remember that in the book of Genesis, it says how Simeon and Levi had been ~~threatened and~~ treacherous and had killed the people of Shechem, and Jacob laid a curse upon them in Genesis 49, Jacob said, and Simeon and Levi, instruments of violence were in their hands, I will scatter them in Israel, and there was a curse on Levi and on Simeon, but the tribe of Simeon was given an area of land in the land of Palestine, and soon they found themselves unable to hold back the Canaanites in their area, and they were scattered through the land and pretty much disappeared as a tribe, but the tribe of Levi had the curse upon them which had been placed onthem through Jacob, they were to be scattered in Israel, the Levites were given no land, but they, standing true and standing with Moses, ~~they~~ their curse was turned into a blessing and though they were scattered abroad throughout the land, and given no tribal inheritance like the others, they were God's representatives throughout the land, and they had particular cities in ~~their~~ every section. Now that's the law as it stands in the Bible. According to the critics, the Levites didn't even come into existence till after they had been in Palestine for quite a long time. According to them, they are a group of people who came into existence and gradually got control of these (2 3/4) ~~(2~~ and according to them the whole matter (3) was a fiction written in in the time of David. Yes? (stu.) Yes, exactly.

Well, so much then for the claim of development within the documents. ~~Th~~ We do not feel that the evidence is actually at all strong for the claim which the critics make, about the priests. They claim, of course, that this business of Aaron and the Aaronic priesthood is (3 3/4) at the time of the exile. And in order to do that, they have to eradicate many, many (4) errors from the earlier documents. But a strange thing is that there is one verse, Deuteronomy 10.6, in which Moses recounting their history tells how Aaron died and his son Eleazer became priest, in Deut.10.6. Well, now that is not the P document. That speaks of a priesthood as being in the hands of Aaron and passed on to his son, Eleazer.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

That is in the book of Deuteronomy, and that's what they say is not held until you get to the P document. But stranger yet, is the fact that the critics feel that this particular verse does not belong in the D document though it is the book ~~fo~~ of Deuteronomy. They think it is taken from the E document, so they put it back in the very earliest stage, although it does go pretty far to contradict their theory that the Aaronic priesthood is a matter which did not co me till the time of th8 exile. They do it because they are in a dilemma. The language of the verse, from its general type of material, ~~is~~ does not fit at all with the D and P material, but with the earlier material. So I believe unanimously all the scholars (5 1/4) and say that this verse is from the E document. I have brought here sometimes Addis' two books, one the oldest book of Hebrew history, which gives what he thinks of the J and E documents consecutively, the other the priestly book and the Deuteronomic, he keeps this in the Deuteronomic book, but he puts an E before and after. He evidently couldn't fit it into E document as he held it but he thinks on the basis of style, you have to say it is part of the E document. And yet it contradicts their theory rather strongly. I think that is a good thing to be aware of, in case you get into discussion on this matter. Yes? (6) They surely must. ~~But I ir~~ But I have not come across a discussion. I looked in Driver's Commentary this morning regarding it, and in Driver's Commentary on Deuteronomy he has an argument how, on the basis of style, this belongs in the E document, but he doesn't pay any attention to the fact that it contradicts their whole claim about the P document. Of course, it may be that you're not thinking so much about the claim of the P document, when you're looking at Deuteronomy, which is mostly of course after the P document, so it would seem to be a very serious oversight. Surely some of them must have noticed it and tried make an excuse. The situation of course is that their claim is that you can divide the Pentateuch into these documents on certain definite criteria, and when you find that these criteria simply don't work, why you have to do the best division you can, and they do the best they can to divide it on the basis of this material. We claim that

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

it does not divide on those criteria. If I was to say that in this ~~vast~~ class, all of the fellows in this class were born south of the Mason-Dixon Line, and all the girls were born north of it, If I were to make that statement it would be very easy to start an investigation and see how far you had to go, in order to see whether it worked out. But that is the way in making any division of matter, you have to find criteria that works, and when you find criteria that do work , you often are on the way to some very important discovery, in history or in science, but in all the sciences, the danger is that people suggest criteria ~~material~~ and then when they don't work they try to force the data into working, instead of recognizing the fact that something is wrong with their theory. That's what is done constantly with the theory of evolution, for instance. And of course, this is really a ~~favorite~~ phase of the theory of evolution, is its application to the Bible with the critical theory.

So now that was e, the priesthood. Under small f, I want to mention a conclusion to this section: f, Conclusion. Simply to summarize what we have observed in examining these views. (1) In only one case is a real claim of as many as 3 stages of development presented. This book that was in the high school library up here, I only saw just as I was coming into class, so I didn't get time to look into it in detail, but I am quite sure--I hope to look into it in detail later, and I am quite sure that I'll find, ~~now~~, as you do find in books of that type--the claim that you have a progress in many (9 1/2) a development between the J document and the E document and then the D and then the P documents. You have development in many regards as among them. Now we look at the alleged development regarding religious ideas, regarding the idea of God, and then, now we're looking at the alleged development regarding institutions, regarding laws. And in this, the way it is stated, you would think you have a certain stage of development in J , another in E, another in D, another in P, but we have not noticed any of their main points, where they claim there is much difference between J and E. We notice, in relation to the idea of God, a claim was made (10 1/4)

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

but in these of religious institutions, we have not noticed any such claims. In relation to E the very first law given, JE, the very first law given, and D, they do make many claims of changing the law between that which we say was given at the beginning of the wilderness journey and that given at the end as they were about to enter Canaan. They have many claims of changes there, many of them we think rest upon reading into the Pentateuch. But they have many such claims there. But claims of real changes in the law, between D and P, they have very, very few. They will claim that the terminology is different , that there are additions, that there is more detail, they'll make all sorts of statements like that, but as to actual claims, alleged development of the Law, it is a different situation. The only real one they have is this one of the priests, where they claim it was the whole tribe of Levites, and now restricted to the family of Aaron, that is a big claim. But that's the only they give.

Actually, their alleged claim of development between four different documents narrows down pretty much to ~~three of the~~ two when you examine it carefully. Though it is given in all the books, they will give what is the law of JE, the law of D, what is the law of P, and it will look as if it were three. We notice how in the case of the Place of Sacrifice, they say that JE, wherever God appears, you can sacrifice, in D it is restricted to one place, then regarding P, they say P does not stress the restriction to one place, but assumes it. So it is different from D, different in its approach but the law is exactly the same. There is no (12) claim of any difference in the law. So that the claim of development through four stages, actually there is no case where they claim there are four stages, and there is only one important place where they claim there are three stages as far as (12 1/4) are concerned. All the rest of the boil down to only two stages. Yes? (stu) In their general statements they do. J, E, D, and P. In fact, the earlier ones used to try to show, you will find many earlier books on the Criticism that talk about the Decalogue, the Ten Commandments of J. You see, after the Golden Calf incident, God again gave Moses certain definite statements about the Law, in Exodus 34.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Now these statements which stress certain things, largely ceremonial things, such as "thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk...

P.105. (3/4)

...and to get ten specific laws out of 34, they disagree as to what the ten are, there is no specific ten. They all agree that one of them is, "thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk." And actually of course that is the law which has more importance in Judaism today than almost any other. Because it is on the basis of that law that the Jews today will not eat milk and meat at the same meal, lest they should mix the milk of the mother with the flesh of the kid, so they will not eat meat and milk at the same meal today, and you look at any butter, which is a milk product, at the same meal with meat, and many Jews have two different sets of dishes, one that they use with the meat and one they use with the butter and milk. Some of you may have read Herman Wouk's novel, "Marjorie Morgenstern," which was a best seller a few years ago. It tells about a young Jewish girl who gets into all kinds of wickedness and vice, as she started out this kind of life and the other kind of life in New York, looking for happiness, looking for satisfaction and she can't find it in all these different things, and it is a very highly moral book in its general intent. Finally the girl ends up with finding no satisfaction in any of these kinds of life. She ends up marrying an orthodox Jewish fellow and settling down to being a good solid wife for him, and having two different sets of dishes, one for things that have meat in and one for things that have milk in. But you see, that is all based upon this command, "thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk." The command actually is given a fair amount of (2 1/2) stress, being given in what they call the J document, in ~~Gen~~ Exodus 34, and also in the E document in the book of the covenant, but the reason for that is because that was a Canaanite religious practice, seething a kid, boiling a kid in its mother's milk, ~~but~~ was an important Canaanite practice that has recently been discovered in archeological excavations, and this ~~was~~ was a means of separating the Israelites from a common heathen custom of today.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

The custom has disappeared, but the practice based upon it has remained a vital feature of Judaism up to this time. But the critics claim that that is the earliest law, the J law of 34, and then you have the E law of Ex.20-23, but actually there is hardly anything of vital importance of difference between them, so when it comes to their discussion, that doesn't enter in (3 3/4) They usually, though they speak of the four different documents, they speak of the first two together as JE, so they speak of it as though there were three stages, but their general statements will show you the four stages of development, then most of their statements will speak more in detail of three stages of development, but when you examine the evidence for three stages, you will find that it usually boils down to only two, and the alleged differences between the other two are practically entirely a matter of wording or of additional detail which would hardly be necessary in such addresses as Moses gave, which were vital to have in a book for the priests. Yes? (4 1/4) They say these were stories that developed during the time of the exile, although--they say the P document contains a considerable amount of early material but also a good deal that was in these books at that time (5 1/4)

Well, so much for (1).

(2), Many of the alleged differences are (5 1/2) caused by reading something into the text.---And rest heavily upon arguments from Style. I think that is abundantly illustrated in the very laws we have examined. Rest heavily upon Arguments from Style. All the books ~~that~~ of the critics say, that the P document knows nothing of any sacrifice before the time of Moses. Before it was ordained that Aaron should sacrifice, it knows of no sacrifices, it has no sacrifice by Noah at the end of the Flood, no sacrifice by Abraham, but of course it nowhere says in the P document these people did not sacrifice. It nowhere says that this is the first of sacrifice that was ever done. They simply give all the earlier statements about sacrifice to the other documents. And the same with the matter of the Place of Sacrifice. They say that you could sacrifice wherever you wanted in JE, wherever God put His name, but actually it does not say that, He says wherever

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

I appear unto you, there I will bless you. It doesn't say anything about sacrifice. Sacrifice is in the previous verse. The asylum. He doesn't say you can go to the altar of God for asylum ~~today~~ in J, He says that is a man kills someone accidentally, I will assign a place where he shall flee. If he has done it intentionally, you may take him away from My altar, and slay him. That doesn't say that the place he is going to assign is the altar, it is an implication which is not necessary at all. It is an argument from Silence.

So they are caused by reading something into the text, and (7 1/2) upon Arguments from Style, many of the alleged differences.

Then (3) Such differences as exist can be explained by the history of the time of Moses and do not require a ~~period~~ theory of development over a long period of time. I think these three statements rather summarize our examination of the alleged development within the documents. With these three matters to take into consideration the argument is not very strong that there is a development within the document. But it is presented in the critical book in such a way as to sound as if there is, and then they go on to a much stronger argument than this, which we will make a capital D:

D, The Argument from History. And this is a very strong argument indeed. You can simply take facts from the Bible and present them in such a way as to sound like a tremendously strong argument. Our answer is not to deny any of these facts, but to say let us look at all of them. Mr. MacKeen? (9 1/2) No, this is the third of the arguments for development. The first was discrepancies within the documents. The second was logical development, progress of the documents. And the third one is that they fit the history, that the documents fit the history. I gave that, oh a good three months ago. (stu.) Sure, isn't that the same thing? You see, I gave it before in the JE form, this time I gave it in the D form, but the idea is identical. How did I word it before? Yes, Violation of the laws, as evidence of non existence. In other words, how do you know whether the laws were violated or not? Well, look at the history. The claim is--you see, the words I'm giving are not inspired words. There is nothing holy

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

about the words I use, but the ideas are important ideas. And you can express the ideas in many different ways. And the idea of this is , that in the history between the time of Moses and the time of Josiah, they say, you find the practice follows the law of JE. In other words they sacrificed in many different places. Solomon went up to Gibeon to sacrifice. He didn't have his great sacrifice at Jerusalem, they went up to Gibeon to sacrifice, and before Solomon became king, when they tried to make Adonijah king, they went out into the valley outside Jerusalem and they had sacrifices there, and Samuel had several different places he went around to and gave sacrifice, so they say, before the time of Josiah, sacrifice was not restricted to one place. It fits JE they say, it does not fit D. And then they say, it is only at D that sacrifice becomes restricted to one place, and restricted to the Levites, because Solomon himself went to Gibeon, and offered 3000 sacrifices. Solomon was no Levite, and he offered 3000 sacrifices. Of course, when they say that, I ask does that mean Solomon went out with his own hand and killed 3000 animals? Or did somebody else do the actual sacrifice? But what the Bible says, is, Solomon sacrificed 3000 oxen. So they say, the person to sacrifice was not restricted, nor the place, until the time of Josiah, till E. And then they say, after that it is the Levites until you get to the time of the exile, when it becomes restricted to the family of Aaron. But actually their evidence for its not being restricted is mostly before the time of Josiah. But in that period between Moses and Josiah, they have a great deal of evidence to bring. We will discuss this tomorrow, and I want to--we won't have 15 minutes now for a little quiz today, but tomorrow we will ...

P.106. (3/4) 4/17/62

...book which Mr. Bozzuto brought me yesterday which a student in high school came across in the school library. The student, as I mentioned, was a recent convert and greatly interested in the things of the Lord, so finding in the high school library, "The Books of the Bible in the Making," by Dennis MacGregor, he took it out and began to

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

read it and it went on discussing things about these various translations of the Bible through the ages, and so on, and I'd like to look it over. I don't know just how much there would be in it that might be helpful and how much there might be that might be quite harmful (1 1/2) But I did look at the short chapter at the beginning about the Old Testament, and this chapter, the third chapter, "the writing of the ~~O.T.~~ Old Testament," the one before "the ~~acceptance~~ setting of the Old Testament," (1 1/2)

throughout, but in "the writing of the Old Testament," he deals quite (1 3/4) with it, and you can imagine the effect on the faith of young Christians of reading such things as this: it starts this way: "all you have to do to see that the Old Testament as we know it does not come straight from the pen of its several authors, is to look at the first three chapters of Genesis. There you will find two quite distinct accounts of the creation of man. The account of the first chapter is startlingly different from the account of the second and third. The tone of the first is lofti~~y~~er and grander, and is also more restrained," then he quotes from it. Then he says, "however, if you turn to the second and third chapters you will find an entirely different story." And then he goes on and tells various things about the 2nd and 3rd chapters. Then he says, "There is no doubt that these stories of the creation of man which have been set down together in the opening chapters of Genesis, belong to very different periods, the second is by far the most primitive one, and between the writing of the two narratives, about as much time ~~ep~~ elapsed as has elapsed between the day of Christopher Columbus and our own. It is very obvious from the character of the stories themselves. You can detect it in reading them alongside each other in English Bibles. If you were reading them in Hebrew you would be struck by the fac t that throughout the first account the word used for God is Elohim, while in the second the name of God is that of Jahweh. The use of the term Elohim goes further back, however, than the dates of passages in Genesis in which it is used. A study of various passages in the Hebrew Bible shows that there must have been originally two documents of which the author of

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

the more primitive one used the name Jahweh, referring to God; while the author of the other used the name Elohim. Scholars call the first document J from Jahweh, and the second E from Elohim. Both these documents served as sources for the later compiler who put them together into what is the first six books of the Hebrew Bible as it has come down to us. ~~Most~~ Both dealt with the same general material but in a different fashion. In the earlier document, J, God is depicted more crudely and in a more picturesque fashion. He was a war-God, and the moral and religious semblance of J expresses a vivid, robust and sometimes (4) vindictive. The writer of the other is more subtle in his interpretation

In contrast to J who interprets the findings of the Hebrew Bible in divine acts, E regards it as a regrettable from a less autocratic form of government that had prevailed in the preceding period (4 1/4) ."

Then he tells something about certain passages which he says came from each of these documents, and then he gives the list of all the four documents, and showing the order in which they came, he put them a little later than what I usually find. He says J written about 850, E about 750, but combined into JE about 650. JE plus D written -- D written ~~about~~ 621 B.C., JE and D combined, he says , in 550 B.C. JED combined with P, which he says was written about 500 B.C., and they were combined in 400 B.C. to make the Pentateuch as we now know it. And he describes how much more primitive, he says, than the J document is, with its primitive ideas of God, and so on, and certainly would destroy a person's faith in the Old Testament as God's Word. He gives these as what scholars have worked out, as definitely true. Now of course that is believed by most scholars today, who work in this field. I mean most who are connected with any university or seminary that is more than 30 years of age. Yes? (5 1/2) His last name is MacGregor, Dennis MacGregor. Dennis is a good first name because of its importance in the critical history, as you all know. Yes, well, it just is another illustration of the fact that this theory is so widespread today. You run

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

onto it in so many places, it ~~seems~~ is being put into more and more of our Sunday School literature in most of our large denominations, into the lessons that are being-- the attempt is being made to be compelled to be used, in the Sunday Schools of the churches all over the country. And you rarely find an attempt to prove it, but it is assumed and its results are presented, and it is something that is very, very destructive today.

Now the second matter I'd like to speak about right now is quite different from that one. I had brought before me evidence of the fact that we are on the right track in having frequent quizzes, because a quiz not only has the great benefit of showing how well you are getting the material, but also helps me to know which parts I am getting across and which parts I am not getting across so well. For instance, in the last quiz we had the even numbers did very well. The marks were quite, I should say the average was a little higher than usual among the evens, but among the odd numbers it was way down below what it usually is. Now that doesn't mean that the bright students are all in the even numbered seats, in this room, because in other quizzes the odds have also done very well. But it does on that particular point which I asked them, the concept either was not grasped, or was not emphasized enough to have it retained, and ~~as~~ so I think that it is wise for everyone's benefit, to take just a few minutes on that particular point now. I would not have known that if it was not for that quiz.

So perhaps we should have quizzes twice as much as we're having so I could get a judgment on all parts of the course, as to which I am managing to get across to you. But that was not one of the most vital points but yet it was one of fair importance, because it dealt with the first of one of the four arguments for development. The question given to the odd numbered students, in that quiz last week, was about that first of the four arguments on which we have not spent much time. It so happens that of the four arguments for partition, we spent quite a bit of time on each of the four. A good deal

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

more perhaps on the third, than on the second of course, but a good bit on all four, on the argument for development, as we find mentioned, in Green's book, for instance, the second and third have to have the great bulk of the time. So that the first is one which I devoted a comparatively brief time to, and yet I was anxious you get the principle of it. The first argument for development, or for order of documents, as you remember was the claim that there were discrepancies among the documents. So I simply ask that the argument from discrepancies be discussed. Now there were some who gave a very good discussion of certain particular discrepancies, such as the difference in the --the alleged difference between the J and E documents as to the reason why Jacob left home. But that wasn't the question, to discuss one or two particular discrepancies. The question was to discuss the argument from discrepancies, meaning of course the argument as one of the four arguments for development. So just a brief reminder of what we discussed in that connection, we pointed out first that the argument from discrepancies, if it can be proved, would not go so far to show development as it would to show that one or other of the documents was not proven. It would be very harmful in that regard, to Christian faith. But as far as proving the developments, that they came in a certain order, the fact that there might be proven to be disagreements in the narrative, one saying one thing and one giving a different thing, of the size of the ark, the length of the flood, or something like that, might prove that one or even both were not true, but it wouldn't necessarily prove an order of development. Then we noticed that we didn't need to spend a great deal of time discussing the matter of discrepancy here, because we have already dealt with so many of them, under the discussion of the matter of the parallel predicament, under that head we looked at a good many alleged discrepancies, but we mentioned that all of those would refer to this particular point also, because if you prove discrepancies under partition or here, they would have an effect in both relationships. Then we noticed that the great bulk of the alleged discrepancies are in the narratives, which do not do so much to prove develop-

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

ment as the laws do. That, as far as the laws are concerned, we notice that a certain number of discrepancies or differences between documents would be natural to expect, in view of the fact that JE represents the material which we say Moses gave at the beginning of the wilderness journey, and D is the material which we say Moses gave just before going into the land of Canaan, and a certain discrepancy or difference of law would be natural between laws given for a people who were going to spend the next 40 years in the wilderness or even if it was only the next year in the wilderness, and of course God knew it would be the next 40, though it had not yet been revealed to the people, but between that law and the law that was given before being scattered out over the length and breadth of the land of Canaan , on settled homes there, there would be many points which would have to be revised to fit the other situation. So these changes in laws would not mean that one or other was wrong, but simply that they were applying to different situations, now those were the matters which I had in mind when I asked you to discuss the arguments from discrepancies. And I note there were three or four who gave it very well. But there were I think three-fourths of the odd-numbers just didn't discuss any one of those particular points, so even though you might have some good discussion of particular discrepancies, I couldn't give them any credit on this particular quiz, since most of the class went that way, it won't really hurt the standing of any one in the end, this particular quiz, it will just give a little extra push to the three or four who did have it correct. But I'm glad to have been reminded by that to review it so that I hope you will alll have that well in mind the next time that we ask that particular question. Yes? (13, J.Gueiros: I think the matter of silence should be taken into consideration as well, that one is narrative, the other is law, naturally the style is changed, naturally. Well, we would have a discrepancy of course.) Yes, there would be some apparent discrepancy...

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

...oh, perhaps just another word on the point we were on last time, the second argument, the argument from logical development. Now of course this is related to discrepancies. But it is discrepancies which arranged in such a way as to show a logical progress, and that we discussed and we noticed yesterday how many of these arguments in this regard proceed from an argument from style or reading something into the text that isn't there. I hope that many of you heard Dr. McIntyre's broadcast this morning, there was a very excellent illustration in it of that sort of argument which the critics use so much, which hequoted. He quoted this morning from a document put out in 1934 by Dr. Wu who was then the head of Yem Shing University in Peiping, China, and in this document he read how Dr. Wu said that Jesus did not believe in the family system. And Dr. Wu proceeded to give his evidence for it, that Jesus said that when a woman was in travail, she was in sorrow, but that when the child is born, she rejoices that a man child is come into the world, and Dr. Wu said that if Jesus had believed in the family system, he would have said that she rejoiced that a man child was born into the family, but the fact that she didn't say "family" but said "world," shows that he favored the communistic system. Well, such an argument sounds ridiculous in our American environment, but in the environment of China, before the coming of the communists, the family not only existed and was considered important as we consider it, but was given a tremendous importance, far beyond what we give it in these days, in this country, and therefore, at that time, if a person had been ~~ready~~ writing that in China, it is most likely that they would have said, she rejoices that a child has been born into the family. The fact that Jesus did not say "family" shows that he was not giving it in China, at that time. But what He says does not contradict (2 3/4)

A woman rejoicing at a child being born into the family would also rejoice at his being born in to the world. But in most of the rest of the world, the term "into the world" would have more validity in it than the term "in China." In other

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

words, from a certain viewpoint, of a certain situation, you say that because a person doesn't use the terminology that would be most natural in that situation, therefore he is taking the opposite viewpoint, that was the sort of argument that was used then in '34, and that has found its expression in the communes and the attempts to eradicate family life under the communists today. But it is the same sort of argument which the critics use so often, and it is good to be familiar with it, because the ability to point out two or three good instances of it can stand you in good stead in discussion of these matters. It is--there are so many instances of that sort of thing. On the other hand I think we should be very careful not to use that method of argument ourselves, it is very easy to fall into. And if you do it, it often is very effective with the particular group you may be speaking to, but I think over the long period your effectiveness is cut down if you let yourself fall into that sort ~~to f~~ of argument, which is very, very easy to fall into. Well, the fact that somebody occasionally uses an argument like that doesn't prove it that his argument is no good. But the critics use it so much, we claim. We claim that you get rid of the cases that rest on this sort of argument and the remaining ones, we claim, can all be explained if you take the viewpoint of the Bible itself, that these laws are given for different purposes, and they were given--J, E, and D at different times, and P for a different purpose than either JE or D. P to be the lawbook for the priests, JE and D given directly to the people. No contradiction, but emphasis on different features, and an emphasis on different features is a natural thing under the circumstances. Now we must go into the third of the arguments for partition, which is an argument which is actually one of the very strongest of the critical arguments. If you go through the four arguments for partition you find some points much stronger than others, some very weak. The same is true, of course, for the arguments for development, but out of the 8, if this argument can be proven true, I would say it is one of the very strongest of all, the argument from history, or in other words, the argument that violation of the law proves their non-existence.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

They say that the laws of JE represent the situation that that is what was done until the time of Josiah. And that at Josiah there is a change, ~~in~~ which result in their following the laws of D. And then that after the exile, from the time of Ezra on, they follow the laws of P, and therefore that the changes in the historical situation corresponding with the different Hebrew law, prove the critical theory. Now, as I say, if this argument can be proven, it is one of the very strongest of all. And in looking at it, we will notice quite a number of alleged arguments connected with it, which on close examination disappear, as we did on another occasion. But we will also find some arguments, some factors in connection with it, which the interpretation of which is by no means obvious, and which if you got into serious discussion of this, could completely stump you, if you did not look at them together thoroughly and see the principles that apply in connection with it. So it is very important that we get a clear understanding of exactly what this argument is, the argument from history.

I am going, then, to read you a little bit from two books in which the principle is presented rather clearly. First, a brief statement of it in George Buchanan Gray's Critical Introduction to the Old Testament. He has a brief statement of exactly what the argument is, on page 32. He says, and now prevalent critical opinion that P is the latest of the three main documents, rests largely on a comparison of the three codes with the actual course of history so far as that is known. Such comparison shows 1) that the practice of the Hebrews prior to the 7th century follows the laws of JE (that is mainly Exodus 20-23); 2) that the practice of the Jews at the reformation of Josiah and subsequently changes from earlier practices in the direction of the laws of D, where they differ from those of JE, and 3) that the practice of the Jews from the time of Ezra ~~on wer~~ onwards follows P, where there is conflict with the laws of JE and D. He says our knowledge of the history is incomplete, and consequently it is impossible to find records of practice in regard to innumerable details in the law. Moreover, certain laws remain constant throughout, as we can see from the repetition of some laws without

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

material alteration in successive law books, and many laws of regulation which first appear in literature in a late code of laws, may nevertheless have existed long before, even the latest law book contains much ancient material and perpetuates with or without modification many ancient practices. The argument then is limited to laws that differ in the extant code, and the argument can only be fully carried where recorded history refers to difference in practice corresponding to difference of law. One or two illustrations must suffice. Then he goes on to give a couple of illustrations and when you look at them, you notice that the stress is on two features. Most of this argument is based on these two features, the place of sacrifice, and the person. Those are the two that are most stressed by the critics. Now of course others point, that does not prove that if they were right, this same argument would not be true of other points, but the other matters would not necessarily come out right in the course of the history. So they do not have a positive argument, from history, on most of the other matters we've mentioned. But we, on the other hand, do not have positive material against them on that, they are just materials that would naturally be (9 3/4)

they must. But these two are matters on which this particular argument is given. They don't say that in so many words, but they usually say, we'll take one or two outstanding features, and then they take those two. Mr. Kaufmann? (10) George Buchanan Gray who was a professor at Oxford University, and he wrote this book on A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament. Well, he has a brief statement further about this argument, but there is a fuller statement in Carpenter's The Composition of the Hexateuch, which I have referred to you a good many times, and since it is a little fuller I am going to read to you what he says about this argument, and I would like you , in your notes, on what I read from this, to take down specific references given. Note the specific references, get the impression of his argument, get the general gist of it, don't try to copy it of course, as given, but get the general features of it, but mainly get the references, and

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

then you can look those references over later, and see just how much or how little validity you think there is to particular ones. This is The Composition of the Hexateuch by Carpenter and (11 1/4) Page 132, the testimony of History. He says the two-fold comparison on the basis of the narratives and the laws thus deals with chronological sequence, JE, D, and P. In turning to the record of Israel's history for the purpose of determining, if possible, the actual dates of (11 1/2) inquiry may take one of two directions. Assuming their diversities of origin it may found itself on positive evidence of their first appearance, or, starting from the Mosaic Age in which sacred tradition has so long located them, it may ask what indications are presented of their observance, and what circumstances bring them definitely into view. Following the method slowly wrought out by the scholars whose patient labor has gradually fixed the stages of Israel's religious development. You notice how he summarizes the long period of sixty years of changes in the theory that we have looked into. I think it is very important to understand how the views varied so much during that period, until it finally became united with the theory of evolution and crystallized into the form that it has retained almost a century now. He says, following this, a sketch is here offered and the witness supplied by history to the principles and institutions of the Pentateuchal Code. For test purposes two leading features are selected, the place at which sacrifice may be offered, and the persons who ~~make~~ may perform it. For the test purposes, these leading features are selected, it sounds as if from any one of a dozen, he just picked these two. Actually I don't know of any other on which a similar argument can be made. But these two are very important points.

"Because a preliminary question, however, is necessary," --now get what he means by this next statement--"a preliminary is necessary. It has become abundantly clear that many of the books of the Old Testament have undergone continuous editorial manipulation. Older materials have been recast, additions have been inserted into the text, and earlier accounts...

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

...the evidence therefore must sometimes be read in another light than that in which it is actually presented and the unconscious testimony of the record may be of more significance than the historian's positive certainty. The chief fact to be explained is the repeated--now this is a very important sentence--the chief fact to be explained is the repeated and systematic violation of the Deuteronomic and Levitical demands on the part both of the people and their responsible leaders, without any attempt to make royal, priestly, or prophetic practice conform to the ~~place~~ plain requirements of the Law. Now that is a very strong statement. I'll read that to you again.

The chief fact to be explained is the repeated and systematic violation of the Deuteronomic and Levitical demands on the part both of the people and their responsible leaders without any attempt tomake royal, priestly, or prophetic practice conform to the plainest requirements of the Law. Now if he would take all the arguments that can legitimately come under this sentence, and put them together, he would have a few rather strong points to present, which would need very careful study, but instead of doing that, he mixes it in with a lot of arguments which are very poor, very weak, but they make the whole thing sound much stronger than it actually is. We will dispose of them, but then we will want to give serious consideration to those which really are strong arguments in this connection. But the statement is a very strong one. Then he said, two circumstances come clearly into view in the early history of Israel's settlement in Canaan, one the variety of local sanctuaries, and two, the frequent performance of sacrifice by laymen. Now that is not quite a fair statement. The second part, the frequent performance of sacrifice by laymen, that is a fair thing to examine under this matter of the priesthood, the person who performs sacrifice. The frequent performance of sacrifice by a layman, but the first one, their claim is that only in one place is sacrifice to be performed, but you notice what he says is the variety of local sanctuaries. Now if you can prove that these local sanctuaries are places where responsible leaders of Israel performed sacrifice, as you can in the case

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

of Samuel, you then have a tough argument which requires very careful consideration. But merely the statement there was a sanctuary there, here was a place, a shrine, dedicated toGod, something like that does not contradict anything in Deut.12, if you read Deut.12 carefully and noticed exactly what it said. It doesn't say you shall have no place dedicated to the Lord anywhere except one place. It doesn't say there shall be no sanctuary in the land, no place considered as holy except one place, it says in the place that I will select to put my name there, there you shall bring your sacrifice, that's what it says. It says there you shall come every year to appear before the Lord. It does not say that you may not have other sanctuaries at which you are not to prepare sacrifice. It does not say that. (4)

However, it does have here some very strong arguments which we must examine carefully but it is interesting to notice how he mixes them in with some arguments which seem to me to be very unfair. Now he continues there, prior to the Jerusalem Temple, there is no trace of any exclusively authorized sanctuary. Now that is a strong statement, prior to the Jerusalem Temple there is no ~~place~~ trace of any exclusively authorized sanctuary. That statement, no ~~place~~ trace, must be understood as meaning no ~~place~~ trace, if we remove those traces which we think were written later, and when you take it that way, it makes it much weaker, doesn't it? If he would say, prior to the Jerusalem Temple there is no clear strong evidence of Jerusalem being the place of worship, he'd be absolutely right, because there isn't. Jerusalem was not the place of worship until the time of Jacob. If he would say, prior to the Jerusalem Temple, the evidence is not extremely strong that Shiloh was the place God had designated as the one place, that might be (5 1/4) But to say there is no trace of any exclusively authorized--he has to get rid of a whole chapter, as we see later, in order to make that statement. But he says, prior to Jerusalem Temple there is no trace of any exclusively authorized sanctuary. The Mosaic Tent was fixed at Shiloh, but there was , even in Joshua's time, a holy place at Shechem, with its solemn stone, and oak in its enclosure , where a national assembly is held, a covenant

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

is made and laws are issued. Would you say there was sacrifice there at Shechem? It does not say. You can be sure he would, if he had any evidence, that there are sacrifices there. There is a holy place at Shechem, with solemn stone and oak in its enclosure, where a national assembly is held, a covenant is made and laws are issued. It is sufficient to point out that sacrifice might be offered in almost any spot. Now how do you point that out? We are looking for evidence, aren't we? It is sufficient to point that out. And for sacrifice, an altar of some sort was indispensible. The country was covered with sacred places, many of them doubtless connected with the worship of the Canaanite occupants, at which the Israelites soon learned to worship. That is certainly true, many of the Israelites fell into following Canaanites practices, went after other gods, as was repeatedly stated in Judges. But that of course does not prove that God's law on this point was not known to them at that time. The case of Samuel is a much more difficult case, as you can readily imagine, you have to look into that carefully. But first get rid of the cases that are not (7)

He says, such was the great high place at Gibeon, (This is a ~~very~~ difficult argument) 1 Kings 3.4. Such was probably was at Gilgal, or stone circle near Jericho. The second was named near ~~Jericho,~~ Bethel, and the third is named near Gerazim. Others were founded by new settlers. Gideon built an altar at Opher, Judges 6.24. Now that sounds more like a valid argument. Gideon built an altar at Okra and devoted a portion of the Midianites booty to his sanctuary. Judges 6.24. And Judges 8.27.
The Danites plant themselves with the grandson of Moses for their priest in the far north, Judges 18.29. The boy Samuel is dedicated to the service of the house of Jahweh at Shiloh, this is no wandering tent, it is a stationary temple, he says, 1 Sam.1.9.

In the Shiloh Temple, Samuel, himself no Levite, still less priest, sleeps in the chamber of the Ark, 1 Sam.3.3, and in after days he ministers at the high place in Rama, his own home, Judges 9.12. How could the law of Deuteronomy been given by Moses if Samuel, a great godly leader like Samuel act as if it didn't even exist? What answer can you give to that? Sacrifice , he says, is equally legitimate upon a rock,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Judges 6.20, or an extemporized altar in the open field, 1 Sam.6.14, and 14.35.

The permanent sanctuaries are not all, however, of equal importance. Shiloh and the Ark no doubt took the lead. Now that is an admission on his part. They no doubt took the lead. It is certainly, if there was one place which God had ordained to be the place of sacrifice, it must have been Shiloh, because Shiloh is where the Ark was for many years, and where Eli ~~ministry~~ ministered, and his sons. Now emerges out of obscurity for the moment, and falls back into the gloom, Rama must have been lifted into eminence by Samuel in 1 Sam.7.17, but any successor in his ministry of the high place, there is no record. Even after the removal of the ark to Zion, the right of sacrifice held for it is still open in the neighborhood of Jerusalem. David offers the offering on a round threshing floor, 2 Sam.24.25. And when Adonijah prepared to claim the succession, he is supported by the priest Abiathar in a festive sacrifice at the certain stone beside the Fuller's Well, 1 K.1.7-9. Now he continues with a very reasonable statement. He says a public act which could not have involved a flagrant violation of sacred law lightly to prejudice his bid for the throne. If Moses gave the address, Deuteronomy, that they are to sacrifice only at the place God shall choose to put His name, and if this law had been well-known to the Israelites for centuries, and now David has established Jerusalem, the tabernacle is there, the ark is there, and now David is in his latter years, near his death, and in order to try to get Adonijah made king, the priest Abiathar goes outside Jerusalem there, and there out in the Valley there, near to Jerusalem, performs there a sacrifice, would that make the people tend to favor Adonijah, or would they not say, well this fellow just utterly ignores Moses' law. Why do we want a man like that for king? Whether Adonijah was a believer or not, you would expect him to pay some attention to what the attitude of the people would be, so that as it sounds, this sounds like a tremendously strong argument, this particular one. Actually it is not half as strong as the one about Samuel, we have just looked at, but much stronger than a great many of them. The reference to that I gave you, 1 K.1.7,9.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Then he continues that the Deuteronomic demands for a single sanctuary being thus unrecognized, it is not surprising to find Levitical principles ignored or defied with equal regularity and persistence. Then he goes on and gives instances which he gives under layman's sacrifice, he gives quite a number of those, we'll take them up at the second part of the argument, but at present we are looking at this about the place of sacrifice, and of course a good many of those about the people would relate to the place too. Like where he says, that Elisha offered a sacrifice, he says, in the field, when Elijah first called him. Inthat case, remember is it 1 Kings 20, or just about there, where Elijah is coming back from the Mount of God, where God has appeared...

P.109 (3/4)

...ploughing in the field with six yoke of oxen and there Elijah came and threw his mantle over him, and we read that Elisha said wait and I will go and say goodbye to my parents and then I'll go with you. Elijah said well what have I do do with you, but Elisha understood that Elijah's throwing his mantle over him was calling him to come and be his servant. So Elisha , we read, killed the oxen and made a feast for his family and the servants, and then came and did menial service for Elijah. Now, if the statement is made, the word used where it says that Elisha killed the ox, really means sacrifice, that the Hebrew word translated "killed" there really means sacrifice. That statement is made, and it is a forceful statement but one which needs examination. Yes? (1 3/4)(stu: J.Gueiros --seems to me that Deut.12.21 makes a special provision for that when--I wouldn't consider that a violation of the law). Yes. This verse you mention, Deut.12.21, is a very important one, we come to that after a little. I don't know how many of you noticed that, I didn't ask you to look for that, I asked you to see exactly what the law is, but that is a very good point, but we will come to that, after just a little.

Now I have read you these instances as Carpenter gives them, of the place of sacrifice, he did not in that particular connection--he does in other connections--point

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

out all the claim that is made that the high places referred to so often in Kings, the high places, they claim, ~~where~~ were places where the Lord was worshipped, but we read, as he points out, that king after king, it is said, was a good king, he was a good man, a man who followed the Lord in the main, but the high places were not removed. ~~Some of~~ You probably remember that statement which ~~you heard~~ occurs over and over in Kings. ~~again~~. Well, when we get to Josiah, he removes the high places, and orders them to do all sacrifice at Jerusalem, so he says, these things are statements put in kings by the Deuteronomists, who is expressing the viewpoint of a later day. He says if these good kings had thought there was anything wrong in sacrificing in the high places they would have removed the high places. But the fact that they did nothing against them, he says is evidence they did not consider that as anything that was wrong. Now this is a summary of the arguments that are deduced on this one point. You see, there are many references which are referred to, many references, and some of them on even a superficial examination, it is plainly shown they are not valid. Some of them involve a very careful examination and then can be shown not to be valid, but some of them involve a study of vital principles, and that we will go into last under this heading. It is important, though, to get a good understanding of this situation. Now that, then, is the statement on the argument on the Place of Sacrifice, I should have said, under D. the argument from History, #1:

1, Place of Sacrifice, and there small a, Instances of Violation. Now I gave you quite a few references, I hope you will look them up and get in mind exactly what they are, and see which impress you as quite strong and which impress you as not really very strong. Just a brief hint in that connection. If a wicked man breaks the law, it proves nothing about the law being in existence, does it? If a wicked man breaks the law, what can you expect. So if it is pointed out that a wicked man performed a sacrifice, that proves nothing whatever about the law. Also, this word "shavah" does it mean kill, in some cases, or does it always mean sacrifice? That is the vital question. But when you find evidence that a good man performs sacrifice at a different place than the place

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

where God has set His name, there you have a matter of principle, a matter which we must examine carefully and see just what the real situation is. If I began to examine it carefully now, we wouldn't have time for a quiz, so we will have to leave that till a later meeting...(5 3/4)

(6 1/4) 4/23/62

...about the argument from Violations, or the argument from History, whichever you call it, and I read you out of Carpenter a summary of his idea of how utterly these laws were disregarded prior to the time of Josiah. This law about the place of sacrifice, and he said therefore how could there have been such a law before that time. He quoted instance after instance and I asked you to just write down the references and to have them in mind for today. But you remember how as he listed so many of these references it sounded like quite a formidable list. Now, as with most such matters when you have a big thing thrown at you that sounds tremendous, it is always good to start in and examine it carefully in detail. I always say that one good argument is worth a dozen poor ones any time, worth more than a dozen poor ones. If you have one proof of something that really stands up, it amounts to a great deal, but if you have a hundred proofs that go a certain distance and then have flaws in them, it's not nearly so important. So when somebody gives you a long list, it may very well be that he has true evidence of the thing. Many things are so clear and so true that you can just reel off six of them. But you always want to make sure that is the case. You want to investigate the facts and see just exactly what they are. Well, now, in this case, we can divide up D into certain categories, and can thus reduce the number of them by a fair amount. I think, as a matter of fact, that the critics have here made the mistake that is very easy for us to make. They have got some very good arguments, but then they try to make it sound a lot better than it is by adding a lot of poor ones, and it would be very easy to just take some of the poor ones and tear them to pieces and make it look as if they had really nothing to talk about.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

But that is not the case. They have got some matters that need to be very carefully examined and understood, but it is well for us first to remove from the list those that really have no business there in the first place. So we will say under small b:

b, Consideration of the Instances. This is the instances of the place of sacrifice being violated, that is, of its being done here and there, rather than in the one place in Jerusalem.

(1) Some cases of alleged difficulty are not really so. And most of these are ~~Some cases of alleged~~ cases where the Hebrew word (9 1/4) is used, that word is the regular word for sacrifice, and the noun from it the same word with a put before it, follows a very common pattern in Hebrew, that we can make a word signify the place of something by putting a before it. Now there are other kinds of nouns formed with a but that is the most common. And here the (10) then is the place of sacrifice, so that it is translated (10) the place . And the word is translated in dozens of places, I think it runs into the hundreds in the Old Testament, "sacrifice." So the critics say, whenever they see the word (10 1/4) they say, well now this is proof that here was a case of sacrifice which was not at the one place designated, but somewhere else, look, it says, at this place. Well, ordinarily does mean that. Here for instance, Carpenter says, on page 139, he tells about Elijah, he says on Carmel he rebuilds the fallen alter, 1 K.18.30, and he witnesses without rebuke the unLevitical proceedings of Elijah, in 1 K.19.21, where the word "slew" is strictly sacrifice. And you remember in 1 K.19, it tells how Elijah came to this place where Elisha's father lived, this wealthy farmer and Elisha was plowing there with several yoke of oxen, and Elijah came up and threw his cloak over Elisha's head, and Elisha came and said, then Elijah walked on. Elisha ran up to him and said, Elijah, wait a minute, just wait till I go and say goodbye to my parents and I'll come with you. Elijah said what have I to do with you?

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

But Elisha knew what he wanted, knew that it was his chance to go and be his servant of this wild man from the desert, about whom he had been hearing, whom he admired, wanted to be associated with him in his great work for God, so we read that Elisha slew the oxen and cooked them and gave food to he people there, in other words, he made a farewell feast for his family and his friends, then he left them and went with Elijah and in later years they spoke of Elisha as the man that used to pour water on the hands of Elijah. In other words, the son of this wealthy farmer was illing to go and do the most menial service for this poor, seeminly wild man from the desert, who he knew was one that God had called and used in a wonderful way, and later on, God used Elisha in an equally wonderful way. But that instance is referred to by Carpenter here and he says, the word translated "slew" is really sacrifice, and the word is

and (12 3/4) in 95 % of the cases in the Old Testament where it occurs is translated...

P.110. (3/4)

...but there are just a few cases where in the English Bible is not translated "sacrifice," but as in this case translated "slew". Well, does that mean then that Elisha simply disregarded the law of Deuteronomy? Here was this godly young man there who had doubtless been studying the word of God and had been hearing about the wonderful things Elijah was doing, and wishing that he would have a chance to participate and to help in the great stand that Elijah was making, and starts his service by breaking the law of Deuteronomy. Remember, I asked you to study Deut.12, a week ago, and you saw in it how it repeated several times, do not sacrifice, as we do now, we sacrifice in different places, but after you come into the land of Canaan, and the Lord has given you rest from your enemies round about, you are to bring all your sacrifices to the one place which the Lord willl select from all of your tribes. Well, would Elisha at the beginning of his ministry simply disregard the law of Deuteronomy, if Deuteronomy already existed? And I would say no, I can't believe he would, it does

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

not seem to me possible, if Deuteronomy existed then, that Elisha was simply disregarding it and making sacrifice out there on his own home, a long distance from Jerusalem, in ~~other words,~~ utter disobedience to the law of Deuteronomy. But to my mind, the answer in this particular case is not to say that Deuteronomy did not yet exist, but to say that that is not what Elisha did, and I think that is quite obvious, if you simply look at the evidence, because as you look back at the law in Deuteronomy, on which this is based, back to Deut.12, and there we find that Deut.12, that the command is given repeatedly, that they are to bring their sacrifices to the one place that the Lord thy God will choose, but then we read in verse 20, when the Lord thy God shall enlarge thy border, as He hath promised thee, and thou shalt say, I will eat flesh because my soul longs to eat flesh, thou mayest eat flesh, whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, if the place which the Lord thy God has chosen to put his name there be too far from thee, then thou shalt kill of thy herds and thy flocks, which the Lord has given thee, as I have commanded thee, and thou shalt eat in thy gates whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, verse 23 continues, only be sure that thou eat not the blood. And in that verse Deut.12.21 where it says, thou shalt kill of thy burden of thy flock, the word translated "kill" is the same word (3 3/4) It is another of the very few cases where the word is not translated "sacrifice," in the KJV. Now is the KJV justified in that? There is not question in this case, because you have it told five or six times in this chapter--all the sacrificing is to be done at the altar in Jerusalem, but then you have in this verse, if that is too far to be done every time you want to have meat, why then you can (4 1/4) your ox or your sheep at your home, only be sure you don't eat the blood. Well, it is very clear from the context that the word which ordinarily means sacrifice is also used in rare instances simply for killing animals, as perfectly plain in Deut.12, and that gives you abundant warrant to take the word (4 3/4) in that same sense,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

in the case that we just referred to of Elisha, there is nothing in the context to suggest that Elisha is performing a religious service. He was making a farewell feast, he wouldn't need the oxen any more, he wouldn't be there to drive them, he was going off to do menial service for Elijah, and he the oxen, he killed them , not for sacrifice, but for food, and doubtless was careful to keep the blood, not to eat the blood, but to let the blood out before they proceeded to use it. So that this case of Elijah is a very clear instance where Carpenter misuses the data, this is one alleged case which it is very evident is not the case at all.

Now in one instance that Carpenter refers to, is 1 Sam.14, and in that verse we read how they were having a battle in v.31, of 1 Sam.14, we read that they smote the Philistines that day from Michmash to ~~Adulla~~ Aijalon, there was a great battle and the people under Saul's direction were very vigorously engaged in the fighting, they had been ordered not to eat, but to devote themselves entirely to the fighting. Jonathan said, that's foolish of my father to give that order, that the men would be stronger if they did eat, but that's what Saul had given , the command, and so we read in verse 32, and the people flew upon the spoil, and took sheep, and oxen, and calves, and slew them on the ground, and the people did eat them with the blood. Thenthey told Saul, saying, Behold, the people sin against the Lord, in that they eat with the blood. And he said, You have transgressed: roll a great stone unto me this day. And Saul said, Disperse yourselves among the people, and say to them, Bring me hither every man his ox, and every man his sheep, and slay them here, and eat; and sin not against the ~~Lor~~ Lord, in eating with the blood. And all the people brought every man his ox with him that night, and slew them there. And Saul built an altar unto the Lord: the same was the first altar that he built unto the Lord.

Now in proving that the idea of the one place of sacrifice did not exist before the time of Josiah, Carpenter says that sacrifice was equally legitimate, out in the field, on an improvised altar, and then he gives the reference to this verse , that it was

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

perfectly legitimate for them to sacrifice of this. Well, did the passage sound as if they were sacrificing? As you read the passage, the people were breaking the law of God, that they shouldn't eat the blood with the sacrifice, and God, and Saul said don't do this, bring all your animals here and kill them by this stone so you can do it in accordance with the prescribed rules, that the blood will be let out, and eat here, nothing was said about sacrifice. Not only that, but the Hebrew word "to slay" here is not (8) it is a word which is nearly always translated either slay or kill. I haven't noticed a single instance in the KJV where is translated "sacrifice," though there are cases where it does refer to the killing something that is being sacrificed, but I haven't noticed a case where it is translated "sacrifice." And it is used in many cases where sacrifice has nothing to do with it. So they don't use the word (8 1/2) in this context at all, and yet as Carpenter says, sacrifice was equally legitimate out in the field on an improvised altar, as it was at Jerusalem. Yes? (8 3/4) Very excellent question.

And the answer is--I was just going to go on to say, I 'm glad Mr. McComas anticipated me, shows he was thinking--but I was going to on to say that I can't believe in view of what I've presented that Carpenter ever would have even given this thought if it were not for the fact that the word altar was used in that next verse, and the next verse says that Saul built an altar there and the word used there is (9 1/4) and is to sacrifice, is a place to sacrifice, it is translated always, and consequently you say right away, well, we've noticed that there are a very few cases where the word is used, not of sacrificing, but of killing animals to eat, well now with the word (9 3/4) also be used of something that wasn't for sacrifice? Would it be? Well, if the verb is, it doesn't prove the noun could be, but it certainly suggests the possibility, but in this case, we don't have to be content with having the possibility suggested, because we are able to turn to the book of Joshua, and there in the book of Joshua, we find in Josh.22, a very

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

interesting story, it is an extremely interesting story, and it is such an interesting story that it seems too bad in a way that it is never used in Sunday School, and consequently--I shouldn't say never perhaps, but at least in 99% of the Sunday Schools it is never used, and most Christians have never heard it, but there it is, in Joshua 22. And this story you read in Josh.22 which tells after they had conquered Canaan, how Joshua told the Reubenites and the Gadites and the half tribe of Manasseh that they could go back across the Jordan to the land they had asked Moses to give them, and Moses had said they could have this land, provided you go and take part with the rest of the people in conquering Canaan, the other side of Jordan. So now Joshua says we've conquered Canaan you can go back to you land across the Jordan and they went back and then we read that in verse 20, we read that these people built an altar by the Jordan, a great altar, (11 1/2) to see to, I think a great altar to seek to the KJ says, surely means a great altar to look at. In present day use, "to see to" means to take care of. I don't think that's what it means, I think it means to look at. At any rate, they built a great altar, and that's the word mizpeh, and then you read on and what happens? The children of Israel heard, the children of Reuben, the children of Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh have built an altar over against the land of Canaan in the borders of Jordan, and they built this altar and they came to them and said in verse 16, what trespass is this you've committed against the God of Israel, to turn away this day from following the Lord, to build an altar that you might rebel against the Lord? Well, how did they know what was rebellion against the Lord? Had somebody seen advance sheets of Deuteronomy, these many centuries before the time when Josiah officially proclaimed it? But we read here that the people said to them, in verse 19, they said don't rebel against the Lord or against us, in building you an altar beside the altar of the Lord our God. And then we read that the children if Reuben, the children of Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh, answered and they said, the Lord knows whether we have done this in rebellion, they said, if we build an altar to turn from following the Lord, to offer thereon burnt offering

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

and meat offering, and peace offering, let the...

P.111. (3/4)

...this big altar here as a reminder to our people of the fact that we are following Israel too, they said in verse 28, it shall be that when they say to us in time to come, you have no part with us, we'll say, behold the pattern of the altar of the Lord, which our fathers made, not for burnt offering, nor for sacrifice, but as a witness between us and you. God forbid that we should rebel against the Lord and turn this day from following the Lord, to build an altar for burnt offering, for meat offering, or for sacrifice, beside the altar of the Lord our God that is (1 1/4)

So here we have in Joshua here the instance where these people said, we are building an altar, and the others said you're breaking the law, there is only one place where the altar is to be, and they said God forbid, we are not doing that at all, we are just building an altar for witness, for a memorial. And they used the word mizpah. Now the word (1 1/2) ordinarily means a place to ~~settle~~ sacrifice, but here is a place where they said this is not for sacrifice, this is for a memorial, this is for a witness. Well, there is clear evidence in Joshua of the fact that the word can be so used, and it is clear evidence then, that when the context plainly says that Saul said don't sin against the Lord in eating this stuff with the blood, just eating it rapidly like that, and not following the prescribed way of killing to avoid eating the blood as Deuteronomy 12 had said, he put up a big stone and said bring your animals here, kill them here and he didn't even use the word (2 1/4) and he didn't even use the word but then when he used the word there it doesn't mean that they considered it sacrifice. I hope you all have well in mind then the importance of Joshua 22, showing the possible meaning of Mizpah as a clear (2 1/2) in this use by Saul, in 1 Samuel.

Some of you perhaps are thinking of a possibly even more important question

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

about Joshua 22, if the people were ready to come and fight those two and a half tribes because of their building another altar beside the one in the one place, does that not prove that Deuteronomy was already out, not merely (3)

Does it not prove it was already out?

Well, it seems to me it does, but it does not impress ~~Carpenter,~~ Driver that way. Driver doesn't even all he does in The Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, when he deals with Joshua, he says chapter 22, the division of the land being thus completed, Joshua dismisses the two and a half tribes for their (3 1/4) use of Jordan, of the altar ~~of~~ erected by them at the point where they crossed the Jordan. He says, verses 7 to 8 (3 1/2) is a fragment of uncertain origin. The source of verses 9-34 is also uncertain, the phraseology is in the main that of P, but the narrative ~~is~~ does not display throughout the characteristic style of P, and in some parts of it there ~~are~~ occur expressions which are not those of P. Either a narrative of P has been combined with elements from another source, in a manner which makes it ~~difficult to~~ difficult to effect a satisfactory analysis, or the whole is a work of a distinct writer whose phraseology is in part that of P but not entirely. So you see how easily Driver solves the problem. Joshua 22 proves Deuteronomy is already written, so all right, Joshua 22 must be later than Deuteronomy. So he says Joshua 22 must be from P in the time of exile, and that of course removes the whole argument but the more you have to keep moving other things on the basis of your (4 1/2) the less valid the things become. But even if the critical argument were to be admitted, which I do not by any means, that Joshua 22 would be from P or from a later writer, somewhat similar to P, after the time of Deuteronomy, it would still remain a fact that it uses the word Mizpeh, not for a place of sacrifice, but for something which has some affinity to that, but which is for a different purpose. So that as far as our problem with Saul is concerned, it completely solves that problem, no matter when it was written. Mr. Gregory? (5) Oh, if he would consider that somebody in the time

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

of the exile got to thinking about the law of Deuteronomy, go t to thinking well now ~~here~~ with ~~it~~ a law like that, it wouldn't be at all strange if the people across the Jordan would invalidate the law and gradually build up (5 1/2)

In fact the whole attitude of the critics at the time of Driver was to consider that most of the material of P was imagination of a later time.

Today the critics who hold tenaciously to the late date of P, nevertheless say it embodies much further material. There is much in P that is historical. I think I mentioned in this class once how Prof. Garstang of the University of Liverpool who was Director of Antiquity for Palestine for a number of years, wrote a book on The Foundations of Bible History: Joshua and Judges. And he says in the front of it, that in this book I am only going to look at those parts of Joshua and Judges which are early, which come from the J and E. He says I'm not going to look at the P much at all because we are interested in the earlier material, not the late material. And yet, he says, it is most amazing that there are places where we actually found archeological evidence showing accurate things in P too. He is quite surprised at it. He admits the fact but he doesn't bother looking at P in the rest of the book because after all, you can't expect it. Mr. Abbott? (6 1/2) Yes, but I'm not sure whether (6 3/4)

It is my impression that you have it in a number of different places, the order that the blood is not to be eaten, that is my impression but I haven't checked it. (stu.) It is my impression but I'm not sure. We have then some cases of alleged difficulty which are not really so. I mentioned these. One other we might mention is the case of Adonijah. You recall that Adonijah was the son of David, who many people thought should be king, after David's death, and David was getting old, and had not ~~been~~ given any permanent definite statement that everybody was familiar with as to who was to succeed him, and so Adonijah went, we read in 1 K.1, went outside of Jerusalem and took with him some

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

of the leaders and there they had a big feast and announced that he was to be king, and we read in v.9, of 1 K.1, that Adonijah slew sheep and oxen and fat cattle, by the stone of Zoheleth, which is by En-rogel, and called all his brethren the king's sons, and all the men of Judah the king's servants.

And then we read in verse 19 that Bath-sheba went to David, she said Adonijah has been made king, he has slain oxen and fat cattle and sheep in abundance, and has called all the sons of the king, and Abiathar the priest, and Joab the captain of the host; but Solomon thy servant has he not called.

And then in verse 25, Nathan again refers to how he slain oxen and fat cattle and sheep in abundance, and in all these three cases, the word "slain" translated the Hebrew word (9) . They are among the few instances where is translated something other than "sacrifice." It is translated "slain," in the KJV in these three cases. Well, now, Carpenter says, is it conceivable if the law of Deuteronomy was already in existence, is it conceivable that Adonijah, making a bid for the throne would flagrantly break the law of God, known to the people. He says if they didn't know anything about Deuteronomy, why it would be quite natural for him to go on and have a sacrifice out there, celebrating his becoming king. Well, his argument is a good one, if it is clear that what he did was to make a sacrifice, but there is nothing said about sacrifice. The only thing to make it appear to be a sacrifice is this word (10) And it is just as reasonable to say Adonijah would not have made a sacrifice there, but that what he did was just exactly what God permitted in Deuteronomy, if you were at a distance from Jerusalem, that he went out and slew animals and gave a big feast, rather than a sacrifice.

The only difficulty with taking it that way is that the word shavah is used three times in there, but we've noticed that there are a few other cases where shavah is used occasionally. Saul (10 1/2)

The case of Elisha certainly is very clear.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

There are a few places, and of course its use in Deut.12.21 is crystal clear that the word shavah could mean to kill animals for food, not necessarily for offerings, though ordinarily that is what (10 3/4) . So that these are cases of a problem which at first sight can appear like a real problem, but which on examination should certainly be omitted from any argument to prove that Deuteronomy was not yet in existence. We have one other case of Shavah where it is translated "slew" that I might mention to you, in 2 K.23.20, tells how Josiah slew all the priests of the high places, that were there on the altar, and burned men's bones on them. Now that is the only case I remember where Shavah is used of killing people rather than animals but that is the case where ~~Joshua~~ Jotham was destroying these wicked altars that Jeroboam had put up, and he slew the priests there and burned men's bones on the altar, it was sort of similar to a sacrifice, and (11 3/4) the word but it certainly wasn't a real sacrifice. I think the fact it could be shavah, to mean "kill" other than sacrifice, warrants his views, and the reason for his selection was that it fit so appropriately the idea that these men who were falsely sacrificing, found themselves sacrificed. Josiah (12) a real sacrifice of course. And then one other instance that I just mention to you because there are so few of them, is 2 Chron.18.2, and in 2 Chron.18.2, we read about Ahab. Now Jehoshaphat had riches and honour in abuhdance, and joined affinity with Ahab. And after certain years he went down to Ahab to Samaria, and Ahab killed sheep and oxen for him in abundance, and for the people he had with him, and persuaded him to go up with him to Ramoth-gilead.

Now there the word translated "kill" is shavah but ~~th~~ does that make...

P.112 - 4/24/62 (3/4)

...northern kingdom at this time, they had put up the calf at and they were sacrificing in defiance of the law of God. There is no question of that. So that certainly ~~should~~ could not be taken as proving the law of Deuteronomy to be unknown.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

And anyway it is highly questionable whether Ahab was sacrificing in this case, because what he was going to do was to get Jehoshaphat to join with him, and Jehoshaphat was a godly man, he was one of whom the Bible speaks very, very highly. The only real criticism there is of him, is that he made an alliance with Ahab. That he is strongly criticized for. Now when Jehoshaphat went up to there and allied himself with Ahab, the very way that Ahab would discourage him from going on, rather than to encourage him, would be to hold a sacrifice, to hold a religious service. Jehoshaphat would join with him for political purposes, but if he tried to make it look as if they were united religiously when it was so obvious they weren't, it would have tended to have the opposite purpose of what he had in mind. So that the KJ very rightly translated it as "kill," rather than "sacrifice." He made a feast, to try to make him feel good and be ready to join with him.

Well, these are just about the only cases where shavah is translated other than "sacrifice," but the one in Deut.12.21 is absolute proof that it can be so used. Now #2) Some cases deal with actions of men who were not models in any sense. He had the northern kingdom, them sacrificing in defiance of God's law, Carpenter does not give those instances, because it would be very obvious that they were simply disregarding God's law, but you have other cases which they do refer to sometimes, like the case where Saul had a big sacrifice, he waited for Samuel, waited and waited, and Samuel didn't come, and then Saul went ahead and performed his sacrifice, and Samuel came and rebuked him strongly for it. Saul was a good example, a real model in this case where he put up the stone and said don't eat the blood, come here and slay them at this place, he was anxious to carry out God's law at that time, but at the other time he was not, and Samuel rebuked him, and consequently in such a case, it can certainly not be considered as an evidence against the law of Deuteronomy being known at that time.

(3), Some cases are expressed commands of God under very exceptional

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

circumstances.

We read how the angel appeared to the father and mother of Samson, and told them to bring a sacrifice and they put up a stone and put the sacrifice on it, and the angel touched it and it lighted, and the angel ascended in the smoke from it. We have a few instances in the book of Judges where God specifically commanded, under certain circumstances--now that ~~circumstance~~ certainly would not show ~~ingo~~ ignorance of general law, that they were to bring their sacrifices to one place, ~~but that~~ if he commanded a special sacrifice in a different place.

The one case that is used as an instance is the case of Arauna's threshing floor. Remember that David , when they had the great pestilence, that David saw the Angel of the Lord there on Arauna's threshing floor, stopping the pestilence, and David purchased the threshing floor, and made the sacrifice there. There was a specific revelation of God under unusual circumstances. There are a few of them that come under that category. Yes? (5 1/4) Oh, they wouldn't say it is a purely human book, oh, they would never say that. They'd say it is a wonderful divine book. Of course they might say there is a lot of divine (5 1/2)

(stu.) You know Karl Barth says that he believes in the bodily resurrection of Christ, not like the ordinary critical theory, he believes in the bodily resurrection of Christ, only he goes on to say, but of course what became of those chemical elements which were buried , nobody knows. (stu.) Well, now that is a point we'll go on to in our next step. We don't have much argument with the critics over these looked at, at the present, because of the next step. Let me give you the next step.

(4) After removal of all these, very definite difficulties remain, especially in connection with Samuel, Solomon, and the attitude of the righteous kings and prophets. These cases that we have looked at up to this point, are quite easy to prove, not to (7 1/4) but if anybody wants to argue about one of them, we don't need to worry much about it, because after you get rid of them you've got some real

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

problems left, and I think that the critics weaken their case by giving these others, because there are some real problems, and the real problems are that Samuel went out and sacrificed at several places, he made a round trip through the land, sacrificed at various places, and Samuel was God's chosen judge during a long period, and Solomon went to the great high place at Gideon, just a few miles north of Jerusalem and there he sacrificed, and did God appear to Solomon in the night and say, Solomon, you have broken the Deuteronomic law, I am going to punish you for it? No, he appeared to him, and said, Solomon, ask me what you want me to give you, he said, and Solomon asked for wisdom in order to rule the people wisely, and God was pleased that he asked for wisdom rather than for long life or riches, so he said, I'll give you long life and riches too.

In other words, Solomon was not rebuked by the Lord when he went out and sacrificed thousands of animals at Gibeon the great high place, a short distance north of Jerusalem, and Samuel went about from place to place through the land, sacrificing, so we have good men, very good men, who sacrifice at other places than the one established place. So we have some real problems, but I should have stopped five minutes ago because I promised you a longer quiz than usual today...

P.113. (3/4)

... command of Deuteronomy, therefore God is going to punish him, that is not what he says. God appeared to Samuel , and said Samuel, you are doing well, I am going to bless you, what shall I give to you? And Solomon asked for wisdom (1)

and He gave him the wisdom that he asked, so that we have here something that is a real problem, this happened at Gibeon, not at Jerusalem. This happened at the great high place at Gibeon, and then after the attitude of the righteous kings and prophets after that, we have the righteous kings described in subsequent years, but in case after case, we read in Kings that Jehoshaphat or A., or somebody else was a very good king, he did what was right in the eyes of the Lord, only the high places he did not destroy, but the people still sacrificed upon the high places. We

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

read that over and over in Deuteronomy, and the critics say, these are Deuteronomic additions to the book of Kings, they are insertions about these good men to excuse them for the fact that (1 3/4) the law of Deuteronomy wasn't in existence at that time, that it ~~proved it wasn't~~ assumes it was in existence and makes these additions to Kings on that basis. That is what the critics say. You find that Elijah on Mount Carmel, after he met the prophets of Baal and proved that the prophets of Baal were utterly wrong because they couldn't get their gods to light the sacrifice, he prayed God and God set the sacrifice afire, and then we read that Elijah rebuilt the altar of God that was broken down. Elijah rebuilt the altar of God, and he put the sacrifice on and God actually lit the sacrifice from heaven, not at Jerusalem. Elijah didn't say, you folks have got to quick go down to Jerusalem and do your worshipping there, do your sacrifice there. Elijah had a sacrifice at the altar of God which had been broken down, and offered sacrifice which God Himself lit, and so we than have these many cases of the non-observance, of the violation of this law, not by bad people, but by good people, people who were God's true messengers, God's true representatives, God's true leaders, who were not obeying this law of Deuteronomy. Does that disprove that this law was not written until the time of Josiah or shortly before? Well, we do not believe that to be the case.

We believe that the book of Deuteronomy gives us indeed the words of Moses, and that Moses gave this command. One thing, of course, we notice, is that the command is not as the critics have proven that it is, that you shall sacrifice only at Jerusalem,--it says nothing about Jerusalem, it says, to the place which God shall choose out of all your prophets. And in the early chapters of Judges, we have evidence to lead us to believe that Shiloh was the place which God had then chosen. We have the headquarters there at Shiloh, we have Eli, the high priest, at Shiloh. We do not have an account in Judges of the destruction of Shiloh, but we have an account of how the Israelites went off to fight with the Philistines, and when the Philistines beat them, Eli's sons said let's take the ark of God with us, and then the Philistines will be certainly

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

be defeated, when they have the ark of God, and they brought the ark of God, and the Philistines said, oh we're done for, they've got their god right with them, they said, they're potent, they said, we'd better fight desperately because if we don't do our very best we are certain to be killed now, so the Philistines fought desperately and defeated the Israelites and killed the two sons of Eli . That we are told, but nothing is said of what happened to Shiloh, but over in Jeremiah we have a reference to Shiloh as the place, it says, that if you do not obey the Lord you will be destroyed as Shiloh was. There will be a terrible destruction like Shiloh, as if the people knew ~~that~~ Shiloh as having had a terrible destruction, and it could be used as an example by Jeremiah, Judges tells us nothing about it, but we have no later reference of ~~being~~ people going to Shiloh or doing anything there. We certainly--it certainly would sound as if Shiloh was destroyed at that time, as suggested in Jeremiah.

So that we, I believe, are justified in saying , that the place God selected out of all the tribes was Shiloh and we have no evidence that Shiloh was not the place to which they brought all their sacrifice, until the Philistines destroyed Shiloh. After the Philistines destroyed Shiloh and Eli was killed, the leader of the--you remember Eli merely fell over and died, he was an old man, but his sons were killed in battle--Samuel became the leader of the people. Why didn't Samuel tell them they should worship at Jerusalem? Why didn't he? Well, it looks as if Samuel either knew nothing about the Deuteronomic law, or else did not think it necessary to apply he Deuteronomic law under the present circumstances, one of the two is possible. (6 1/4)--stu: will you repeat that please?) Yes,I say, the only conclusion we can draw from Samuel's disregarding of the Deuteronomic law is, that one of two things occurred, that either Samuel had never heard of the Deuteronomic law, or that Samuel did not think it necessary, for some reason or other, to apply the Deuteronomic law just then. Yes? (7) Well, why would they want to? There is no evidence God had put His name in Jerusalem, is there? Jerusalem was a city at that time held by the Jebusites, the Jews

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

had no access to Jerusalem, there is nothing to lead us to think that God had said, Worship at Jerusalem. David selected Jerusalem for his capital, and he brought up the tabernacle to Jerusalem and set it up there, put the ark there, but then Solomon built the temple and the glory of God came into the temple and Solomon prayed that prayer of dedication and from that time on, it was understood that Jerusalem was the place God had selected. Before that, we I think are justified in assuming that Shiloh was the place. Now Shiloh was destroyed. What was Samuel's first thought? What should he do? Should he say oh my, we got to sacrifice at Shiloh, let's quick go and establish a new altar at Shiloh, let's do all the sacrifices there, or did he say, we've go t to find out what is the new place God wants us to sacrifice? There are two considerations that have to be brought in here, and for one of these we go to the New Testament, because I think that the matter cannot be understood without recognizing this vital principle. We find this principle in Matthew 12.4, in Mark 2.26, and in Luke 6.4. We find it in these three places, and I believe you will find further evidence ~~in t~~ of it in the New Testament. Now in Matt.12.4, we read that at that time Jesus went on the Sabbath Day through the corn, and his disciples were anhungered and began to pluch the ears of corn and to eat, and when the Pharisees saw it they said unto him, behold, thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do on the Sabbath Day. The law was , not to work on the Sabbath. And here they were harvesting grain on the Sabbath, and eating it. But He said, well I, after all, am the one who has created the world, and I gave the law, and I can change it now if I take a notion to. That's not what he said. What He said was, have ye not read what David did, when he was anhungered and they that were with him, how he entered into the house of God and did eat the shewbread which was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them which were with him, but only for the priests. Or had he not read in the law how that on the Sabbath Day, the priest in the Temple profaned the temple (9 3/4) that is, the priests did work in the temple on the Sabbath, which was necessary for the carrying on of

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Temple work, but that is not considered as breaking the Sabbath, and David, when David was with his men and they were fleeing from Saul they went into the house of God and ate the shewbread which was only ~~the~~ for the priests. David went right in there and took it for his men, it was a matter of life and death for them, and then he continued, but I say unto you that in this place is one greater than the temple, if ye had known what this means, I will have mercy and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless, nor the Son of Man who is Lord even of the Sabbath. Now in Mark 2.26 we find almost the same words, except that in verse 27, there is a statement we didn't find in Matthew. He said unto them the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath. In Luke 6.4 we have the same incident described, and there he says that (in verse 5) he says, --well, the son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath, we find in the first place, but this statement, the ~~Son of man~~ Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath is given at the end, not as the basic principle here. He is not saying to the Pharisees , well now I am the Lord of Glory, so what I do is all right, I gave the law and I can change it, that is not what He is saying to them. He is mentioning His importance at the end of the discussion but the big point of the discussion is, haven't you heard what David did? David took the shewbread, why didn't God strike David dead for taking the shew bread? and eating it on the Sabbath. Why didn't he? David took it and he is not blamed for it, in this case where it was a matter of life and death. Now this is very, very different from the argument the woman gave me in Montana once.

I was out there and it came Sunday and they got out in their, these people got out with their machines and began working in the field, and I said why it's Sunday , you're not going to work your machines on Sunday, are you? Why, they said, the Bible says, if your ox falls into the pit on the Sabbath, pull it out, and he said, if we don't work on Sunday we won't have enough grain for us to feed our oxen, and they'll be just as bad off as if they fell in a pit, so we have to work on Sunday to give

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

them enough. Now that is an evasion, they could get along with less oxen, they don't have to have so many oxen in order to have to work on Sunday to take care of them. But the Bible does say that if your ox fall in a pit on the Sabbath, pull it out. If David didn't bother to bring food along, and he got a little hungry and went in and took the bread off the shewbread and ate it, the Lord might very well have treated him the way he did David's friends...

P.114. (1/2)

...keep it from falling off, and God struck him dead, because he was disregarding God's holy law, but David disregarded it, he went into the temple and ate the shewbread and God did not condemn him for it, it was an emergency, it was a matter of life and death The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath. In other words, the purpose of the Sabbath is to give men his needed rest, it is to set aside a certain regular recurring time, in order to remind people of God's plan, God's order and plan for the ages, it is to set aside a certain definite amount of time, in order to set apart for the worship of God, exclusively, though He is to be worshipped at all times. The purposes of it are for the good of man, and the whole ceremonial law is for man's benefit. The ceremonial law is given in order to be a blessing to man, in order to show man great truths, in order to illustrate the great principles of law to man. And it is God's will that man should obey the ceremonial law, and carry it out as He gives it, but it is not like the moral law, Man is guilty before God whenever he breaks the moral law, the ceremonial law is given for man's good in leading men to God, in giving them to understand the great principles of God's law, and therefore as a part of the ceremony that we have, the ceremonial law in the Old Testament, very fully given, because it illustrated facts about Christ who is coming, and you had to have it just right to get these ideas into your head. After the first coming of Christ, the ceremonial law for the Christian is not ~~through~~ described in detail anywhere, and good Christians differ as to details of the ceremony which Christians are to perform. I heard of a church wanted to practically split because some

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

of the people thought we should always stand when we prayed, others thought we should always kneel. But the Bible doesn't say, because what God is interested in is the attitude of the heart, not the attitude of the knees, and before the coming of Christ, there were important matters of illustrating truth, and now we have these truths explained in the New Testament, and so the details of the ceremony are no longer of the same importance as before, but the principles that the ceremonies indicate are of course of just as much importance as before, so this principle of the difference between the ceremonial law and the moral law, in other words that the fact that the law was made for the Sabbath was made for man and not man made for the Sabbath, is a principle that is vital in this connection. We find that God gave very severe penalty for not holding the Passover at the time He gave, but when Hezekiah had his great passover and they had neglected it for years, and Hezekiah introduced this great Passover, he said there had never been such a passover since the time of the early days as this, we read that there were many people who were away, or different reasons they couldn't be present at the passover, and they had another Passover a month later for them, they disregarded the details of the ceremonial law in order to carry out His main point, and next year, doubtless, they planned ahead of time, to be available perhaps. But that year, when it was just reintroduced, they made this special-- Mr. MacKeen, what was on your mind? (4 1/4) Well, there is a will there is a way. Samuel could have said Shiloh is the place where God said sacrifice is to be performed, I am going to go over there to Shiloh and I am going to, on the ruins, build a little temple, it won't be much because I don't have much resources but I'll build a little temple there and there I will perform sacrifices, and let the people come to me and bring their sacrifices to me, and you think they would have come? I think quite a few of them would've wanted to, but I don't think many of them would come, because we had a situation then, the Philistines had conquered, and they had destroyed the army of Israel and from this time on, for many years, we have Philistine

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

garrisons scattered throughout the land, we have the people pretty much living in caves, or as refugees in places here and there, people acting very very carefully lest the Philistines destroy them, it was not until the time of David that they got real freedom from the Philistines. In Samuel's time they were always gaining a little freedom and losing it, gaining it, losing it, And Saul also was constantly fighting with the Philistines, sometimes he'd have a fair measure of independence, other times comparatively little, until finally Saul was killed in a great battle with the Philistines. And it was David, who after a number of years managed to overcome the Philistines, and reduce them to where they were never again a great menace to the land of Israel, but you have a period there of a very considerable length, when you can hardly call your soul your own in the land because of the Philistine overlordship, over the land. And under these circumstances it is entirely possible that Samuel went back to the Deuteronomic law and read it very carefully and read the words that when the Lord has given you rest from all your enemies round about and has established you in the land, then you are not to sacrifice as ~~you~~ we do now in different places, but you are to bring your sacrifices to one place, which the Lord shall designate out of all your tribes, and it is possible that Samuel said, we are at present absolutely unable to overcome the Philistine tribe, now maybe if we devote our prayer and thought for the next 20 years, God will give us victory over the Philistines, shall we not sacrifice for 20 years, or shall I carry on the little sacrifce in one place here with the few people who can come, and the rest have no religious service? Or shall I say we do not yet have rest, we had rest from our enemies, the land was conquered, the place was established in Shiloh, but now we are in a situation where we do not have rest from our enemies round about us. We are in that interregnum, as far as the ability to carry out this is concerned. It is important that we sacrifice in one place and preserve this evidence of the unity of God's people, that is important, but it is more important that we carry on sacrifice.

Now it is altogether possible that is what Samuel said, to himself, now it is possible

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Samuel
~~Daniel~~ did not think the thing through, but simply acted on it, but just as Jesus said, the Sabbath is made for man and not man for the Sabbath, Samuel acted as if sacrifice was made a s a representation of man's worship of God, as a representation of something God is going to do later on to make possible man's acceptance before God, it is very important in the lives of the people that the sacrifice be kept up, if under present circumstances this important evidence of the unity of God's people in the one place, and this important means of presenting the ~~means~~ rise of deviations and false ideas in many places, cannot be enforced, we carry out what we can of it, and this under the circumstances we have to (8 3/4)

At any rate that is what he did, he established sacrifice in about five different places, he went around on a circuit every year, he held a yearly sacrifice in each of these places, and the people came together there and performed their sacrifice and he reckoned the law without shedding of blood is no remission of sin, he brought to them the vital lesson involved, but this one particular lesson, about the unity of God's people was to be represented by the making of the sacrifice at one place, that he was unable to do anything about. Now that is what happened. Now it seems to me we have two possibilities, we can accept this explanation which is founded upon Jesus' statement about the ceremonial law which meant the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath. Or we can say, Samuel didn't know anything about it, the critics are right, Deuteronomy was not yet written. But to my mind the preponderance of evidence is in favor of this, of the two. Mr. Gregory? (9 3/4) Yes, and I would say, that in the providence of God, God was a wonderful (10 1/4) God taught that Samuel should go about and have the sacrifice, but when Jerusalem in the latter days of Jerusalem, Jesus was facing, (10 1/2)
he was facing the Pharisees, and what was the answer of the Pharisees? Carry out every little minute law, every little minute restriction, carry it out to the last jot and tittle but as far as the spirit of the law, many of them utterly ignored it and forgot it.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Jesus said this ought ye to have done and not left the other undone. In other words, the spirit of the law was what mattered, the other mattered too, but it mattered less. The spirit of the law is the vital, the moral law is the vital, the great principles of God's dealing with man , are the vital things, the ceremonies are given as means of illustrating, as means of making it clear to men's minds, that's what it means--they are to be followed insofar as is possible, but the moral law is to be followed in all circumstances. And one isn't to make excuses, to ignore the sacrificial law, or ignore the ceremonial law, but that certainly is not ~~worse~~ worse than making excuses to follow the letter and ignore the spirit. Well, now then , if the Jews when Jerusalem was destroyed had followed the example of Samuel, they would've said Jerusalem is destroyed, but without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins, God has prescribed the sacrifice, we cannot perform them at Jerusalem, therefore we have to perform them somewhere else. We cannot carry out the ceremonial law in the full, but we can carry it out to some extent, but instead of that, the Jews took the attitude, that here is the law, you can't sacrifice except at Jerusalem, therefore we can't sacrifice, so they dropped all sacrifice from that day to this, and I would say that in that they were absolutely wrong, but I would say that God saw that these people should be wrong in their interpretation in order to cause sacrifice to cease shortly after the death of our Lord Jesus Christ, and as a result we have Jews all over the world, reading the law which says without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins, and reading the law which devotes chapter after chapter after chapter, not simply of the O. T. but of the very part they prized most highly, of the Torah, the first five books--chapter after chapter of the details of sacrifice and they don't carry out any of them , because they can't do it at Jerusalem, in the temple, therefore they don't do it at all, and it gives...

~~P.115 (~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

...symbolize the unity of the people, God's people, in order to make it easier to keep the unity and not have different groups going out with different ideas, but in addition to that, God probably (1)

just in order to that Pharisaic misunderstanding, which resulted in carrying out the fact of sacrifice shortly after the Lord's Return. Miss Pickett? (1 1/4) Oh, thank you, Miss Pickett, I had spoken now about why Samuel disregarded it, now from Samuel's time on, that we hadn't referred to, but we should go ahead and take just a word about that.

Samuel under the circumstances was unable to carry out this provision, and he could have carried it out, yes, but he knows a dozen other things which were more important. He did what was most vital and ignored this. Under Saul the situation was the same, and by the time David became king, so long a time had gone on that people had forgotten it, and it had disappeared from people's minds. (2)

even though they read it over and over, they read the law, they ~~could~~ did not know this. If you think that's queer, you do the same thing. You read the Bible and there are some things you just don't know, you don't think they apply to you, you don't know them.

Well, then, God caused that Solomon should build the temple there and have his great prayer and people could come to understand this, but the practice was pretty well established of worshipping in other places, and so Solomon, before the temple was established disregarded it, he went (2 3/4) and Saul, in the purity of his heart, was at that time seeking to follow God to the full, and God praised him for it, then, later Saul turned away from following God, for a time.

But we read in 2 Kings where--1 Kings 2.3, isn't it, yes, 1 Kings 3.2--where we read about his going there, we read in chapter 3 of 1 Kings, that, verse 2, we read that only Solomon sacrificed in high places because there was no house built unto the name of the Lord until those days and Solomon' loved the Lord, walking in the statutes of David, his father, only he sacrificed and burnt incense in high places,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

and the king went to Gibeon and sacrificed there for that was the great high place, thousands of offerings did Solomon offer on that altar. Solomon did not evidently realize the law, and God praised Solomon for that which was good and caused that through Solomon's activities the stress should be laid upon Jerusalem, and the people were bringing their sacrifices to Jerusalem, but then came the disruption of the kingdom right after Solomon, and the northern king wouldn't let the people come to Jerusalem to sacrifice, they stopped them from it, and under those circumstances, the prophets in the northern kingdom had their great battle against the prophets of Baal, and Elijah rebuilt the altar of God, it was better to sacrifice to Jehovah up there than not to sacrifice to him at all (4 1/2) And the northern kingdom was unable to come to Jerusalem, the kings prevented it, some of the people doubtless migrated, I doubt if a great number did. In the southern kingdom there were people still sacrificing at the high places until the time of Hezekiah, and then we read that Hezekiah destroyed the high places, but they evidently went back (4 3/4)
in the days of Manasseh. The critics say this story by Hezekiah is very much overdrawn, because they say it was (5) Josiah who restored the high places, and that Hezekiah, they say, (5) that according to the Scripture, Hezekiah had a great reformation before Josiah did. And with him, it wasn't finding a new book in the Temple, but he carried out the principles of Deuteronomy, according to what it tells. Well, then , of course, we agree that the book of Kings wasn't written day by day writing down what happened. The book was put together some time, it may have been put together after the time of Josiah, it may represent a judgment of somebody who was familiar with what Josiah said, did these statements, but we believe that the statements represent (5 1/2)
They say these are written by the Deuteronomist who wanted us to think that as being the law, we don't think people who were loyal enough to God to want to carry out his law would be trying to misrepresent what was the situation (5 3/4)

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

We think they were people who knew that as the law that came from Moses, and are referred to as having been broken as a blemish on the (6) That is our interpretation. But without this principle of the fact of the relation between the ceremonial law and the moral law, that the moral law is God's fixed inflexible law, based upon principles of right and wrong, the civil law is the application of the moral law to changing circumstances, and the moral law--the ceremonial law is the law for ways of worshipping God and driving home to our hearts those great principles that God wants to have carried out, and without that principle I don't see any way to explain these many cases of the apparent infraction of the Deuteronomic law, but with that principle in mind and secondly with the fact of the interregnum that occurred through the Philistine conquest, the people scattered here and there, unable to have unity, and the long periods which went on in which it was impossible to carry this out, and then people just got into the habit of not carrying it out, and you will say, well, then, they got into the habit of not carrying it out, why didn't they, when they read it, see this is what we should do, and go ahead and do it? Well, you'll find many things that we read that we intend to ignore, the Christian church--godly ministers for a couple of hundred years, in many of our churches, read through the Bible and preached the great central doctrines, faithfully, but they would read about the rapture, they would read about the second coming, and they practically never preached about it, they wouldn't think about it, it just did not attract their attention. You think how can people do that sort of thing? You would never do it, maybe you wouldn't but I think most of us are fallible human beings. I was--

I was in another Seminary before I was in this Seminary and in that seminary they had a habit then of the seven members of the faculty meeting together every Saturday to make plans for the next year, to make all the plans and discuss them at great length. And I remember one time our finances became rather bad, and it was decided we must cut down for next year, so we made plans to try to cut down for the next year.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

And one thing was to make certain rather strict about receiving new students, so we made certain restrictions and in the course of these restrictions it'll cut the entering class down too low, so somebody put in, "however the restrictions will not apply if the entering falls below 23," it being understood that nothing shall be done to cut the entering class below 23. Well, I sort of didn't like that number 23, and do I spoke up and said, now I want it put in here in these restrictions, that it says not under the 23, and I said, this being understood that this restriction applies only th the year 1932-33. Dr. Machen said, well, Dr. MacRae, if I put in a thing like that, the whole thing is just ~~junked~~ for the year 1932-33, it has nothing to do with any year after 32-33, the whole thing is that, I said, yes, but I would like to have it on this particular rule. I'd like to have that statement here so it is understood,in any case, that this is for 32-33. So he said, all right, what's the harm, put it in. So they put it in. The whole thing was for 32-33, that particular thing is specifically said, it being understood this applies only to the year 32-33, and for the next four years, or five, I guess, while I was a member of that faculty those rules were still in effect, exactly as they were, and the number 23 was referred to repeatedly, even three years later an that was established in the rule, even though it said right there that it applied only to this year.

Circumstances changed, during the year, such that I had no reason to object, nor did anybody else object, it just continued, but it was said, repeated, here is the law. Numbers 23, and right after it, it said, it being understood this applies only to the year 1932-33. ~~When~~

When I was in Los Angeles, before I came east there was a tunnel onthe way to town we used to drive through, and on that tunnel, cars would go through averaging about 30-35 miles an hour, but I remember during the many times during the last five years I was there, seeing a big sing on that tunnel which says $100 fine for riding, driving, or propelling any vehicle through this tunnel at a rate faster than 8 miles per hour. And that was there, those last five years that I was there, at least. It may

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

have been there for 30 before, I don't know. But when I went back five years later I was glad to see the sign had been removed. Because everybody drove through, 30-35 miles an hour, today they probably go 50, but the sign said 8 miles per hour.

It is a thing that happens in human life, human people being fallible as they are. You get into the habit of disregarding something, and then unless somebody comes along with a great vital urge to make a big point and talk about it and drive it home to you, nobody notices it. And the same thing applies to the adding, like the adding of that number 23, that time. Now here in the case of this law: the Sabbath was given for man, not man for the Sabbath. Sacrifice was vital for man's relation to God. It should be at one place, that was the regulation for a good purpose, for the life of Israel as a nation, but when Israel was destroyed in 70 A.D., the people were so set on carrying out the precise letter of that ceremonial law, that they disregarded all those chapters for 2000 years, that say that without shedding of blood there is no remission of sin. And the Jews have not had sacrifice all that time,

So this principle of the difference between the ceremonial law and the civil law, the difference in purpose, that the ceremonial law is to be observed, and we are to study and see what it is, but we are to see what its purpose was. And the moral law, that there can be no interregnum, there is an interregnum in the ceremonial law, a period of a hundred years or more, when it could...

P.116. (3/4)

...in the course of it we should observe moral laws. The ceremonial law if it's a matter of life and death, if it's an important matter of changing circumstances, we can adapt the ceremonial law to fit the situation. That principle applies. We can understand the many cases , particularly Solomon and Samuel, and Elijah, where there seems to be an ignoring of what is expressed in Deut.12, four or five times in that one chapter and three or four times more in course of the book of Deutereonomy.//

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

You see why I told you that the evidence from history is the most difficult of the critical arguments. There is no use trying to explain it away with specious arguments, it is far better to face the facts, see what the facts are, and see how if we apply the principle that Jesus enunciated, and Jesus did not say, it was said to you of old times you must do this, but I say to you it's all right to pluck corn on the Sabbath. That's not what He said. He said you object to this in relation to Sabbath, you object to healing on the Sabbath, Jesus said to them, haven't you read what David did, how he broke the ceremonial law when there was a reasonable proper purpose for doing it? He said, the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath. He gave it as a principle which had always been valid, rather than as a new development for a new situation, as He gave certain other times.

Now this is a very important point to see, it is important for our whole attitude, I believe, toward the Bible and toward the law of God, and it is said when you see people taking some small point of ceremonial law, or some point that has a reasonable important place, perhaps, but which is far inferior to many others, and pushing it out of proportion to where it upsets other things that are extremely vital in Scripture. In this case, if we do it, we almost logically have to take the critics view. Yes, Mr. Abbott? (2 3/4) It was not performed in the high places by those whom God established as the leaders of the people, in (3 1/4) There is no evidence after that time of anyone who is described in Kings or Chronicles as God's prophet, God's man, one who was a properly--a leader of God's people who should properly be recognized as such, sacrificing in the high places, after (3 1/2) Solomon. But the people, many of them, did it, and the king did not force (3 1/2)

Yes? (3 1/2) I can't say whether there was or not. That would be an interesting question for you to look into and see if you can find a (4)

Yes? (4 1/4)

Deut.12 says it about four times and there are three or four places further on in Deuteronomy

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

where it is either said or implied, but then they say the P document assumes it throughout, there is certainly the assumption in Leviticus all through, that the sacrifices are to be brought to the priest in the center of the area, there is no suggestion in Leviticus that it is all right to bring your sacrifices to other places. It is not specifically ordered, but it is certainly understood.

Well, we have finished a vital point here, we have just three minutes left, and maybe I could give you a very brief question. Rather than start another point. Let's take a very brief question. Use your Bibles please. Odd numbers, very briefly state the significance of Deut.12.21. Even numbers, very briefly state the importance of Ex.6.3. Do what you can in three to three and a half minutes. ...

P.116. (4/26/62) (10)

this matter of the argument from History, and as I stated ~~in it~~ it is the most, it is the strongest of the critical arguments. It, and perhaps, from the Parallel Passages, are the strongest of the arguments. But the thing is of course that with the Parallel Passages, if you carry it to an extreme, it reduces the whole thing to absurdity. That particular feature does not apply here. But their argument that if the book of Deuteronomy had been God's law given through Moses, you would not find godly men like Samuel, and Solomon simply disregarding it, and sacrificing in various places, and you would not find, they say, then, the godly kings who are highly trained disregarding the fact that the high places were continued. It does not say that these godly kings after Solomon that they worshipped in the high places, that they sacrificed there. But it does say, this man was a man who was true to the Lord, who followed God's word and who strove tomake the Word of God (11 1/4) in the nation, only it says the high places were not removed, but people kept on sacrificing at them.

The other arguments, as we have seen, they have many instances of violation, but the others are quite easily dealt with. If a wicked man disobeys the law, that proves nothing. And the fact that Adonijah (11 3/4) near Jerusalem, the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

fact that Saul had the people out in the field, in the course of the battle, in each case the word is perfectly explained by the usage in Deut.12.21, where it is said they made at a distance from Jerusalem, if they're too far to come in every time they want meat. Well, now of course, that Adonijah, he wasn't far from Jerusalem, he is not obeying that law. No, we are not saying he was but we are saying that it's not necessary to say he was sacrificing, he might be slaying these, when you were not supposed to slay them here, without offering as sacrifice, but he wasn't sacrificing as far as any clear statement goes. So that we can get rid of half of two-thirds of the alleged instances, but we've done so we still have left very vital cases, particularly Samuel...

P.117 (3/4)

...and therefore we expect Samuel to be a model in anything that is expressed and dwelt upon as vital in the Scriptures. In the case of Solomon, we note in his latter days, Solomon fell away from complete loyalty to God and did much that was wrong, but the particular instance in Solomon's case was not taken from his latter days but from his early days, and it is in fact an instance in connection with which God praised him. God did not say I praise you for offering sacrifice at Gibeon, He didn't say that, but God did come to him the night after he offered all these sacrifices at Gibeon, and gave him that wonderful offer of blessing without a word of rebuke, so that is pretty substantial, along with the cases of Samuel, and these are definite cases, they cannot be explained away, One of two things is true. In the case of Samuel, one of two things is true. Either the Deuteronomic law had not yet been written, or else Samuel felt that there were justifying reasons for ignoring that particular law, and I don't see any way to explain the case of Samuel, unless we accept the second alternative of these. Because Samuel' was God's leader, who trained the people, who taught them the word of God, who went about from place to place, exhorting them to obey Him, offering these sacrifices, and he was the one whom God chose to appoint Saul as king, and when the people asked for a king, Samuel

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

said to them that they had rejected him and rejected his God, and God said to Samuel they have not rejected you but rejected me, so you cannot say that there was a clear teaching in the word of God, given by Moses, given several times in chapter 12, and repeated two or three times later, and then contained at the end of Joshua, when the people were about to fight with one another, to have civil war over these plain disobedience to this law. You cannot say that was in existence at the time of Samuel, unless you say that Samuel was quite convinced, and rightly convinced, that under the circumstances it was justifiable to ignore that particular law. And I feel that we are perfectly safe in saying that Solomon was justified, in taking that attitude, and that was the attitude he took on the basis of the attitude that the Lord Jesus Christ took toward the Sabbath, where He said the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath. And this does not mean that one can simply ignore God's command regarding parallels, not at all.

It doesn't mean that God can ignore God's commands about religious service, but it does mean that the vital thing is the heart of the message, it is the spirit of the message, it is the moral law, that is the vital thing, and the ceremony is given to drive something home to the mind, and the ceremony is something that under normal conditions would be strictly observed, but that there may be abnormal conditions which justify abbrogation or change for a period in the ceremony required. That the Sabbath was made for man, but not man for the Sabbath. Yes? (4 1/4) Now I don't have that material, but there have been studies made of the historic books of the Old Testament to show that the law of Moses was well-known to the people at various periods. Now the evidence would be much more extensive at some places than others. One evidence, for instance, which is given in the time of Samuel is that Saul conquered the Amalekites, and he kept Agag, king of the Amalekites, kept some of the leaders, and he kept a lot of the animals, and when Samuel came, Samuel said what is this bleeting of oxen that I hear? And Saul said I have retained the best for sacrifice, and Samuel said, to obey is better than sacrifice, and Samuel (5 1/2) before the Lord. Well, now, why would Saul think that was

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

wrong, why would Saul think he should've killed all the Amalekites, what would be his reason? We are not told inSamuel that Samuel had commanded Saul, or that the Lord had given a revelation to Saul, that all the Amalekites should be killed, but you go back to Exodus and read how the Amalekites attacked Israel as they came through the desett, and you read that God said to Moses, write this in a book, that God has declared Amalek forever, and I will wipe out Amalek from under heaven. Now they say, this must be that Samuel is strongly rebuking Saul for disobeying the Pentateuch in this case. Now that is one case (6) Now that of course is not Deuteronomy, that is Exodus, but whether there are precise cases in Deuteronomy or not, that would be a very excellent thing to investigate, but I don't have that material ready. But it is a good question, as you see, if there was no evidence of their knowing anyting about the Pentateuch that would be a very strong argument for the critics, to use, and you can be sure they would make much of it. There is much evidence for their being familiar with many things in the Pentateuch, and in the case of Samuel, the writer of the book of Samuel--did Samuel write first and second Samuel, that's one question on which you can be dogmatic, nobody knows who wrote Hebrews. The Bible nowhere tells us, we have no way of knowing, but we do know that David did not write Hebrews, that we can be confident of, and we can be equally confident that Samuel didn't write 2 Samuel because it deals entirely with events after his death, so we know Samuel didn't write 2 Samuel.

Now first and second Samuel form a unit, they are one book, in the Hebrew, therefore, it would seem most probable that first Samuel also was not written by Samuel, it is called Samuel because Samuel is the outstanding character, Who wrote it, we have no idea. Whoever wrote it was not led by the Spirit of God to introduce a statement by way of explanation, of Samuel's acts. But he did include a statement of the fact that Samuel went about through the land, holding these annual sacrifices. That he states. And of course when we look back at the book of Deuteronomy and we find the command is given, Moses does not say as soon as you enter the promised land you desist from all sacrifice

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

P.117. ~~(except at the one place God gives. Moses says when you~~
(8)

except at the one place God gives. Moses says when you are settled in the land which God has given you, and the Lord has given you rest from your enemies round about, then you shall desist from all sacrifice anywhere except inthe one place that God will choose in your land, to have sacrifice. Very evidently during the days of the conquest this may have taken ten years. During that time, they performed sacrifices whereever thett headquarters were. God wanted sacrifices carried on, they were the means of bringing before the people the consciousness of sin, and the consciousness that man as a sinner before God needed atonement, and that something must be provided to take man's place, in winning an acceptance with God, that was something God wanted constantly stressed, and so sacrifices were performed in the wilderness, they were performed in Canaan, then we read how they came to Shiloh for their regular service, and so we are safe in concluding that Shiloh was the place where God had put His name. After the defeat by the Philistines, after Shiloh was probably destroyed, we never hear of it again, as a place, and we have reference to it in Jeremiah which implies it was terribly destroyed, after the raids, the defeat by the Philistines, during the time right up till ~~then~~ David's time, for a period of nearly a century, the Philistines were in general control of the land. They did not have the Israelites so organized that the Israelites were completely under their thumb. The Israelites enjoyed a very considerable measure of freedom, but there were Philistine garrisons scattered here and there through the land, and when Saul became king his independence was constantly on a shaky foundation, he was often having to ~~with~~ fight with the Philistines, and finally he was killed by themin a great battle, so we have a period of nearly a century in which nobody could say that the Israelites had rest from their enemies round about, they were in constant danger , in constant difficulty.

Another of the circumstances, Samuel may very well have said, when we are at peace from our enemies round about, God wishes it stressed, the unity of the nation, the unity of the people of God, by having the sacrifice at one place, and God wishes under those circumstances that the sacrifice shall be rigidly kept to one place, to avoid the rise

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

of different divergent groups inthe land that will gradually adopt attitudes contrary to what God has revealed, and consequently there is a vital purpose in this, but under present circumstances, you cannot carry that out, the people can't come to one central place, and therefore that being the situation it is far better to have sacrifice but by not have it strictly in accord with the (11 1/4) than not to have sacrifice at all. Now whether Samuel thought that through or whether just in the situation he proceeded to do what was necessary and didn't face that question, we don't know, but at any rate there is no evidence that God in any way showed displeasure with the attitude that Samuel took on it. Then after Samuel had taken that attitude for many years when Saul became king it would be very unlikely that a change would be made unless Samuel spoke up vigorously and urged that a change be made. And Samuel had many other things on his mind at that time, and in addition to that, they still were in very grave danger from the Philistines, in constant pressure from them, and under the circumstances other things may have seemed much more important to Samuel than this. And so Saul may not even have thought about the matter, we have no reason to think that Saul was a particularly close student of the word of God, Saul was a man who in his early days undoubtedly sincerely wanted to do what was right, but probably he got most of his knowledge of what was right from other people. Then after Saul's death, David continued, David for seven years had only two tribes, the land was in turmoil, after 7 years David got control of the whole land, and then he conquered Jerusalem, made it his capital, and gradually it may have come to people to realize that Jerusalem...

P.118. (3/4)

...yes, well obedience is more important than that, right, but obedience means obedience to the law given. The law was given through Samuel, therefore, sacrifice is important, the question is if you cannot carry out all the commands or laws, which are most important? Well, they are commanded to have sacrifices. Samuel going about every year, (1 1/2) different places, having sacrifices in

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

them, was obeying the law to sacrifice, but here is a law that is tremendously stressed, ~~here,~~ the Amalekites are to be wiped out from under heaven. Samuel ignores that law in order to perform sacrifice. It is obedience to the law of God as fully studied, and carefully understood, that is vital, but very often you will find a situation where, on a particular situation there is some detail that you can't carry out if you carry out the main thing, and in those cases you have to make your choice. I think I have told in this class, already, but I'm going to repeat it again, because it is a good illustration of the attitude you are not to take.

The young Jewish fellow, now a professor in the University of California--I was talking to him down here at the University of Pennsylvania a few years ago and he mentioned to me that there was a law which the Jews followed, that all the firstborn had to fast on a certain day, and he was one of them, so he was to fast, but he said, we don't like to fast. So he said we find another law which says that whenever you finish reading a main portion of Scripture then you can have a day of feasting, celebration. So he said, about two or three days before the day on which the firstborn are supposed to fast, he said, we take a main section of the Scripture and we start through three chapters of that and start reading, so each day we read a chapter or two, and we just finish on that day, and the result is that we have two commands: we have a command to feast because we've finished reading a main portion of Scripture, we have a command to fast because we are a firstborn--two commands, you can't obey both of them, so we obey the one to feast.

Well, that is obedience but it is obedience to the letter of the law, and utter disregard of the spirit of the law. And if you're going to obey the Scripture, you have to find a spiritual purpose, the objective, the principles in mind are the important thing, and the matters of form, matters of ceremony, every matter of that type that God gives has a specific purpose, but the purpose is related to something of principle, something of meaning, something of moral law, and it is the principle, the moral law, the thing

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

that is represented, that is vital, and if it is impossible to carry out the precise letter, or if in some cases carrying out the precise letter will have the opposite effect from what the letter was intended, the Lord expects one to use his judgment in relation to this. He expects him to study the Scripture, to get great principles, and apply these principles, rather than to study the Scriptures, to grab a sentence and follow that literally, like in the case of the Circumceliones in North Africa in the 5th century A.D., those wild fellows who went about the country trying to force people to obey the Scripture, and they said, that Jesus said to Peter, put up thy sword, so they never used a sword, they just took clubs and beat men to death with clubs, because the Scripture says put up thy sword. Well, it is perfectly evident, if you study the Scripture, when Jesus said put up thy sword , He was not giving a command for all time, to put up thy sword, he was giving a command in a particular situation, to put up the sword. And it has relevance to any other similar situation, but Christians are abundantly commanded, the people of God are abundantly commanded to fight for great issues in the Scriptures, the Scripture is very pacifistic when it comes to standing up for one's own individual rights and one's own individual glory. It says to turn the other cheek , it says to do everything to keep from fighting for your own individual rights or glory, but when it comes to purposes of God and the accomplishment of His will, the Scripture not only permits fighting, it commands fighting. That is, the Old Testament very clearly does , and the New Testament certainly nowhere denies it. But you do not learn what God's will is by taking a couple of words out of context, you have to get the principle involved.

Now in this case you have a matter which is very considerably stressed, but it happens after the Lord has given them rest from their enemies round about, they had rest from their enemies round about, but then they reverted to the situation at the time of the conquest, when they had no rest ~~from~~ for nearly a century , they were constantly under enemy attack, and enemy (6 1/4) and under those circumstances the question was, shall we sacrifice but not keep it in one place, or shall we do away

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

with sacrifice? And Samuel, ~~while though he~~ very likely followed the principles, followed God's purposes, rather than simply to obey the letter of the law.

The Jews at A.D.70 took the other decision. I would say from a viewpoint of loyalty to the Scriptures, omitting the matter of Christ, or of the New Testament, anything like that, simply from the matter of having the Old Testament, and following the Old Testament, I would say they were definitely wrong in A.D. 70. The law says you must sacrifice, the people said we can't sacrifice because it is supposed to be at one place and the Romans have taken that away and won't let us even enter it. Consequently they did away with sacrifice, I would say, from the viewpoint of their loyalty to Scripture, they were obeying the letter of one particular law, and loosing something that was far more important. But I would say, that if God makes the wrath of wicked men to praise Him, He was in that case, using men's mistakes, in order to cause sacrifice to cease when that ~~was~~ which it represented had been fulfilled through the death of Christ. Miss Pickett? (7 1/2) Yes, very good. I wanted to look at Samuel, and then at Solomon, and if there is anything further--I thank you for mentioning that because I don't want to forget it or overlook it, but I would like to finish Samuel first, before we take up Solomon. If I forget it , please call it to my attention again, because I intend to take it up. Mr. MacKeen? (7 3/4) You are asking, I believe, if I understand correctly, about the original ~~man~~ command. I asked the whole class to study Deut. 12 very carefully, and to see in Deut.12 exactly what is commanded, and in Deut.12, we read in verse 6, that--in the first few verses about how--v.5, unto the place the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes, to put His name there, even unto His habitation, shall ye seek and thither thou shalt come. Thither thou shalt bring thy burnt offerings, and so on. Verse 8, ye shall not do after all the things that we do here, this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes, for we are not as yet come to the rest of the inheritance which the Lord giveth you, but when ye go over Jordan and

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

dwell in the land which the Lord your God giveth you to inherit and when He giveth you rest from all your enemies round about, so that ye dwell in safety, then there shall be a place which the Lord your God shall choose to cause His name to dwell in, thither shall ye bring all that I command you, your burnt offering, your sacrifice, and so on. Now that verse in Deut.12 is right in connection with the original giving of this command, and that is very important--I am glad Mr. MacKeen called attention to it. I have been referring to it a number of times, but it is very important for everybody to have in mind, just where it is, and what it is. You can interpret that verse that means, as we go over Jordan and dwell in the land that God gives you to inherit, and He has given you rest from your enemies round about so that you dwell in safety, in other words, the conquest is completed, then he establishes a place to sacrifice, and from then on, you never sacrifice anywhere else, no matter what happens--you can interpret it that way, but you can equally reasonably interpret it that after you go over and dwell there, and the Lord gives you rest from your enemies and you dwell in safety , then there is a place and as long as you keep on dwelling in safety, you sacrifice only at the one place, but that if you revert to the situation like today, where you are wanderers-- I mean like when Moses said "today," where you are outside of the land and where you have no access to the place which God has borne you out, or where you have enemies all through the land, holding you in subjection, that under those circumstances you cannot obey this command to sacrifice only at the one place, therefore, you have to sacrifice at other places, rather than not to sacrifice at all. There is a little bit of problem in the interpretation of the verse, and there is a problem in interpretation of many things in Scripture, you have to compare Scripture with Scripture. God has not simply given us a series of 1, 2, 3, 4 , that are so simple that nobody will ever have any difficulty knowing what His will is, He has not done that, He has given us a book for a complex life, a complex world, where sin is all around us and where Satan is very active, and He wants us to study His word and determine what the principles

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

are, what are the vital principles? And if you have something that at one time everybody is going to do because they then think it's tremendously important to carry on sacrifice. Why you don't have to give a lot of commands, be sure you offer sacrifices, because everybody thinks that that is tremendously important. But if they ~~asked~~ apt to get to carrying sacrifices all kinds of places, and then break the uniformity of the nation, and get off into all kinds of divergent sects and they don't yet have the whole word of God to study in order to determine what ~~Israel~~ His will is, then it is vital that he then stress and stress repeatedly the unity of the place of sacrifice. But that doesn't mean that He means that the sacrifice doesn't matter, half as much as that you sacrifice only in the one place. Under those circumstances it is necessary to emphasize this feature, the other doesn't need so much emphasis, but it was perfectly obvious to everybody, in that time, that sacrifice was very vital. It was when you got the Pharasaic scribal attitude of the New Testament that we must watch every little particular word, every line, every sentence, every jot and tittle of the law. Jesus said the law will not depart--said, not one jot nor one tittle will depart from it until all was fulfilled. But He means the meaning of one jot or one tittle, He doesn't mean that every jot and tittle is tremendously important because there are many cases where they make no difference to the meaning whatever...

P.119 (3/4)

...a man wrote me from the University of Virginia, who was active in student work there, he said, it'll be fifteen years before anybody in the University of Virginia will even think the Bible is worth looking into, after this article in Look Magazine, which has practically said you can't depend on the Bible at all, nobody knows what the text is, there are thousands of variations ø in the Greek manuscripts, and scholars are now starting to study these, they're trying to find what the text could really be. Even the Lord's Prayer is uncertain, because in the book of Matthew some manuscripts don't have the last sentence of the Lord's Prayer in at all.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Well, the fact is, when you look at the Lord's Prayer in Luke that last sentence is omitted altogether. Well, what is the Lord's Prayer, is it the way it is in most manuscripts (1 1/2) and Matthew, including "for thine is the kingdom, and the glory, and the power forever." Or is it the way it is Luke where that sentence is omitted? Which is the Lord's prayer? How're we going to ~~pray~~ find it if we don't know which is the Lord's prayer? And then you find in Matthew some manuscripts leave out that last, and what are you going to do, how can you pray at all, you don't know what the Lord's prayer is. Well, the fact of the matter is of course that just before the Lord gave the Lord's prayer, He said, let not your prayer be vain repetitions like the heathen who think they'll be heard for their much speaking. It isn't your repeating any words that matters, it is the thought that matters, it is the principle, it is the idea. And the ideas of that sentence are clearly taught in the Scripture. Clearly taught. And whether you use them in the particular prayer, or not, doesn't matter. I think myself God intentionally taught that Luke would give it in the form Jesus gave it one time He gave, and Matthew in the form He gave it another time when He gave it, and that the two forms would be different simply to tell us that you'll never get to heaven by repeating the Lord's prayer over, even a hundred thousand times, but that if you take the thoughts that are in the Lord's prayer and make them vital in your life, it will receive the blessing of the Lord. Well, (2 3/4)

the attitude of so many people that it is particular forms and ceremonies that matter, rather than the the principle of the teaching of the word of God, and so many people take that attitude toward the Scripture that it's very easy for the liberals to come along and say well, the law of Deuteronomy cannot then have been given, or Samuel could not have ignored. It is a difficult argument, there is no question about it, but I wouldn't be a bit surprised if God just let it be that way, apurpose, so that it would give us an impetus to examine the matter and realize afresh that it is the principles that are vital rather than the repetition of particular words and

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

forms. And then of course in Samuel's case I think we can clearly understand what happend in view of that situation, but then we come to Saul, and I don't think Saul was a man who went to the word of God and studied it carefully and thoroughly, he took what other people said, but he was anxious to obey the law, and he ecactly carried out the principles of this chapter, where it stresses, but you must not eat the flesh with the blood, You remember what a fuss ~~Solomon~~ Saul made in the battle because they were eating the flesh with the blood. He put up a rock, he said here you bring your animals here and kill them according to the law strictly, so you do not eat the blood with the flesh. And he carried out the Mosaic law very strictly. He certainly was familiar with the Pentateuch to do that. But then we have David who was still fighting and then David gets established and then David says I'm going to build a great temple for God in Jerusalem, and the Lord said to David, no, you're not the man to do it, you're a man of war, let your son do it, he is a man of peace. So with that thought then , giving His approval to David's act in selecting Jerusalem as the new headquarters, ~~because~~ to take the place of (4 3/4) the place at which all sacrifices would be done from then on. He didn't say so in so many words, but it would seem reasonable to interpret that way. Then you have Solomon, and Solomon is a young fellow, and Adonijah tries to become king, and most of the leaders favor Adonijah rather than Solomon, but David the old man, practically in his dotage, hardly realizing what's happening, when Bathsheba comes to him and talks to him, and realizing, he rises up with a little more energy despite his extreme age, he calls people in, and he makes the young man, Solomon, king, and Solomon wants to be a good king and wants to do what is right, so Solomon says I'm going to obey the Lord, and he says we're going to have a great sacrifice, we're going to Gibeon that great high place, a few miles north of Jerusalem, and he goes to that place and he slays in utter definace of the P law, the priestly law, which says that only the priests can sacrifice, we read that Solomon slew , was it ten thousand

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

oxen, and sacrificed all these oxen, he had this great festival there to the Lord, and what is the Lord going to do? The Lord says, well, Solomon, it's nice you want to make a lot of sacrifices, it's nice you want to do what's right, but look, you've broken the law, you should have done all this at Jerusalem. Well, one thing about the Lord is, He is tactful. The Lord, when there is reason to show when you have the wrong spirit, He will rebuke you in the strongest language, like when he struck the man dead that tried to steady the ark. They were disregarding the law in this situation where it was carried by (6 1/2) of David. But when a person is trying to do what is right, and is anxious to follow the Lord, the Lord comes to them with advice and help to lead them gradually from where they are, and clearly, over into what is right, rather than with a sharp denunciation, because despite their desire to do what is right, they are mistaken and are doing wrong. You find that in the gospels.

You find that inthe Gospel of Matthew written to the Jews who are in misery under Roman oppression, tells them about the great king, you're going to have your own king, Jesus is the king predicted in the Old Testament, He is going to do away with all oppression, He is going to establish His kingdom as King. Well, then Mark writes for Romans and the Romans are the great kings, and does the Lord have Mark start out and say, oh Romans, you serpents, you have no right to take over the kingship, you should abdicate from it, because the Jews are the people God has selected as His own people, you should not be ruling. No. He starts in with what the Romans need, the Romans need someone who can accomplish things, someone who can do things, and that's what the Romans need, that's what they're looking for, and Mark writes for the Romans, telling them of the one who can do, the effective servant, and by the time you get through the book of Romans, you realize that the one who can work the great miracles, and do what is needed, is the real king, and you should (8)

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

So when Solomon tries to show his loyalty to God and his great interest in doing God/s will, after he did it, even though he had not carried it out, the command that it is only to be at the one place, God appeared to him and asked him what He should give him, as a sign of His blessing, and then Solomon instead of asking for long life and riches, asked for wisdom that he should rule the people aright, God praised him for it and said you've asked for wisdom instead of long life or riches, I'll give you all three. So He did, and with the wisdom Solomon had, he doubtless realized it soon, because he it was who built the temple, who prayed that marvelous prayer of dedication, who spoke about the presence of God there in the Temple, and the Temple being the supreme headquarters in Jerusalem there of the worship of the king, and then after Solomon, we have no evidence of later good kings sacrificing anywhere else. But the writer of the book of kings, writing from a time after Josiah had fully enforced the command, says in speaking of these men, he says they were good men who did the Lord's will in the main, they wanted to, but he says they did not do away with the high places, they didn't do sacrifice elsewhere, but they did not intervene with power to stop the worship of the Lord on some of these high places. Yes? (9 3/4)
No, they're two distinct problems. This is the southern kingdom we are dealing with. The northern kingdom we have no king of the northern kingdom who is spoken of as a man who lived after the Lord (10)
Somebody said, the southern kingdom, there are two kinds of kings, good kings and bad kings, in the northern kingdom there are two kinds: bad kings and very bad kings. Well now it is true that there were some kings in the northern kingdom who were not very bad, but there is no king in the northern kingdom who can be considered as a man who was really trying to serve the Lord, and do the Lord's will. There were some of them who were quite friendly to the prophets and who stood behind the prophets to some extent, but none of them who really tried to obey the Lord, and so in the northern kingdom Jeroboam introduced a worship which not only disregarded the law that worship

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

was to be at once place, sacrifice at one place, but in addition to that, had an idol, he had the golden calf. Now of course the Golden Calf was supposed to represent Jehovah, it was not heathenism, it was supposed to be the worship of Jehovah. And some think that the calf was supposed to be, not the god, but the pedestal on which the God stood, you can't prove that one way or the other, but that we can say, they meant by the Golden Calf, they meant to stand for the word of Jehovah. I meant that is what they meant the people to think. And when the Baal worship came in that was so much worse than (11 1/2) that was so terrible an enemy to the worship of God that the prophets during the time of the Baal worship gave their attention to that to the extent they ignored the Golden Calf almost altogether.

But that doesn't mean they felt they were right. The Baal worship was the tremendous great thing that had to be met, so Elijah and Elisha dealt with that.

So I think the principle involved there is not too difficult to understand and I think that the Lord let it be that way in order to ~~try t~~ encourage us to look at it again and realize that importance to them. There is many a good Christian who spends years of his life trying to enforce some minor matter and neglecting to make his life really count for the big things that the Lord wants him to stress in life. And Samuel did not make that mistake, but I think he (12 1/.2) though He did not command them to, they were disobeying in doing it, but I think it was part of His purpose because the sacrifices were now fulfilled in Christ, and it is a wonderful evidence that they were done away with, a very (12 3/4) reason for this command probably, in the divine economy was that after A.D.70 the Jews did just worshipped this, the Torah, the Law, they don't pay much attention to it, they build their lives on the Talmud, which is supposed to be commentary and discussion...

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

...and they have no sacrifice at all, and the only reason is because they have no access to Jerusalem, to the Temple are, to perform sacrifice. At least that was the only the only reason through a good many centuries. Of course today (1)

Well, now, that, I think, covers this vital principal. I took all of today reviewing all of this part of the time reviewing that from yesterday, but it's very important to understand it fully and accurately, and correctly. And I don't think we advance our cause a bit in simply brushing things aside with ridicule. We want to look at things fairly and see what the real facts are. And when we do, if one doesn't understand this principle, you have a real problem here. Now that problem, ~~to~~ suppose ~~prove~~ the critics prove their point completely here, that would not prove the whole critical theory, it certainly wouldn't do that. At most it would prove that the book of Deuteronomy was written. It wouldn't prove the whole thing. But it is one of the many points which they put together (2) in support of the critical theory. It is perhaps the one which has most validity of all. Yes? (2 1/4) That is an interesting problem. I don't know as but he says he will. He specifically in Deuteronomy and repeats it, you are not to worship, to sacrifice, in places scattered through the land, but to that place where the Lord will put His name, there you are to. Now Solomon recognizes in his dedication prayer that God has (2 1/2) in Jerusalem, but we have no statement but we have Solomon's statement that . Mr. MacKeen? (2 3/4) Well, they were all through then, there were some over in Transjordan, Reuben and Gad. (stu.) Well, it's where, all we can say is it is where the spiritual leaders felt this was where God had put His name, and the prophets spoke and acted as if it were true. But we have no specific statement to that effect. Yes? (3 1/4) Well, of course, that is the big reason for opposition to higher criticism. The big reason for it is not that they were worshipping in places for worshipping of idols, they were intended for the worship of the wrong, but that they could so easily become

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

places of false worship, or that people could so easily go off on all kinds of diversions. Now we are in a day when God wants everyone to study the word, and to see what it says and follow what you find there, and try to follow accurately what you find in the word. We have the whole word, but in those days we did not yet have the whole word. Jesus had not yet come, many things were through a veil darkly in the Old Testament, and God was taking, setting Israel apart as the nation through which He'd give the word and through which He'd prepare the way for the coming of His Son. Thus under those circumstances it was very important that there be kept a unity rather than the development of a lot of different areas holding very divergent ideas, which might easily have developed brand new religions of all kinds, in addition to following after religion (4 1/2)

So it was for a definite practical reason that this command was given. It was not a spiritual sense, it was (4 3/4) but it was a vital factor

Well, I think we can start the next section which is, this was ~~4b(1).~~ IV, D, 1, The Place of Sacrifice. Now 2, The Persons Who Perform the Sacrifice. And I anticipated a little bit, a few minutes ago, I wonder if many of you noticed how I did it, but I anticipated a few minutes ago when I said, Solomon in utter disregard to the Levitical law, the law of P, that only the priests and Levites can perform sacrifice, Solomon went and with his own hand slew 10,000 oxen, it says. Well, that is the way it would sound, the way the critics talk, exactly. But I wonder how many people really think that Solomon with his own hand killed 10,000 oxen? He'd have an awful strong arm, an awful tired arm , before the day was over. The matter of the place of sacrifice is a much easier one to be definite about, because it's at one place or it's at another place, but the matter of the person who performs the sacrifice you can say that a sacrifice is given by anybody who provides the ox for it, he give s a sacrifice. But the law is that the act of the sacrificing is to be done by the priest, and so you

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

have here a case where your words can often lead to an ambiguity. Well now that is a point we come to soon under this, #2 is the person who performs the sacrifice, let's take small a under it, ~~the=A~~ a, The Exact Law. I have a reference here to Num.18.7 and there we read, where the Lord says to Aaron, starting at v.6, and I behold I have taken your brethren the Levites from among the children of Israel, who knew they are given as a gift for the Lord to do the service of the tabernacle of the congregation, therefore, thou and thy sons with thee shall keep your priests' office for everything of the altar and within the veil, and ye shall serve, I have given your priests office unto you as a service of gifts, and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death. There is a specific strong command, given that the priest's office, for everything of the altar and within the veil, are given as a priests office unto you as a service of gifts and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death. Now that is the command which the critics say was written in the time of the exile, when this fiction was originated that there'd been a man named Aaron who was high priest and all the priests were to be descended from him. They say that this fiction originated at the time of the exile and that the sacrifice was originally was opened to all (8 1/2) his descendants, then it was was restricted according to Deuteronomy to the Levites, and then at the time of the exile, this new law restricting to the family of Aaron was introduced. Now that is their statement, and therefore, if you find evidence of others than Levites sacrificing before the time of Josiah, it would be an evidence from their viewpoint against the book of Deuteronomy having been in effect before the time of Josiah. And if you have evidence of Levites other than those of the family of Aaron doing it before the time of the exile, that would be evidence against the P document, against this patt of Numbers having been in existence before then.

Now we must say that we have between the time of Josiah and the exile, there is hardly any evidence (9 1/2)

So that we cannot say from history we have evidence of three stages, we can't say

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

that. This is the only place where they have a real claim of three stages, as you know. They say there are four documents, but the claim of four stages is very, very . The claim of three stages is rare. Most of their claims amount to claims that in a particular place between one ~~statement~~ stage and the next, that there is a real development, a real change. But here they claim three stages, but our evidence will mostly be from before Josiah. Now there they have claimed to have a great deal of evidence, and most of the places we have looked at, where it is at another place, can also be considered under this matter of whether another person performed the sacrifice. We want to look into those ~~things~~ instances, but the principles in this matter are pretty much the same as in the other. The different heads we looked at in the other would pretty well apply here. We have only half a minute left so I will not give you a quiz this morning, having had two this week anyway. I had thought of giving you one or two of those early verses that were alleged not to be by Moses, I hope you'll remember them...(11)

(4/30/62)

(11 1/2) ...what was your question, Mr. Gueiros? (It seems to me that there was a provision already for the cities of refuge and he didn't go to a city of refuge, he went to the altar, and that the critics would say that the law wasn't existent at the time.) Yes, I think that was the point there in relation to the critics. Why didn't he go to the city of refuge? Instead of going here? According to the critical theory, when were the cities of refuge established? (12)...

P.121. (3/4)

...according to the critical theory the place of asylum, the place of refuge, was the altar until the time when in the days of Josiah or somewhat before they wrote this book in order to centralize all worship in Jerusalem, that would do away with all this throughout the land, therefore they had no place of asylum through the land, because there is only one altar left and that was in Jerusalem, therefore, cities of refuge were

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

invented at about the time of Josiah, instead of having been there from the beginning. Mr. Kaufmann, question? (1 1/4) This is a statement in the form of a question. There is a question but I think your real point is a statement. Your statement is, is Joab's going related to the specific purpose of cities of refuge? That your statement? The purpose of cities of refuge was for who to flee to, anybody in danger? Yes. A man in danger from man's ire was permitted to go to the city of refuge, and according to the city they could go to the altar and (1 3/4)

Now that's a very good point that Mr. Kaufmann has brought up, we will not as yet answer it, but we have the point before us, a vital thing to have.

There is another consideration which might also be of real interest to you. Yes? (2) Yes, and we're dealing with the same one he has presented, he is accused of having murdered (2 1/4) Yes? (stu.)

Oh, I see, well this would be involuntary (2 1/2)

How's that? (stu.) I don't think you could call this manslaughter. There is no evidence of any heat of passion. According to Solomon, Joab was guilty not of manslaughter but of murder (3)

but Mr. Kaufmann, from the distance he had yet read in the passage raised a very good question. Is it related to the purpose of the cities of refuge which was to protect people who were in danger of being killed by relatives of someone whom they had accidentally killed, but had not murdered. Now that question, up to this point, we have no evidence (3 1/4)

but when you get on to v.32 you find that Solomon alleges that Joab is guilty of murder. Now there is another point I'd like to mention, wonder if anybody knows what it is. According to the ~~critical~~ critical theory, the cities of refuge are invented because the altar at Jerusalem was too far for people to flee to, from all over the country and they needed new places of asylum to take the place of the altars here and there throughout the country. Now to what altars did Joab flee? It was the altar in

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Jerusalem, so what would it have to do with the Deuteronomic law anyway? That is, if the purpose of the cities of refuge was to the altar, there is only one altar left, and Joab was right there beside that altar. So it wouldn't affect him, particularly. And does this prove here that that was (4 1/4) once the person was at the altar of the Lord he was safe. Does this record prove that? Now that's looking ahead a bit (4 1/2)

I don't know as we need to read these next verses, suppose all of you read it for yourself, and just scan ahead through verse 34. I guess now everybody is through 34, how safe was Joab by the altar? Solomon said, kill him there, didn't he. He said, we'll kill you outside but if you won't come out, we'll kill you there. In other words, they didnot feel that the altar was the established place of asylum where a man was safe. But this account here shows that Joab in danger thought the altar was a good place to run to, and that's always true. It does not prove it was the established place of asylum for the person who was guilty of involuntary manslaughter. There is no involuntary manslaughter here. He was not safe there. There is no evidence that anybody considered him safe except to this extent, that such a sacred place as the altar, nobody without authorization from someone ready to take responsibility would go in and touch him there/. But Solomon did not feel that he was entirely safe there, Solomon said he was a murderer, kill him there, and they went and did it. So that it does not prove anything really about the critical theory at all. That is to say, the critical theory maintains that as part of the centralization of Deuteronomy, doing away with altars around the country which werent', according to that theory, the regular places of asylum, it was necessary to provide cities of refuge. This proves nothing to support that theory, and that is, it is a very good theory the critics have on the matter of asylum, to me the great difficulty with it is there is no evidence to support it. You don't disprove it, you just don't have evidence to support it, it just stands there as a pure guess, and you cannot establish a thing like that without some

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

evidence but this can be suggested. The point they usually suggest is the statement, if a man commits murder you shall take him away from my alter. Now that doesn't mean that a man has to commit murder to be saved there, it means even there, it means wherever he goes, the murderer is not to be protected. Quite different from the attitude of today which forgets all about the murdered people and has tremendous sympathy for the murderer. I was rather pleased to see that some magazine, where was it, an article had just come out by the Dean of the Graduate School of Columbia University, supporting capital punishment, which is very much against the whole trend today. I don't think he is a man who is at all interested in the Bible or who has a Christian stand, so far as I know, but it's interesting that there should be a voice raised (8)

But certainly the attitude of the Bible is that a man who commits murder should be killed. Yes? (8 1/4) He had no reason to think he'd have a right to claim protection. He was seeking protection from entirely different reasons. ~~There are~~ Those who had supported Adonijah were being wiped out. He was filled with terror and (8 3/4) Now he probably didn't have a helicopter to get quickly there. He probably had ample means of some other kind, though nothing compared to what Solomon had. (stu.)9 1/4) They say there is no evidence, it was a lie. (stu.9 1/2) Well, it wouldn't be a very satisfactory place to stay very long for refuge, there were no provisions for living there whatever, but it would be a most natural thing, if you were in danger, to try to get to the most sacred you could, for safety. You would certainly think that people would not defile a sacred place by killing him there (10)
it would be a natural place to run to in any kind of danger. But it wouldn't be a place where you could stay there. It would be just very temporary. It would be the sort of thing that would occur to a man filled with terror grabbing the first place that he could get. No, I don't think this would refer to where the ark was, this would probably

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

be the brazen altar. Yes? (stu.) I am not sure whether much is made of this or not. But it is the only thing I know that they could rest it on except that one statement, from the horns of my altar ye shall take him. Take him away from the altar, a man who is a murderer. The other seems to imply (11) if a man is in terrible danger he will ruh to the nearest thing he can find for safety, and this fits with it. You can read into both that that's the established place of protection. You can read that in, but you're not justified in doing it. Miss Pickett? (11 1/4) They say the cities of refuge were not established till after the time of Josiah. In fact, I'm not sure they'd be sure (11 1/2) they ever were established, but they would say that the book of Deuteronomy made a provision for the establishment of them, and a concomitant of doing away with the altars all through the land. (stu.) The altar in Jerusalem would be the one remaining altar, yes. Yes? (12) Certainly, if they did away with all the other altars they 've still got one in Jerusalem, so that...

P.122. (3/4)

...now #2, the Persons who perform the sacrifice. This is something which is touched upon a great deal in the book of Leviticus and Numbers, the priests did this, the priests did that, it is the priests and it is Aaron and his sons set apart to be the priests. They are definitely assigned that work according to the so-called priestly documents, that is, according to these sections which the critics ~~have~~ attribute to the P documents. We have one explicit one, that is Num.18.7. There we read, starting with verse 1, the Lord is speaking to Aaron and his sons and directing them to perform the work of sacrifice and overseeing the whole religious life of the people, they are to minister in the tabernacle, and then he says in verse 7, therefore thou and thy sons with thee shall keep your priests offering for everything of the altar, and within the vail, and ye shall serve. I have given your priests office unto you as a service gift, and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death. That is a very strong statement. The stranger that comes night shall be put to death, I am giving this service to you as a service gift.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Now does anybody remember a case where God interfered with someone who tried to take over the priest's office without a right? (2 1/2) This is one of the kings of Judah, the one who died in the year that Isaiah had his great dream, and so on. And he went into the temple and began to offer the incense himself. This is quite a little bit before the time of Josiah. (3)

And he went into the temple and began to perform the incense, and we read that the priests came in and they said to him, you, king, have no right to do this, and you should get out of here. And then the king looked down and saw the leprosy coming out on his body, and that he rushed out of the temple and spent the rest of his life (3 1/2)

in retirement in his own house, with no contact with people (3 1/2)

So there is a case where the man was not put to death, the command here "ye shall be put to death," but he is not immediately put to death, though leprosy meant he would be killed eventually, but it is a case where the king, the one who had authority to put people to death, in the case of the priestly office, where the king was himself punished by the Lord in a very, very severe manner. The man who began with every sign of being a very successful and effective Christian, was a man who tried to take over things that the Lord had said belong only to the priests, and the result of this was that you have that terrible (4 1/4)

So that the command here is given as a command for the direction of the government for the enforcing of this position, the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death. It doesn't mean that anybody who makes a mistake shall be killed, it does mean that all the resources of government are to back up the priests in their claim to this, and if somebody insisted upon breaking this law, that he would be put to death. That is the definite order given here in Numbers. Now that is the law, but the critics claim to point out a great many instances where the law is broken. I shouldn't have said that is the law, that is the of the priestly (5) order, as they claim. This is the only instance where they claim there are three steps, you remember.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

They claim that J and E have sacrifice by any head of a family, and of course we have Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob offering sacrifices, they say P does not recognize this. Then they say that D restricts sacrifice to the Levites, the priests the Levites, the Levitical priests. Well, of course, Aaron and his successors were Levitical priests, they were members of the tribe of Levi, priests, but the fact that in Deuteronomy Moses repeatedly speaks of the Levitical priests, the critics say, means that at that time the effort was made to restrict sacrifice to the tribe of Levi, and then that at the time of the exile, when the P document waswritten, a further restriction was made, limiting it to the family of Aaron, which they say is purely an invention of the time of the exile. That is the theory in three stages, and the specific law is this one (6 1/4)

Now the instances of it, this book of Carpenter again, Composition of the Hexateuch, is one of the most impressive from the critical viewpoint, of the whole matter that I know of, so I turn to p.134 in it, where I find it stated , "The Deuteronomic demands for a single sanctuary being thus unrecognized, it is not surprising to find Levitical principles ignored or defied with equal regularity and persistence." This is small b:

b, Instances Noted. "Whatever may be the early history of the tribe of Levi --and no branch of the history of Israel is more obscure--it appears plain that religious usage in an age immediately following the settlement is entirely unconscious of the requirement of the priestly code. There is no ~~place~~ trace of any exclusive sacred order. The chief authority is civil, not ecclesiastical, the congregation is dissolved, the high priest disappeared, the people had no proper unity, they are scattered tribes, and the work of establishing a political and religious bond requires hundreds of years." These are his statements, much of which is pure assumption. "All through the main narrative of Judges 3 to 16 there is no mention of professional priests. Now in Judges 3.17 we have a man establishing his son to be a priest, and then this man, finding a wandering Levite , and hiring him to be priest in place of his son--priest before an image which he has--that doesn't prove much about what good people who followed the word of God thought was the right thing to do.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

what a man like that did. But that is in Judges 17, then Judges 18 tells about Dan did. And how it says the Danites took certain men and made them priests of their shrine in the northern part of the country, and it says that the end of the last verse, that this continued all the time that the house of God was in Shiloh. So the picture in chapters 17 and 18 of Judges would seem to be a picture of individuals disobeying the law of God, and establishing a situation with perhaps wicked men who were of the house of Levite, establishing something that was contrary to that which was ordained, it doesn't prove that the established law wasn't there, but he doesn't make that his argument there, he says Judges 3-16, the main narrative in the book of Judges, has no mention in it of professional priests. Now of course we say right away, if it said in Judges 3-16 that the house of the Lord was at Shiloh and the high priest was there and all sacrifice was ~~pefr~~ performed there, that would immediately answer the problem, and settle it in line with the Levitical kingdom, of the book of the Pentateuch. But does the fact that no such statement is there prove the contrary? Their argument is an argument from silence.

An argument from silence can sometimes be a very strong argument, but it depends on whether it is necessarily to be expected that such a statement will occur. If you read about an Englishman who made a trip to the united states in 1955, and suppose he wrote a book 300 pages long about his trip to the United States, in 1955. And you went through that book and didn't find Eisenhower mentioned once, is that proof Eisenhower was not present at that time? If you find no mention of the fact that the capital was at Washington, would that prove that it was not there at that time? The man would be writing about the things he saw, in which he was particularly interested. Now if the man wrote a book and told about his being in the United States during an election year and told about all the excitement here and the people's discussion, and so on, and he didn't mention the man who was a candidate then, that would be a strong argument, perhaps against the common idea that (11) this was incorrect, because it would be natural to expect some reference under those circumstances.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

So his argument from Judges 3-16 there is certainly an argument worthy of note, but up to this point it does prove that the Levitical situation was not there, and that there was not the established high priest of the tribe of Aaron, but his next sentence does raise definite difficulty. He says Gideon and Manoah sacrifice after the fashion of the patriarchs of elder times, references, Judges 6.26 and13.19, so you note these two as instances of alleged violation of the law. Gideon sacrificed, we read in chapter 6.26. ~~Now Noah~~ Manoah sacrificed we read in Judges 13.19. Then he goes on and speaks about chapter 17 which I mentioned to you, a wealthy Ephraimite who piously establishes a household sanctuary , installs one of his own sons as its priest, 17.5. Even the wandering Levite whom he engages on the annual small stipend of ten pieces of silver, a suit of (12)

was not of Aaronic descent. Then he continues at Shiloh the priesthood has become hereditary in Eli's family, but..

P.123. (3/4)

...serve the Lord. Now what tribe did Samuel belong to? Samuel we are told about at the very beginning of 1 Samuel, and from the statement there we would not have any reason to think that he was a Levite. It is my impression however, there we read there was a certain man of (1 1/4) of Mt. Ephraim, an Ephratite. Tells of Elkanah, the son of (1 1/2)

Now I believe there is evidence in Chronicles to connect him up with the house of Levi, there is nothing said about that here in Samuel, but how could he be from Mt. Ephraim, in other words, Ephrathite, that's the name of the area, but how could he be from the area of the tribe of Ephraim and still be a Levite? Would that be possible, Mr. Paik? Why not? If he was a Levite, would he have to be in the area of the tribe of Levi? You remember, it was told that the Levites would be scattered through the land, and consequently you have wandering Levites all through the land. As the Pentateuch stands, God ordered that. Simeon and Levi were to be scattered abroad in Israel. Then the curse upon Levi was changed into a blessing, they were scattered abroad as God's representatives

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

among the people. But therefore there would be Levites in every area and doubtless there'd be intermarriage so that there is nothing in 1 Samuel here to deny that Samuel might be a Levite, but there certainly is no definite statement that he is of the family of Aaron Yes? (3) Yes, it mentions (3 1/2) a Levite. I believe you'll find that statement in Chronicles. 1 Chron.6.27. Oh yes, sure enough, 1 Chr.6.16 says "the sons of Levi, Gershom, Kohath and Merari," and then it gives the descendants of each of these, and then in verse 20 it says that Gershom one of the sons of Levi, Libni his son, ~~Jeas~~ Jahath his son, ~~Zimri~~ Zimmah his son, then in 22, the sons of Kohath: Amminadab his son, Korah his son, Assir his son, Elkanah his son, and then it traces down this way till it gets to Samuel in verse 28. So Samuel according to 1 Chr.6 is a Levite, of the family of Levi. 1 Sam.1 does not mention that fact about him. But his being in the Temple then is not in defiance of the Levitical (4 3/4) according to Kings and Chronicles. Yes? (4 3/4) Yes, you read about Samuel in 1 Sam. 2, 1 Sam.3, rather. We read and the child Samuel ministered unto the Lord before Eli. It came to pass at that time when Eli was laid down in his place, his eyes began to wax dim, he could not see, and ere the lamp of God went out in the Temple of the Lord, where the ark of God was, and Samuel was laid down to sleep, and the Lord called Samuel, and he answered, here am I. So that before the light went out in the temple, that means, he says, here, "that in defiance of all Levitical perscriptions, he slept beside the ark." I think that is reading something into the passage, but he was in the temple, where the ark was. To say he was beside the ark or in the room with the ark is reading into it. The critics are very apt to do that. It is good in reading critical writings, but in reading any writings, take what they say and test it. Anybody can make a mistake, or can unintentionally misrepresent, even sometimes perhaps intentionally, but what he says is that Samuel, a youth from another tribe, we find actually according to Chronicles he was a Levite. Then he continues and mentions different cases of sacrifice, and then he deals

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

with Samuel particularly, he tells how often Samuel sacrificed, and then he says Saul sacrificed, says, 13.9, 14.35, 15.15,22, that Saul sacrificed. He says, over the family sacrifice, once a year, at (7) or some other elder probably presided. And then he says no series of incidents brings into clearer light, the habitual and unconscious violation of the order of the lineage and the priestly code than the story of the treatment of the ark. What happened to the ark, Mr. Harrison? (7 1/4) Taken by the Philistines. And how long did they keep it? (7 1/2) Well why didn't they keep it longer? (7 3/4) The ark messed things up for the Philistines. I thought it was God that did that, caused difficulty for the Philistines. Anyway, how did that get the ark back? (8) Yes, the Philistines, finding --they put the ark in the temple of their god Dagon and the next morning they found their god Dagon lying on the floor, broken. And they found that they began to get diseases too, and boils and all kinds of misery, and they decided it was due to the ark and they decided to get rid of it, so we read in 1 Samuel that the Philistines took two cows that had never been harnassed to a plow, two milk cows and they separated them from their calves, kept the calves there, put the two cows in the front of a cart, and put the ark on it and they started and headed right up to Israel. That was of course an evidence that the Lord was causing something contrary to ordinary natural things that occur, that these cows would draw the cart up toward the land of Israel, carrying the ark, carrying it back. So they started to take it back and as he says here, when it is sent back by its Philistine captor, 1 Sam.6.12, the cows bring the ark in which it has been placed into the fields of Bethshemesh are gathering the wheat harvest. Now let me read you what it says in 1 Sam.6.12, and listen closely to this and then note what he says about it. He says here in 1 Sam.6.12, The kine took the straight way to the way of Beth-shemesh, and went along the highway, lowing as they went, and turned not ~~aside~~ aside to the right hand or to the left; and the lords of the Philistines went after them unto the border of Beth-shemesh. And they of Beth-shemesh were reaping their wheat harvest in the valley and they lifted up their eyes and saw the ark, and rejoiced to see it.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

And the cart came into the field of Joshua, a Beth-shemite, and stood there, where there// was a great stone: and they clave the wood of the cart, and offered the kine a burnt offering unto the Lord. And the ~~Levit~~ Levites took down the ark of the Lord, and the coffer that was with it, wherein the jewels of gold were, and put them on the great stone: and the men of Beth-shemesh offered burnt offerings and sacrificed sacrifices the same day unto the Lord.

Now does that sound reasonable, what I just read? Entirely reasonable? (10 3/4) (stu--Mr. J.Gueiros: it seems so, because they were offering, they had the oxen, they had provided the sacrifice, but they had the Levites there, the Levites made...) How many had it open in front of you? Well for the sake of the others let me read again, just a part of it. We read here that the the cart came (repeated// as above).

Now was there a priest of the house of Aaron there , to offer sacrifice. They don't say there was anybody of the tribe of Aaron, do they say there were any Levites? Does it make sense? You think so. I think so too, but Carpenter doesn't.

Let me read you what he says. He says the cart stops beside a great stone. The grateful reapers immediately extemporize a sacrifice. The cart was chopped up to kindle the altar fire, and// the (12) kine were offered as an offering to Jahweh, When the sacrifice is over the Levites appear and take down the cart from the part already burned. And the men of Beth-shemesh repeat the rite. That's the way he assesses it. (stu: He is really reading between the lines.)...

P.124. (3/4)

...but now is it not possible to take it as it stands? Suppose I were to say in 1959 I visited Berlin and Norway. I went up to New York and there took an SAS plane over to Hamburg and then down to Berlin. You say, well that's crazy, what does he say--he says he visited Berlin and Norway and then after he went up to Norway he went up to New York and took the plane and went over. You wouldn't take my words that way, it is quite a common thing to give a general summary, and then to repeat giving details. It is common in all sorts of languages, but here if you're going to insist one clause following

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

the other in chronological order, then you get exactly what Carpenter says. The burn the cart, they sacrifice the cows on it, and then the Levites come and take the ark off the cart that is already burned, and put it over on the stone. Mr. MacKeen? (1 3/4) It certainly infers there were Levites there who were involved in the sacrifice. (stu) Carpenter says, this singular incongruity is only explicable on the view that verse 15 is an editorial insertion. Now the thing that it seems to me is worth noting is, if this is an editorial insertion, which makes no sense whatever as he takes it, wouldn't the person who put it in have had sense to see that it didn't make sense? Would not a person putting it in put it in such a way as to make sense, If it is such complete nonsense, as he claims, why it is pretty hard to think anybody would ever insert it in a place such as this. He says here we do not have an omission in the Greek to prove it is an insertion. Well, in other words, if we did have an omission in the Greek, that doesn't prove you have an insertion, but he admits here you don't even have that. But he continues, he says, the sequel proves the Levites could have had no share in the proceedings, the men of Beth-shemesh, afraid to retain the ark in their midst, propose its removal to Kirjath-jearim, how does that mean the Levites could have had no share in it. He says, there it was placed in the house of Abinadab and the townsmen consecrate his son the guardian. The fact that the ark was thus permitted to remain for many years in lay custody is one of the most singular circumstances of this singular age. Well, you would think you lived in a singular age, if you lived in an area in which Philistine bands were coming through the country repeatedly, if Philistines had defeated your army, and had their main headquarters down to the southwest, if they had garrisons all through the land, and there was constant danger from them, you would think you were in quite a singular age, and it would be pretty difficult to carry things on under those circumstances in normal fashion. When those things continue for a century, or a century and a half, you have a situation in which it takes a lot of investigation to get things back to what they were before that time. It was a singular age, there is no question about that. But not in the way he said. He said this is one of the most

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

singular circumstances in a singular age, Samuel shows no concern for it. Well, was Samuel ever concerned about it? It nowhere says in the Bible Samuel shows no concern. It nowhere says Samuel said, I am not interested. But it does show Samuel under a difficult situation, trying to keep alive the knowledge of God among the people, and going about among them and having sacrifices here and there. Perhaps the very fact that he wasn't of the family of Aaron, made him hesitate about trying to reestablish the tabernacle with the ark and all that. He did what he could as a Levite. Why should he step into the priest's office? Eli had been killed, and the curse had been pronounced upon Eli's family (5 1/2) through Samuel. He had all he could do with trying to keep up the religious life of the people as a whole without trying to do this part. He was not entitled to do it, he would have come under the condemnation of (5 3/4)

So that he says Samuel shows no concern for it, the descendants of its former guardians , the priestly house of are indifferent to it. How does he know that? That is purely a guess, is it not? Maybe they were terribly upset that they could not but they had no possibility of doing it. Saul was not interested in it. That is, we have no statement about Saul being interested, we do have statements about how Saul tried to enforce certain of the laws very definitely among the people, and we have statements of how he was constantly busy and trying to protect them against the Philistines, until finally Saul was killed, he and his whole family, by the Philistines in the battle. But he says Saul was not interested in it, and it is not till David is firmly established in Jerusalem that he prepares with great solemnity to transport it to Jerusalem, 2 Sam.6. An unhappy disaster interrupted the procession, and with an extraordinary violation of Levitical propriety, the ark was carried into the house of an alien bearing the name of a foreign god, Obed-edom, of Gath. Well Obed means a servant, but edom was not the name of a foreign god, who was Edom? Edom was Jacob's brother, so the servant of Edom wouldn't necessarily be connected with a foreign god, I don't know of any foreign gods named Edom. It is true that people often have names like

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Dr. McIntire

(CB)

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

that, with names of a foreign god in, the servant of so-and-so, like they have the servant of the Lord, Obadiah, the servant of Jehovah. This is Obededom. A man can have a name like that, connecting up with a place, with an area, with a group of people, or something, it doesn't have to connect with a god, but he says, that this is an extraordinary violation of Levitical propriety, it was taken there and its final transfer was effected three months later, David himself assuming a priestly vestment, conducting the sacrifice, and pronouncing the benediction in the name of Jahweh. Now when does David conduct these sacrifices? Let's look at it, 2 Sam.6.18, we'll barely have time to glance at it: They brought in the ark of the Lord, and set it in his place, in the midst of the tabernacle, that David had pitched for it, and David offered burnt offerings and peace offerings before the Lord. And as soon as David had made an end of offering burnt offerings and peace offerings, he blessed the people in the name of the Lord of hosts.

Does that say that David with his own hands sacrificed the burnt offering for the people? Well, we have to leave that...(8 3/4)

(5/1/62) (9 1/2) ...between that and the priestly code, Levites could offer but not other-- Levites could offer, it was not then restricted to the sons of Aaron. That is their argument, now they do not have any cases I know of between the time of Josiah and the exile to ~~say~~ point to and say look these are Levites they are not sons of Aaron. But anything you would have before that which was not a son of Aaron, even though he was a Levite, or which was not a Levite, would be an argument for them. Now we are interested at this point in looking at any which they allege, whether they were Levites or not. My answer is that --which we've not come to yet, just incidentally--my answer is that in some of the cases they're really Levites but I do not claim they all were. I do not claim that. So that at this point, Mr. MacKeen is getting us to be sure exactly what we're meaning. We are meaning that the critics say that there are offerings made by men who are not Levites, after the time of Moses, and prior to the time at which they date the Deuteronomy or the Priestly code. That is their argument. And we look at illustrations which they allege.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

We notice that they say that Samuel made offering, he was not a Levite, and in that connection we differ with them, we said that we accept the statement of Chronicles that he was a Levite. They say that offerings were made by Solomon who was not a Levite, and we agree with them. Solomon was not a Levite. They say that offerings were made by Manoah and by Gideon who were not Levites, and we have no reason to think they were Levites. Manoah the father of Samson, or Gideon in the instances from the book of Judges. And they say that when the ark came back from the Philistines, they say that made an offering, they say there were no Levites there. Well, we notice the next verse says, that the Levites made the offering, well, they say, that verse is an interpolation. They say the previous verse says the people made an offering, so that that verse, they say is an interpolation. They say then that offerings were made with no sense of guilt, no thought of anything wrong, by men who were not Levites, before the time of Deuteronomy or by men who were not members of the house of Aaron, prior to the time of the priestly code. But they also have another stage to their argument...

P.125 (3/4)

...other people, that is, other members of the family of Aaron, or even some Levites, are sometimes called priests, and it is true that if you go through the Old Testament you will find that the word (l) is normally used of the family of Aaron. But we have a few cases where it is used of others of whom there is no evidence that they belong to the family of Aaron. Look at Ex.19.6, which the critics say is part of the E document. There it says you shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation. But that would include a lot of people who weren't from the family of Aaron, wouldn't it? You shall be unto me a kingdom of priests. Then when you come to the--a little further along in this account given in connection with the book of the covenant, you will find a mention of the priests who were not to come near to the Lord, only Moses and Aaron, verse 24, for instance in chapter 19. It says Moses said to them, away, get thee down, thou shalt come up, thou and Aaron with thee, but let not the priests and the people break through.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

That suggests that there were people called priests before Aaron had been set apart for the priest. Now verse 24 of chapter 19. Also verse 22 says, let the priests also come near the Lord and sanctify themselves, lest the Lord break forth upon them. So there were people before Aaron was set apart (2 1/2) for the priesthood-- there were people who were called priests, according to the P document. You get 2 Sam.8.18 where you have a--at the end of the verse, a statement is made that David's sons were chief rulers. I don't know why the KJ translators render (3 1/2) chief ruler, the word is simply same word as used for priests. So it seems to say here that David's sons were priests, and in 1 K.4.5 you have a man who seems to be the son of David's son, and it says that in 1.K.4.5 that Zabud the son of Nathan was principal officer, in the KJ, but the Hebrew word is Kohim which is usually translated priest and this man is a grandson evidently of David. There are one or two other cases where the word "priest" is translated chief minister or town official or something like that, but it is the same word, Ø kohim. So they say there are people called kohim who were not of the family of Aaron, and this as you see has a real bearing on the argument. If the law was not given and the priests were limited to the house of Aaron, in the time of the exile, it would be quite natural for David to make his own sons priests, or to make his grandson a priest, or for there to be other priests as mentioned. So much then for b, instances noted.

Let 's take up small c, Consideration of the Instances. Under this, we notice, (1) Kohim like Zavath was not always used in the narrowest sense. Our laws, Num.18.7, said that God had given the priesthood to the family of Aaron as a gift, the ministry of the sanctuary was given to them, but the word priest was used before Aaron was set apart as we noticed in chapter 19, for other people who had services to perform in connection with the sanctuary or with the offering. The word is already used in various--we even find in the Psalms a reference to a man who wasn't a member of the family of Aaron at all. It says that I will make you a priest after the order of Melchisedec, and Melchisedec was certainly not of the family of Aaron, he was not even of Israel, but here is a mention of

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

making somebody a priest after the order of Melchisedec. So the word priest, while the priesthood of the sanctuary according to the law is given to Aaron, the word priest is sometimes used in a broader sense, and it would seem that David's sons and occasionally other officials were given a title of priest, but nothing is said in connection with them, to suggest that this meant that they carried on the service of the sanctuary. It evidently was sometimes used as an honorary title, just as in government today, they call the man who is in charge of all the armed forces of the United States, is called the Secretary of Defense. Now if I want to write a letter, but I don't think anybody ever dictates a letter to the Secretary of Defanse. The word is an honorary title. He is not a secretary, he is very far from being a secretary, he probably never writes anything, he dictates everything to secretaries, he probably has a thousand of them in his establishment, but his title is the Secretary, Mr. Secretary. It is used as an honorary title and terms like that are often used in this way. Now Kohim was not used a great deal that way, but it does seem to have been used occasionally that way with these sons of David and these others.

There certainly is no proof it wasn't, there is no statement in connection with those people that they actually did perform sacrifice. So that the broader use we have found Jahveh, which ordinarily means sacrifice, was used simply to kill, meat and kill animals for eating, we found that right in Deuteronomy 12.21, and Kohim occasionally, not often, was used in a similar way. So this is not a tremendously important point under our consideration, but it does dispose of certain of the cases, that Kohim like Zavah was not always used in the narrowest sense. That was #(1).

Consideration (2) I think is much more important. It is that often the person giving the sacrifice is spoken of as performing it. Often the person who gave the sacrifice is simply said that he sacrificed. And consequently when you read that somebody offers, somebody sacrificed, that does not mean necessarily that he performed the technical task which would be limited according to the law as to the priest. We have a very interesting instance of it in 1 K.3.4 where we read about Solomon. We read in 1 K.3.3,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

And Solomon loved the Lord, walking in the statutes of David his father, only he sacrificed and burnt incense in high places. And the king went to Gibeon to sacrifice there, for that was the great high place, a thousand burnt offerings did Solomon offer on that altar. Can't you picture Solomon lifting up a thousand offerings, one after the other and putting them on the altar, cutting their throats. Solomon offered a thousand offerings, why the very expression makes it impossible that it definitely meant his actually doing the offering, ~~during~~ doing the task of the priest. Solomon gave the offerings, Solomon presented the offerings, Solomon made an offering, it was his offering to the Lord, but the performance of it, of most of it at least, and probably of all of it, was performed by professional priests set apart for the purpose. In fact, it could hardly be just the high priest and a few score associates, they would have to have a lot of priests to do that. Mr. Miller? (10 3/4) Yes, that shows that the custom which had come under Samuel's time, when they were under the Philistine control, of having sacrifice in many different parts of the land, Solomon was not yet really aware of the fact that that custom was contrary to the law, and Solomon when he began his kingdom did sacrifice in various places, but then he established the temple at Jerusalem and prayed to the Lord that the Lord's mercy would be particularly there, dedicated the building as the place which the Lord had set apart for the offering of the sacrifice, and it would seem likely that then he realized that the Deuteronomic law was that it should be only in the one place. Of course, unfortunately Solomon was led astray by his foreign wives, and toward the end of his reign he actually fell into idolatry to some extent, so that in the latter of his reign he was not at all a model. In the early part, when he is receiving the Lord's praise for what he is doing, he is still...

P.126. (1)

...now it might be, but I hardly think it is, but in Solomon's case certainly he had. (stu.) Well, there is no question that he did sacrifice to Baalim, it says he sacrificed to Baalim, so at least in some of the cases others might have done it, there is no proof

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

they didn't, in all . And if in the case of Solomon you use the term, "he offered" for offerings he didn't personally make, there is no reason why it may not be used that way in a great many cases. But I don't think that explains all of it, but I do think there are many which that would take care of. That was (2) then:

(2) that often the person giving the sacrifice is spoken of as if he performed it.

You will hear people today say, well, we've been saving our money for some time, and now we're getting a mortgage, a loan from the bank, and we're going to build a house for ourselves. Well, sometimes they go out and actually set to work and build a house, but normally when a man says I'm going to build a house, he means he is going to hire somebody to build a house. It is quite ~~proper~~ common, when a person provides the means for it, and gives the orders which result in its being done, it is spoken of as if he did it, and doubtless in many cases that was so. After all, the Lord gave credit for an offering to the man who provided the offering, the credit didn't all go to the priest who did the actual detail, so that it was particularly inaccurate in that case that the terminology should be used that way. So that accounts for a number of such cases, and I would think that in the case of the Levites of Beth-shemesh, if this second verse there was not, as Carpenter insists, a later insertion--I don't believe it was, I think it was original, I do not think that it is contrary to normal usage in the Bible, and in other books too--the statement given in general, and then go back and give the detail of it. The statement, "they made a sacrifice," then it mentions the Levites. The precise , the actual carrying out of it was by the Levites, in that case. And I believe that that takes care of certain of these cases, quite a few, but the person did not do the priest's work, he gave the offering, then it was Levites or members of the family of Aaron who did the work. Of course, according to the law of Numbers, it was Aaron's family who had the priesthood, not the Levites as a whole, they just administered the sacrifice under Aaron's direction. But if Aaron had 15 members of his family and they had a thousand oxen to offer, they would have to have other Levites with them,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

they couldn't--15 men couldn't possibly offer a thousand oxen. Yes? (stu.) Yes, but I feel myself that you have to take that as a statement (4)

(stu) But they would be God's representatives, His representatives, holy people, set apart for his representatives, and bringing his blessing to the world, I would say. But I wouldn't think that specifically (4 1/2)

The--so much then for (2). Now (3), one we ~~often~~ also gave under the place of sacrifice, but we did not dwell on this. And I don't think we'll dwell on it here, but we mention it:

(3) There are certain cases where it was a definite command of God, or a situation in which the Lord could be considered as overruling normal procedure. It seems to me that that is so in the case of Manoah, and probably also in the case of Gideon. The case of Manoah we have it in Judges 13, that there was a certain man of Zorah, of the family of the Danites, whose name was Manoah. And this man had an angel spoke to him and give him a promise he would have a child, and told him how this child was to be blessed of the Lord, and we read in verse 15, Manoah said to the angel of the Lord, I pray thee, let us detain thee, till we shall have made ready a kid for thee. And the angel of the Lord said to Manoah, Though thou detain me, I will not eat of thy bread, and if thou offer a burnt offering, thou must offer it into the Lord. For Manoah knew not that he was an angel of the Lord. Manoah said to the angel of the Lord, What is thy name, that when thy sayings come to pass we may do thee honour? And the angel of the Lord said unto him, Why askest thou thus after my name, seeing it is secret? So Manoah took a kid with the burnt offering and offered it upon a roch unto the Lord: and the angel did wonderously, and Manoah and his wife looked on. For it came to pass, when the flame went up toward heaven from off the altar, that the angel of the Lord ascended in the flame of the altar. And so // here we have a supernatural event, which in connection with this, this offering was made. And yet it is pretty hard to escape the feeling that there is no suggestion there is anything wrong in their making an

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

offering to the Lord under those circumstances.

The case of Gideon, I don't remember the exact reference, yes, there it is, Jud.6.25: ...the Lord said to him, Take thy father's young bullock, even the second bullock of seven years old, and throw down the altar of Baal thy father hath, and cut down the grove that is by it, and build an altar unto the Lord thy God on the top of this rock, in the ordered place, and take the second bullock and offer a burnt sacrifice with the wood of the grove which thou shalt cut down. Then Gideon took ten men of his servants and did as the Lord had said to him. Now in that case, with all these servants there could have been a Levite. We can't say there was, ~~but~~ because there is no statement there was, but there was a definite command of the Lord in that situation. Well, so much then for (3), special command of God. Now (4) is a different sort of consideration.

(4) That the priesthood of Aaron and Eleazer is recognized in JE, in Deuteronomy. Mr. Miller? (8 1/4) Yes, well, in that case, I would think that it would be certainly not at all unlikely that the king had Levites there. It doesn't specifically say so, but I don't know what right they have to assume they didn't. What is the reference? (2 Sam. 6.18) Here we have David bringing in the ark of the Lord and David offered burnt offerings and peace offerings before the Lord, and as soon as David had made an end of offering burnt offerings and peace offerings, he blessed the people in the name of the Lord of hosts. Now you can interpret that, the critics insist, as meaning that David took a sacrifice and made it, and stood up and gave a blessing to the people, you can interpret it that way, but it does not have to be interpreted that way, because it is not a proof that David performed the priestly function. David was the king, he had all his host there at the time. The important thing was David and what he was doing, rather than any particular priest, but it is not ~~always positive~~ at all impossible in this case, that when David offered burnt offering, peace offering, that David provided the sacrifice, gave the orders, and the professionals carried it out, as priest. I take it that here is a case where most likely that was what happened. Yes? (9 3/4) Yes, now the ephod is a special linen —

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

//like an apron, that was worn and the word is used, there were various ephods, and there was an ephod that was ordinarily worn only by the priest, but there were other ephods and I would think it altogether possible that he word some sort of a special festal garment, without its meaning that he took that which was given before the priest. Yes? (10 1/2) Yes, the king was the head of a large organization and he was having this performed by those who were set apart to do it. Now it does not specifically say here that he had sons of Aaron doing it, but you can't prove he didn't. It is not a valid argument against it, but it is not mentioned here--I mean against the view that he realized that the sons of Aaron were the ones set apart for this, it is not specifically mentioned in this context. You might read that one of the admirals during the war saw our enemy ships and he fired ten shots at them, and it wouldn't mean that he went down and put the shots in the cannon, and pulled the lever and did it, but he would give the order. You would say that he did it, he was the one who was responsible. But it does not contradict the law that the priestly functions are to be performed by the descendants of Aaron. It can sound that way, but it doesn't. Now there are other cases that cannot be disposed of as easily, but I think that is one that can be disposed of.

Now we haven't looked at all the cases yet by any means, but before continuing I want to note this (4), that...

P.127. (3/4)

...do not have evidence in history that they did, but they simply disregarded it. Well, now the case of David does not prove they disregarded it. It would not be necessary to have stated it in that connection there. There are other places which certainly look somewhat in that direction, but that place does not prove that it has been disregarded. But we do have in JE an evidence that the JE document which the critics say comes from the time of Jehoshaphat, that it recognized that Aaron and his son Eleazer were priests, and recognized a priesthood through Aaron, continuing in his family. That is Deut. 10.6, and you say Deuteronomy, you say right away, well, that's

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

the D document, this is Deuteronomy, that's not the JE. Well, suppose it was the D document. According to the critics, the D document makes it the Levites and it is only later, in the P document, that the Aaronic priesthood is recognized. But here in Deut.10.6 we have the statement made that, by Moses, in his address, that the children of Israel took their journey from Beeroth of the children of Jaakan to Mosera: there Aaron died, and there he was buried; and Eleazar his son ministered in the priest's office in his stead. That is a pretty strong recognition in the JE document of the priesthood in the family of Aaron, Aaron and his son Eleazar. Well if that's in the D document that would contradict the critic's theory , which is that according to the D document it is only the Levites, not till the P document that you get the priests. But they don't think that's part of the D document, they say that there are a few verses here which are an insertion. Well, why don't they say they're an insertion from the P document, because they already have the account of the (2 3/4) death of Aaron in the P document. And because when you compare the statement in Numbers of the death of Aaron which they say is in the P document, with this, you find that at first sight the two contradict each other. The place is different , the order of march is different, and the language is more like the language which they claim is typical of E than the language that they say is typical of the special style of P. Therefore, if they would admit that this to be considered a part of the P document they would give up their whole basis for their partition of it. So according to their own basis, they, I believe, unanimously assign this to the E document. And if they do that, that puts the Aaronic priesthood right back into the E document. Now they don't discuss that much, they just pass it over, but they do state, wherever you have--every critical book I've looked at, when you come to this part of Deuteronomy, they say it is from the E document. Some of them discuss the evidences, how it must be E, because it can't be P, it contradicts P, it's the other parallel, you've already got P in Numbers. This is the other one, and they say the style is different from Deuteronomy, and so on. On the critical method of approach, and

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

division, if you carry their system out logically, or if you're going to throw their system away, then there is no relation to but if you carry their system out logically, this is E document, not P. And if you do, it knocks the very foundation, one of the main kingpins of their theory, that the priesthood of Aaron is a matter of the time of the exile in the P document. . So I think it is a very, very interesting fact. It is --as in any field, if a theory works out, you may find it very complex and difficult to apply, but as you get to work and examine it your complexities will fall more in line and you will find that simple principles work to us if your theory is correct, and when you find more and more you have to explain away, you have more and more room to question whether your theory is correct in the first place.

So in this matter of the person to sacrifice, I consider ~~compare~~ Deut.10.6 to be quite a serious difficulty to the critical argument. Well, then, in that connection--that was (4), I mention also as (5) of difficulties to the critical theory:

(5) That 1 Samuel--they point out that in Judges there is very little recognition of any established priesthood of the family of Aaron, but when you come to 1 Samuel, there in 1 Samuel you have the recognition of the house of God at Shiloh with Eli the Aaronic priest, who is in charge. You have Eli there, you have God punishing Eli for not having been strict enough with his sons, has permitted his sons to go out without getting the training they should have had, and you have God saying He is going to remove the priesthood from Eli, but the recognition of the unified priesthood is right there in the history of this beginning part of the book of 1 Samuel. So the critics say, you have evidence people were not familiar with. You certainly have this pretty strong evidence that they were in 1 Samuel and Deut.10.6. Well, of course they can just take a verse out and say oh that's written later on. Well, they certainly don't think the story of Samuel was written after the time of the exile, the time of the P document. They--you cannot take Eli out of the story of Samuel, he is deeply imbedded in the story, so that, as against ~~not~~ they're saying that there are cases where there seems to be no evidence of their being familiar with such a

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

, we do have these cases where there is clear evidence existing of the Aaronic priesthood. Of course, if somebody had explained to whoever wrote the book of Judges and Kings that the critics in these days would question the existence of the Aaronic priesthood at that time. They could have put in a specific reference here and there in order to give us clear evidence of the fact that it did exist. But the purpose of the Bible was not to give us the full history, the purpose of it was to show us how God dealt// His people, and this is an important part of His dealing with His people, and this is brought out clearly but it is not carried on in every relationship through the history. So that where He has a considerable period with no mention of it, it is not a proof that this did not exist. You might have a history of the United States, a small history of the United States, in which during a period of thirty years, in the account of the history, there is no mention of the Supreme Court. That does not prove that the Supreme Court is not in existence at that time, there just would not be a vital reason why you need to mention it in connection with the outstanding events in history. Then when you get up to the Dredd Scott Case and those situations, the Supreme Court comes in very vigorously. You say, where did they come from, we haven't heard them mentioned since 30 years before. Well, they were there all the time, they were active, but there was no outstanding reason to mention them in the particular period. Yes? (8 3/4) I do not recall at the instant a specific reference, but I don't think you'd have any difficulty finding one. Because I have never heard ~~of~~ (9) it doubted, I've never heard it questioned, and we do have descendants of Eli referred to, I'm quite sure. (9 ∅ 1/4)

I do not have the reference though right at hand. Now that was #(5). We must however mention here what we mentioned in connection with the place of sacrifice. That would be (6):

(6) After examination of all the cases, after removal of all the cases which are very overdrawn, tremendously exaggerated, there still remains a certain number of cases which seem to require the application of the same principle which we applied in connect-

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

ion with the place of sacrifice; namely, the recognition of the difference between the ceremonial law and the moral law.

The moral law: thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not commit adultery. The moral law is fixed, unchangeable, it is in the nature of God. Other laws consist in the application of the moral law, which is the civil law, and consist in the arrangement of ceremonies and of religious practices, to direct a person's mind toward the Lord, to bring to his thoughts the things of the Lord, and these are subject to religion in case of necessity. The sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath. And when the Philistines overran the land, it was much more vital that Samuel, the Levites, performed sacrifices than that he find some member of the house of Aaron to do it, and that he go about from place to place, rather than try to get the people together in a large assembly which would've aroused the Philistines immediately to come and make an attack, and would've made it impossible. Rather than leave them without religious instruction, when they couldn't come together it was better to go to them. Rather than leave them without sacrifices, it was better for the man whom God was specifically blessing and giving position of leadership there. He was a Levite, even though he was not of the family of Aaron, he proceeded to carry this out, and so I do not think in this case it has to be applied in nearly as many cases as in the other. But it does, I think, enter into it. We have to recognize this difference between the ceremonial law and the moral law, or we have to say well here is a problem we just don't know the answer to, and the critical argument can be made to sound very, very strong, but I believe that we get rid of a good bit of it by examination of...

P.128. (3/4)

...not a series of specific laws as to ceremonies and forms which must be carried on exactly so, and that's the vital thing, but that it is a presentation of the moral law, a description of man's lost condition, a statement of how man can be saved, and ceremonies to take these facts and bring them to people's minds, and stress the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

matters it is vital for people to know about, and these, in order to prevent all kinds of devitation and all kinds of coming in of false documents, there are regular procedures prescribed which would normally be carried on but that in a case where this is impossible it is the Lord's will that the ceremony still be carried on with such changes as necessary. Yes? (1 1/2) Well, I don't know as I've ever heard, it presupposes a certain attitude toward history which most of them simply don't take, that God was actually in this selection. I mean, the original theory we started with a definitely ungodly attitude, of the natural process, that by human natural process this had come into existence, but then they present their arguments that godly believers are led astray by them, and feel they have to accept it, and they accept it. Well, then for them to try to defend it--they're sort of in between the two, you see. And I have not come across a statement of an attempt by one of them to try to answer this situation. I don't know how they would deal with it, they might ignore it or might (2 1/2)

but I think it is very vital we don't

And I believe that when we fairly examine the situation, we find that there is nothing in their argument sufficient to restore our faith in the absolute inspiration of the Word of God, that these laws were (3)

but their violation in a certain period is explainable under the circumstances of the case. Yes? (3 1/4) No, c, consideration of instances.

Now answering Mr. 's question a minute further--our first purpose in examining this, our most vital purpose is to see that we can take the Bible as the Word of God, entirely true, and find no argument which should properly involve us in serious difficulty, in holding our faith entirely in God's Word. That is the first basic purpose we might have. Now a second purpose, is to be familiar enough with the material that we can help others who are being misled by it. And I would say that for the Christian who solidly accepts divine authorship of the Scripture as a whole, and solidly accepts the fact that God is working in the Old Testament, preparing the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

way for the coming of Christ, that for him this quotation of the words of Christ, "the sabbath made for man," an exOplanation of the situation of the interregnum with the overcoming of the Philistines and all that, should be sufficient to satisfy him that the critical argument here can be properly answered for his use. Now of course if a person takes a completely unbelieving viewpoint, that everything is a natural development, well naturally he can't believe that the angel made the sacrifice go up, went up to heaven in a sacrifice, he can't believe that God performed the miracles described in the Bible, to him it is all a human book. But the person who takes that attitude needs to be saved and to come to believe in the God of the Bible, and then to proceed from that basis.

But my emphasis at this point does not incline to convince that one, that he is wrong, but it is trying to save the one who is wavering, going over in that direction. You will have contac t with many such, in Christian work, because almost any institution you go to today, if founded as much as 40 years ago, almost any , you will find that it is taught in the classes, if they teach anything about the Bible, the critical theory is what they teach, and young people who go there are bound to be affected by it. I heard a man just last Saturday give a paper, he was a chemist, and a very, very find Christian, you could see that, he was a man who declared his acceptance of all the doctrines, of salvation, the great doctrines of the Bible, he was a very ardent Christian believer, and an active Christian worker, but he gave this paper in which he s aid that he had come to the conclusion that he said, the Bible is inerrant for the purpose for which it is given. Now he said the purpose for which it is given is to give us God's revelation about God and about Christ and about salvation, now he says that is revelation inerrant, now he says when you come to arbitrary inaccuracy, that is considering the scientific or historical statement that it is free from error, he says, that is not the purpose for which it was given. And of course, as others pointed out to him, there is no stopping when you take that attitude. He tried to take the attitude that the resurrectio

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

is vital to our Christian faith. Well, of course, that is true in the Bible, it is free from error, but when you get into details of creation, well how does our salvation rest upon that? Well, I asked him how about the virgin birth, there? And he didn't know what to say. Because the Bible constantly says, if the dead rise not then are we yet in our sins, very clear, but it doesn't say that about the virgin birth. So where are you going to draw your line? The teaching of Christ is that the Bible is God's word and it is free from error, and we have to--a person does not have to believe that to be saved, but to be an effective worker I believe he does, and many, many , thousands of Christians in these days--earnest Christians,-- are facing these problems and not knowing how to answer them. And just a little knowledge as to what the criticism really is, and what their arguments are, can enable one to help them very (8 1/4)

And I would say that the recognition of the fact that Christ pointed out as the difference between the ceremonial law, and the moral law, should be tremendously helpful in--of course, also you don't have to explain all the cases, by that, there are comparatively few. A great many of the critics talk a great deal about things that on careful examination just disappear. And when, after all the critics' arguments, they put in JE the verse that says that Aaron is the priest and that Eleazar his son succeeds him, that seems to me to know the foundation of this theory pretty badly.

Now this was D we were looking at, which was the discussion of the developmental theory, and under that we were looking at, no, IV is developmental theory; D is the argument from History, and then E was the other argument which I gave, from Order, and you remember that that was fitness to certain specific times of certain documents, that was E, the fourth argument, the third was the argument from History, the fourth was the Fitness for certain times. This is E then:

E, Appropriateness of certain sections to particular periods. Now I mentioned to you in beginning to look at these four arguments for development, that the strongest of them are the second and the third. The first ~~under stress~~ on Discrepancies would not prove the development

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

theory, would not prove the evolutionary growth. The first would not, the second, if it can be proven, would go along with the fourth, the third if proven conclusively is a very, very strong argument, the argument from violation of history. Now the fourth one is the fitness of certain, the appropriateness of certain documents to particular periods when they were written. Now this argument as expressed sounds like a big general argument. Actually it boils down to an argument regarding only one of the documents, and that one, I am sure, you have no difficulty in telling which it is, but if you should, I'll tell you Thursday morning. (11)

(starting again, 5/3/62, 11 1/4)

...that was just one half the class, ~~but~~ the other half

but that was Deut.12.21, so it seemed as if about half or two=thirds of the class got the whole point of that verse Deut.12.21 and the other half did not. Now perhaps I made a mistake in giving that quiz in not telling you that you could use your Hebrew Bibles if you wanted to in connection with it, because I am sure, if you read the verse in the Hebrew Bible, you would have immediately noticed the point of it, but I had you read it in the English Bible and I had explained it to you before, but some it slipped their mind, but it is a very important point, and therefore I want to take a minute to be sure that everybody has it thoroughly in mind. It is not likely that I'll ask you again to discuss that precisely, Deut.12.21, but there are many other questions that might be asked with which this would have a very important relationship. Deut.12.21 you remember is the verse that gives the ...

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

...rejoice before the Lord only you must not

and the importance of that verse is that the word there translated "kill" in the English version is exactly the same word which a few verses earlier was translated "sacrifice" and which is translated "sacrifice" later on. Now it is all very well for us to say, well, in these cases where the word (1 1/4) is used, you're not to shavat except at the one central place but some cases where people didn't, why zavat in those cases doesn't mean sacrifice, it means kill. Well, somebody says, what a crazy (1 1/4) evasion of But here you have absolute proof it is not an evasion, it is a fact, that the word shaphat which ordinarily means "sacrifice" sometimes means to kill, simply to eat, and not to sacrifice, and therefore you are justified when Saul says, bring your animals here to this rock, and shavat from here by the rock, in order that the blood might flow out and that you will not eat the blood with the sacrifice, you are justified in saying that Saul is not there conducting a sacrifice, and you are justified in doing the same thing when the people go with Adonijah up to, near Jerusalem, there. That of course ~~was~~ would not be following the rule that you were supposed to do all your killing of animals at the temple unless you're too far away fromthe temple to kill it conveniently, it would be breaking that rule, but nevertheless it would not be, necessarily, sacrifice, which would fit in very well with this argument about (2 1/2)

so Deuteronomy 12.21 is quite an important verse in our discussion, the point was a rather simple one, and I think that half or two-thirds of the class had it, but there were about a third or a little more that did not have it (2 1/2)

so the mark on that quiz was different from any other we've had yet, in that they all ran to one extreme or the other, that is, practically all, instead of spacing out as they usually do, and while we're speaking about the quizzes, I'd like to mention that there are a very few who have missed several quizzes recently, and if a person has missed a quiz on account of sickness, why if they will bring a definite statement to that effect, that they were sick in bed and unable to be here then to take the quiz, they can take a test

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

next Monday or Tuesday to make up the quizzes that have been missed on account of sickness. Other quizzes, if a person wants to make up, they can make it up, but even that we can't give as much credit as if you take it at the proper time (3 1/2)

so that Monday and Tuesday, if somebody wants to take an extra makeup quiz, I'm not urging anyone to, we've had two of these quizzes, if anybody wants another one, get a note to me today, to the office addressed to me, telling what hours Monday or Tuesday, ~~we~~ you'd like to take it, and I'll have available for anybody who wants to take a quiz then, to make up for ~~one and~~ this and one you took a low mark in. Yes? (4) No, but if there is only one I wouldn't bother with it. If you've only this one I would not bother with it. I mean, now, we're far enough that there are enough of them, that one isn't going to affect the average grade very much. The quizzes will count about one-half the semester mark, that is to say, if somebody didn't take any of the quizzes at all, but takes an examination and gets a 95, well, we'll average 95 with 0 which gives a 47 1/2, you see, for he course. The final exam will count about half, so that I would say that one quiz maybe two, I wouldn't bother with. But if a person missed as many as three since our last makeup and would like to make them up, why you can take a test Monday or Tuesday, but let me know what hours. Leave a note for me stating the ~~house~~ hour, and then I will have questions for you at that hour, with Mrs. Baker, if there is anybody that does. I would say that if you got a fairly godd average, there wouldn't be much point in giving another quiz now, because we'll have a longer quiz so soon, a week from next Monday that we have the final exam, and that will count far more than these special quizzes at this time.

Then I'd like to mention that I have had put on the Reserve Shelf in the library six copies of the book, The Higher Criticism ~~and~~ of the Pentateuch, by Green, and six copies of the book, Carpenter's The Composition of the Hexateuch. Now those six copies of each are there in the library on the Reserve Shelf, and please do not anybody take any of them from the Library. This is a large class and I'd like to have them available to anybody

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

who'd like to use them, so please do not take them out of the Library--anybody at all, that would be quite unfair to other members of the class. They are there available and if you listened closely and followed the work as we went along, I don't think it is necessary that you use them for review, but I think some of you may find it very helpful for review. So let me say that this book of Carpenter gives a very strong presentation of the critical viewpoint with a lot of detail, and it might be good for you to go through as summary, but between now and the exam, if you wanted to you could find that things I have specifically quoted from it, particular sections I have dealt with, you could ø refresh your memory or correct your notes very well from it. The other book, The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch, by Green, has a very interesting and valuable discussion of the content of the Pentateuch in the first part, which is not of particular relation to this particular course. But after that beginning of the book, he has quite a good discussion of the history of the (7 1/4) of the criticism, and a good discussion of the different stages and of the main arguments, and particularly the ones on partition. He has a very good treatment ~~presentation~~, not so much from the viewpoint of a great many instances, though he has a few, quite a few--but from the viewpoint of good explanations of principles involved. If a person had done nothing in the course, up to this time, whatever, hadn't even been here, but they were to take Green, and take those sections of Green, about three-fourths of the book, and get them thoroughly in mind, I think one would almost get enough to pass the course, such basic things are there--except for one thing, except for the book of Deuteronomy. He does not deal with that, except the very slightest. Aside from that, it is quite a very good presentation. For further study, of course, there are other books, I'll mention at a later time that you can use for your own help in later years, if you want. But I'm putting these on the Reserve Shelf now, thinking they might be of some help in preparation for the examination.

Now continuing with our discussion, we were yesterday finished our discussion of the argument from history, of violation as evidence that the laws did not exist. We have

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

completed our discussion of that, and will refer back to it briefly in our final conclusions, but before doing that, I want to go on to E which is the fourth of the arguments I mentioned to you a long time ago as the four arguments for development, and this fourth one is E, The appropriateness of Sections to Particular Periods, and as stated there it sounds very formidable, sounds as if there is a great deal in it, However, it so happens that evidence from J or from E that would relate to the particular time of Jehoshaphat, or even of David, I do not know of any (9 1/2) that is alleged. Nor do I know of any particular evidence that is alleged (9 1/2) that it fits with the background of the exile, so this argument pretty well simmers down to the matter of the book of Deuteronomy, and on that there is a big argument made by the critics, that Deuteronomy fits that particular time, that Deuteronomy is exactly related to the conditions and situation of that time. They have a big argument on that, which we will have to look at at considerable length. However, I am not going to look at that argument in this point in the outline, but to save a separate number for a consideration of the book of Deuteronomy. So at this point in the outline I simply mention to you that this fourth argument really relates only to Deuteronomy, which we are going to consider separately. But as to the theory of development I believe it is useful to have in mind that even if the critical argument regarding Deuteronomy were to be proved, even if it were to be proved, that Deuteronomy was written in the time of Josiah, or shortly before, that that would not prove the theory of development, that I wanted to stress, that ~~was~~ would not prove the theory of development, the partition largely applies to the other books, they take out certain sections of Deuteronomy, but that the bulk of the book, they think, is the D document, and there are certain sections in other books they think are part of the D document, but the D document as a whole, as they think of it, isn't one you think of as largely composing the book of Deuteronomy, and even if the book of Deuteronomy were to be written at the time of Josiah, that would not prove that Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers could not have been written by Moses, and

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

it would not prove that Joshua could not have been written at the time of Joshua, so that this argument, while it would be very helpful in establishing one big feature of the theory, the claims of Deuteronomy, and so forth, yet it would be very, very far from proving the whole document theory and would do nothing toward proving the Partition theory, so that that is, I think, very important to have in mind, and that is all I'm going to stress at this point under E, but rather to leave the details of discussion of whether Deuteronomy is so appropriately related to the time of Josiah, as to make it a strong argument for its having come there, for a special discussion under a separate Roman...

P.130. (3/4)

...the conclusion regarding the developmental theory, and here I simply want to stress again a few main facts as to its bearing. The claim that J shows a primitive step, E shows next, and D the next and P the next, that claim actually, as we have seen, rests not upon showing any particular thing that you can show a developing (1 1/4)in four stages, hardly any in three. It is mostly claiming that two particular documents, that one is more advanced than the other. It is interesting, I was reading yesterday, they had a big symposium on archeology which was thirty years ago, in that a professor at that time in the University of Pennsylvania said, that the fact that in Ex.34 we have the decalogue of J, the Ten Commandments of in the early primitive form contained in J, before the more advanced form we have in E, in Ex.20, he said this is now accepted by practically all scholars as completely proven. That was what this Prof. Barton of the University of Pennsylvania wrote 30 years ago, and I was interested to come across that statement of his last night because about a month ago I heard a present outstanding professor of the University of Pennsylvania, one who is very strongly attached to the main aspects of the critical theory speaking and somebody raised a question about the Decalogue of J and E or the Decalogue of J, there isn't any such thing. So it showed a strong (2 1/2) retreat from that particular idea. Now I haven't taken up your time with the Decalogue of J, because it seems to me a rather ridiculous idea, but it is interesting to see how this

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

man at least does not hold to the idea that we have the primitive stage of the Ten Commandments in Exodus 34 and the more advanced in Exodus 20. It is extremely plain that I don't see how (3)

But developments in J, E, D, and P, we have noticed it is usually just two alleged stages ~~rather than~~ rarely do they mention three. We have looked at the claims which are most stressed. We notice that regarding the character of God, what the situation is, their religious theories, religious ideas. Then we have noticed in institutions those which are most stressed, examined them and have found that there are comparatively few points at which a very big argument can be met. There are things which raise real difficulty and we've examined those rather fully, and we have seen that in those two stages you can dispose of two-thirds of the instances they give very easily on good solid bases, cutting down the number of (4)

and then on the other, if a person recognizes the principles that Christ set down, that the ceremonial law is not like the moral law, that it is different, that the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath, and particular conditions and upheaval would fully justify a temporary failure to carry out particular ceremonies and laws, that those particular problems, I believe, can be quite satisfactorily handled, but we want to remember, after all is said about alleged developments between the documents, that even if they could prove development among the documents, the whole thing rests upon the idea that you have separate documents, and so the Partition theory is really basic to the whole matter of development. Now Deuteronomy is a separate book. If you can show that Deuteronomy definitely differs from Exodus, there are marked differences, difference of viewpoint, and so on, that ~~should~~ could be a big argument for thinking Deuteronomy was written much later. But when it comes to dividing up Genesis, and Exodus, putting a few verses here and a few there, and a few there, and going through that way, and having different documents, and then saying you show a development between them, there is a tremendous danger of arguing in circles. Your development theory rests upon the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

 1962

belief Check this section documents proven that you can separate out by your

partiti to see if it v .me, and Green takes far more time, on the matter

of part complete in :velopment. Are they justified in separating them?

I do no 1952 you the reason why I think the differences are there,

that are not think these are sufficient evidence to show

distinct

n is something which fit in with the attitude, the evolutionary approach which is becoming so widespread, 90 years ago--it fits with that, it was a part of that movement, and it would have, in any case, the evolutionists would have had to try to explain how did the Bible come into existence, how did we get these books, and all ready for their hand was the long development of the theories (6 1/4) it was ready for their hand, with a little juggling around of it, and taking what was formerly thought to be the earliest document, and making it the last, but keeping the documents the way critics then thought they should be. You had something ready to hand to show development, and it fit with that movement of the times. And I believe that was what caused it to be preserved when the same attitude had been almost entirely given up as far as other literature is concerned.

There are very few today who try to divide Homer up in this way. Most laugh at that sort of thing as far as Homer is concerned. It is not done with any new document. It is not a thing that is today actively worked on in other things except the Bible. But it was worked on with everything a hundred years ago. All the ancient writers were divided up, and the division with the Bible became fixed and held because of its union with the developmental theory.

Now we go on to capital V, The Book of Deuteronomy. Under that: A, The Critical View stated. Under that: 1, What is the Critical View? We have already noticed it in connection with our history of the rise of the criticism. The view is, #1, that a large part of the book, that is the greater part of the book, was first accepted by

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

the Jews at the time of Josiah, in 621 B.C., about--~~it~~ it being~~n~~ the book of the Law which Josiah discovered. 2 Kings 22.8ff. Now of course in Introduction last fall we looked at that in connection with a different problem. And I trust you all are familiar with that passage, how they came, Hilkiah the priest came to Josiah and said we have found the book of the Law in the temple, as they were repairing the temple at the king's orders. And Huldah the prophetess said, this is a genuine book, it is the word of God. And Josiah read it and he said great wrath has come from God upon our people because we have not observed the word of this book. And he proceeded to do away with all the high places, and he proceeded to destroy the mark of heathenism in the land, he proceeded to carry out a tremendous reformation in the land, 621 B.C. And this is the view of the critics, that the book of Deuteronomy was first accepted by the Jews at that time.

Now we do not differ with them in the view that Deuteronomy was discovered in the temple at that time. We are not sure it was only Deuteronomy, it might have been the whole Pentateuch. We think it is equally possible it was the whole Pentateuch, but we have no doubt that whatever was found, Deuteronomy was included, because Josiah's reformation to a large extent deals with matters presented in Deuteronomy. So we have no difference with the critics as to Josiah having found the book of Deuteronomy in the temple. We raise a question whether it was only Deuteronomy, whether it was not the whole Pentateuch, but we're not sure of that, nor do we care particularly. But where we differ with them, very strongly, that we maintain that the book which was then found was not a new book, but an old one. That is our great difference from the critics at this point. Now that was #1, what the view is.

#2, Note that there is wide critical agreement upon this point. A few years ago a student of linguistics of the University of Pennsylvania, who was studying the language of particular periods, set to work to make a study of the linguistic features of the Hebrew language at the time of Josiah. And therefore he studied certain portions of the book of Kings and the book of Deuteronomy, as his basis for the study of the language as used

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

at that time. It is assumed by all the critics that this is the time, approximately the time, when the book of Deuteronomy was written. So there is wide critical agreement that Deuteronomy comes from that particular period. Now the critics, the majority of them will say that J was written in the time of Jehoshaphat, but I heard a noted professor not long ago saying how he thought that--he wondered if the author of J and the author of the court history of David, in 2 Samuel, if these two men knew each other, he said my if they did it must have been thrilling because they were both outstanding writers among the...

P.131. (3/4)

...with variations. And with the P document they would say, during the exile(3/4) some might say a little earlier, some might say later, but there was quite a period, but that at 621 B.C., Deuteronomy first came into general acceptance, that they practically all the critics agreed to that. So that is (1 1/4)

But #3, There is considerable disagreement as to the matter of origin of the book that was found by Josiah's priests. There is considerable disagreement as to the matter of origin of the book then found, which they say was the D document (1 1/2)

Considerable disagreement as to how it was--when it was written. Not over a tremendous period but yet it becomes rather important because of the rather serious problems involved there. Now it is an interesting thing, the Hastings Dictionary of the Bible is one of the most widely used Bible Encyclopedias, it came out about I guess about 50 years ago, now. It was, it has four or five volumes and many very strong articles, there is occasionally a conservative article, not like the Encyclopedia Biblica, radical but very definitely liberal in the main.

Now in it in the 2nd volume there is an article by F. H. Wood, page 358 of the 2nd volume, and in this article speaking about Deuteronomy, Wood says, the majority of critics believe this book of the Law to have been the result of a pious fraud promulgated

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

by Hilkiah and Shaphath, with the intention of deceiving Josiah, into the belief that the reforms that they desire were the express command of God revealed to Moses. Now he says that quite volubly, he says it very definitely, it was a pious fraud, he says, with the intention of deceiving Josiah into the belief that the reform they desired was the express command of God revealed to Moses. Well, that is the attitude which (3 1/2) took when he presented the theory about 1820, that is the attitude that Wellhausen took , that is the attitude that the bulk of the first critics took. This was the priests of Jerusalem who wanted to get all the sacrifice concentrated in the temple, who wrote this book in order to get that result and persuaded Josiah to think that it was an old book. That is their attitude. It was a pious ~~fa~~ fraud. You see, it was a fraud with a good purpose, so they call it a pious fraud. It was a good purpose, because the people were getting into all sorts of wickedness and confusion with these shrines all over the country, some of them ~~even~~ had actually heathen practices, some of them actually were worshipping heathen gods, some of them might have been very true to Jehovah, but there was variety, there was all kinds of opportunity for confusion, and there were all sorts of heathen practices in the land, that needed to be rooted out, so they wrote a book advocating all these good things, and then persuaded Josiah to think that here in the temple they had found it, and said look what we have found here, and they put it there in the first place, in fact, they had written it. And that was the attitude of the original critics.

Then, when very believing men from Scotland and England, studied under these critics, and were convinced of the criticism, but still some of them were very, very earnest in declaring their views, in the bodily resurrection of Christ and in the great doctrines of the New Testament, some of them couldn't quite believe that the book of Deuteronomy could be a fraud, a book which advocates such good principles and such high principles. So they said no we don't think it is a fraud, we think that it in some way got into the temple there, and Hilkiah really thought it was an old book,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

he was deceived rather than deceiving anybody else. It had gotten in there some way, actually it was written by somebody perhaps 50 years before, and so some critics think it was written in the early part of Josiah's reign, some think it was written during the reign before, during the wicked reign of Manasseh that lasted for 50 years, and there ~~are~~ is some considerable difference as to just when it might have been written or by whom, but that it was found then and then first accepted, that was unanimously agreed on. Yes? (6) The other fellow. I think they would hold that it was at this time thought that J and E came (6 1/2) from Moses

and of course Josiah certainly thought they came from Moses, I don't know anybody questions that, but the king thought so and the king (6 3/4) proceeded to act on it.

Well, in the first volume of the Hastings Bible Dictionary, the same Bible Dictionary from which I have just quoted this bald statement, that the majority of critics believe it was a pious fraud intended to deceive Josiah, in that same series, that same set of books, in volume 1, page 602, there is an article by ~~Ryan~~ Ryle, in which he says the finding of this book of the Law in the temple is described as a fortuitous occurrence, there is no foundation for the (7 1/2) that Hilkiah himself had written the book and that the story of ~~his~~ its finding is a fabrication. The account is straightforward and natural , it is generally agreed that the book may have been written in the reign of Manasseh, or in the early part of the reign of Josiah, so here is the same Bible Encyclopedia, you have in one volume a statement, it was a pious fraud, written by the men who found it in order to deceive Josiah, and you have in the other volume a statement that it--the account was straightforward, there is no question about it, they believe it was genuine, but that somebody had written it in the early part of Josiah's reign or during Manasseh's long wicked ~~reign~~ reign, when the believers in the Lord (8 1/4) were persecuted by Manasseh ~~in the matter.~~ // And there had been one of those times it had been written and some way it got into the temple there, and Hilkiah actually thought it was genuine. Now there you have the two views both

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

expressed, and both expressed dogmatically in the Hastings Dictionary of the Bible. And so that points up an essential problem with the critical view, so we'll mention that in #4:

#4, the view that the book is a pious fraud presents a great moral difficulty.

Now this difficulty is inherent in the whole critical view, but it is especially strong here. Driver says, oh, he says, we don't understand the spirit of the day, he says these were good people who wanted to have great reforms, but he says, this was customary then to put what you wrote in the name of some great ancient man, and when they said Moses, that was not ~~the~~ considered lying at all, it was merely the custom of the day. Well, it doesn't sound that way when you read how Josiah took it, he took it as an old book that the people were obligated to follow and had been turning away from , and had not been following. Now Josiah said, great wrath has come upon our nation because we have not followed the words of this book. The attitude certainly described in Kings is~~which~~ they thought it came from Moses. They did not think that it was anything written recently by somebody putting Moses' name on it. It presents a great moral difficulty because so much of Deuteronomy has such a high moral tone, it is one of the loftiest ever written anywhere. It is amazing how many of the wonderful statements that Christ quotes from the Old Testament, He quotes from the book of Deuteronomy. It is one of the great moral standards of the world's history is the book of Deuteronomy. Now how could a man write such wonderful lofty material as this and all the time telling a lie, saying Moses has done it when it was he who was doing it. It presents a great moral difficulty, ~~and~~ if it was a pious fraud? So many of the critics are turning away from that idea of its being a pious fraud. They--and also scholars of antiquity are more and more saying, there is no such thing in ancient times as a pious fraud, it just wasn't. So it is ridiculous to say that it was a pious fraud.

Well then, that's #4, #5, Historical difficulty. Of course this really shouldn't come yet because we're not discussing the critical view, we're just stating it, but

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

I will present this now nevertheless. The historical difficulty with the idea that the book was first written then. If it was a fraud, did these men, how did these men, who wrote such good material, and evidently were not hypocrites, how did they put on such a front of pretending this was an old book of Moses, and if they hadn't written it, as Ryle says, they really thought it was, how did it get there in the temple, and who wrote it? Who wrote it and simply put it aside and some way it got there in the temple, so they could accidentally find it? ~~Th~~ It is quite an accidental sort of thing, ...

P.132. (3/4)

...written bysome body in the northern kingdom, then, of all things, how did it get down here in Jerusalem, and get into the temple ? If it was written comparatively recently, wouldn't the paper look quite different than if it had been old paper, and the ink, and everything, wouldn't it be rather obvious ~~that~~ if it was quite a recent ~~wri~~ writing? There are great historical difficulties with the whole theory. But we pass on from this to capital B, Critical Arguments for the Date of Deuteronomy. We have so far stated simply what the critics believe about the date, and then we have noticed difficulties with their claim that that book was first discovered then in the temple and people thought it was old and yet it had just been written.

But now we go on to their argument, ~~what~~ one argument , and #1:

1, The Claim that the general background of the book is late. Under that small a:

a, The Monarchy is described, they say, in terms which plainly recall the reign of Solomon

One verse to which attention is called in this connection is Deuteronomy 7.14 which says that kings should not send to Egypt for horses, it says that when you have a king he should not build up great numbers of horses, get horses from Egypt and establish himself in great power and glory, and all that, but the king should follow the book of the law of the Lord, and study,and so on. But Solomon, we read in 1 Kings 10 how Solomon imported these great numbers of horses from Egypt and how he built these tremendous palaces and all these things he did. Isa.31.20 refers to sending great

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

amounts of tribute to Egypt and so on. They say the idea of Solomon's glory and everything must have been in people's minds when this was written. Well, this particular argument, I don't think we need to feel is so extremely cogent, because after all , according to our view the Israelites had just come out of Egypt, where Pharaoh ruled with a glory that certainly was every bit as great as Solomon's, probably far greater because it was a much greater empire, and they were accustomed to Pharaoh's glory, and they saw what kingship was apt to become, and it certainly was not out of place for Moses to warn them of it, even though it was not God's will they should have it for some time after their coming into the land of Canaan, ~~but~~ so this particular argument to which much stress is given does not impress me as nearly as strong as some.

b, They say, that the book of Deuteronomy ~~destroys~~ describes the prophetic order as strong and active, but requiring scrutiny of its claims. And this rests upon two passages and these are very important passages, you should be familiar with them in any event. They are Deut.13.1-5, and Deut.18.20-22. Now these passages, the first of them says, that if there arise a prophet or a dreamer of dreams and he gives you a sign and the sign comes to pass , and he says now let's go and worship other gods, you should not listen to that man but root him out from your midst because he is trying to lead you astray from the true worship of the Lord. That's what Deuteronomy tells us. And it is a very important passage in connection with the test of a prophet. And then the other passage, Deut.18.20-22, Moses said, how will you know the Lord's will after I am gone, he says the Lord will send you a prophet like unto me, him shall ye follow. And he predicts a series of prophets ~~who~~ to come, reaching, we believe, their climax in the greatest prophet of all, the Lord Jesus Christ, but a series of prophets to give them the Lord's will and of course, after the end of the Old Testament the prophets cease. The time of the Maccabees there were no prophets, but during the time of the kings, we read in the history of Kings and Chronicles we find many prophets coming and giving their message from God. This was a common feature then, and how

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

were we to know who is a true prophet? Well, we read in the book of Jeremiah that prophets rose among the people in exile. You know they had taken part of the people into exile, in the time of Jeremiah, the rest were still in the land, and the people in exile had prophets who said you're going to come back within the next five years you will get a chance to go back to Jerusalem, and Jeremiah said these are false prophets, he said you should build houses and settle down where you are in exile because it is going to be many years before you come back to Jerusalem. So Jeremiah said these were false prophets , they said Jeremiah was a false prophet. We have evidence in Jeremiah of people right in Jerusalem who claim to be prophets who said Jeremiah was a false prophet. There is one verse in Jeremiah which says how has the pen of the scribe written falsely, and some say that is proof that Jeremiah knew that Deuteronomy was a pious fraud. Some say that, while others think that Jeremiah actually wrote Deuteronomy himself. Of course, it is building too much on a very little, anyway. But you do have plenty of proof that the prophets were a large phenomena in that time, and the book of Deuteronomy refers to them, and tells (7 3/4)
to be sure that you're dealing with a true prophet. Now they say that fits with that sign. Now of course we can say why wouldn't it fit with Moses' sign. Remember that the Spirit of the Lord ~~said~~ descended once upon 70 people and they prophesied, and one man was still in the camp and --at least two were still in the camp, --and they prophesied there and somebody came to Moses, and said, Moses, rebuke them, Moses said, I wish all the Lord's people were prophets, so according to the Pentateuch they had prophets in Moses' day. We know they had them in the time of Josiah. They didn't have them of course after the end of the Old Testament. Well, this second argument then, they say it fits the time of Josiah. We admit it does, but we think it equally well is appropriate to the time of Moses. Then c:

c, The Law of Unity of the Sanctuary. And this of course is one of the critics' big arguments. Josiah destroyed the high places. He made all the sacrifices to be done

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

in Jerusalem. That's the law Deuteronomy gives, three or four times in one chapter, chapter 12, and he quotes it two or three times later in the book. It fits with that, there is no question of that. Then d, There are various heathen practices forbidden in this book, which we know to have existed at that time. For instance in 2 Kings 21.5 we know that Manasseh built altars for the worship of the hosts of heaven, "the hosts of heaven" is the term used for the heathen deities he worshipped. And we find in Deut.17.3-5 the people are told they must not worship the hosts of heaven. Carpenter makes a big argument of this on p.146 in his discussion of Deuteronomy. Carpenter says that Deuteronomy was especially concerned with the abominable rites sponsored by Manasseh, the predecessor of Josiah. Yes? (10 1/2) Yes, Deut.17.3-5.

Carpenter says, Manasseh was himself the first to introduce a new cultist (?) to the host of heaven, for which he built altars in the two temple courts, 2 Kings 2.25. It seized hold of the imagination of Jerusalem and became popular, Jer.8.2 and 19.13. It is plain ~~He explained~~ that it would not be legally forbidden centuries before it arrived from Mesopotamia, and its severe treatment in Deuteronomy, the penalty of death ~~of~~ by stoning is affixed to it, 17.3-5, is an indication of the indignation it excited in the minds of the prophetic champions of Jahweh, who saw Manasseh desecrating the place where He had chosen to set His name, and so the mention of various heathen practices which we find were in the land at that time, in Deuteronomy, forbidding these things then, they say is an evidence that that was when Deuteronomy was written. That was d, then e, There are general warnings in Deuteronomy(and quite a few of them) of the danger of ~~the~~ deportation ~~of~~ (12) abroad and of captivity in a foreign land~~s~~.

Deuteronomy has got long sections telling how the Lord will send them off into exile, if they turn against Him and forget the old law. Well, they say, in the time of Josiah the northern kingdom had already gone into exile. Deportation, exile was a familiar fact to people then. It just fit for Deuteronomy to have been written at that time. Carpenter says it is sufficient to allude to the familiarity of the writers with the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

characteristics of the invaders, and the most ghastly scenes of seige and famine, the description, he says, in Deut.28.49, plainly had the Mesopotamian tyrant in view, and he says that portrayal of the hopeless weariness of exile in 28.64-67 implies that background of real experience hardly conceivable at least, before the fall of Samaria in 722 B.C., and the forced march of the prisoners beyond the palace. He says the language of Deut.29 and 28 can already describe the expatriates of Israel as a present thing.

Well, those were under #1. The General Background of the book, they say, is late, and you might give a little thought to some of these I've just mentioned. Could they have been written in the time of Moses? They do fit the time of Josiah excellently, could they have been written in the time of Moses? Well, think about it a little, but I won't start #2 today, one minute left to go...

P.133. (1) (5/7/62)

...and under that capital B, under that #1, and there we noticed five points under that, a,b, c,d,e, and that e was the general warnings of danger of deportation abroad and of captivity in a foreign land. Then we were ready to go on to #2:

2, The differences of its style from that of other books of the Pentateuch and similarities to that of later books. We dealt with that rather briefly. We noticed that it, well, we had previously dealt with it. (stu.1 3/4) Now just open Deuteronomy at random. I turn to chapter 9, starting with verse 7: Remember, and forget now, how thou provokedst the Lord thy God to wrath in the wilderness, from the day that thou didst depart out of the land of Egypt, until ye came unto this place, ye have been rebellious against the Lord. Also in Horeb ye provoked the Lord to wrath, so that the Lord was angry with you to have destroyed you. I just opened at random and read two verses. Now open Leviticus at random and read two verses. Lev.22.17: And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto Aaron, and to his sons, and unto all the children of Israel , and say unto them, Whatsoever he be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers i

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

in Israel, that will offer his oblation for all his vows, and for all his freewill offerings, which they will offer unto the Lord for a burnt offering; ye shall offer at your own will a male without blemish, of the beeves, ~~and~~ of the sheep, or of the goats.

Now open Genesis, at random, 23.3 and I read: And Abraham stood up from befor his dead and spake unto the sons of Heth, saying, I am a stranger and a sojourner with o you, give me a possession of a buryingplace with ø you, that I may bury my dead out of my sight. And the children of Heth answered Abraham, saying unto him, Hear us, my lord.." You see the difference of the three styles, a very marked difference. In Genesis there we have narrative, in Leviticus there we have giving a detailed regulations for the priests that are carrying on their services and for working out details of the law. In Deuteronomy we have exhortation to the people to obey the Lord, and to follow His book. The styles are very different of the three. So the argument is, the difference from that/ style ø from that of other books of the Pentateuch and the similarity to that of later books. You open Jeremiah you can find many passages that sound very much like Deuteronomy. Jeremiah is exhorting the people to turn from their sins, turn to God and follow Him, and there is very much a similarity between many parts of Jeremiah, and the book of Deuteronomy. So that is the second of the main arguments given for the dating of Deuteronomy at the time of Josiah.

3, The special relation to the reforms of Josiah. We have the first in 1 Kings we have the full account of the reforms of Josiah. How when Josiah heard this book which they had found in the temple Josiah said great wrath has come upon our land because we have not obeyed the words of this book, and Josiah proceeded to remove the signs of heathenism in the temple, to take out the emblems for the worship of the hosts of heaven, to get rid of all the abominations in the temple, to do away with the high places throughout the land, and to have a great passover, which we read, that there had not been such a passover for many, many years in the land as Josiah (5 3/4)

Now Carpenter says on page 152-3, after speaking about

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

this reform of Josiah from this law book, he says what was this law book? It is expressly called a covenant book. This could not be the whole Pentateuch which nowhere bears that name and is moreover too long to be publicly read aloud at one meeting. Nor can it be identified with the covenant spoken of in Exodus 24, for this, as far as the covenant words can be traced contains no threats resembling those specified in 2 Kings 22.16-20, nor does it by any means account for the king's act. such as the =suppression of the local sanctuary and the celebration of the passover in a new style.

St. Jerome, the great scholar of the ancient church early identified it with Deuteronomy. St. Jerome the great Christian scholar pointed out that the reforms which Josiah carried out, point after point, they coincide with what the book of Deuteronomy commanded, so, continuing, as Carpenter says, the proof lies in the fact that the proceedings of Josiah correspond step by step with these demands. The covenant promise, in the language of the historian, pled with the king to keep the Lord's commandments with all his heart and his soul, the very words that you'll find in Deuteronomy. The temple is first purged from all its (7 1/4) emblems, the ~~metal~~ dedicated to the Baal, and the Asher, and the heavenly hosts were carried out and burned, the Asher itself was burned as commanded in Deut.12.8 and 7.5. The (7 1/2) forbidden in Deut.23.17 were ~~was~~ in the temple precinct were destroyed. The horses and chariots of the sun were removed, and the chariots burned, the altars for the worship of the heavenly hosts were overthrown, just as commanded in Deut.12.3, 4.19, and 17.3. And the (7 3/4) where the grim fire sacrifices of children had been performed was desecrated, as commanded in Deut.12.31 and 18.10. Alike in the city and country, the high places and their altars were broken down, the sacred pillars were shattered and the (8) as commanded in Deut.12.3. The priests were now to be allowed to come up to the central altar as Deut.18.7 had provided but they received their maintenance in accordance with these demands from the temple duties.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

witchcraft and necromancy were suppressed, Deut.18.11, and the whole reformation received its final sanction in a passover celebrated on the new principle of the place of sacrifice, 2 Kings 1.3-21, a celebration such as had never been seen before, drawing the people together from town and hamlet throughout the land. Each stage of the movement thus bears upon it the impress of the Deuteronomic code. Now that's what Carpenter says, and there are only two things, one word and one phrase in it to which I would raise any objection or difference whatever. One of those is where he says that (9) a passover celebration on the new principle of the unity of the place of sacrifice. What evidence does he have that this was a new principle? This principle was followed in Josiah's (9 1/4) but do we have any proof that it was not followed in previous passages ? So there he is subject to question when he says a new principle. (9 1/2)

say on the principle that is involved in it, we certainly agree with that, there's no difference. And then he says, a celebration such as had never been seen before. Well, that word "never" is a word which is mighty hard to say about anything. Never. You can say that this--something positive about it, but to saythat a thing has never (9 3/4) is a very, very difficult thing to say, because it requires absolute knowledge of all things. Now if you can find in a different place where it says there never was a passover like this, well, that settles it, but you do come rather close to finding that. You turn to 2 Kings 22 where we have the account of Josiah's great passover, and you read there, 23 I guess it is (22 tells of the finding of the book), 23 tells about the great passover which he carried out, of the great sacrifice, and the discussion of all these various things, and you read in verse 22, surely there was not holden such a passover from the days of the Judges that Judge Israel, so in all the days of the kings of Israel nor of the kings of Judah.

Now that comes mighty near to being what Carpenter says, there never was such a passover before. But I think you have to interpret the "never" in the two in a

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

different sense. I don't think it is justified, ~~I think the author~~ to think the author of Kings claims this is the new What the author of Kings is saying is, this, after the 50 years of Manasseh's reign in which the Bible has been forgotten, and idolatry and heathenism brought right into the temple, after the end of that, when they turn back to God and find the book of the law in the temple, and decide to ~~try to~~ follow it, there was such rejoicing in connection with it, such joy there was a passover, such a tremendous celebration, that surely, he says, there was never such a celebration since the time of the judges nor in ~~during~~ all the days of the kings of Israel and Judah. It is as if you would say of the end of the war, when the day came when the war was ended, surely there never was such happiness in the United States as in the day when the war was won. That doesn't mean that somebody looking back to the days when some other war was won, if they were here, would necessarily agree, but there are a few high points which are so high that you use the word "never" about them in that way. About the great joy there was, not there is no reason (12 1/4) ...

P.134. (3/4)

...leave out those two and we will agree with everything that St. Jerome, writing as early as ~~in~~ 400 A.D., says that Josiah's reforms at point after point carry out (1) in Deuteronomy, and if anybody wants to say that the book of the law which Josiah found in the temple did not contain the book of Deuteronomy, he has not only the critics to dispute with, he has us also to dispute with, because I don't believe that any critic who studies the Bible can have the slightest doubt that the book of Deuteronomy was what influenced Josiah so tremendously in carrying on his great revival, his great reform. We would have no difference from the critics that Deuteronomy was found. We would not agree with them when they say it could not be the whole Pentateuch. I'm not sure that we can dogmatically say that it was the whole Pentateuch. Perhaps it was just the book of Deuteronomy, but I believe it was equally possible that what was found in the temple at that time was the whole Penta-

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

teuch. It had been neglected by the people, they had not been studying it, and a thing easily falls into neglect, especially at a time like that, when unbelief was forced by the king, Josiah's grandfather, in his heathen practices throughout the land. It had been greatly neglected and largely forgotten, but whether at this particular time they found Deuteronomy alone, or whether they found the whole Pentateuch, it was Deuteronomy which particularly influenced Josiah, and there is no reason it shouldn't. Deuteronomy is the book of exhortation, the book urging people to obey God's law and ~~the~~ to follow God with all his heart and soul. And if it was the whole Pentateuch and you got it in and read the whole Pentateuch, you would be affected and influenced by it all, but the greatest influence was from the last part, the part (2 3/4) Yes? (2 3/4) ~~Th~~(stu., Mr. J. Guerios: ~~you~~ He compares the principle of the word "never". How would he explain the events that took place in the time of Jehoshaphat and Hezekiah which were earlier times, when they had that kind of revival as well?) They say those are in Chronicles, Chronicles is a late book. You see, this account we have read of Josiah is in Kings, Kings does not have a similar account of the great reforms of Hezekiah, but Chronicles does, and according to Chronicles, there was just about as great a reform by Hezekiah as there was by Josiah. But the critics either say that did not occur, or that it greatly resembled (3 1/2)

I say I would definitely disagree with their emphasis on the "never," and to their saying it was similar,
But otherwise, from this page I've read to you, I don't see any grounds for difference with the fact that it was the great exhortations of the book of Deuteronomy which book so affected Josiah. So that Deuteronomy is either the book that was found in the temple, or is a part of the book that was found in the temple at that time.

You might say, why didn't they put the name on it? Well, it was not customary to name books in those days, and in the Hebrew Bible, most of the books are simply named by the first couple of words. It is a comparatively modern custom, giving names to books. About a hundred years ago it was customary to give a book

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

a name telling just what was in it. If you pick up a book from a hundred years ago, you will read in it , The Experiences of Mr. Simon Brown in connection with the War of 1812, telling of how he was captured, what experiences he went through, the battles that he endured and how he came out safely. That will be the title of the book of a hundred years ago. Now if you get a book of about 50 years, they're apt just to call it a book, Brown's Diary, but if you get the book on that subject written today, they'll call it No Darker Room, or Great Joy, or something like that. Today it is the style to give books names that tell you nothing whatever about what their context is. And I think it is a miserable habit, I hope we soon get away from it, but practically every book published today seems to have a title that tells nothing whatever about the book. I read some time ago a little bit about Benjamin P. (5 1/4) the Secretary of State of the Confederacy, and I was tremendously interested in it, ~~and that would be a 25~~ I happened to see a book among the 25¢ books, for sale, a book called Beloved, and glancing into it I saw it was the life story of Benjamin P. Jewitt. I don't know what on earth the word had to do with him, but it was a most interesting story of Benjamin P. Jewitt, but that is the title they gave to the book. And reading that book I got greatly interested in his close friend Slidell, who was the ~~British~~ Confederate Ambassador to France, and I happened to come across another book written by the same author. It was called, The Big Family, the story of Slidell. And that's the way they title books today. So I doubt if we're any better off today than they were in the time of Josiah when they didn't give titles at all. The Bible says that they said, we have found the book of the covenant of the Lord. Certainly that is not an unfair title to use of Deuteronomy, but it could equally apply to the whole Pentateuch, it is not the specific name of any particular part of it, but I would agree thoroughly that Deuteronomy was either the book found or was the main part, was an important part, the part that influenced (6 3/4)

It doesn't prove when it was written. So much then for this summary of the critical

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

argument for the sake of Deuteronomy. There is of course a great deal of detail that might be presented under each of these , particularly the one relating to (7)

Now when I first discussed this subject, about 1937, when I first discussed it in class, I followed pretty much this same outline to here, and then I called C, Answer to Critical Arguments, and then a few years later I changed C to Recent (7 1/2) Diverse Views, and made that D, and now I'm tempted to go back to the original but I think I won't. I think I will make C, Recent Diverse Views. Now the fact of my hesitation on that theme represents a change in the general attitude of scholarship, and it is a change with which I think it is well that you should be familiar. The Graf-Welhausen theory was presented by Wellhausen in 1878 and during the next 20 years it won its way, the older scholars died off, and the younger scholars accepted it unquestioningly exactly as it was. Then, as archeological material came more and more to the front, men began studying these books and making up new theories. And the result was that about between 1915 and say 1940 or 45, you had the feeling that though many critical scholars were questioning important features of the Graf-Wellhausen Theory, that that theory would soon be discarded and that there was a great diversion of opinion on most of the points related to it, and that probably within a few years there would be a new concensus of unbelieving scholarship on some new viewpoint, that was our theme then, we felt that Graf-Wellhausen Theory was on the way out, because so many people were questioning details of it and often very important details. But that was an era which seems to me has largely died out today, and today the attttude of the critical scholars as a whole is simply to accept the main essentials of the Graf-Wellhausen Theory ~~and~~ as that which has been proven and which is accepted, and of which there is no doubt that this is the fact, and that is the general attitude today. Today the critical scholars as a whole take comparatively little time trying to prove it, they simply assume it's true, it's true, it's just as certain as the theory of evolution, it's just as certain as that the world is round, it's just as certain as

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

that the rocket hit the moon last week, it is a fact of modern times. That is the general attitude which was taken toward it today. And so today it is simply something taken over as a rule without any great amount of study of it. Study is devoted to particular details or aspects, but quite largely study has been shifted over to matters like so-called Biblical theology, and psychiatry and that sort of thing, but the attitude of the liberals is, this is proven. Now, this, as I say, I hesitated, I felt inclined to ~~sto~~ drop this, but I think I will leave it and will read to you a few words, if you will pardon the quotation from a book published in 1938 by Haverford College. It was called the Haverford Symposium of Archeology of the Bible, and in this some pretty good scholars, some that were fair, and some who were very good, wrote different articles, and professor Jordan A. Barton, who was then professor ~~of~~ at the University of Pennsylvania, wrote one on the present status of Old Testament study, and in this he surveyed writings on the Old Testament of the previous few years, and in it he said, in connection with the investigations of the book of the covenant, this is page 53, mention must also be made of discussions of it concerning the code of Deuteronomy. Since the days of Dizetti it has been believed that the reform of king Josiah was based on the code of Deuteronomy, and that the code had been compiled either in the reign of Hezekiah or of Manasseh, or of Josiah. Within the past twenty years , this fixed point of Pentateuchal criticism has been challenged with Deuteronomy. And then he spent two pages quoting from quite a large number of scholars who, he says, claim that this is the body of old (12) Israelitish law, which originally made no effort at centralized worship, and that the commands in it about centralizing worship were inserted in it. And then he tells about several scholars who he says claim that Deuteronomy actually was written after the exile and is later than the priestly code. And he gives a number of scholars whom he recognizes as men of high ability, holding each of these two views, though (12 1/2) who himself held tenaciously to the Graf-Wellhausen theory ends up with saying that these theories are not win-

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

ning acceptance and that it is pretty well established that there is a book written at the time of Josiah, that it is still generally accepted. Incidentally, then he has a paragraph about prof. N. T. Kyle, of Xenia Seminary, who issued in 1920 two volumes holding the Mosaic authorship of the whole Pentateuch, but he ends with the statement, the volumes were astute and learned but reveal the mind incapable of appreciating the evidence on which the modern conceptions of the Pentateuch rest.

That of course is the conclusion regarding anyone who believes in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. He reveals a mind incapable of appreciating the evidence on which the modern conception of the Pentateuch rests...

P.135. (.1)

...30 or 40 years ago. It seemed as if the critics were unable to assimilate the new archeological evidence, and they had to twist and change it here. Dr. Albright even said to me at that day, he said, there are only two scholars in Germany today who are orthodox Wellhausians, and he said, they're not orthodox. That was his feeling about it. That the Wellhausen theory had been twisted by so many (1 1/2)

Well that has largely died down. And today the attitude is, it is established, it is fixed, it is (1 1/2)

That is the general attitude, and so today you won't meet so many who really have a thorough understanding of the bases on which it is, but the books which they are using will contain that material, and the arguments ~~which~~ in them will be given, which have been presented to you here. So we don't need to spend much time on this recent views, but I think it is good for you to be aware of the change that ~~will take~~ was taking place then and how the attitude today is to react against it and say well the thing is proven, after all, Wellhausen was right. So after all, you see, the liberals, in a way, they are simply taking the thing on its (2 1/2) That's the attitude in this field and in biological science, to a great extent, because of its relation to evolution. The attitude 30 years ago was, Darwin's theories are pretty largely disproven,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

we believe in evolution but we don't believe what Darwin taught. Today there are many people who believe what Darwin said was right, and evolution (2 3/4)

There was that same (2 3/4) of investigating further, starting to move again, and then finding this would lead you to accept the Bible, which they ~~could not do,~~ would not accept, and then reacting back into simply an acceptance on blind authority of that which was presented nearly a hundred years ago.

I picked up a Methodist Sunday School Quarterly yesterday and found this statement, that it is now proven, that the book of Deuteronomy was not written until ~~700~~ several hundred years after the time of Moses, given in a Sunday School Quarterly for the young, (3 1/2)

Well, we go on to D now. D, Answer to the Critical Argument. And here #1 is extremely important.

1, The General Background involves no greater insight into the future than would be natural to a leader who had brought the people out of Egypt. Now you could say God knew all about Josiah's time, God knew all about what would happen at that time, 500, 600, 700, whatever it was, years before, and God caused Moses in Deuteronomy in his address to the people there to speak directly against the evils that would come into the land at the time of Josiah. God revealed this to him and caused him to include it, that would be entirely possible. There is no reason God could not do such a thing, but it is not necessary for us to assume that he did, because in the book of Deuteronomy the insight into the future would be perfectly possible to a man who had lived in Egypt, was familiar with a settled organization, people established in towns and villages, as it was going to be in the land of Canaan, with polytheism all about him, with the, all of the false religions around there, and who at this time was on his way to Canaan, who had lived for forty years in the desert, around people who had contact with visitors from Canaan, who knew of the habits and customs of Canaan and knew that the desert life was not what God was leading the people toward, but they were

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

about ~~in~~ within the next few weeks to head across the Jordan into Canaan to the promised land. The book of Deuteronomy has a relation to a settled life such as they would have in Canaan, but this would be thoroughly familiar to a man such as Moses is described as being, and when it comes to saying that the worship of the host of heaven which Josiah rooted out from the people there, this would never have been known to anyone in the time of Moses, I would question whether there is any time in history when you didn't find heathen people worshipping the sun, the moon and the stars. ~~It~~ They would be the most natural object for worship. In Egypt the sun god was the greatest of all the gods, and the other gods, the moon god and the various gods had their place in the worship there. The worship of the host of heaven would be a perfectly natural term to use, and of course the mention of Baal, Asherah, these were the established gods of Canaan, and even the Egyptians knew because there were Egyptian stories (6 3/4) which told about experiences Egyptian visitors had had in the land of Canaan. So that the matter which relates to revival of Josiah, the general background , the matters relating to the situation, settled community, settled houses, building of cities, and so on, all that would be perfectly familiar to a man who had led the people out from Egypt, and who knew (7 1/4) into Canaan. That's #1 on the general background. Then #2:

2, There are definite points of agreement between its style and that of other portions of the Pentateuch; the differences do not go beyond what might be expected in view of the different purposes. What is the purpose of the book of Deuteronomy? Its purpose is to exhort the people to be true to the Lord, to follow His law, and to obey Him. Did Moses ever dream that the people, after all God had done, and would do, bringing them into the land of Canaan, would turn against Him, and would forsake His holy law? Well, if he didn't, he'd be mighty optimistic after the experiences he'd had in the wilderness, with time after time, when there had been great revolt against him, and against the Lord, and when the people had said, let's go back to Egypt, rather

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

than die in the wilderness. He was thoroughly familiar with human nature and its tendencies to turn away from God, and he realized the great need of a great final exhortation at the end of his life to the people to obey God's law, and to be true to the Lord. And in an exhortation like this your style is quite apt to be very different from your style in writing the law books for the priests, to give precise details of how they are to adjudicate difficult cases, or how they're to carry out the ritual service of the temple, and it also is quite sure to be very different from the style of ordinary narrative, and there is no reason why the same person should use both, particularly when we remember in addition that this is written at the end of Moses' life and the other may have written 20 or 30 years earlier, and a certain amount of change could easily take place in a man's style, particularly when during that time he was constantly exhorting and constantly trying to lead the people to a closer walk with the Lord. There is a difference of style that has a difference of purpose.

I think I mentioned to you my experience with buying a typewriter and the two letters that came from Buffalo and the great difference between them. There was a difference in purpose, and we are quite apt to use quite a different style when we are speaking to a stranger or someone we are trying to win or trying to make a good impression, than when we are speaking to someone with whom we have a relationship, a very informal relation, and we get a bit irritated at them about something, our attitude is apt to express itself in quite a different sort of language. It is natural to use a variety of language in a variety of purpose, so that the different purposes influence him here, but also there are definite points of agreement in its stead. Oh, under this we mention a small a, Reason for Difference of Style. That I just spoke on, the reason for the difference of style. Moses a little older than he was, the style might be a little different, but particularly the different purpose of D as compared ~~today~~ with the J, E, and P. Of course that is one of our big points in our whole consideration of the Partition Theory on the style. That the difference of style is really a difference

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

of purpose rather than a difference of individuals. (11 1/4) the purpose of narrative, of precise law for the priests, and of exhortation to obey God's will.

b, Actual similarities to other parts of the Pentateuch. That of course is under the general heading 2, here. We do not have to hunt for them, they are abundantly pointed out by the critics themselves. The fact that Lev.26, for instance, which is in the priestly code, part of the priestly material, but the language there rises to quite a Deuteronomic (12 1/4) of hortatory and admonitory elements. You have then ocassionally, not often, in what they give to P, occasionally as in chapter 26, you have a note on exhortation in it, where the style is quite similar to that of P. More frequently in JE you have it. In JE you have many similarities of style with Deuteronomy, particularly as there are occasional places where there is a certain amount of argument or exhortation contained in the discussions that are included in the narrative of JE. And Divetti, of course, was one who in modern times presented the view, in 1805, that Deuteronomy was the law book of Josiah and was not written till then, but Divetti presented that theory the common attitude of the critics was that the E document, which included both E and what they now call P was the earliest document and J was the late one. And Divetti actually thought that the author of J was probably the very man who wrote the book of Deuteronomy. So you see he did not think that the difference in style between J and Deuteronomy were sufficient to require ...

P.136. (1)

...c, The subsequent influence of the style of Deuteronomy was great but it appears stronger in earlier books than later. That is an interesting point. Solenso thought the Deuteronomist hand was (1 1/2)

He said there were 117 Deuteronomical verses in Genesis, 138 in Exodus, and 156 in Numbers. And in the later books, in Joshua, Judges, and Samuel, but particularly

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

in Joshua and Judges, in Kings, you find many places where Driver says there is the style of the Deuteronomist very definitely included in certain things in these books. But Driver says, the purity of the Deuteronomic revisers (2 1/4)
to diminish in the later books. He says it is strongly marked in Joshua and Judges, hardly appears in Samuel at all, and is mingled with other forms of expression in Kings. He says it is interesting to note what is on the whole an interesting accumulation of deviation from the original Deuteronomic text, till in 2 Kings 17 it is mingled with fragrance derived from the book of Kings itself, Judges and Jeremiah. In other words, the style, this hortatory style had a great influence on the subsequent books, but Driver himself said it is greater on the earlier books than on the later, from which of course he would not draw the conclusion that seems to us a very reasonable concusion to draw, that these earlier books were written when it was freshest in their minds (3)

Now 3, The relation to the reforms of Josiah is admitted, Deuteronomy was in view. Certain parts of the book were especially pertinent, others were not. Finding of the book at that time seems established. Its Mosaic origin is not thereby disproven. That is a long heading. It would be silly to try to argue against the critics' statement that Josiah was greatly influenced by Deuteronomy. I have no doubt he was, but that that means that Deuteronomy was just written then, seems to me to be entirely unnecessary, and of course, as we've already noticed the idea that it was written then strikes very serious difficulty, it strikes moral difficulties, was this wonderful book urging (5) high morality, high ethics,------ great loyalty to God, written by men who were putting across a pious fraud, and pretending it was written by Moses when they knew all the time it wasn't? It is just about impossible to believe in that sort of a Christian character that would be definitely (5 1/4) dishonest in its actions while at the same time using its dishonesty for the advancement of the highest morality and the highest ethics as you find in the book of

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Deuteronomy. Moreover, ~~it is~~ the idea that it is a pious fraud written at that time, is very difficult to accept, and historically it is very difficult if this was a recent book written just at that time to accept the idea that they were fooled and (5 3/4) thought it was an old book, that surely it would have been quite easy to see that it wasn't unless a very deliberate attempt was made to deceive and even then it should (6)

And if, as many of the critics hold, it would not apply(6) it was written in northern Israel, or it was written in the time of Hezekiah or Manasseh, how does it come to get into the temple there hidden away to be found in this wise? It takes a very tremendous amount of imagination to figure out how it had come to be there under these circumstances if it wasn't a fraud, and if it was (6 1/2)

Some of the critics have said, ~~the bulk of the crop, have~~ that Huldah the prophetess who declared this is a true book of God, this is God's word, that she also was part of the scheme and she knew they had written it, and she was lying for this purpose in order to get these good (6 3/4) she was trying to deceive. It is pretty hard to believe that. So then it was the book which was related to the reforms of Josiah that,we have no difficulty with that, but that it was written at that time is not thereby true, but in fact there are very strong differences in belief, and so we go on to capital E:

E, Positive difficulties with the Critical View.

1, Deuteronomy contains much that is unsuitable to origin at the time of Josiah or of Manasseh. And it is very interesting that this book of Carpenter's where I read you from page 152-3 where he so strongly maintains that Deuteronomy is the book that had this effect on Josiah, how exactly it fits with it. He goes on in the next two pages to raise serious questions whether the whole book was involved in this. He says, there are many things in th e book which would seem to have nothing to do with Josiah's reformation, and he says it is hard to think of some of these other sections of Deuteron-

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

omy as being ready by Josiah at that time and leading them to make this great reform. He says that there is so much of doesn't seem to relate to that that he has no doubt that the original D document is a comparatively small part of Deuteronomy, and that other things were added later from time to time. Well, the fact is that you take the book as it stands and while there are many laws which are definitely finding effect in Josiah there, they are scattered along with other laws dealing with a wide range of subjects, often seemingly trivial. The standpoint is entirely that of the time of Moses.

Now this we could look into at great length to look at particular details, but we'll just mention three here:

a, Israel is everywhere treated as a unit. There is no suggestion in Deuteronomy whatever of a divided kingdom. It is pretty hard to think that the book was written in the northern kingdom and no mention whatever of the division of the kingdom which (10) and it is pretty hard to think of it written in the southern kingdom and no mention of this, no slightest reference. Now God could have led Moses in his address written centuries before to urge the people not to break up, or to condemn them for any thought of breaking up, and departing one part of them from the law of God. He could have done that, but God didnot lead him to do that, so if there was that attitude it would not be to me an argument against Moses having written it, but it is pretty hard to think of somebody writing at that time and not having the slightest thread of any realization of this fact which had existed already for centuries, until just before the time of Josiah, that the kingdom had been divided into two parts, each claiming to be the true Israel, there is not a suggestion of that in the book of Deuteronomy. Then small b:

b, The Law for Extermination of the Canaanites. This is stressed in Deuteronomy. ~~It was~~ The law for extermination of the Canaanites. It was vital at the time of Moses, that they should wipe out the Canaanites from the land in order that they would not be led astray by the abominations of the Canaanites. But in the time of Josiah the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Canaanites had not been there for centuries, and to have this stressed, which we find in more than one passage in Deuteronomy, on the extermination of the Canaanites, is very strange to think of anybody putting in , in a book that was written at that time.

c, The injunction to destroy the Amalekites. I understand that down in Philadelphia here there is a place in back of a building or somewhere that was set apart by William Penn for Indians to camp on when they came into Philadelphia, so they'd have a place to camp there when they visited. I believe the place is still there now. I don't know how many people know anything about it, but it certainly would be strange for somebody in a great address today would urge us to respect the rights of the Indians and not interfere with their camping place in Philadelphia, It would be quite natural for William Penn-- question? (12 3/4) That's what they would have to say. I don't know what else they could say. Yes. But once you say that, then all the more when you're thinking of the idea of apious fraud, it is hard to think it is something that got in there accidentally, that would certainly have to be a pious fraud, if they put those in to pretend (13 1/4) Yes?

(13 1/4)...

P.137. (3/4) (5/8/62 - record marked "4/8/62")

...the Lord is going to be wiped out completely from the land. He said it could not possibly have been written except in the time of Josiah, when things were looking up and everybody was cheerful and happy. Well, others find

in the time of Josiah, because, they say, if that was done then, the people who wrote it must have made an intentional attempt to deceive. It couldn't possibly have been written then and been accidentally been thought to be an old book. If it was written then the three, Hilkiah and these people, were right in on a definite plot to deceive. (1 1/4)

But we noticed yesterday there are a good many things in it like the law to exterminate the Canaanites and strong injunction to destroy the Amalekites, that are very unsuitable

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

for that time, and it is very marked the fact that all the people of Israel have one name. There is a constant stress on your tribe, your nation, the place out of all your tribes, and all that. There is not the slightest suggestion anywhere in it of a division of the kingdom, and it is mighty hard to think of somebody making up a book like this, when for centuries the kingdom had been divided, and not having the slightest echo of that in it. It is very interesting that Carpenter who was so convinced of the date of D, of the D document having been written in the time of Josiah, that he finds things in it which he says it is pretty hard to think of as having been written at that time. He says there is no apparent ~~of~~ appropriateness as far as the program of the Deuteronomic reforms are concerned, in the historical retrospect, chapters 1-3. But neither is there, for example, in the law which regulates birds' nests, or (2 1/2) upon a roof, chapter 22. With what feelings could Josiah have listened to these details? In other words, he feels that a great deal in the book must have been added later, couldn't possibly have been put in a book that was written in order to produce this great reform and to lead Josiah as he makes these great changes And therefore he feels that actually the P document is a comparatively small part of the Deuteronomy, and most of the rest of it is additions which are made later. So when you start dividing it up piecemeal like that, you can see what it does to the strength of the (3) of the argument as a whole. Anybody that looks at it simply as a book here, a book that Deuteronomy comes from (3 1/4) all these things in it that don't fit the date of Josiah at all make a pretty strong argument against the critical viewpoint. Then #2:

2, The critics exaggerate the promise of centralization of worship both in Deuteronomy and in the reforms of Josiah. From the way they write you would think this was the' main purpose of the book. You would think that this is the vital thing that is set forth to do, but it is interesting that such critics as Welch who 40 years ago strongly maintained that it was written in the northern kingdom, Welsh maintained that the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

passages dealing with centralization of worship were later insertions, that they were not in the original at all, and if (4 1/4) the fact that he produced shows how that while it is very clear and strong that the altar should be one altar, one central altar at which the sacrifices are to be performed, these are comparatively small parts of the book as a whole. It is strongly and clearly given, but is by no means the outstanding thing in it, as the critical argument would almost lead you to believe.

Then when you read the read the account in 2 Kings 22 of Josiah's reform, you find that the whole bent of his reform was against heathenism, it was against idolatry, it was against the worship of false gods, that was the stress of it. He destroyeth the high places, but many of the high places are places of idolatry and heathenism, and a great part of the stress was on removing the heathen emblems, the heathen (5 1/4) and the heathen deities and all that ~~sort~~ from the central temple at Jerusalem, removing all these signs of heathenism that had been brought in during the wicked reign of Manasseh, that is the main point of his reform. It is not primarily a stress on centralization of worship, though that does enter into it.

And then a very interesting thing in that connection is that right in the book of Deuteronomy itself we find a passage which would seem to contradict the idea that the main stress of Deuteronomy is on the centralization of worship. We find this in Deut.27.1-8. Listen closely to this and see how you think this fits the idea that Deuteronomy was written at the time of Josiah in order to lead them to do away with all of the altars and to centralize their worship in the altar at Jerusalem:

And Moses with the elders of Israel commanded the people, saying, Keep all the commandments which I command you this day. And it shall be on the day when ye shall pass over Jordan unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, that thou shalt set thee up great stones, and plaister them with plaister. And thou shalt write upon them all the words of this law, when thou art passed over, ~~(which I pass over)~~ that thou mayest go in unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, a land flowing with milk and honey; as ~~which~~

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

the Lord God of thy fathers hath promised thee. Therefore it shall be when ye ~~have~~ be gone over Jordan that ye shall set up these stones, which I command you this day, in Mount Ebal, and thou shalt plaister them with plaister. And there shalt thou build an altar unto the Lord thy God, an altar of stones: thou shalt not lift up any iron tool upon them. Thou shalt build the altar of the Lord thy God of whole stones, and thou shalt offer burnt offerings thereon unto the Lord thy God: And thou shalt offer peace offerings, and shalt eat there, and rejoice before the Lord thy God. And thou shalt write upon the stones all the words of this law very plainly.

Now how many of you know where Mount Ebal was? Mount Ebal, was it at Jerusalem? Was it at Shiloh? It was not near either one, but Mount Ebal and Mount Gerazim were two mountains right at Shechem, the place where the modern Samaria are. Quite a distance north of Jerusalem and not particularly near Shiloh. And there the book of Deuteronomy commands that after they cross over the Jordan, there they are to build an altar and there they are to sacrifice burnt offerings and peace offerings. Well, now, if the main purpose of Deuteronomy is to enforce centralization of worship why on earth would they be given a command like this? Why would anybody insert it? Well, of course the critics believe unanimously it was not in the original Deuteronomy. It was inserted later. But if the idea that they can sacrifice in different places through the land is something which you find in JE, make the sacrifice wherever the Lord puts His name, but that now with this Deuteronomi law, all that is changed and there is only one place where they can sacfifice that is the big import of Deuteronomy. How would anybody afterward add into Deuteronomy a statement that they were to build an altar on which they sacrificed, at Mount Ebal? It is simply entirely inconsistent with that idea. It is interesting to see what Driver in his commentary on Deuteronomy, what he thinks of this section in chapter 27 here. He says, of the beginning of chapter 27, he says, verses 1-8, the passage appears to be composite, verses 1-4 and verse 8 belong closely together, all relating to stones and what is to be written on them,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

but they are interrupted with verses 5-7 relating entirely to the altar. He says verses 1-4 and 8 and also verse 7b abound with marks of the Deuteronomic style, which are absent from verses 5-7a. It seems, he says, that an older injunction from JE found in verses 5-7a respecting a sacrifice on Ebal has been taken up by D or will follow (9 3/4) Supplemented by the addition to 7b and combined with the instructions written the inscription on stone of the Deuteronomic law.

Now that is a very involved way of getting this passage together, based on the claim or ability to tell from each verse whether the style is Deuteronomic style or not, but whether this was written, according to Driver's theory , these two verses about their sacrificing there were written long before. Well, if the big of Deuteronomy has its big stress the centralization of the one place for worship, that's the big stress of Deuteronomy, and in the P document, that is so well established now it is just taken for granted, in the P document. How did some Deuteronomic writers, in connection with the writing of Deuteronomy or shortly afterwards somebody wrote in the full style of Deuteronomy, writing this 1-8, insert these two verses in the middle of it, from JE, contradicting the major thesis of the book, according to that theory. As you see, it is like the passage in Joshua, where the people across the Jordan erected a schismatic altar so the other side were even going to make war on them, and of course, they say that is a late Deuteronomic addition added, because it accepts the altar of centralization of worship. Now here, right in Deuteronomy you have this injunction, and if this injunction , if it is Deuteronomy as its main stress, centralization of worship of at the altar, it just is inconceivable anybody later could have put that in. It just makes it impossible, an impossibility, in the (11 1/2) whole theory.

However, if you take it from our viewpoint that Moses gave this whole book, this is what Moses gave rather than what anybody wrote at the time of Josiah, then you find that in the book he laid down the normal order for the situation after they are

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

established in the land and the Lord has given them rest from all their enemies round about. But before that time, before their establishment, the Lord has given them rest from their enemies round about, it is important that they keep up sacrifice and keep up their regular worship, and consequently when they come into the land, according to the plan of strategy of the book of Joshua, they come together and then they go to the north of Jericho and go up the valley which brings them up near Mount Ebal, right in the center of the land and then from that place they conquer to the south and then to the north, which is half the effort it would be to conquer them all at once. And with that strategy of the book of Joshua, the first place they get a solid foothold in the land, is by Mount Ebal, and there they (12 1/2) and write the law of God on the stones of this altar they made, and have sacrifices there at the beginning of their campaign. It fits perfectly with something written at the time of Moses, laying down the regular system for the time when the land has rest from its enemies, when they are to centralize, but which does not take effect before the land is conquered, and which can be laid aside if necessary during the time when they're under Philistine oppression and cannot get together in one place, sacrifice should be centralized, but better to have sacrifice uncentralized than not to have it at all. It fits perfectly with the idea of Moses having written it. But to get the book of Deuteronomy together in this way, as the critics say, at a later time, imposes simply an impossible situation in the day of Deut.27.5 and 7 into it at all. So that we find there that the heading I've given this under is that the critics exaggerate the promise of centralization of worship both in Deuteronomy and in the reforms of Josiah. That is a very important point, but I might almost say that it is even more important that these two verses in Deuteronomy, there is no conceivable way they could have been put in the book at the later time, if the critical theory is correct, and if the critical theory of the centralization of worship isn't correct, then there is no basis for putting the book at that time anyway. So maybe I should have given a separate heading for this particular

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

feature or some of you will forget, but I hope with the stress I've given, now you'll all remember, because I feel it is very important...

P.138. (1/2)

...F, I am not going to spend a lot of time:

F, Alleged Contradictions Adduced to show it to be Non-Mosaic. And under this:

1, Changes of Laws. There are cases where there are slight changes in the laws in Deuteronomy and the other sections, and there are some of a fair amount of importance, and these contradictions they claim that it and the rest of the Pentateuch couldn't have been written at the same time. Actually, on careful examination and the recognition of the fact that this is given, not at the beginning of the wilderness journey but at the end of it, with the entrance into Canaan in view, the slight chance of (1 3/4) in Deuteronomy are entirely understandable. They say, for instance, that on the law of assylum that JE--there is also a place of assylum, but if you read the law of JE, in Ex.21 it says there explicitly, that I will appoint a place where you may flee, when you are accused of murder. He says I will appoint a place where you may flee. There is no point at the beginning of the wilderness journey to tell about places of refuge. But the principle of it is right there, in the book of the covenant, I will appoint you a place to which you may flee. It goes on and says that in the case of murder, from my altar you may take him away, but that doesn't say the altar is the place that God is going to appoint. Even from God's altar, even from as safe a place as that, a murderer may be taken away and be killed. But He says I will appoint a place. Now in Deuteronomy just before they enter the land, He gives explicit laws about the place of refuge. The critical theory holds that they had altars all through the land so that was assylum for them until the time when Josiah took away the altars, and the ~~writers~~ writers of Deuteronomy, realizing that the removal of the altars would interpose a real problem here, made up this idea of cities of refuge. Well, you'd have a rather difficult job persuading people all over the land of Israel who had never heard of

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

a city of refuge before, persuade them that this was something that Moses introduced, and that they should now (3 1/4) They certainly, even if they had fallen into disuse there would be some recollection of their having been given the cities of refuge. It is a rather queer sort of thing to think that you can introduce, not as a new thing but as a revival of an old thing, ~~and~~ simply by an edict in a new book written at that time. There is no contradiction there at all, but it fits perfectly with the idea of Moses. Also in the case of self-enslavement, of perpetual self-enslavement, in that situation you remember that he says in the first that you are to bring ~~men~~ them to God,--the translation (4) which doubtless means to the center of worship, and there you are to put the man's ear against the doorpost and drive the awl through it as a sign of his permanent self-enslavement. Now in Deuteronomy it doesn't say, bring them to God, it simply refers to their doing it at the door of their own place, because the critics say that is because worship is not centralized at Jerusalem, but it is more reasonable to think, it is because they're now going into the land and going to become scattered, instead of having all these together around one central sanctuary in the heart of the camp during the bulk of the 40 years previous to that time. So the alleged changes of law, there are different changes of law, ~~so~~ though many of the alleged ones are simply a matter of different terms used to express the same thing, but when a law is actually changed, the change of the law is explained in view of the fact that the book of the covenant laid down general principles, expressing in certain laws, and laid down what is vital for their life in the wilderness. And the book of Deuteronomy gives more of these as they enter the land where they're soon going to be scattered about, over a wider area, and it is important to drive these laws into their minds and hearts. Mr. MacKeen? (5 1/2) No, I'm glad you asked that question, because that is a very important thing to have in mind. The book of the covenant is a specific technical term which is used for Exodus 20-~~23~~ 23, because in Ex.24 it says that Moses and the elders of Israel met together, had a meal

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

before the Lord and ratified this book of the covenant, and God commanded Moses to write it down very explicitly. This book of the covenant, that is those four chapters. That is called there, the book of the covenant. Now the modern Jews call that section Mish Mahim, which is the Hebrew word for judging, because after it gives the ten commandments then God spoke to Moses, these are the judgements, these are the Mish Mahim. I don't care which you call it, but I will refer to those specific three or four chapters, now those chapters are of tremendous importance, because they are the law of E. You see, J and E are almost entirely narrative, but there is a little bit of law in them, and that law is the book of the covenant. So it is the change between the book of the covenant and Deuteronomy, the change we are now speaking of. We are not speaking of the law book of the priests, which they call P, which includes a great part of Leviticus and a very considerable part of Numbers, but of the book of the covenant which is E. Then they claim there is a little bit of law in J in Ex.34, but we haven't paid much attention to that. Although in view of Mr. MacKeen's question, there is just another word I'd like to say here, which is vital.

Mr. MacKeen spoke about the higher critics' (7 1/2) and it is common parlance in higher critical circles to speak of the higher critics, meaning the espousers of the Graf-Wellhausen theory, and in general I don't see any great harm in that terminology, but I do think that, if you come into discussion with people who are working in this field, that one can avoid unnecessary offense, because the term "higher critics" properly understood, simply means one who is interested in determination of authorship and authenticity. Therefore, anybody who studies that question about any book is in that way a "higher critic." A higher critic doesn't mean one who destroys, it doesn't mean destructive criticism. If --a lower critic of Shakespeare is one who tries to determine the correct text of Shakespeare, a higher critic of Shakespeare is one who tries to determine whether Shakespeare wrote it or somebody else, and there is no question but certain of the poorer of Shakespeare's plays were

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

written partly by Shakespeare and partly by other men, and it is an interesting thing to try to do that. So that the term "higher critic" as properly used does not imply a particular view at all, but simply a study (8 3/4) of the facts.

Now we often speak of destructive criticism, meaning higher critics who take an approach that is destructive. It is hard to get a really satisfactory term. Perhaps the supporters of the Graf-Wellhausen Theory is a better way yet of expressing it, But I just think it is well to have in mind the danger in that term "higher criticism," because we have been doing higher criticism in trying to prove Moses wrote it. If you prove Moses wrote it that is higher criticism. Well, now that was #1, the matter of changes in laws.

#2, Alleged Historical contradictions. And these actually are quite minor. We could spend a good bit of time on the allegations that certain statements in Deuteronomy contradict certain statements in Numbers. The --it amounts principally to something like this, that in one of them God commands, send spies out, and in the other Moses, you asked me to send spies out. And it is alleged to be a contradiction. Well, suppose that it is a contradiction, it doesn't prove the Graf-Wellhausen. But there is no reason to say it is a contradiction. If God commanded him to send spies, that doesn't prove the people didn't ask him to send spies out. There is no reason why both could not be true. The same is true of the judges. He says, I appointed judges, men to work with me, now we're told in Numbers that Jethro, his father-in-law advised him to appoint them. Well, there is no contradiction. In one it is saying his father-in-law advised him to do it, and in the other is saying that he did it. There is no contradiction. But there are alleged contradictions in small matters. But one which perhaps is somewhat larger is the matter of where Aaron died. One says he died at Mount Horeb, the other says he died at Moshera. And in Numbers we have a list of places he went to, with Moshera named and then three or four other places named and then Mount Horeb. While it is arranged in a different order in Deuteronomy. But evangelicals students

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

consider that these places described, where in the one ~~it~~ they went down as Numbers tells, and then as Moses tells in Deuteronomy he describes it when they came back up, and Mount Horeb is a large area, and most (11 1/4)

the place where it happened. We don't know where these places are anyway, so it is hard to understand the precise details about them. There is not a contradiction between them. And if there was ever such a contradiction, it wouldn't prove the critical theory. In fact you might say one of the evidences of the fact that the four gospels are genuine products of the apostolic age, is the very fact that we have apparent minor contradictions between them. One man didn't make up a story and a couple of other people copy it verbatim, but four different men gave the facts as they were able to gather them, and the result is that when you examine them superficially you find all sorts of apparent minor contradictions, but when you examine them carefully you find that on all the basic things they agree, and that most minor contradictions are explained when you look at the matter carefully, and the fact that there may be certain cases where we are not sure exactly what it means, does not mean that (12 1/.4)

how the statement two different

ways could fit together perfectly, and we have Moses speaking to the people in his farewell, he gives a survey of situations and in his survey he may look at things from a slightly different viewpoint or he may recall certain different incidents than he did when he wrote down the account in the book of Numbers or in the book of Exodus. That doesn't mean there is a contradiction but it may be that he gives different aspects of the facts and if we knew the whole facts we'd see perfectly how they fit together. But if Moses didn't write this but somebody wrote it at a later time trying to palm it off as the work of Moses, we can be quite sure that he would look into what was already there very carefully, to be sure that he agreed exactly and verbally rather than have any apparent slight contradictions in what he wrote to what had already come to be widely (13 1/4)

the work of

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Moses. So these slight apparent contradictions are not really an argument against the Mosaic authorship and they certainly are not an argument for the Graf-Wellhausen Theory. They are like the matter of alleged discrepancies which we examined rather briefly as the first of the four arguments for development even this (13 3/4)

even if it could be proven it would not prove the Graf-Wellhausen Theory.

#3, Certain phrases in Deuteronomy are claimed to be inconsistent with Mosaic Authorship. And of course we come back to that outstanding one that we discussed at an earlier time. These are the words which Moses spoke beyond Jordan. And if Moses wrote it, "beyond Jordan," why did he say this is what Moses said beyond Jordan, when he was beyond Jordan when he said it? Wouldn't "beyond Jordan" then refer to the other side, and of course the fact of the matter is that in the early chapters of Deuteronomy we find the phrase "beyond Jordan" used covering both sides, across the Jordan. If you were on one side...

P.139. (3/4)

...but it comes to be used mainly for the land to the east, so that as a rule (1)

but it can be used and here in the early chapters of Deuteronomy it is very clearly used of both. But just starting Deuteronomy, using the first verse, you can make a big argument. This can't have been written by Moses because whoever said Moses was beyond Jordan when he gave these must have been on the other side of Jordan, or he couldn't have said it. Well, that is (1 1/4)

but in Rome they spoke of the part of northern Italy just south of the Alps as cisalpine Gaul, on this side; and then they spoke of the section north and west of the Alps as transalpine Gaul, and even when Julius Caesar was up there in Transalpine Gaul he referred to coming from cisalpine Gaul. He says I came from this side of ~~ford~~ Gaul. Well the reason is (1 3/4)

And that happens constantly in matters.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

So that the matter of a phrase is one that could be gone over at great length but I don't think it's necessary for the two are simply facts, we can now go on VI.

VI, General Conclusion Regarding the Graf-Wellhausen Theory.

A, The Critical Attack on the Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch is not Proven.

When a new discovery is made in science, or in history, or in literature, it usually takes a very complicated presentation to give the evidences for this alleged new discovery. But if the new discovery is a genuine one, usually on further examination the argument seems to simplify and eventually new evidences are discovered so that almost anything which becomes established reaches the point where it can be proven very simply so that evidence is given in (3 1/2)
very validly the strong evidence, and nobody needs a tremendous lot of argument to prove it. That is true in case after case where a great advance is made in knowledge. It may be a tremendous advance in knowledge to work the thing out, but after you find it you find more and more simple evidence to point toward.

Now that is not true of the denial of the Mosaic Authorship. You make a theory denying the Mosaic authorship and then you have to explain away certain sections that are inconsistent with your theory, and then you have to make certain changes, and certain changes in this and that and the argument gets more and more involved, and more and more complex the further you go, instead of becoming simple.

There were big discussions centuries ago on is the earth round or is the earth flat? Now we have certain various ~~very~~ clear simple evidences, of course today people have gone around. That establishes the point. Take an eclipse of the moon and you can see the round form of the earth going across the moon. Very clear. Take the horizon. The higher you get the further away you see, and the smoke of boats seen from beyond the horizon. There are certain simple clear evidences. Take the fact that the earth goes around the sun instead of the sun around the earth. There are very clear simple evidences which can be given to show that. It was a

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

great discovery to prove but after it is proven, the evidences worked out quite clearly. It was not that way at all with the denial of the Mosaic authorship.

Denial of Mosaic authorship authorship raised more questions than it solved, and presents us with a tremendous body of things to try to explain away, which are far more easily explained, the ~~bulk~~ bulk of them, on the acceptance of the Mosaic authorship. That is not to say we understand the answer to all these problems by any means. We don't know all about any ~~ethical~~ epic of history. You take almost any battle in the Civil War, and you read three or four accounts of it, and one account one General made a terrible mistake which (5 1/2) and according to another account, this man did the very best he possibly could and something entirely different happened. Some of the most important facts, in connection with them, are greatly disputed and difficult to prove. You have so many facts entering into the event of a particular day. Now you take all the events that enter into the Mosaic period and there are many of them that we simply don't know and it is natural enough that there are many things we don't fully understand, but there are far more things we don't understand when we try to explain them as coming together by such a long complicated and unprecedented process. A process you cannot find a real comparison to anywhere else as the Graf-Wellhausen Theory. And that leads very naturally to

B, The Development of the Graf-Wellhausen Theory was part of a movement, widespread, that is now almost entirely abandoned.

I have often quoted to you in this course from Abbott's, The Documents of the Hexateuch, which appeared in two volumes. The first volume he called the oldest book of Hebrew History, and this gives the texts of the J and E documents, as he understands them. The second volume, which gives the texts of the D document and the P document, as he understands it, follows a few years later, but even then it was 1898 when it came out. But it is interesting that in his ~~fu~~ preface to this, he speaks of the long delay in the ~~add~~ issue of this second volume, but he said, in the ~~li~~ light

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

of later investigations I have been able to make some improvements in details, but on main points my position remains unaltered, I still believe that the views advocated by Kuenen, Wellhausen, Robertson, Smith and Dr. Driver are in substance established as foundation for all subsequent inquiries. These views must be tried on their own merits, It is true, he said in 1898, that (8) dissection of the Iliad into some 18 ballads has long since been abandoned by sober Christians. It is also true that (8 1/4) ReConstruction of early Christian History is ~~deem~~ demonstrably untenable, but surely it is strange logic as far as (8 1/4) argument, that because Homeric and New Testament scholars have erred therefore Wellhausen's analysis of the Hexateuch is worthless. One has only to remember the difference ~~that~~ which meter makes, not to speak of the fact, the Iliad is a great achievement of literary art, and this Deuteronomy wasn't. To see that there never could be any exact parallel between theories on the composition of the Iliad and the Hexateuch. It would be ~~farther from~~ in the highest degree to analyze Leucidides as we have just declaimed to ananyze the Hexateuch, or the books of Samuel, or to deny the unity of authorship in the plays of Sophocles, though scholars with scarcely an exception constantly asserted that the book of Isaiah was written by several hands and of very diverse king.

I think those statements of Abbott of which I only read you a selection give a very clear evidence of the fact that the attitude which was taken in 1850 of taking Sophocles and Homer and all these things and dividing them up into all sorts of documents which was given up regarding all of those, and is practically not done at all, he is maintaining toward the Bible along. And it of course has extended further since that time, in relation to the Bible, but he admits that it is given up almost entirely regarding --not entirely given up, you still find a little of it in ~~classes~~ classical scholarship, but not much, while at that time it just ran riot.

And today when we find a new classic of ancient Babylonian literature,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

excavated, that never was known before, no one thinks we can start in and divide it into the ABC and D documents and show how they fit together. A hundred years ago that would be the first thing they'd try to do. Yes? (10) It is a preface at the very beginning. That is one of many evidences that can easily be found of the fact that this was a widespread movement which was done to all literature, and ~~was~~ is abandoned now, almost entirely, except in regard to the Bible. I think I mentioned to you picking up in 1920 what was the the new Cambridge Ancient History, and reading the Introduction, that people will be surprised to read that the old ideas of the Iliad of Homer being unhistorical and simply a lot of different Greek poems fitted together had been given and we now recognize a great genius who wrote the Iliam of Homer, but that when it comes to the Bible on the other hand, it is now proven that Moses did not write the Pentateuch but that it was a number of different writers over a widespread period of time. This has been maintained because of its union with the theory of evolution, the union with the development theory, and I've tried to show you that a hundred weak arguments put together do not prove anything. One strong argument may. You can't jump across a ravine in two jumps, a hundred jumps that go three-fourths the way across won't get you over. You have to have one to get you all the way. And here we have a hundred different arguments which sound like a tremendous accumulation of arguments, but any one of them, carefully examined, prove the false far greater of establishment of the critical theory, yet it is today taught as the established result of modern scholarship and practically beyond question.

Now it is true that your leading scholars today, your leading linguistic scholars, investigators of ancient antiquity, love to point out how Addis and these others divide into D1, D2, D3, how they divide it into D1, 2, 3, 4, and J1, J2, and say that all this is ridiculous, this dividing verses up into little sections, they love to poke fun at that, but they maintain tenaciously, as Albright says, that there is no doubt of the once independent existence of the great documents

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

J, E, D, and P. The insist upon this, though it is simply a carryover of a method now largely abandoned and yet its results are taught as the concensus of scholarship which anybody who knows anything about the Bible is supposed to know to be true. So it is very important to have an understanding of this situation. Then C: C, The Method of the Graf-Wellhausen Theory has ~~great~~ grave flaws. That is the method, instead of saying here is Deuteronomy, when does it come to us, let's see what the evidence is on it, they find something that proves it comes from the time of Josiah, all right, here are things that don't, look the other way, all right, take them out, they're not part of it, take them out. They do not take a thing as it stands, and examine it as a whole and see what they can prove, but when you start with the assumption that you can divide it up into all kinds of little sections and then prove about them, you might as well say you can prove anything you want. I could prove, for instance, that every dollar bill in the pocket of anybody here has got the number 6 in the number on it. I could prove that very easily if you give me the authority to take all of those that don't have six in and say they're not really in this room , they're in the next room...

P.140. (3/4)

...very important, not just because it is important whether Moses wrote them. It is. It is the foundation of the Bible. It is the start of the five books of Moses. It is the solid foundation of the whole Scriptures. Referred to more in the New Testament than any other part, and when Christ could easily bring a good clear argument from some other part of the Bible, he often brought an argument that wasn't half as clear from the Pentateuch because ~~it~~ of its being the foundation, and therefore seeming at least to appear to have greater authority, but still the great importance of this book is not simply to show that we can believe in the Mosaic authorship, but it is to have an understanding of the fallacy of the method which the critics apply to every single book of the Old Testament. There is not a single one they don't. Up until maybe thirty

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

years ago it was said that Ezekiel is the fulcrum upon which the whole criticism turns, that the book of Ezekiel shows exactly what people thought at this particular time and we can compare with it, it makes a tremendous evidence (1 3/4)

But about thirty years ~~ago~~ ago they extended the same methods to Ezekiel and now they divide Ezekiel into all sorts of separate documents, and they do that with every book of the Old Testament. It is most distressing to take Briggs' two volumes on the Psalms, in the International Critical Commentary, and you'll find hardly a Psalm but what he divides into two or three different original poems which have been put together. Two verses are from this poem which was written at this time and three verses are from another poem written 400 years later, and two verses from the first one and three from the second. Sometimes you have two different poems, sometimes three. It is a method which has just gone wild, but it is the method used in dealing with every book of the Old Testament and it finds its results, its conclusions in the Sunday School literature which is today attempting to foist it upon all of our large denominations, and the churches, the effort is being made to force the individual churches to use it and teach it in their classes in Sunday School. And it is in the literature, it is based upon this false theory. So we could take a couple of years and take every book, and go through the arguments for it generally, and those against it generally, different parts, and all that, but I think we do far better to take one vital section and try to get a greater understanding of the method as it applies there, with all the strongest of the arguments and then see just what they really say. And I have tried very hard to be objective and not to brush aside any evidence but to look at it fairly and squarely. Because I think that is the only way of dealing with them, which in the end will produce results. You can simply ridicule and with unthinking superficial people you may win a few over, and people already with you, you may arouse to strongly supporting you, but ~~with~~ really thinking people are repelled by that sort of treatment. And examine them fairly and objectively,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

and see just how much there is to it, and then is I think the end accomplished .

D, We are today in a position to test the historical accuracy of the Scriptures far better than ever before, because of the great advances in archeology. I told you once, and I think it is worth repeating, about the time about 12 years ago when we were in Wilmington, a professor in Crozier Seminary said to me, Dr. Pritchard who will be professor in University of Pennsylvania next year, is now out in San Francisco for the last three or four years, excavated at Gibeon, very widely known in his field, he said to me, at Crozier we're going to have Professor Pfeiffer of Harvard speak tomorrow night, maybe you could get up and here him, or some of your students.

Well, I couldn't make it but I told my students and I think there were 15 went up and they got there a little late. It was about ten miles. They arrived there and they told me later that they were in the hall outside when they heard Pfeiffer, they heard Pritchard introducing Pfeiffer, and Dr. Pritchard said, Dr. Pfeiffer, you will be happy to know that everybody here thoroughly agrees with you in your solid acceptance of the Graf-Wellhausen theory of the Pentateuch. That was part of his introduction. The boys ~~A voice~~ came in right after ~~his and~~ he said that, so his statement was not true afterward, but it was true right before. They came in and sat down. Pfeiffer spoke for about three quarters of an hour and he gave evidence after evidence from archeology of the accuracy of a particular statement in the Bible. Statements in the Pentateuch, statements in other parts of the Bible which had previously been thought to be unreliable but archeology showed the remarkable accuracy of them. And then after he finished that, he ended up with his conclusion, that we must never forget how much we owe those great scholars who developed the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis, and gave about (6 3/4) . It is lip-service support, and I think heartily by most of the university teachers today , to the Graf-Wellhausen Theory. But at point after point, where a statement in the Scripture previously seemed to be the imagination

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

of a later day new archeological evidence shows how it exactly fit the facts of the time and often facts which were not known at the time when the critics think that the particular point or the particular section was written.

I mentioned to you about hearing a professor who solidly accepted the Graf-Wellhausen Theory in its main essentials, say, just about a year ago, mention a certain statement in the Pentateuch about the maid being given to Rachel, and he said, all the scholars unanimously agree, this is part of the P document. The story is from the J document, but where it says Laban gave Rachel Zilpah as her maid, they all say that is the sort of a genealogical sort of a statistical statement that only P would be interested in. That simply because all scholars agree, but he says they're all wrong, because he says, we have now discovered in Nuzi a sizeable number of marriage documents from the very time, the very area, in which Laban lived, and in these, in every case where a family of some standing have a daughter who is married, they always say and the father gave her so-and-so to be her maid. This is part of the established custom, in fact, he said, these accounts of the marriage of Rachel, and of Leah, he said, they're just exactly on the form which was the regular established form of marriage document at that time. Well, he didn't go on with that. There is no way in which the writer of the J document 4 centuries later would have known, which is (9) and no way in which the writer of the P document a thousand years later ever would have dreamed of, but at point after point, archeology knocks the foundation out of the sceptical presupposition in the back of the critical theory as held a century ago.

Now certain ones gave hours in which you'd like to take a make-up quiz, and we will have it ready for you at those hours specified, and if anyone else would like to take it at the same hour you're perfectly free to do it. I won't have it ready at the time when nobody said, but at a time when anybody said I don't care how many take it.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Entirely optional. Some of you are perhaps quite disappointed that last week and this I did not give any quizzes. We were able to cover that much more...

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

DRIVER'S ANALYSIS OF GENESIS

P Gen.1.1-2.4a 5.1-28 30-32 6.9-22 7.6 11 13-16a 17a(except 'forty days' 18-21
J 2.4b-4.26 5.29 6.1-8 :,1-5 7-10 (in the main),12 16b 17b

P 24; 8.1-2a 3b-5 13a 14-19 9.1-17 28-29; 10.1-7 20 22-23 31-32 11.10-27 31-32
J 7.22-23 8.2b-3a 6-12 13b 20-22 9.18-27 10.8-19 21 24-30 11.1-9 28-30

P 12.4b,5 13.6 11b-12a 16.1a 3 15-16; 17
J 12.1-4a 6-20; 13.1-5 7-11a(to 'east') 12b(from 'and moved')-18; 15 (analysis uncertain); 16.1b-2 4-14
A Special Source 14
E 15 (analysis uncertain) 16.1b-2 4-14

P 19.29 21.1b 2b-5 23 25.7-11a,12-17
J 18.1-19,28 30-38 21.1a 2a 33 22.15-18 20-24 24.1-67; 25.1-6 11b 18
E 20.1-17 (18) 21.6-32a(32b) (34); 22.1-14 19

P 25.19-20 26b 26.34-35 27.46-28.9 29.24
J 21-26a 27-34; 26.1-14,(15),16-17,(18),19-33 27.1-45 28.10 13-16 19 29.2-14
E 28.11-12 17-18 20-22;29.1 15-23

P 29.29 (with perhaps fragments in ch.30) 31.18b
J 29.31-35 30.3b-5 7 9-16 20b (part) 22b 24-31.1 3 46 48-50
E 29.25-28,30 30.1-3a (to 'knees'),6 8 17-20a 20c-22b (part),23 31,2 4-18a,19-45 47 51

P 33.18a 34.1-2a 4 6 8-10 18-18 20-24,25(partly) 27-29
J 32.3-13a 22 24-32; 33.1-17 34.2b-3 5 7 11-12 19 25(partly),26 30-31
E 32.2 13b-21 23 33.18b-20 35.1-8

P 35.9-13 15 22b-29; 36(in the main); 37.1,2a
J 35.16 21=22a 37.12-18 21, 25-27 28b(to 'silver') 31-35
E 35.16-20 37.2b(from Joseph)-11 19-20,22-24 28a(to pit) 28c=30 36

P 41.46 46.6-27
J 38.1-30; 39.1-23 42.38-44.34(with traces of E);
E 40(with traces of J); 41.1-45(with traces of J) 47-57; 42.1-37 45.1-46.5(with traces of J)

P 47.5-6a 7-11 27b-28 49.1a 28b-33 50.12-13
J 46.28-47.4 6b 13-27a(to "Goshen"),29-31 3-7 49.1b-28a; 50.1-11 14
E 47.12 48.1-2 8-22(in the main, probably) 50.15-26

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Pentateuch: 2nd Semester pp. 1-202, rec. 1-45. File no.1 1961-62. Dr. Allan A. MacRae. (Gloria - typist)

A. *The Importance of the Subject*

Sixty years ago, even forty years ago, you could go into almost any theological seminary, and you would find the students asking, "is this true, or isn't it true?" Was the Pentateuch written by Moses or is it made up of various sections written by different people at different times? The professors in those seminaries today are convinced of the higher criticism, and the students who go there are mostly convinced of it, or at least are ready to take what the professors say, and there is no great argument about it. Practically every student who is in a present-day liberal seminary, or has taken a course in a present day university is convinced of the higher criticism, but he is largely convinced of it because his professors have told him about the higher criticism. He has probably been given a few arguments which seem to him to be very strong. He does not know much about it but he has assumed that his professor is correct. Now if you simply come along with some ridicule, he will put you down as an ignoramus and pay no attention to you. However, if you show that you know the real basis on which it rests and the arguments which were advanced a hundred years ago, and carried the day for it, if you show that you know more about it than he does, then you can go on and show that, though there are some strong arguments for it, it also has some very great weaknesses. If you can show what those weaknesses are, and some of the newer developments that are not usually taken into account by those who are convinced of the higher criticism, you have a tremendous advantage.

So I feel that, rather than give you a little information about all

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

the books of the Old Testament, to try to show that they are dependable, it is good to look in depth at one vital section -- the Pentateuch. We shall examine the many changes in the higher criticism during the last two hundred years, and see how the views that were held in one period or another have gradually changed. We shall look at the arguments that led to these changes, and see the very questionable basis on which the whole thing rests, as it is taught today. If you can get a real understanding of this matter you will have something that can be of tremendous value to you in your Christian service. It may be of great value to you now as you deal with individuals, or you may have very little use for it for a few years, but I am sure that if you get a real knowledge of it, there will be many times within the next ten years when you will find this knowledge extremely valuable. However, you need to have more than a superficial knowledge, in order to have a really good understanding of what the destructive higher criticism of the Pentateuch is, how it has developed, and why it is wrong.

Since we feel that our primary task in the seminary is to give you a a good start in understanding the Bible, and a foundation in methods of doing Christian work, so that you can go on to serve the Lord effectively, we confine our study of the higher criticism of the Pentateuch to this one course. Therefore it is very important this course gives you a clear understanding of the main points in this very large subject, that you get its principle features solidly in mind, so that you will have them when you need them, even if it be five or six years from now.

It is important to realize that this is not a straw man; it is not some kind of a fool idea that a few people hold. This is a theory built up by

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

a number of very brilliant minds, examining a large mass of data, and coming to certain conclusions of which they are thoroughly convinced. You can deal with them much more satisfactorily if you realize the force of the arguments with which they deal and understand the strength of certain aspects of the data that they have and also the importance of certain other data that they are apt to overlook.

Whenever you discuss the Bible with someone with a modernist background, the question of the higher criticism is sure to be involved. It will enter the understanding of any magazine articles if the author has done has done any study of religion other than from a fundamental viewpoint, and this is a matter in which each section builds on the section before. It is more like Hebrew in that regard. If you don't get the first ones, the second ones will be meaningless to you. And if you don't get the second ones, the third ones will be meaningless to you. It builds right along in sections.

B. *The Importance of the Pentateuch.*

Its place in the Old Testament:

Pentateuch, is a Greek word, which means five-fold. The Pentateuch is the five-fold book. It is the five sections that make up one production. Yet the critics no longer talk of a Pentateuch, they talk of a Hexateuch; they combine Joshua with it, and then divide it up the way they do the rest. We call it the Pentateuch, The Five Books of Moses is perhaps a better way to call it. It is the beginning of the Scripture and everything else in the Old Testament looks back to it. The Jews very properly gave it a place of preeminence, in their synagogue and in their study. They always read from the Pentateuch in their services. They read from other books, skipping through various sections, but they go straight through the Pentateuch.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

It is the foundation of the Old Testament; it is the law upon which the rest of the Old Testament stands. The Pentateuch has a place of similar importance in the Old Testament and in the Bible as a whole. When Jesus argued with the Sadducees, he might have used arguments from later parts of the Bible that would have been clear and easy to understand, but instead of doing so, sometimes he gave arguments from the Pentateuch that were more complicated. This was not because he didn't think they believed the rest, but because he knew that they realized the primacy and solid foundational nature of the Pentateuch. Thus, He rested His argument for immortality, not simply on the resurrection, not simply on the clearer statements in the last part of the Old Testament, but on the statement about God being the God of Abraham!

Throughout the Bible, the Pentateuch is foundational. The main principles are introduced and they develop from that start. If you can blast the Pentateuch into a thousand pieces, you will have disrupted the foundation for the rest of the Old Testament, and the New Testament claims throughout that it is based upon the Old Testament. The apostles are constantly saying: "this is what the prophet says", "this is what Moses says", or "this is what the Old Testament teaches". They build upon the Old Testament; in the Old Testament the Pentateuch is primary. The Pentateuch has a place in the Old Testament, and in the Bible that gives it a very special importance. In the course in Old Testament History we study its contents to some extent. In this course we are not particularly interested in its contents, except as they enter into the questions of the higher criticism. The higher criticism deals with authorship, though not exclusively with authorship.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

C. *The Importance of the Authorship of the Pentateuch.*

Who wrote the Pentateuch? You might say: what difference does it make who wrote it? God gave it to us! It is His revelation. If we accept it as true and take what it says as correct and to be believed, what difference does it make who wrote it?

Well, the higher critics do not accept it as true; they believe it represents human ideas at many different periods, combined together into one rather heterogeneous collection. But it is important that we believe in its authorship. If we believe it's true, what difference does it make who wrote First and Second Kings or First and Second Samuel? How many here think Samuel wrote 2 Samuel? Nobody. I'm glad there is nobody because all of it deals with events after his death, during the time of David. It is perfectly obvious that Samuel did not write this account of events after his death.

Samuel is a book about David's reign. We believe 2 Samuel is true but we don't know who wrote it, and it doesn't matter. Who wrote the book of Hebrews? Nobody knows, but God gave it to us. The Holy Spirit led the writer, whoever he was.

All who accept the higher criticism believe that at least portions of the Pentateuch are entirely contrary to fact, and some of them believe that most of it is simply mythology and legend, I would say.

There has recently been a trend back to accepting the main historical facts of the Pentateuch. It is different from the situation 40 years ago, because 40 years ago, because 40 years ago the effects of archeology had not been felt to the extent that is has today. Forty years ago it was comparatively rare to believe that Moses even existed.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

I heard a professor at the University of Pennsylvania recently speaking very highly of Moses as a great founder of the nation. He believed thoroughly in the greatness of the man, but he says the only thing he did was to found a nation. He says that is enough greatness for any man. He says that Moses didn't make laws, that he organized a committee that gathered together some laws from some other nations and thus produced a rather poor combination of laws. But he believes much more about Moses than most of the higher critics did 50 years ago.

Who wrote the Pentateuch? Perhaps it wouldn't matter if God did not tell us. But if it is true, then all of its statements are true, and in Exodus 17 we find a definite statement. In Exodus 17:14, we read: And the Lord said: write this for a memorial in the book", (our English version says, "in a book", but the Hebrew says, "in the book." "Write this for a memorial in the book and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua." There Moses is commanded to write the account of the event that has been described in the previous verses. Here is a claim that Moses wrote at least what is recorded in Ex. 17:14.

Now in Ex. 24 we read in v.4: "And Moses wrote all the words of the Law, and rose up early in the morning and built an altar." Then in verse 7 we read: "and he took the book of the covenant and read in the audience of the people, and they said: "all that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient."

The book of the covenant is Ex. 20-23. Now it says here that Moses wrote all the words of the Law, and it says in verse 7 that he took the book of the covenant and read in the audience of the people, and they said: "all that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient". So these two passages

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

in Exodus claim that Moses did some writing. In Numbers 33:2 we read: "And Moses wrote their goings out according to their journeys by the commandment of the Lord." Then there is a list of the various places the Israelites visited on their travels through the wilderness.

Deut. 31:9-12 says: "Moses wrote this law and delivered it unto the priest the sons of Levi, which bear the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord unto all the elders of Israel." And verse 11 says, that Moses commanded them..."when all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God in the place which he shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing. Gather the people together, that they may hear, and that they may learn, and fear the Lord your God and observe to do all the words of this law." Deut. 31:9-12 says: "Moses wrote this law and commanded it be read to all the people and read in subsequent years to them." Does that claim the whole Pentateuch was written by Moses, or does it just mean the book of Deuteronomy? Well, it is pretty hard to think of it as being less than the book of Deuteronomy. In this same chapter, verses 24-26 we read: "And it came to pass when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in the book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites to bear the Ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee." Deut. 31:9-12 and vv.24-26 say that Moses wrote the book of the Law of God and commanded it kept by the Ark. Was this the book of Deuteronomy or was it the whole Pentateuch? At any rate the claim is made that Moses wrote a very substantial amount of material to be kept by the Ark. We are also told in the passages we noticed in Exodus and in Numbers, that he was told to write certain things and put them in the book though we do not have a definite statement in any of the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

first four books that Moses wrote this book in its entirety.

So under Internal Evidence is a., Direct Statements of Authorship, which I have read to you.

b. The Pentateuch claims to contain information that came through Moses. You'll find repeatedly in various books of the Pentateuch claims that "the Lord spoke to Moses, saying." You find this statement over and over. The statements that Moses actually wrote are comparatively few, yet there are a considerable number of them, as I have read to you. But the statements that God spoke to Moses are numerous, and there is nothing in the last four books of the Pentateuch which is not connected with a situation where Moses was present and would have personal knowledge of it, according to the way the account stands.

Now somebody may say, well, what about Genesis? Does Genesis anywhere say it was written by Moses? No, it does not. There is no statement in Genesis that it was written by Moses. Well, then, maybe were the last four books written by Moses and not Genesis? Well, that might be a question that you would find it interesting to try to figure out, but it would be a theoretical question, not a practical question because there is nobody that I know who believes it. The higher critics, for instance, who divide it up into sections believe that certain parts of Genesis and certain parts of the other books go together and were written by the same individual. They believe there were many points where you have close contact between certain sections and certain sections of the other books. Genesis is an introduction to the other four books, telling the history of God's dealing with mankind for that time. If we believe that Moses wrote the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

other books it would be quite natural for us to think of it as at least

highly probable that he wrote the first book also. That is as far as we need to go on that at this point. The internal evidence is very strong that Deuteronomuy claims to be written by him. It's definite that parts of Exodus and Numbers claim to be written by him. It's clear that Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy all claim to contain great sections which it says the Lord spoke to Moses, and that everything in these four books, at least after the very first parts of Exodus, which would be before he was born--everything else is something with which Moses was specifically and directly connected, and it is not at all unnatural, though not required by any specific statement in the Pentateuch, to believe that Moses also wrote Genesis and prefaced this to the rest.

We shall turn aside there, for a moment to ask what we mean by Mosaic authorship. Does that mean Moses wrote every single word of these books? Personally, I think he did. But I would not argue about this.

No, I shouldn't have said that I think he wrote every word in Genesis, for there are one or two cases where a town is given a name which came into use later on. In such cases my guess is that Moses used the name the town had in his time and that later on somebody put in the name the place had at the later time. Thus, if you would read that somebody came to New Amsterdam in 1650, and wrote a new account, you might say he came to New York, even though it wasn't called New York then , but the place we call New

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

York is the place to which he came. There are probably--I don't mean to be dogmatic on it, I say there are probably places where certain names may have been changed later so they would be intelligible to people using the later names.

Now personally I have no difficulty in believing that God may have led

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

Moses to write the account of his death, just before it happened. I don't see any difficulty in believing that Moses may have written the last half of the last chapter of Deuteronomy, telling how he went up in the mountain and died. God told Moses what was going to happen and might have had him write it in the book before he went up the mountain. That's possible though most people prefer to think that Joshua added it afterwards. Even so, it doesn't affect the authorship of the book. Moses can be author of the book even if small changes were made in it later on by others who also wrote under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and were kept from error. We believe that the Pentateuch, as it was in the original manuscript, was inspired of God and free from error and if a few sections were put in by other people than Moses, we believe they were also put in under God's guidance. That is not our question in this course. Our big question is the authorship of the book as a whole. I incline to think practically every thing in it, maybe even every word, is what Moses wrote.

Now if somebody wants to think that when it says that "Moses was the meekest man on earth" and therefore prefers to think that Aaron or Joshua put it in later, I say; "If you want to think so, I don't object to your thinking it, so long as you believe that God inspired the man who put it in." Personally, I think that Moses put it in, because I think in the light of the context, he was amazed at the meekness that he had shown in that situation. I don't think anybody else would show such meekness when people were criticizing his wife the way they did, but he sat back and left it in the Lord's hands and the Lord took care of it entirely, without Moses lifting a finger. And Moses was amazed and wrote that Moses was the meekest man on earth. And I think he was. But if you want to follow Professor Alders of

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

the Free University at Amsterdam when he says that Moses never could have written that and so somebody else must have put it in, I don't object, though I don't agree. But that's not our point. Our point is that the authorship of the book of most of what is in it--I would say of practically everything, but if you prefer, of the bulk of it, came from Moses, and that the whole thing is true and describes events and gives ideas that God wants us to have.

I would say that the Pentateuch, as it was in the original manuscript and substantially as it was in the time of Ezra, and almost as it is today, contains a few minor errors of copying, but except for that I would say that it is true and it is God's Word and it is entirely dependable, that I know. Mr. Abbott asks: "If the title of this section is The Importance of the Authorship of the Pentateuch, and you've given all this, could you now state it in a sentence?" The importance of the authorship of the Pentateuch--I just took a minute or two to discuss what I meant by authorship but I didn't necessarily mean Moses wrote every single word, though I don't see any reason why he shouldn't have written practically every word. #1 Internal Evidence: a., Direct Statements of Authorship; b., It claims to contain information that came through Moses.

2. *The Attitude of the Lord Jesus Christ.*

This is of tremendous importance. I really question whether many people realize just what the attitude of the Lord Jesus Christ was. Because if they did they would feel that the very basis of our Christian religion is at stake in this question of whether Moses wrote the Pentateuch or not. In Matthew 8:4, Jesus said: "go thy way, show thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded." Did Jesus Christ know that this

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

thing that the Jews thought came from Moses came from an unknown writer of a thousand years after the time of Moses? Did He know that and still say "the gift that Moses commanded?" Certainly He implied that Moses had actually commanded that this be done.

Matt. 19:7-8: "they say unto him why did Moses then command to give her a writing of divorcement and to put her away? Jesus said unto them, the reason that that's contained in the book of your law is because of the hardness of your heart"--He could have said that and it would have sidestepped the question of who wrote it, but He did no sidestepping. Jesus said, in verse 8, Moses, because of the hardness of your heart, suffered you to put away your wives, but from the beginning it was not so. In other words, he applied it to Moses specifically as having done it. Some people say: "Oh, that's just a term for Law, they say Moses did it, they mean it is written in the Law." Well, we don't use the term for Law that way; we don't say for Law that was written last year, "Blackstone commanded," or "King George commanded." We don't do that, and it is ridiculous to say that that's what the Lord did. He certainly thought that Moses had commanded it when he made that statement.

Look at Mark 12:19-26 which I referred to a few minutes ago. The Sadducees are asking Him a question about the resurrection. In verse 26 we read: "And Jesus said, as touching the dead that they rise, have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him saying." Now He could have said, "Have you not read in the book of Exodus, how in the bush God spoke to Moses saying." Then it would say nothing about who wrote it, and nobody would be excited about it. he wouldn't be saying they were wrong, He just wouldn't be discussing the question. But when Jesus said,

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

"have ye not read in the Book of Moses," He was saying, "This is the book of Moses." In Mark 7:10 there is another reference to what Moses commanded. There are many such--I will not try to give you nearly all of them, but I want to give you a few outstanding ones. "But Moses said, honor thy father and thy mother." That is in the Ten Commandments--God said it. Why did He say Moses said it? Well, it means that Moses wrote it in a book in which he says that God said this.

Luke 16 is a very interesting chapter. In verses 29-31 we read about Lazarus who had gone to Abraham's bosom. The rich man, in his torment, asked that Lazarus be sent to warn the man's brother. Jesus said: "Abraham saith unto him, they have Moses and the prophets, let him hear them." Why didn't he say, "they have the books of the Law and the Prophets?" That wouldn't imply who wrote it. He said, "they have Moses and the Prophets," and he said, "nay, father Abraham, but if one went unto them from the dead they will repent," and he said unto them: "if they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one arose from the dead." Jesus explicitly said that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. He put the seal of His authority upon this fact, and so the question at stake is not merely as to whether the Pentateuch is written by Moses, what is at stake is whether Jesus Christ is the Lord of Glory or is not. If He were the Lord of Glory and knew that it was an old superstition that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, which wasn't true, but it was a good book and worth their reading, He could have easily side-stepped the question. Instead time after time He explicitly said that Moses wrote it. John 5:45-47 is another very good illustration: "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father, there is one that accuses you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me, but if ye believed not his writings, how shall ye believe my word?" How could Jesus say that if He knew that Moses never had written it at all?

Many of the higher critics have believed that Moses never wrote anything. They used to even believe that writing was unknown at that time. Now of course that is quite given up, because we have much writing from before the time of Moses. "If ye do not believe his writing, how shall ye believe my word?" The attitude of the Lord Jesus Christ is very clear on this point, and therefore we can't say: "Well, let's believe in Christ, be safe in Him, but what difference does it make who wrote the Pentateuch?" If Jesus didn't know what He was talking about, how can we be safe through believing in Him? The foundation of our religion is at stake in the question of whether Moses wrote the Pentateuch.

Now I don't mean we should go out to the unbeliever and try to convince him Moses wrote the Pentateuch, as a way of bringing him to the Lord. To be saved, a man needs to see himself as a sinner and to see Jesus Christ as the all-sufficient Saviour -- not to be convinced of the authorship of the Pentateuch. But after a man becomes a Christian then he needs to know where to get his knowledge of Christian beliefs. And if he is a Christian he will want to follow the Lord Jesus Christ and therefore will know this to be a fact, that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, because jesus explicitly set the seal of His approval upon it. So we will see more and more as we go on that it isn't just a question as to who wrote the Pentateuch, but is the Pentateuch true? You cannot hold the higher criticism and believe that the Pentateuch is true, you can't do that. But it centers around this question of the authorship. Is it written by the one man, at one time, giving the

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

ideas God wanted him to have, or is it written by many men at different times, with different sections brought together into something that is entirely different from what any of the writers ever imagined that the book would be?

3. *The Authority of Jesus Christ.*

What is our attitude toward Him? The question is not what you think of Moses; it is what you think of Christ. If you think of Christ as the Savior, if you think of Him as the One who truly is the Lord of Glory, and knows all things, then you have to believe what He says, and when He says it as clearly and strongly as this, and bases so much of His teaching upon what Moses said, there can be no question about it. The authority of Jesus Christ is thus involved.

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm

EXAMINATION IN: INTRODUCTION TO THE PENTATEUCH

Monday, May 14, 1962

English Bibles are to be used in this examination. Time: Not over 2 1/2 hours--plan your time so as to finish.

1. a. Clearly state exactly what is the critical view of the Pentateuch, as widely held at present.

   b. Clearly and fully state the part that each of the following men had in the development of the Critical Theory: Eichhorn, Hupfeld, Graf.

2. a. As fully as you can in 1/2 hour, discuss the argument from Parallel Passages.

   b. As fully as you can in 20 minutes, discuss the argument from Variation of Style.

3. As fully as time permits discuss the bearing and interpretation of each of the following verses:

(a) Gen.37.28	(i) Deut.12.10-11
(b) Ex.4.24	(j) Deut.12.21
(c) Ex.6.3	(k) Deut.27.1-8
(d) Ex.21.14	(l) Deut.31.9
(e) Numb.6.25	(m) Josh.22.29
(f) Num.12.3	(n) 2 Kings 22.8
(g) Deut.1.1	(o) Phil.2.8
(h) Deut.10.6	

http://www.macraelib.ibri.org/Syllabi/62Pentateuch-II/README.htm