

quote the same statement from Dr. Robert Dick Wilson as to what we mean by the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. I do not have it right in front of me at the moment, but it is substantially this, that when we speak of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, we mean that Moses wrote these books and that at least the great bulk of it is what he wrote. It does not mean that there might not be interpolations or additions made at a later time by inspired men, which are just as much inspired and true as the original. It does mean that the book as a whole, as it was in the days of Christ, is true and dependable regardless of which parts came from Moses and which came from other men, but it also means that the overwhelming bulk of it came from Moses. I would personally say this: I do not believe that there is any proof that anything in the Pentateuch as we have it today came from anyone other than Moses. I do not believe there is any proof that any section is not from Moses, but I do not think it is necessary to hold to the fact that every sentence of it came from Moses. I think it is not impossible that there might be additions or insertions of minor nature which were made at a later time by inspired men. I think that is entirely possible. I do not think it affects the major problem that it is a book of Moses. But I certainly reject any view that the great bulk of the laws of Moses were not written until a thousand years after his death and united together by different men. It is utterly contrary to the teaching of the Bible to say that many contradictory sections were united together. The truth of our religion is at stake in the dependability of the Pentateuch and possibly in the Mosaic authorship, since Christ so explicitly spoke of it. It is not a matter of the same relative importance as the difference between the Lutherans and the Reformed on the nature of the communion. It is far more important than that.

It is not of the type of importance of the difference between Roman Catholic and Protestant as to whether seven additional books are part of the Old Testament. They consider these part of the Old Testament. We consider them Apocryphal writings. But they hold to the other thirty nine books; and besides, these seven books are on the whole good books. There are teachings in them on minor matters which we think are false but in the main their teaching is in line with the teaching of the rest of the Scripture. It is a serious error but not a fraction as serious as the error of saying that the Pentateuch is not