

words and you could separate them out into two complete stories, but you wouldn't necessarily include all of both of them. You might very well include both of them on important things, but when you came to less important things, you would only include one of them. So, if you cannot prove a continuous document it does not prove there were not two sources. That is very important. If you can prove continuous narrative, it is a strong argument for two distinct sources; but if you can not prove it it does not prove there were not two sources, because a person could very easily use two sources and only take part of each, not taking the whole story out of either one. So this argument is more important than the second, because the third is quite sure to be there even if only part of each document were taken.

This third argument from parallel passages is one of the very most important arguments for the critical theory. Actually it is far more important than the alternation of divine names. According to it, part of the same event is described and then it is described over again. Why on earth would the same thing be told twice? You would not expect a sensible person writing about my trip to Palestine a year ago last summer to describe my day when I went up to Ai and Bethel and then to describe the same things all over again. If somebody took my account and took Dr. Harris' account and went through what I said and then went through his, and just gave them one right after the other without any heading, a person could easily get the idea that it tells of two different trips, that I had made the trip one day and that he had made it another day. If there were no names you could easily think that two different trips were described. There would be a parallel. If you would examine them carefully you would say, "two different men did not go on two different days and see exactly the same things in the same order and have the same other companions with them and ride in the same kind of car and have the same experience with Arabs along the way and have the same Arab come up behind Dr. Harris and strike toward his skull with Dr. MacRae there just in time to grab it out of his hand, and read twice about the other little incidents in both stories." You would say the same thing is being told twice. You would think that fellow that combined them together without explaining that they are parallel stories must have been pretty stupid. This could be the strongest possible kind of an argument for there being two