

That sort of thing must be studied by the officials of the election, and the people as a whole can look them up any time they want to. So the argument that there is a development in the document with regard to the person who performs sacrifice is entirely an argument that rests upon silence, and it is not the type of silence that makes a reliable argument, so there was no necessity of mentioning it in any of these documents.

If the people do their sacrifice in the one place as designated, it would stand to reason that they would come to the ones designated to carry it out. If the people were performing sacrifice all over the land then it might have been of more importance to stress to them who the designated ones were. Once you have one given, it is not a proof that the other did not exist if it is not mentioned.

I hope that is sufficient discussion of the Evidence of Development within the Documents.

When it comes to details the critics have no hesitation in taking a section and saying, “This fits the intermediate idea of D, so it belongs to D. This fits the early ideas of J, so it belongs to J.” Thus they rearrange the material to a very large extent according to their idea of development. Even so, you do not find such evidence of development in the documents as the critics claim is there. The phenomena are mostly such as fit naturally into the idea of the Pentateuch as it stands. At first the brief covenant is given to the people, establishing their permanent relationship with God. Then they are given the detailed regulations for the priests to study, carry out, and to look up details for particular needs. Then, forty years later, a farewell address is given by Moses in which he stresses those things he thought were necessary for the people as they would go into the land.

I do not mean to say that we can tell what Moses would necessarily have to stress in them. I do not mean that by any means. It might very well be that Moses would think something to be particularly important that we would not consider very important, and therefore would stress it greatly in his farewell address. What I am saying is that in a farewell address Moses did not have to go over the whole law. He