

even if completely proven, would affect the matter at too few points to really be a great evidence for the truth of the critical theory. That is to say, if the others are not proven it goes like this: suppose that somebody said, “All lawyers are honest,” how could you prove it? Suppose he says, “Look here, I know a lawyer, and he is so honest that when he picked up a purse on the street that had a hundred dollars in it, he did not put it in his pocket but he put an ad in the paper for someone to come and prove that it belonged to them.”

What have you proved? You have proved that one lawyer is honest, but you have not proved anything about the rest of them. If you take all these different points in the documents and claim that at two or three particular points the history corresponds, then that could cast considerable doubt on the reliability of the scripture at those particular points, but there are not many of them and they are points at which we have seen that the development within the documents is not as the critics claim it is. On many other points, where they claim that there is development, there is absolutely no evidence from history. It is the strongest argument of the critics but it is one which touches very few points. That is very vital to have in mind.

The argument from history cannot be applied to many points because we do not have evidence. Somebody might say, “Since 1900 it has been customary to have the President always come from the west, and before 1900 he always came from the east.” If you made that statement it would be quite easy to disprove it, because we could just look it up and see where were the presidents had come from. But if somebody were to say, it used to be, prior to 1800, that the mayors of towns in America were always men of independent means, I do not know if anybody here would be able to say whether that was true or not. You would have to go and do some searching, but you would probably find no statement. We have thousands of documents dealing with the eighteenth century, so we could study through those documents and look for evidence on this, and probably we would find it. But on the Biblical history all the evidence we have is what is in the Old Testament. There is nothing else. So, if somebody wants to make a statement that the border between the tribe of Ephraim and Manasseh would fluctuate, you can not prove it one way or the other.