

it, such as you have had, and will then go on and study Orr, he will find it tremendously profitable. The vital ideas and points which we have dealt with in this course would be driven home to your mind from the way Orr deals with some of them and touches others. And I think you would find that he brings out many additional details that are extremely helpful and valuable. I wish it were possible for most of you to study Orr now, after finishing the course, rather than during the course, and certainly not in advance. For that reason I have been thinking in the last two or three days that I should suggest that if any of you would like to study Orr's book this summer and take an examination on it, we could give one hour of elective credit for it. I think that would be about the amount of work that it would require. It would be very valuable to drive home to your mind the vital points and to get additional worthwhile details that you could not get in a course of the length of this one.

At this point I might mention another book which deals with the authorship of the Pentateuch, *A Short Introduction to the Pentateuch*, by Professor Aalders, a professor at the Free University of Amsterdam. It came out about a year ago. It is published by the Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Great Britain and distributed by them in the United States. In this book Professor Aalders has taken up the various arguments on the Pentateuch. I have not looked over his material very fully, but glancing at it I got the impression he had done a very good job with some of these arguments. There is some very fine material in the book. He is a very fine Christian man and a very fine scholar. I met him years ago in Scotland. I looked into some of the chapters of Aalders' book and found some very good material and I imagine the rest is also very good, but I was sorry to find that in the middle of the book he devoted a chapter to what he called "Amosaica and Post-mosaica," in which he took up some of those old arguments made before the criticism ever developed, and said that some of the statements could not be by Moses. But I believe they could be by Moses! I do not see any proof that they are not. They are not matters which, like the criticism, involve a complete rearrangement; they are matters of individual statements which could conceivably be interpolations. I do not think it is necessary to consider that they are. Anyway, they are isolated statements which do not prove anything about the rest