

Various alleged contradictions and anachronisms have been pointed out in the Pentateuch as evidence against the Mosaic authorship. The majority of these prove unwarranted on close examination. I shall mention a few briefly.

It is said that the use of the name of the place Dan, is an anachronism, for this is alleged to have been introduced after the Pentateuch was written, to replace the old name of Laish. There is no certain proof that this is the same Dan. There is a New York, Pa., and a Philadelphia, N.Y. If it is, perhaps a sign was used for the place, which might have been called Laish originally, and then later the same sign might have been retained and called Dan. In Korea the same signs can be read by Chinese, Japanese, and Koreans, but are pronounced differently by each. Or, even supposing that some later scribe had replaced the obsolete term Laish by the up-to-date one Dan, how can that ~~be~~ used as an argument against the essentially Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

The iron bedstead which is referred to in the book of Numbers used to be considered an anachronism, but subsequent investigation has proved that iron was used in Egypt long before this time.

Some say that the phrase, "on the other side of Jordan", proves the point of orientation to be Palestine. But the Hebrew phrase means simply "on the bank of", and may denote either bank.

I shall not take the time to deal with other such arguments. Many of them might be taken up, but few are of any great weight, for most of them disappear under careful examination. Over against them we might set the evident knowledge of conditions in the Sinaitic peninsula which the writer shows. Modern investigation there has upheld the historicity of the incidental