

be insufficient to deal adequately with this argument. But I will sketch the answer, and develop some parts of it with more detail than others.

The first step in the answer to this is to examine the alleged duplicates. These we may divide into four main groups:

1. Imaginary duplicates.
2. Similar accounts of different or similar events.
3. Similar ^{or different} accounts of the same event.
4. Confused accounts of the same event.

Because of limitations of time I shall not discuss the last three groups in this paper, but shall devote my attention to the first group. These imaginary duplicates we may divide into seven classes.

A. Mere assertion without proof.

This is found in the alleged duplicate where Hobab and Jethro are both called "father-in-law" of Moses. Evidence discloses that the word used may describe any relation by marriage. So there is no duplicate here. The word is used in all four families of Semitic, and in each of them it has this broad usage.

Another example of this is in the account of Zipporah. From the account it is easy to gather how she left Moses when he said "BOH", and how she was brought back to him in the wilderness. There is no duplicate here.

B. Cause and effect.

Here we may refer to the case of Issachar and Zebulun. In the list of the sons of Jacob, a reason is given for each name. The critics go down the list, and ascribe the reason to one document and the naming of the child to another.

C. Cases of the repetition of a command when it is