

Only one case, and that is a phrase that does not say that at all. So here is a contradiction that is introduced into it to insist on interpreting one little phrase in such a way as to contradict many other statements. And thus ~~allegedly~~ ^{allegedly} to show two different opposite views. They say, It is a land that eateth up the inhabitants thereof. That is the statement -- the one statement that the critics ~~can~~ claim shows the -- proves that according to one document they said It is a poor land, it is not a land that is worth ~~accepting~~ our going into and trying to live. Well now this statement, It eats up the inhabitants of the land: What does that statement mean? Well we find a statement like Ezekiel ??????? that two other places in the Bible. In ~~Ex~~ 36:13-14 we read: "Thus saith the Lord God because they say unto you thou land devourest up men and hast bereaved thy nations therefore thou shalt devour men no more; neither ~~bereave~~ ^{bereave} thy ~~naions~~ ^{nations} any more saith the Lord God." God says this land won't eat up its people any more as it has in the past. Does that mean that the land was a poor land? an unfertile land? Well in the context here you do find some references to lack of rain, some references to difficulty in growing crops, but you find more references to enemies coming in and fighting. And so it may in Ezek. refer to the land not being a good land, but there is just as much reason to say that in this case in Ezek. what it is pointing to is that the land in one which there is fighting and destruction and thus the land eats up the inhabitants thereof. The other occasion where this phrase occurs is in Lev. ~~26:38~~ 26:38. And there in Lev. 26:38 the Lord says. And ye shall perish among the heathen, and the land of your enemies shall eat ~~of~~ you up." The vs. right before it says "and ye shall have no power to stand before your enemies". The idea here is of destruction by enemies very definitely. So it definitely is so in Lev. It may be so in Ezek. And here in this passage in Num. you have all these other references to the fertility of the land. To say this one phrase shows that according to one document the land wasn't ~~of~~ fertile at all but was very unproductive is reading a great deal utterly unwarranted into one brief phrase and contradicting many other statements in the context with it, and then using it as an argument to say that there are two distinct docuemnts. So this third case of an alleged contradiction just doesn't stand up.