

who takes pity on him. In B the aggressors are robbers, outlaws whose nationality is not defined, and it is a Levite who shows mercy.

Both the maltreatment and the act of generosity are different. In A the sufferer is beaten and half killed, and needs to have his wounds bound up and liniments applied, which is done by his benefactor on the spot. In B he was stripped of all he had and left destitute, but no personal injury was inflicted; accordingly he was taken to an inn, and his wants there provided for at the expense of the Levite who befriended him.

The lesson inculcated is different. In A it is that the duty of loving one's neighbor is not limited to those of the same nation, nor annulled by national antipathies. In B it is that he who has been befriended himself should befriend others.\*

Professor Green's point is clear. No one disputes the parables' unity. Duplications, even with apparent contradictions, do not imply multiple authorship. As Dr. Green says,

The ease with which these results can be accomplished where obviously they have no possible significance, shows how fallacious and inconclusive this style of argument is.

(ibid., p. 125)

This writer, after reading Green's treatment of the parables, decided to try finding "documents" for an Old Testament story. The Tower of Babel episode in Gen. 11 is supposedly from the single J document. Yet it contains sufficient duplications and details to allow a division into two separate accounts:

X

(1) And the whole earth was of one language and one speech.

Z

(2) And it came to pass, as they journeyed to the east, that they found a plain of Shinar, and they dwelt there. (3) And they said one to another, Come, let us make brick, and burn them thoroughly. And they had

\* The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895), pp. 118-124.