

mentioned six connections in which historical criticism is said to be ~~legitimate~~ ^{legitimate}. Under the first of these he points out that the biblical writers, like ourselves, sometimes employ conventional language. Thus when we say "the sun set," the Hebrew would say, "the sun went in."

p. 14
It seems strange to place under "conventional language" a discussion of the authorship of biblical books. The paper says that we should accept the claim of Psalm 110 to Davidic authorship at face value, but seems to question the validity of all other biblical statements about authorship when it says that "we need to determine authorship of a book on other grounds than merely an appeal to the biblical notices regarding authorship."

I agree that we need to interpret carefully on this point, and to determine in each case whether a statement refers specifically to a writer or speaker, or whether it is merely a conventional way to indicate a book or perhaps to refer to a group of books that might begin with the one mentioned. All these methods are in common use today in referring to sources.

When the New Testament says that Moses made a certain statement, belief in inerrancy would require that we accept it as a fact that Moses actually did make such a statement. In Romans 9:27,29; 10:16,20; and 15:12, Paul specifically quotes from Isaiah the man and thus the Holy Spirit placed His seal upon the authenticity of the first, second, and third sections of Isaiah, and denied in advance the modern critical theory of three Isaiahs.