

There is a review here of what already has been said--the six arguments which the higher critics use to prove that the Hagiographa was written very late, or at least the Canon had not as yet been closed. The theory of liberal about the Canon then is that the Canon was accepted in stages. It is that the Jews accepted Deut. in the time of Josiah as an authority and that in the time of Ezra they had completed the first stage of the Canon and accepted the entire Pentateuch as coming from God. That ~~the~~ at some time later than this, around 300 or 200 B. C. they accepted the 2nd division of the Canon called the Prophets and then at some later time at perhaps 100 B.C. or perhaps later, they accepted the 3rd division--thus there were three definite acts of Canonization in which a certain group of books were made authoratative--this is utterly opposite to the the Conservative point of view that holds that as the books were written they were canonized immediately. We would strongly deny anyone who would claim that there were any group of people that got together and claimed that they would agree to make this certain book or sections of the O.T. as Canonical.

"The Canon of the Old Testament, by Ryle presents the higher critical view quite well. Hastings Bible Ency. and other books present the higher critical view.

C. Preliminary Consideration of the Arguments--

1. Note the lack of positive evidence for the theory. According to them there are three three stages of canonization, but there is absolutely no historical evidence for either the 2nd or the 3rd --that doesn't say that it didn't happen but it adds a point on our side. ILL. of seeing a dead person who had been murdered but if no one saw it, it is much harder to get evidence unless there has been a witness for it. ILL. of finding where the Constitution of the U.S. has come from--it just didn't happen. We have more ~~the~~ evidence of happenings 2000 years before this time than we do of things happening during the time when they claim the Canon was put together. The reason for that is that 1000 before that people were writing on clay tablets and these were wasily preserved but later they wrote on papyrus which didn't keep as well. People in Palestine. That is possible that these things to have disappeared ~~but~~ for such an important thing as the Canonization of the O.T.--for no trace of a council meeting etc. and you notice there is no reference in the Hagiographa for example that there was some council that decided on the other parts of the Canon--that none of these books would have kept a record of this ~~important~~ event seems very strange indeed. This is not a conclusive argument but there is no phrase or reference to make these books ~~canonical~~