

being doing that ever since Jews started going to synagogues; but we have no right to assume such a thing without proof: if that was such the case there would be some evidence of that taking place. It would not be something that just stood to reason naturally; Ill. of putting synagogues up without using nails and someone would ask why do they do that since we put nails in all other buildings and the answer would be that that has always been the case but you have a right to assume that it was; they would naturally follow the old custom unless a change was urged. There is no reason to believe that pulpits were used in early Protestant churches. Our point in all of this is not to prove that we don't have an argument from silence--it is not the automatic thing which would naturally go forward; if it were to remain, there would have to be a tenacious effort to keep it going thus; but one cannot assume that there was such an effort without any evidence to that effect. One never has any right to assume anything in any field of study without facts to prove that an assumption leads in that direction. You have that natural tendency to keep it in order if you have a book bound with it, but when in rolls, the tendency would be for the rolls to get all mixed; they are just like the books in your book shelf which naturally shift around with the use thereof. We noticed that there was evidence of a change, you have no right to claim that they have stayed together, when we have so much evidence that there has been a change. We have noticed that Jerome explicitly states that there was a change. Most of the critical scholars simply wish to brush this evidence aside but with such a scholar as he was, there is no right for brushing what he says aside. # 29 That is the sort of argument which one finds so commonly--when you don't find any evidence, just O. that doesn't matter. Ill. of man who was in class in U.S.C. and he mentioned something that was in Paul's epistles--the prof. says, "When did Paul do any thinking?"--the impression is left; what a fool you are for thinking that Paul ever did anything. When you try to prove a thing to a person, it will take much more study to really prove a point, than to say well, no fool would believe that and let it go at that. That is an error in which any of us could fall and do fall. We certainly don't honor the ~~real~~ Lord by doing things thus; but we do honor Him if we build on facts and evidence and not brushing the problems aside lightly. Anyone that brushes this evidence aside about the three-fold putting together of the canon is something that cannot be brushed aside lightly. The evidence is strong and is almost conclusive that the books of Ruth and Judges were once among the Prophets but were changed because of liturgical reasons according to Bleek and _____. These were two books that were read at the feast days--it is natural that they would want those five books together in a body.