

If a person always goes the same way about do all kinds of work, you might be able to work for some people who understand you faults and failings but if going out into the ministry and you are going to do something that is worthwhile there, you are going to have to be able to set up a very small detailed point and take up a whole sermon making that detailed point clear and also to take a big general point that covers tremendous area and make that clear--to be able to do both types of jobs. It is a matter of training in methodology.

We are still looking at 4. under D--under that we have looked at 5b--the explanation of our present rise of the sections in our present Heb. Bible. We found that it is easily explained through the use of liturgical use--that does account for a use which has almost absolute proof that it occurred between the 2nd and 4th century ^{A.D.} ~~1st~~--we know that this principle was operating. That is why it is wrong for anyone to say that it is impossible that it should arise this way instead of being so sure that it came about through a 3-fold change in development. The transfer of Lam. and Ruth to the Hagio. must have happened not very long before 400 B.C. because Jerome speaks of it as having various viewpoints in 391 A.D. It probably occurred between 300 and 400 A.D. but definitely before 400 A.D. Now if Baba-Bathra was in the 2nd Cent. then we would have to say that this occurred before that, but still was remembered sufficiently for Jerome to tell about it.

e. Our conclusion regarding the theory of the Critics

1. The critical theory doesn't rest upon historical evidence of something having occurred. It is an attempt to account for a present situation. There is no evidence of the books in ancient times having been made canonical in groups. There is no evidence of the stages which took place which the critics hold on to so tenaciously.

2. We re-examine the arguments in the light of our present argument.

(1) Certain books which are said to be late--there is no evidence for that, and even if they were late that would not prove the critical theory.

(2) The Samaritan Pentateuch--that wouldn't prove the critic's theory.

(3) The Synagogue's Lessons--it is not the effect of our present grouping but its cause. The reason that they are read on the Sabbath lead for the books to be put into this grouping. The critics have a fact there but they explain it in a wrong way.

(4) The argument of the Law and the prophets--that doesn't prove anything. The disputes didn't prove it either.