

You will remember that our very simplistic thrust is that if the Bible says it, we give it full credence until some cause forces us to do otherwise.

### 3. The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch

The definitions used in the terminology are still in the concepts of our term-defining at the beginning of the course. The higher critical views of a destructive nature are constantly undergoing various changes and may not always be worded as we try to present them in this material. But the overall concepts have changed but little and will be in agreement with our terms and discussion. You will see a marked difference in current literature on the subject and that of several years ago: modern liberal accounts simply give the higher critical positions as established truth and do not bother much to seek to show the evidence; earlier works spent pages explaining why. So in many critical areas the speculation of earlier critics has become the established findings of the later scholars and is simply presented as such. It is often called the assured results of modern scholarship.

#### a. Early doubts of Mosaic authorship

The matter of authorship is closely welded to the matter of authenticity and genuineness (?) and the two areas may be treated together. The earliest doubts in this area were largely from parties outside the Christian community and we sketch merely a few...

(1) Porphyry...the neo-platonic philosopher and disciple of Plotinus. Much of his energy was spent finding flaws in the Bible and criticisms for Christianity. His biblical criticism and questions are very modern. He was, of course, a thorough pagan and outside the church. He doubted the authenticity of Moses, Daniel and the Lord, himself. He certainly had neither living nor future with the church...thus his critique is hardly a formal part of introduction.

(2) Ibn Ezra, a 12-13th century wandering Jewish teacher of some merit, raised questions regarding passages he thought unlikely to be Mosaic. He was a limited representative of the Hebrew community of his time and certainly not a spokesman for the church. He is popularly hailed today as a sort of "father" of criticism although this is very hard to see in any real way.