

We have looked somewhat into the facts which we find in the Hebrew Bible. At least we see plainly that it is divided up into **three** divisions. We have noted these various explanations of the Jews, Green and Ravin, and then the Critics. We believe that direct word came to these who wrote and then other times they wrote and the Lord kept them from error--that is why the apostle Paul says that he said what the Lord said word for word, and then he says, "I say and not the Lord--he gives his judgment as an apostle of the Lord and the Holy Spirit keeps him from error. Both of them is ^{free} from error. To us it seems a distinction without a difference. We cannot see any difference between the spirit of prophecy and ~~and~~ the Holy Spirit and we question whether they really mean by that. Often people will invent two terms to cover a thing and they figure that they have explained matters but we must try to avoid falling in such an error. When we give a term, we should try and see what we mean by that term. Ill. of term in medicine which doctors use showing that they don't know what that means--what does the term--metaphysics mean? Aristotle wrote a book and he didn't know what to call it so he called it a book that comes after the book on physics--called it metaphysical. The term in itself didn't mean anything. Then review what Ravin and Green claims but then there is the hitch of Lamentations and Daniel--there are some who though great scholars, think they will answer a question just by shouting a little louder or using some pet phrase such as it stands to reason or it is obvious and some people do that a great deal, and other do it occasionally but it certainly isn't the way to decide what the truth is on those matters which aren't obvious. # 9--Review of what already has been said in a previous lecture. Ill. of colored people, more found in the South than in the North--it is because a Yankee invented the cotton gin. Where the cotton was grown it became profitable for those to take that business over. It is not logical but rather historical. The critic would say that it was a historic process that we have the three different canons in the O.T. Sometime after that many books have come out standing dogmatically for this theory of the writing of the these books of the O. Testament. We make a law authoratative as soon as it passes both houses and the President signs it. There may be a law whether we hear of it or not; whether we recognize it or not. If man makes it authorative we wonder when they did make it thus. But we say that God canonized it immediately after it was written.