

at the University of Chicago. Dr Olmstead's views are also far removed from those of Bible-believing Christians. He is very destructive in his attitude toward many parts of the Old Testament, and has recently worked out new theories regarding the life of Christ which are very strange and very destructive at many points. Liberal scholars consider him a historian of great standing. At a meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis at Union Theological Seminary in Manhattan, between this last Christmas and New Year's day, he gave a paper which attacked the views which are held by most liberal scholars. The issue of *Time* magazine of January 13, 1941, on page 34, summarizes his paper as follows: "Historian Olmstead's findings made most of his Biblical Literature colleagues sputter. They think the Synoptic Gospels (Matthew, Mark, & Luke) give the truest picture of Christ's life, assigning a much later date to St. John's Gospel. Dr Olmstead said roundly that it was the earliest, written only a few years after the Crucifixion, and by far the most reliable of the four. It is the only one with a coherent chronology, he declared, and the only one which reveals a sound legal understanding of the various trials of Christ."

If you should desire, possibly you could find a copy of the *New York Times* for the right date, and get further details on his paper. Or perhaps if you were to quote any magazine, you would rather quote that than *TIME*.

To me it is very interesting that theories which liberal scholars formerly considered absolutely proven should be so flatly denied by other liberal scholars of the standing of Professor Torrey and Professor Olmstead.