

were soon carried further, dividing each of these up into others, and that eventually, Geddes, Vater, and Hartmann presented systems which said that somebody put together all these fragments. That seems very unnatural, unless you had a great many writings. If so, why wouldn't one of the writings be preserved? It seems very unnatural, but it is that to which the early documentary theory led, and for a time the fragmentary hypothesis was the standard.

When a man sits down to write a book, he naturally has material in his mind that he has gathered from many sources, which he checks. He may have books before him from which he gets a fact here and a fact there and makes comparisons. He may have many sources, but he works it over and writes it in his own words. Thus you may find that Shakespeare wrote a play and that there was a play written in Italy two hundred years earlier which is quite similar in some regards. Perhaps it has some similar characters, so you say, maybe Shakespeare got his idea there. That does not mean he copied from them. Then you may find something written by a French dramatist which has features like one of Shakespeare's characters, and you say he got the character there. You are not sure whether he did or not, but you could make a theory as to the source of his idea. That is very different from saying he copied them, or that parts of their documents are imbedded in his writing.

Sometimes a person, instead of studying things through and giving the results in his own words, may unconsciously follow a work almost word for word. There was once a thesis presented for a Master's degree in the seminary in which a man discussed certain matters of Apologetics and when he came to the resurrection of Christ he said the evidence for the resurrection of Christ is very definite and clear, and then he went on at that point for three pages to give various evidences. Someone in the faculty happened to notice that what he had written there agreed almost word for word with what was in Mr. Eppard's syllabus. If he had wanted to say in the course of his paper that Mr. Eppard had given a very fine presentation of the evidences of the resurrection, and then had quoted with Mr. Eppard's permission, that would have been acceptable. But for him to simply use the words without saying where he got them is not considered proper procedure.