

the new theory concerning its origin the correct one? Arguments raged back and forth over this question. Today the Christian world (that portion which studies these matters) is divided into two sections. Most of the older institutions of Christian learning are now in the possession of those who hold the viewpoint that the Wellhausian Theory has been proven and established. It is just as absurd a suggestion to question that theory as it would be, in their opinion, to question the theory of evolution. That is, of course, among us the theory of evolution seems highly questionable as we know it, but in the scholarly world as a whole evolution is simply taken as established fact and there is not much debate any more as to whether or not it is true. One is considered obscurantist and unintelligent who fails to believe: one's force of reason is accused of lacking faith in the discoveries of science.

It is exactly the same with regards to the Wellhausian Theory where among scholars, teachers, and the majority of those in all levels of education this theory has been embraced. In practically every one of the schools at least thirty years old teachers and students maintain that anyone with any intelligence knows that the Pentateuch is made up of many different sources which were woven together. They might say, it used to be that most people believed that God revealed it and Moses wrote it down, just as there used to be people who believed that the earth was flat, but now everybody knows the earth is round and every intelligent person knows that the Pentateuch is a body of intertwined sources. This is the attitude which is taken today, and is contrary to the evidence against it which we are going to examine in this course. The result is that the professing Christian world is divided with one side thinking this theoretical division of the Pentateuch to be an absurd approach that no sane person could ever believe in. And the other side, which has most of our seminaries and virtually every academic university chair obliging, has exactly the opposite attitude considering anyone who questions the theory is beneath intellectual respectability.

Another important factor in our discussion of the Pentateuch is an attitude, being vehemently and forcefully taught in Apologetics in certain circles today, which seeks to assert to the believer in apologetics that one does not and can not know anything unless he recognizes God first. You have to recognize God first, and accept our presuppositions, before we can discuss matters of fact or spiritual reality. But this is simply taking an attitude of absolute opposition in which you cannot talk together intelligently; it denies the intelligibility of its opponents ideas through the logical fallacy of circular reasoning which asserts that you are simply wrong unless you blindly accept their correct presuppositions on "faith." This not only makes faith appear to be an intellectual "leap," lacking any reasonable foundation, it also does not treat one's opponents as quite fully human in its denial of man's innate propensity to think in a linear fashion. I also think it is an attitude contrary to the attitude of all the writers of the scriptures and to the attitudes of the makers of the creeds of our churches. I do not think it is an attitude which advances the Christian faith, although many who hold it are undoubtedly very sincere Christians. I think that holding such an attitude in regarding the Pentateuch is very harmful in its results, and thus this course is based upon a diametrically opposite viewpoint. The foundation principle of this course, as of any apologetic work which I have ever done, is this: there are certain facts that are brute facts, if you want to call them that. That is, they exist whether