

and each of the six students who testified to tell us what the other garden stories are from pagan mythology that are like Gen. 3. It was ~~kwaxax~~ amazing the answers they gave. The fact is there is no garden story in any pagan mythology that is at all similar to the story of the fall of man in Genesis 3. There is no such thing. But you see how subtly unbelief is taught.

If you were asked the question, Are there garden stories in pagan mythology that are like Gen. 3, you would immediately say, Are there ~~ax~~ or aren't there? But you don't ask that question. You say, Compare other garden stories from pagan mythology with Genesis and immediately you say, What are the similarities, what are the differences? Your mind makes the jump over here of assuming they exist. It's the -- one of the cleverest ways of bringing people to a conclusion, is not to give a direct == not to give it directly, but to ask a question that implies it. All these people were convinced there are other garden stories, but they could not agree on what they were, and when they told us what they were, or what they thought they were, there was no similarities. They were no garden stories and they were not like Gen. 3. You see how they put Gen. 3 right into the category of an old mythological story!

Another of the questions was, Give the textual and linguistic evidence for the multi-documentary theory. Well, that one I tried to get them to give, but I couldn't get to give any evidence, because there isn't any! There is no evidence. But give the evidence, implies there is such evidence. Actually these books rested on authority. One professor there said this is the result of the careful research of scholars during the last 50 years. The fact is that the theory as taught today is exactly like the one Wellhausen gave 80 years ago. There is not a single bit of arduous work == research by scholars in the last 50 years that has contributed to the theory in any way!

Another of the questions that was asked implied various other things this way about the unreliability about the early part of the Bible. I think it is important we examine the grounds of our view. Why do we believe that this book did not come together through an artificial very involved process like this high-critical theory. There is nothing similar to it in what is considered to be true of any other literature anywhere. One hundred yrs. ago something similar was considered true of Homer but not nearly as complex and that has been given up by practically all the scholars. What are the grounds of our actual attitude toward the Bible. Well, we believe that God is. We believe God can speak if He chooses. The Bible says He has spoken. "God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time=past to the fathers by the prophets" Such a simple concept. Yet it's such a complicated one. God has spoken.