Moses or Mosaic

Criticism in Union Theological Seminary in NY in 1938. He says on p.117-118 on his book,"A Warning may here be derived from the which from the time of its history of criticism more than a century ago the criticism of the conception Gospels has been curiously The theory was put forward and for some time was generally accepted that the Iliad and Odyssey were compiled from a great number of documents, differing in date and authorship and revised by several editors. In this account of the poems there were doubtless some elements of truth, but the main effect of it was that Homer was sacrificed in the interests of a theory. His most splendid passages were discarded because they were too good for a primitive mam ballad critics are now agreed that if we are ever to explain these poems we must take them as they are, not as they might have been if they had been made according to our plan.

In 1909, the statement was made by one of the make great British classical scholars \* (in 1919?) The Wolfian cloud still hangs over the study of Homer. It has had a blighting effect on Homeric studies which otherwise thanks to the advance of archaeology might have made surprising progress. We must abandon the Wolfian theoryy and all that it takes. The Iliad and Odyssey were written down when they were composed and the text has not been substantially altered since."

Now we don't have to feel necessarily the Iliad and the Odyssey were written at one time and by one person. That is an unnecessary part of our belief. But the Iliad and the Odyssey in the form in which they are passed down to us are now recognized by all scholars as not capable of being divided up into a lot of little sections. If they were, no oneis capable of reconstructing such a division.

As far as Genesis is concerned, I don't say there were not sources for Genesis. I know Moses did not see God talkingto Adam in the Garden; Moses was not with Abraham when he went to Egypt. Moses was not with Jacob when he crossed the Jabbok. Moses did not know these things at first hand. How did he get the information? It is not impossible God would have revealed it all to him as he wrote it down. Not impossible but no matter of faith to hold that. Personally it is my guess that these people to whom these events occurred wrote down accounts of them; these accounts were passed on. I would not be surprised if Abraham wrote all of Gen. up to his time. I would not be surprised if Joseph wrote the story of his life, or or one of his friends wrote it. We don't know. There were doubtless sources from which the knowledge came. God could have done it the other way, but we have no evidence He did thereforex then or in any other book, so we have no reason to feel that it is most probable that it was done other than by taking together, but the Book of Genesis has the sources as the evidence of one mind, or afranging and presenting it in an artistic wazyz way. The person who wrote it as we have waszowe it today, in line with present scholarly ideas, would certainly have been one individual. Perhaps some sections fairly wm long to some previous editor wrote it. But the quotations I have

read you are sufficient to show that no sector of literary scholars today would think that if that were the case it would be possible for us to tell what the sections were and to divide them into the original

sections.