

much separated in that in the Biblical area there is this strong underlying prejudice against the Scripture among the teachers who have been affected by ~~sp~~ this and it affects was their whole emotional outlook and attitude.

The literary scholars have not stressed the change. There are a few, like I quoted one or two, but I had to do a lot of hunting to find this-- a good clear statement of what happened. The strongest evidence of what happened is simply the lack of continuance of ~~the~~ the method, but a comparatively few people have clearly expressed the change that has taken place, but it is clear it has taken place. They have not stressed it--they have simply changed their emphasis and abandoned that to the point where if you refer to it they would simply sneer at it.

One book written by a very anti-Christian writer that I went thru on literary studies, in his index he referred to higher criticism. I looked it up and here he has nothing of this source criticism in his whole literary discussion, but in onw point he said, It is almost supernatural the success that Biblical students have had in dividing the Bible into its original sources. He does not even suggest that such a possibility had gotten into the other literature.

QUESTION: What do you think of this idea that the writings of Moses-- they were all his writings, but they were combined and edited by later compilers? Is there any truth in that do you think?

REPLY: No. There is no truth to that. No evidence for it. It is assumed to be true but most of those who assume it don't believe Moses wrote any of it. Some like Prof. Selin would say he wrote the 10 commandments. According to the evolutionary theory yo- have to re-arrange the stories. Wellhausen said they do not tell us anything with which they claim to deal; they tell us only about the time in which they were written. The background is the ideas, the men centuries later who wanted to get across and so they made up the stories. Now we have sufficient evidence from archaeology that there is so much factual, so many points at which you can show the factula accuracy of the Bible even tho the great bulk of we just don't have evidence which to show one way or the other. Not to show it's true, but certainly not to show it's false. But there are so many points where you can see precise evidence of it that people try to fit in with the evidence. That is most try to fit in, not all.

I was much interested once in seeing a headline in a paper about Dr. Brestead who was head of the Oriental Inst. in Chicago and who carried on excavations. This was in a newspaper and it said: THEORIES OF FUNDAMENTALISTS DISPROVED. Subhead: Bible shown not to be free from error. Then it began: The Bible will never be shown to be free from error. This statement was made by Dr. Breasthead, Director of the Oriental Inst. of U. of Chicagg in connection with giving to the press information of the discovery that one of his exploratory teams had made of ~~xxxx~~ certain facts which fit in exactly with certain statements of the Bible. What he had found corroborated the Scripture, but it was his unbelief and his intent to keep it from being realized that ~~giz~~ gained the headline. The average person reads the headline and reads what this great scholar says and does not see the implications of it.

But of course in one way I think it's wonderful. Back about 1850-60, anything anybody found in the Near East that seemed to fit with something in the Bible was heared: "Isn't this wonderful. Look at this evidence of the Bible. Time after time it had nothing to do with it. The tendency was to take anything you found and