Oral Tradition

1. Statements as to alleged accuracy of oral transmission, with precise references.

Von Rad, <u>Genesis</u>, (Philadelphia: Westminster Press) 1961 trans.from. a German edition of 1956. p. 341

The list in Gen. 36. vs. 20-30 also gives the impression of being a reliable ancient tradition. A notice like the one in v. 24 bears the stamp of authenticity, and the same is true of v. 35.

befoods until to add off mi bilinios diferent restar

Meek, Theophile James, Hebrew Origins (New York; Harper & Rowyev. ed. 1960 p. 213 Albright argues that the stories of Moses, transmitted orally for four centuries or more before being put into fixed form, are at least as historically religible as the accounts of Soroaster and Gautama, which were transmitted much langer by oral tradition, and in this he is perfectly right. As a matter of fact, however, we have little dependable information about either Zoroaster or Gautama, Indeed we have weed an test film so little about Zoroaster that we cannot even date him with any cereries by aller we tainty, and the data for his religion are so obscure and so conflicting that no two specialists agree in their interpretation of the evidence, as Albright himself recognizes.<sup>33</sup> There was a time when we ni shekir til had complete and detailed biographies of every great religious leader: p.214 Moses, Jesus, Zoroaster, Gautama, Laotze, Confucius, Muhammad, and the others. Modern historical criticism, however, has reduced these ong samela s biographies to very small proportions, and that of Moses has shared the fate of all the others. If modern historians cannot agree (and they 10110-001-0-00 cannot) about the life and teachings of men so recent in history as Lincoln and Washington , concerning whom we have such abundant con-· End strength, mill temporary records, and hence cannot speak with certainty about them, it 11 M. 125 \* 100\* is surely most presumptuous on our part to say that we can speak with certainty about Moses. There is much of truth in what Albright has to say about tradition, but it can never have the accuracy that he na mangina di accords it, and in this we are not hypercritical, as Albright asserts; and The beam fi we are simply realistic. Even contemporary written records are always est is as serve have. biased and hence not absolutely accurate, as modern historians are discovering in the case of Lincoln and Washington and hosts of others.

7 49 Mult there they not note to be a local count to a strict with a sector. There is misticked to some interval on count trees so that the trict with the sector.

splantae of theman of briever of griveling affe togical as not so is the difference of the state of the second

7.1. the broad and accurate to relaxtabled on room station by search the second of the fact to a more above above to constant or your area witch would derive the deviction of a grad to stap the constant at a reasonable representation of a second constant report to same. If not desire predictions, is format to be reached to react to be grad of a respect of an internal factors, included or with able from the too be an appended of an internal start of the second of able from the too beaution.

Date as for and the and for your concern for the tertaining in their for the tertaining in the form

. The second Co

Control 1995