

been that he would say to himself, Father wasn't such a fool after all. The Bible isn't as inaccurate as--- there are a lot of good points about what Father believed!" So whenever he would find something that would fit with the Bible he would call out to the skies, Isn't this wonderful! The result is he got a reputation among conservatives for being a great conservative scholar because his material was a tremendous help to conservative views. But wherever he found Haupt wrong and the Bible was right he emphasized that, and wherever he had not found evidence he stuck to Haupt's general idea. So he got a great reputation, and he deserved the reputation he got, but his emphasis was on those things that fit with the Bible rather than on the points that were still in his ~~find~~ mind that == where he didn't think it was right. So among some radical scholars there was quite a animus against him, because they thought, Well after all he's conservative! And they just kind of ruled him out! But the best scholars all had to recognize his greatness. I always felt it was fine to take the good arguments and evidence he gave as supports for what we believe and the points where he holds a theory that doesn't fit with the Bible, well I'm interested if he presents evidence for it and see what the evidence is. But I don't see any great point in making a big fuss over that myself.

You take a man like Dr. Allis -- he would find a statement that Albright ~~x~~ made that contradicted the Bible at some point, and he'd say, Isn't Albright terrible, we should keep away from a man like that! He's awful! But I never felt that way toward him. Toward the end of his life, he wrote a autobiography and he said, People had asked him --- Oh, by the way I should mention that he married a woman who was a Ph.D. from Johns Hopkins in European studies. I think he married her in Palestine. She there in