

and arranged in chart form so you can look across and see just what each of these writers does with every verse. I have found no two of these writers who agree exactly on the division of the text. No two agree exactly. Now here is a very interesting thing. This book by Bernhard Anderson (used in hundreds of colleges) gives you a list of the verses of the J document, the E document, the P document. This book was published in 1956 and just this year a second edition of the book came out.

The second edition gives you a list that is revised in <sup>maybe</sup> 20 or 30 places for what he gave ten years ago. Well, science has advanced! Ten years ago he told us what belonged to each of these documents; today he's made a score of changes in it. Has science advanced? But the fact is that what he gave in his 1956 edition was almost identical with what Prof. S. R. Driver published in 1895; while in his 1966 it is almost identical with what Prof. Cappenter published in 1904. So that leads up to 1904. That is nothing recent. He has simply adopted a different one; these two editions of 60 yrs. ago which differed very slightly but taken all together quite a number of separate cases, and hardly fitting in with the idea that the style is so obvious that even a superficial reader can see the difference.

Now I don't think that many of the modernists realize a certain fact, and I don't think that many of the evangelicals or fundamentalists realize it either. I did not realize it until the last few months. I had an idea of it, but I had no idea how strong this actually was, how much evidence there actually was until I began to look into it. This fact: the temper of studies in the 19th century which laid back of the attitude of biblical scholars which produced the G-W Theory, that this temper of literary and historical criticism had almost completely changed today. So completely changed today that most scholars today do not realize the change has occurred, nor do they realize that the other view ever existed.

I've gone through a few dozen books on literary criticism published within the last 10-15 yrs. ~~and~~ in search of evidence on this point, and it is amazing how much evidence we come across. It shows that this change took place rather gradually without people realizing it, but it definitely has taken place. There was a full of literary criticism which began in 1795 and which went up to about 1930 into which the idea of the Bible as a Mosaic fits exactly; it is just a part of that whole general movement. Today when books like Anderson's here will say, "We must apply literary criticism to the Bible like to any other book. We must take the standard methods that are in existence." What they are doing is to take the methods of literary criticism of a century ago, not the methods of literary criticism of today.

I mentioned a few moments ago, Prof. Butlmann(?) Prof. B in 1795 said: When Homer wrote the Iliad and the Odyssey writing was not in existence. He said, When we go through the Iliad and Odyssey we find contradictions and we find inconsistencies and error. So he said, There never was a Homer. These are amalgamated from different lays, several different stories, separate songs -- amalgamated together.