

They had accepted it in the main--at least your OT professors. This beautiful evolutionary theory. The study of Archaeology, the study of ancient history began to show that this part of it would not work, that part would not work, that part would not work. Dr. Albright said to me (about 1925), "There are only two orthodox Wellhausenians left in Germany, and they are not orthodox."

A little after that I read an article by an American Professor in which he said We may have to give up the whole evolutionary idea of these documents because of the new discoveries ~~yk~~ that have been made, but even if we do, we must always be thankful that it was the Wellhausen theory that enabled us to get rid for all time of the idea of an inerrant Scripture.

In 1930 there were many who felt the evolutionary background of it was so out of line with historical developments that the theory would soon be abandoned. Even some of the liberal writers wrote making attempts at a new theory of development. But no new theory was found that was satisfactory. Today practically every scholar twists the Wellhausen theory out of line this way and that way with the basic facts of it as originally taught. But the fundamental principles of the Wellhausen theory had build upon and used--the theory of different sources coming together and affected this way with the writers who combined it and made the changes and all that--that they hold to tenaciously to this day.

It is now 2 min. to 9:00 and I was told to talk about an hour and have discussion. I don't know what some of you would like to say about this or some aspect of it. Ask fruther questions on.

I used to say I don't want anything typed unless I have a chance to work it over thoroughly but now tapes are everywhere and people must realize that people make little slips when they speak and mixed up a little that they would not say. It has become so common that I don't feel one can hold the line that I tried to hold for a long time. In questions often I find facts are brought together in a way one has not thought of sometimes. I enjoy answering questions. So if I make some slips in answering I think it will be understood.

QUESTION: One of the things that I believe the Wellhausen theory harps on is the fact that as you look thru Gen. and Exodus, you will often find the same story told a couple of times. Like creation, etc. Many events repeated a couple of times. That leads them to say there were two authors and someone put their accounts together. What do you feel is a reasonable evangelical response to this sort of thing?

REPLY: One thing that should be mentioned is that life in the past was much slower than it is now. We want to move quickly. We say a thing once and it is enough. When the Bible was written there was a slower course of life, and there is more repetition. Look in Joshua when time after time in describing one incident they will tell one aspect and tell it again. There is considerable repetition.

Now if you would go to the writings of Buddah, in the original you would find that the Bible is absolutely free from repetition in comparrison with the tremendous amount of it in Buddah's writings. He will say that somebody came to Buddah and asked a question. Buddah gave an answer. Gives if fully, and then the man will say, But did you mean this? And Buddah will give practically the whole thing over again. Then the man said, Now is it this? He will repeat it and Buddah will say, That's right and now you go and tell others. Then it tells how he goes to somebody and gives the whole thing over again. You have those repetitions over and over.. There is so much of it in Buddah that in the translations they