

Now in the Flood Story they say that we have two flood story. This article I referred to given at the Hermeneutics Conference referred to the J Flood Story and the P Flood Story, etc. In order to get them, you take the story of the flood in which it emphasizes the greatness of the flood, by repeating a certain element to give some idea of how tremendous that flood was. In telling a story that is a natural literary device to repeat and stress how great it is. Most of those things in connection with the beginning of it, there is not one thing in the repetition. There is often 3 or 4 times the thing is said to build up the picture. Then when the story comes to an end it just stops. And there is no repetition in the latter part whatever.

Of course they say those parts were removed by the Redactor. But actually you cannot construct two complete stories. You have to assume that least half of each one was ~~repeated~~ omitted by the Redactor, who combined them. The parts that are said to be repeated are repeated not twice but three or four times. It is a literary device that is building up the force of it.

And there is a Babylonian story of the flood which in some ways is very similar to the Biblical story. Some will tell you that the Biblical story is ~~derived~~ derived from the Babylonian. That is carried to a great length by some. That is another area of consideration. But the interesting thing is there are many similarities, and I believe the Babylonian story represents reminiscences passed on from generation to generation of that tremendous flood and what happened that had been corrupted to quite an extent in the course of years. So it has definite differences from the Biblical story but remarkable similarities. The striking thing is that the elements which one story has in the Biblical they will say, like the sending out of the birds, they will give that to one of these two sources. It is not given in the other, etc.

You take these, ~~like~~ which they find in the J and in the P documents; you find most of them combined in the Babylonian story of the flood. So the idea that we have two flood stories or that we have two creation stories simply are not true though they are repeated so many times that someone who has to attend classes where they hear them over and over and over is naturally pretty sure to reach the point where they assume they are true. If they examine the facts they do not stand up.

The number== the impression you get from some critical books is you have the whole series. Dr. Albright said that when I was not yet familiar enough to contradict anything he would say, Why you have a whole series of the J stories, a whole series of the P stories, why you have so many things similar it is very obvious you= have two stories combined. When you look at them actually it is not. You take a sentence where something is said and is repeated for emphasis and you can divide it, and you take things that are somewhat similar and put them there and even then you don't get a whole series. But that idea has been tremendously taken beyond what the actual facts are.

QUESTION: Why, in your opinion, is the evolutionary theory continued in Biblical studies and not in literary criticism? In literary criticism you went back and the concept. Why did not that take hold in Biblical studies?

REPLY: Why didn't it take hold, because for one thing the two were distinct departments. They have come largely to ignore each other. Except the literary critics (many of them) tend to scoff at Biblical criticism. But they are pretty