

Not all critical ~~scholar~~ scholars go to the length of Well° and Noth in their denial of actuality to ~~any~~ the historical statements of the Pent.° There is has been quite a group in recent years that who has have taken great interest in the evidences from archaeology which at so many points fit with the statements ~~i~~ of the Bible as it ~~isw~~ is written and not with the history as reconstructed by the Higher Criticism. Many of these scholars tend to accept as historical any statement in the Pent.° for which they have found evidence elsewhere, but ^{to} reject ~~those~~ those statements/^{for} which ~~represent~~ we have no external evidence. This is hardly a fair way to deal with a great ancient document like the Pent.° Noth himself points out how inconsistent it is. Actually the many places at which archaeology confirms individual statements in the Pent.° ~~isw~~ ~~lead-us-to====as~~ are rightly interpreted as leading us to feel that we can put great dependability ~~on====upon====it=as~~ ~~whole~~ on the whole of it as a historical document. Witnesses can be judged by the truth or falsehood falseness of their statements. When we find a witness dependable in case after case it is only reasonable to assume that he is dependable throughout unless we can ~~also~~ produce clear evidence to the contrary, and there is no statement in the Pent° for which clear evidence can be produced that it is not historically true.

There is a prominent ~~no~~ group of ~~scholar~~ scholars in Scan. with today's? attack the entire Well° theory, a group that is known as the ~~MR~~ Uppsala School, which attacks the entire Well°'s theory, but itself presents a view that is even more inimical ~~(that)~~ (that's not the word you used, but I think it is what you intended "inimicable") to ~~any~~ Chr° truth. According to the views of Engnell (?) and the Uppsala school, ^{very} ~~xxx~~ little if any