

result the beautiful consensus of authorities disappeared. Each O.T. scholar held his own particular variant of the Wellhausen theory. At point after point, its major features were given up. For the last 30 years O.T. study has been largely in a state of flux. To many workers in the field, the Wellhausen theory had seemed to be the original starting point from which to proceed, Where there is no evidence one way or the other, portions of the theory are retained. Where there is evidence the attempt is made to fit the understanding of the Bible into the new evidence that has come to light. No unified theory or interpretation has resulted. A friend of mine attended a number of courses in the study of various O.T. books by a noted scholar, who was himself one of our outstanding interpreters of the new material from the ancient Orient. He was astonished to see the attitude which this man took toward the various phases of the Wellhausen theory. In book after book the Professor would tear into the conclusions of the--into its common conclusions as to the date of the various sections and sources and documents supposed to enter into the construction of the book. Hardly a stone would seem to stand of the Wellhausen reconstruction in the book which was then under investigation. However, the thing which amused my friend was that in each case when reference was made to some other book which was not the subject of the course, the Professor would simply turn to the leading books on the subject, written by exponents of the Wellhausen school, and would accept, without further investigation, accept their statements as to the sources and date of origin of the various sections of that book. In whatever he was studying he was quick to point out that factual evidence differed with the current critical view. In the books which he was not studying, he assumed that these views were correct.

As time permitted it would be interesting to take up a number of the instances where new factual material has shed light upon various statements of the O.T. An interesting one relates to Isa. 20:1. Here we have a statement that Isaiah received