

You were saying, <sup>speaking</sup> ~~saying~~ about the use of the term today, and of course terms  
<sup>senses</sup>  
 are used in very different/senses by different people, but it ~~seems to me~~ seems to me  
 we can say that there are three attitudes among liberals Liberals today. Ther  
 is the attitude that follows Wellhausen actually very closely in the documentary  
 arrangement, and also in the matter of the evolutionary theory, and this actually (2nd)  
 I am quite sure the attitude of the ~~the~~ great bulk of the men who are writing semi-  
 popular books on the OT<sup>o</sup> today. They follow exactly Wellhausen's documentary theory  
 and <sup>they</sup> ~~the~~ follow very closely his evolutionary theory. Then you have men like  
 Wright who ~~claim~~ claim that his evolutionary theory has been abandoned, ~~and~~ that  
 nobody holds it anymore, nothing to it, but they keep the same documentary theory  
 that he had. And then you have men like Eissfeldt (?) and these others who  
 have altered the documentary theory, but it rests upon the same foundation  
 principles as ~~is~~ his, and to quite an extent ~~the same~~ is the same; ~~then~~ the  
 main thing is, they have four documents ~~is~~ instead of three, and as far as I have  
<sup>everyone</sup>  
 been able to see, ~~suppose~~ <sup>everyone</sup> who has done extensive study in the verses themselves  
 in recent years in order to determine what document they belong in, has adopted  
 the four-document theory instead of the three-document theory; and of course that  
 is a very great departure from Wellhausen. And so we have these three main  
 attitudes today, it seems to me. And we have those who will depart quite widely  
 from Well<sup>o</sup> and yet will ~~is~~ insist that the Well<sup>o</sup> theory in its main essentials is  
<sup>even some</sup>  
 what is held and has been proven. And we have ~~some~~ <sup>even some</sup> who depart only a little from him  
~~it~~ but who insist that they are not Wellhausenists, they have given up that (not clear).  
 So you have a problem definition, whatever you do. Whatever you do, you have the  
 problem, and we have to think how we can handle it ~~is~~ so as not to make statements  
 that somebody can take ahold of and say, "Look ahere, how ridiculous what he says."  
 That our statements we can support; and yet our principal objective is not getting  
<sup>across facts and ideas and statements in a</sup>  
 particular statements, but getting facts and ideas and arguments ~~across~~ <sup>across</sup> way  
 that will influence people to abandon a view that has no solid foundation, and  
<sup>today</sup>  
 that/stands as one of the greatest obstacles today to faith in the W<sup>o</sup> of G<sup>o</sup>. Oh, No (?)