

What what we are attacking here is the idea that the Pent^o could not have been written by one man, because it bears within it the marks of having been formed by a long process which involved the coming into existence of various separate documents which circulated separately for a time, and then later were combined, with little change were combined. Now that much, practically all ^{with little change} your living scholars, aside from your Scandinavian school, ^{will (?)} agree on. And that, it seems to me, is the basis of the attitude that we're trying to deny. We are trying to say that that idea cannot be taken as something that is solidly established. We're not saying such a thing could not happen. ^{sometime.} We are saying it cannot be proved that that happened in the case of the Pent^o. And most of your liberal scholars assume that some such process did take place, and that ~~it~~ it is provable that it did, and that therefore any other view is impossible than some form of that idea; that a long process of gathering material into separate documents which circulated independently and eventually were combined lies in back of it (not clear) and therefore the orthodox idea of it simply can't be true because we know that is true. It's like the matter of bleeding for disease. A hundred and fifty years ago, no matter what disease you had, somebody would bleed you. They would cut down the amount of blood you had and they thought that would cure almost any disease. Some people just once a year they would be bled anyway, because it ~~was~~ was a good health precaution, and that was universally considered (bw) - a century or so ago. And even as recently as thirty or forty years ago they were selling leeches down here in Phila^o for bleeding people for general health. Today nobody would think of such a thing. Well now, if someone in treatment of some particular is saying, "That's what we've got to do ~~is~~ because that's what they did 150 years ^{ago.} ~~ago~~ ~~everybody~~ ^{ago.} everybody would laugh at him. Now here they are doing something in relation to the Bible which was an attitude universally held - almost, regarding literature a few years ago, but ^{not} now/held regarding anything else but this. So it's time to rethink whether it applies in this either. Well, we ~~can~~ can't solve all problems in one book. The one thing that today is