

transliteration. That you can tell what the Hebrew letters are. There's no ambiguity or confusion in it. Most scholarly writers use a system which a semantic scholar would say is much more scientific but it's not more usable. But I think Albright's criticism hurt him. The scholars just poo-pohed the thing. The average Christian would say, I know that's nonsense, the whole Wellhausen theory. He has a brief summary at the beginning of what it is. I don't think the average Christian would bother to wade through a real presentation.

Frankly I was disappointed when I came up here. For many many years like we had at Princeton, we had two hours of OTI which was mostly the canon, but also about tests and MSS, and then I had two hours and went through a whole semester on pentateuchal criticism and when I got here I don't know who made our first schedule, but as it was made the two courses were combined into one course in OTI, and I don't think in 3 hours to cover all of that you can possibly give much idea of what the criticism really is and how to answer it. I was busy every minute of a two hour course. Of course I spent a lot of time giving an idea of how the higher criticism developed, giving exactly what it is, what its arguments are, and then explaining how to answer it. I felt it took every second I had. But there are too many other things to fuss about when that was quietly done by whoever made up the curriculum.

Of course naturally in 3 years, what are you going to teach? You need more practical stuff than we are having. You need it now. But I don't know what you can eliminate to make room for it.

Neher: I know Dr. Vannoy gives an overview of Wellhausen, Gunkel and VonRad in OTH, and you've sort of got that in the back of your mind when you go into OTI.

O that's good. He does that in History. That's good, yes. I'm glad to hear that.

I was speaking about Wilson's pedagogy, but it led into this.