

But it is a big step in the direction of the acceptance of the general principles of the higher criticism which is completely given up as far as other literature is concerned. And all scholars agree that the great Indian Mahabrata, the great source of Indian lore, is a gradual growth that came through the years, and there was a score and other things were added. But they agree equally that nobody can tell when one part or another part was written or what the sources are. Scholars in the literary field have given up the idea that this sort of thing was possible. Yet in the religious field you find it taught-- well, after all we should treat the Bible like we treat any other book. We look for sources in other books. The higher criticism, there is nothing wrong with it -- that's just trying to see who the author is, etc. Well, they don't use it anymore for that, except in connection with the Bible, or maybe with Homer. Nothing else. So that is a very unfortunate thing, but it is true, and it is the result of the fact that most of your evangelical scholars have gotten their advanced training under liberals. So even though there is a far greater number of real scholars who are evangelicals today than 30 years ago, a far greater number, -- 30 years ago the liberals just about had the field of scholarship. And the evangelicals while they were in the great majority were interested in evangelism and in missions and these things, which are tremendously important, but they didn't see the importance of scholarship, the way they have come to during the last 30 ~~year~~ years.

But there ^{was} ~~is~~ no institution left where they could get a doctor's degree without being subject to a lot of anti-Christian propaganda, and in most cases some of that has sunk in. I have seen some real fine evangelical scholars who really stand for the Word of God, who have been so irritated at people who have criticized them