

The same is true about an edict that was supposed to have come from the early popes establishing his authority over other bishops--it was easy to prove it wasn't written at that time by finding things used in it that weren't known at that time. If someone brought you a writing that was supposedly by Ben. Franklin and in it he gave various fine suggestions about practical life and you would say fine--that sounds like him but as you read along you would find an illustration about driving up a hill and what happens when your radiator gets overheated--you would know immediately that he didn't write it. There were these kind of things in these decretals of Sylvester and Donations of Constantine which were proved to be frauds and that gave the impetus to prove that this came from this section and this came from another time--he was extended then to the Bible but it has largely been given up as far as ancient writers go and today we do not do that unless we have conclusive evidence of it. I think that it would have been given up concerning the Bible too, were it not for the fact that Wellhausen united it with the ~~fixx~~ theory of evolution--consequently it became part and parcel of the developmental theory, explaining the origin of religion on the basis of natural development--thus nicely bowing God out of the human and I think that is explicit in the God-denying critics. I think that it was back of the minds of others who didn't even ~~realize~~ realize it, but I think in others they had no idea, but they accepted the theory because they thought the evidence was overwhelming. It is actually the thing I think that has caused it to be preserved--just as firmly proved as the theory of evolution.

The critics are pretty definite as to what material is JE and what material is JE and I think most of you could pick out the P material quite easily--it is statistical, innumerative type of material. It would not be nearly so clear in Gen. 1 or the flood story, though one could see that they are closer than to simply list incidents. We have noticed how hard it is to divide up documents on basis of style and it isn't done today as it used to be. It is quite interesting to look at ancient documents where perhaps a piece is broken and guess what goes in these places and then find another copy of the document it is rare indeed that we find that the fill-ins have been correct. ILL. of working with Babylonian document just this year and just now they have discovered a new copy of this one which had some broken off from it.