

these men in the OT° field who say, 'Well, we may have to give this up, but we must hesitate about it because after all we must remember that we owe to the acceptance of the Wellhausen theory the escape from the idea of verbal inspiration. They (?) (4 1/4) and frankly ~~d~~ say that. They are grateful to be delivered from <sup>a</sup> ~~the~~ supernaturalist view. ~~They think think it is~~ ~~blatant(?)~~ They think this did it(?) But now, if they've been delivered they might give up the thing they think delivered them. But I'd like to protect those who would ~~be won away from~~ <sup>????</sup> a supernaturalist view by who still hold it (?) .

I want to make the steps to the ~~argument~~ argument clear if possible. This came into the OT° from the classical field. Eichhorn said, (he was the first to use the term "Higher Criticism.") he said, "Anyone who is familiar with classical ~~the~~ literary study will find the term 'Higher Criticism' no ~~my~~ novelty." They are used to it. It was already widespread then. The habit of dividing up ancient ~~documents~~ documents into sources and claiming a lot of them were not authentic and so on - that approach was common in these other <sup>(?)</sup> literatures. They extended it into the Biblical field from those. Then it was extended into the Biblical field, and continued in those, until about 30 to ~~or~~ <sup>had been</sup> 40 years ago, and by that time it was largely given up in the fields from which ~~it~~ <sup>it</sup> came into the Biblical field; and so now, if we are going to continue it in the Biblical field we ~~must~~ <sup>we</sup> must establish it on the basis of ~~sound~~ sound arguments from that field because we don't have them any more from other fields. And during this period there has been discovered a great ~~lot~~ deal of new literature which ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> more closely related to the Bible than that from which this theory was originally taken. But practically nobody is applying such methods to this new literature, although many of the phenomena in it are very similar to the phenomena in the Bible. <sup>It's</sup> ~~There's~~ a very strong argument <sup>argument</sup> if we can really make it ~~not~~ clear. It's an ~~argument~~ <sup>argument</sup> as to the validity of the sort of logic which is being used, that it was the sort of logic which was ~~not~~ considered quite ~~a~~ popular a century ago, but which today, ~~is~~ outside of the Biblical