

field, very few scholars think of as ~~an~~ a valid type of argumentation or a valid type of evidence to build such a ~~the~~ theory. Of course, in taking chemistry or/physics there were all sorts of theories held in the middle ages. Today we have entirely different theories. And you can't base anything in those sciences today on something because it was taught 200 years ago. You have to look at it from a solid logical basis today on the basis (?) of fact ~~and~~ and experimentation. And that's what we need to do with the Biblical field. We need to say, "What evidence is there actually?" We can't say, "We must apply the same methods we apply in all literatures (?) You are not doing that. They say that, but that's not what they are doing. But they are taking over abandoned ~~methods of~~ methods of literary study that are have been given up. They are still clinging to them here. No, I wouldn't really say ~~where~~ that's where it began. (?) It was an attitude. Perhaps you might say this: that during the middle ages there ~~was~~ was a very great attitude of ~~and~~ credibility, of crediting all kinds of stories about the ancient world, and then with the coming of the Renaissance, and the coming of modern knowledge and new discoveries, people began to be very skeptical, and the skepticism went to an extreme, as the attitude of ~~wide~~ <sup>blind (?)</sup> acceptance had before, and so the attitude of attitudes of one hundred fifty two ~~hundred~~ hundred years ago the attitude of two hundred fifty to three hundred years ago of many scholars was <sup>a</sup> ~~an~~ strong reaction against the ~~credulity~~ <sup>easy</sup> credulity of the middle ages. It was a ~~reaction~~ reaction of where "we won't believe anything about ancient times unless we have very, ~~of~~ very complete evidence ~~of~~ of it." And consequently they took most of the ancient works and said, "They're not ~~reliable~~ authentic. They are not reliable. Somebody forged them. They came into existence some way like that." So they said, "Cicero's orations against ~~Cataline~~ <sup>by his slave</sup> Cataline. He didn't write them. They were written/in order to raise ~~Cicero's~~ Cicero's reputation." Of course it's absurd to think that his slave had a fifty (?) abilities that Cicero had. But that was typical of the extreme skeptical attitude that was taken. And the strange thing is that