

the present attitude of archaeologists regarding the OT. He began with telling about the Pentateuchal hypothesis (the GW theory). He told about the great scholars Hupfeld and Graf and Kuenen, these great men who had done so much to illumine our understanding of the OT. He praised the great brains and intelligence of these men. Then he went on to say that their viewpoint of higher criticism had been attacked. He said that the men who had attacked it had not showed much brains. Their attacks had been very weak and he minimized on them as if they didn't amount to much.

Then he said that in recent years there had come to light a great deal of archaeological material and very strangely the archaeological material seems to show that at point after ~~the~~ point the great scholars who developed this marvellous theory were wrong, and that the rather puny minds of the traditional defenders were on these points correct!

Then he went ahead and spent about 3/4 of the article giving archaeological evidences one after the other of the accuracy of statements in the OT on matters that had previously been doubted. He ended up something like this: What is our conclusion? Our conclusion is that we must never forget the great debt we owe to these great minds who originated the GW theory!

I thought it was a strange instance of giving evidence which pointed in one direction and yet in your conclusion showing that after all you stand with the consensus of scholarship and must not be thought to differ from it.

I was talking with this same archaeologist in Jerusalem some years ago. Speaking of the G-W theory he said to me, Only two orthodox Wellhausenists are in Germany now and they aren't orthodox. By orthodox he meant holding to the theory exactly as Wellhausen propounded it. In other words he meant that there have come tremendous changes in the viewpoint regarding it as a result of the effect of archaeological evidence upon it.

In other words he meant that there have come tremendous changes in the viewpoint regarding it as a result of the effect of archaeological evidence upon it. The attempt is to hold to the theory wherever you have no archaeological evidence to the contrary. The old attitude was, Here is the Pentateuch. It says Moses wrote it. Here it stands with all these statements about ancient times. Now if we find some evidence that fits in which a statement here that is further proof of the accuracy of the whole.

The present attitude is most of the archaeological students today have been trained in the higher criticism. They have been given this as that to which all scholars agree to be the facts. The present attitude is, here is the situation, here is the theory. And here is some archaeological evidence which clearly contradicts it at that point. Our argument must change at that point. Here is