

some which contradicts this point. We must change this point. And the attempt is made to change the particular point at where it is affected, but at points where you have no archaeological evidence to hold to the theory! Instead of taking the evidence and seeing which does it fit with best--the G-W theory or with the Bible as it stands.

The result is that various scholars have tried to hold to the G-W theory but to twist it to fit with archaeological evidence. They are twisting it many different ways. So the consensus of criticism is greatly broken at point after point, but the bulk of the critics give lip service to the theory and try to maintain the theory at all such points as where there is not specific evidence showing they are wrong at those points.

Recent arch. studies have forced those changes as violently to disrupt the former unity regarding the material. I remember hearing Prof. Albright at Johns Hopkins U. give an address before the American Philosophical Society in Phila in 1929. He gave material from archaeology bearing on the accuracy of statement after statement in the book of Genesis. Some of which would come from the J document which would be many centuries after the time of Genesis. Add it's pretty hard to think the author of J would have any way to get direct information so many centuries after, but here was evidence in it.

And then there was even evidence of accuracy in the P document which comes 1000 yrs. after Moses, and he gave this evidence a whole evening before the American Philosophical Society and he concluded this way: With this remarkable evidence of the accuracy of these things, many of which are written so long after the time of the event, we can only conclude that these stories must have been handed down by word of mouth with absolute accuracy or many centuries until the time when they wrote the different documents and put them together and combined them.

looks in this direction but yet holding the theory and trying to fit them together. Because we have an abundance of writing from those early periods. An abundance of written material which we have discovered from the time of Abraham and long before. How much simpler it is to think that Moses wrote it down and that the earlier parts were written down and actually passed on in written form and consequently it comes to us from the very time of the events described, rather than to think it came together by this elaborate process, the greater part of the evidence for which rests upon the idea that there are contradictions between the different documents, and that actually they are not reliable.

There is an interesting book, The foundations of Bible History, it's called. Subhead: Joshua and Judges. It's by Prof. Garstang of Liverpool U. He has done a great deal of archaeological work in Palestine. He is a man who on the whole is recognized as an excellent archaeologist, though occasionally he goes off the deep end at one point or another. In general he's very good. In this book he goes straight through the books of Joshua and Judges and points out