

between archaeological evidence and Biblical discovery. In a way of course this is a great detriment. If the archaeologist of today were men trained in the background of belief in the Bible as were those of 60 years ago, we would have these discoveries blazened to the world today which are largely buried away in footnotes.

And they would have a tremendous influence in increasing people's faith in the Word of God. 60 or 70 yrs. ago almost anything an archaeologist and archaeologist found or even remotely believed might possibly throw light on the Scripture he assumed immediately was proof of its accuracy. It was blazened abroad. Today that is no longer done.

On the other hand there may be a great advantage in it. 70 yrs. ago archaeologists found many things that proved the accuracy of statements in the Bible, and they found other things that had nothing to do with the accuracy of Biblical statements but they jumped to the conclusion that they proved something in the Bible to be true. There were a great many statements made by archaeologists 60 years ago which had no foundation. That is, the facts were true but they did not relate to these verses and statements. They were something entirely different and they would try to fit it together but today the attitude is the other way.

Consequently from the viewpoint of evidence the material found by archaeologists who go to it expecting to find the Bible untrue and nevertheless finding a tremendous amount of evidence fitting into it as true, you might say is stronger and more dependable evidence than that of men who went to it expecting to find exactly what they did find. They are finding evidence against their wishes rather than finding the evidence they had hoped to find.

6. We have now examined each of the 4 arguments. We have found that no one of these arguments is absolutely adequate to prove the hypothesis that we can say that the Pentateuch came together as a combination of these particular documents each of which existed separately and were combined by some redactor. No one stands this test. No one is adequate to prove the hypothesis nor do all of the arguments together prove this hypothesis.

7. Such division of ancient books into various documents was part of a widespread movement now practically abandoned as far as other writings are concerned. Such division of ancient books into various documents was part of a widespread movement now practically abandoned as far as other writings are concerned. In the case of the OT it is persisted as a result of its union with the development hypothesis. That is why, I believe, it has lasted.

In the case of the OT it has persisted as a result of its union with the development hypothesis. So we have the two hypotheses. We have the partition hypothesis, and we have the development hypothesis and G and W combine the two. It is very important that we see how they combine them and what is the importance of each. Our next Roman Numeral is VI (I think)

VI The Developmental Hypothesis. I called it V last time but