

able to write it up in clear enough fashion that it will be easy for someone to ~~may~~ see exactly what it is and then see how weak the evidences are for it.

Today the holders of the theory, though in all the main points they hold exactly the same as Wellhausen did, back in 1878, nevertheless there is a very vital difference in approach that they take from the approach he took. Forty yrs. ago they were dogmatic: there is no question this is true. Today, they are getting a little more hesitant, at least the best, the leaders who have done the most study, are getting less dogmatic about it. The reason for that is because in these last 100 yrs. we have discovered so many facts that fit with the Bible as written and don't fit with the Wellhausen theory. There are so many points in which it is clear that the 5 books of the Pent. assume facts that Archaeology shows us to have been actual situations at the time to which they refer. Wellhausen stated it very ~~gri~~ boldly, We do not find in the Pentateuch anything that tells us anything about the days of Abraham or of those times; all we find is about the later times when these were written. He was very clear on that. That it was entirely a product of the imagination of a later time. There is a book that claims to be used in hundreds of colleges as a textbook - "Understanding the OT" -- very interestingly put out, put out about 10 yrs. ago, a new edition just put out ~~a~~ now with charts, maps, pictures, a very attractive book. A very attractive book by Prof. Anderson of Drew Seminary, and in this book the Wellhausen theory is simply presented as estab. fact in order that you may understand the OT. One page has a chart that shows what the Wellhausen theory is, and if W could see that chart he would just shudder! Because it contradicts what W strongly believed. The chart shows what W taught, but adds to it what would have disgusted W. That chart shows you these diff. documents from which he says the Pentateuch was formed. It shows you J written c. 850 B.C., the E written about 750 B.C., then the two lines going down and joining together as they claim these two documents were interwoven to form one they call JE. Then it shows the D document written c. 620 B.C. and then a line going down from JE and then the two combined into JED. Then it says the P document starting c. 500 A.D. and going down connected with this other to form JEDP, the Pentateuch as we have it.

Now Wellhausen would have exactly agreed with these straight lines showing the development of these phases of these documents. But what Anderson has put in that would make W shudder is a dotted line above each of these lines, going way back for hundreds of years earlier. He puts in his dotted lines before everyone of these to show it going back to early tradition. W says ~~W~~ you can't learn anything about the times of Abraham or Moses from the Pentateuch, only about the later time when these documents were written and Anderson puts in a dotted line to show how tradition came down from the earlier period. That's because of archaeology, because we've found some many things that were known in that earlier time & forgotten about, and then we find them here & we have no way we can imagine how anyone in David's time could have possibly have known them unless he had something that was written at the earlier time. Consequently this dotted line which is put in is really dynamite underneath the theory!