

CONTENTS



CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY: THE PROBLEM STATED.—Pp. 1-24.

What is the Old Testament ?

Problem of the Old Testament : relation to criticism.

I. THE PROBLEM TWOFOLD: RELIGIOUS AND LITERARY.

How are we to conceive of the *religion*? natural or supernatural? ✓

How are we to conceive of the *literature*? age, authorship, trustworthiness, etc.

Dependence in part of the second question on the first.

Popular view of the subject: distrust of "Higher Criticism."

Need for discrimination of issues.

The question not simply one between "Higher Critics" and "Non-Higher Critics."

Deeper issue: the supernatural in the religion of Israel. ✓

Division on this subject among critics.

Gains from critical movement.

II. THE FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE: ATTITUDE TO THE SUPERNATURAL.

Place of religion of Israel among historical religions.

Its claim to a special divine origin.

Kuenen and the "modern" school of criticism.

Israel's religion "nothing less, but also nothing more," than other religions.

Denial of supernatural in history and prophecy.

"Natural development" alone recognised.

Petitio principii involved in this position.

Facts of religion and history to be impartially examined.

Importance of true guiding principles.

A case of competing interpretations of Old Testament.

Ultimate test in fitness to meet the facts.

- III. THE LITERARY PROBLEM: ITS DEPENDENCE ON THE RELIGIOUS.
- Interest of Christian faith in literary questions.
 - Belief in supernatural not necessarily bound up with questions of dates and authorship.
 - Yet close connection between critical premises and critical results.
 - Critical theories have scientific value.
 - Yet mainly elaborated in rationalistic workshops.
 - Rationalistic "set" of German criticism.
 - Rationalistic basis of Wellhausen theory.
 - Its temporary popularity.
 - Improbability that a theory evolved from this basis can be adequate for Christian faith.
 - In this connection dates, etc., not unimportant.
 - Dates often determined by critical assumptions: used to subvert credibility.
 - Need of recasting of theories on believing principles.
- IV. ATTITUDE OF CRITICISM TO "REVELATION."
- Argument that contrast of supernatural and non-supernatural is less important than it seems.
 - Professor W. R. Smith on high views of the "modern" school.
 - Defects of this view of Israel's religion.
 - Ambiguity in use of word "revelation."
 - Admission of "providential guidance."
 - "Revelation" in sense of psychological development.
 - Dilemma here that revelation leads to belief in supernatural, and in direct communications of God to man.
 - Christ the touchstone of the supernatural for faith.
 - That view of revelation alone adequate which culminates in His Person and redemption.
 - Sketch of course of subsequent discussion.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER I

CRUCIAL POINTS IN THE CRITICAL THEORY.—*Pp.* 25, 26.

CHAPTER II

THE OLD TESTAMENT FROM ITS OWN POINT OF VIEW.—*Pp.* 27-51.

- Place of Old Testament in the economy of revelation. Tendency of purely critical study to obscure view of this.
- Right of Old Testament to be heard for itself.
- I. THE ORGANIC UNITY OF THE *Book*.
- The Bible a unity.
 - Many books, but structurally one.

- Illustration by contrast: "book-religions."
- No unity in ethnic Scriptures (Koran, etc.).
 - The Bible has an organic character.
 - Marked by plan, purpose, progress.
 - Unity grows out of religion and history.
- II. FULFILMENT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE NEW.
- The Bible in two divisions.
 - The second the counterpart and completion of the first.
 - The "Servant" of Isa. liii.: fulfilment in Christ.
 - Religion of Israel a religion of hope.
 - Anticipation of better economy.
 - The Messianic idea.
 - New Testament realises hopes and promises of the Old.
 - This relation inward and vital.
- III. TELEOLOGICAL CHARACTER OF THE *HISTORY*.
- History dominated by idea of purpose.
 - Sketch of development—primitive and patriarchal history.
 - Mosaic and later history.
 - History viewed retrogressively.
 - Uniqueness of this.
- IV. UNIQUE IDEAS OF THE *RELIGION*.
- The uniqueness generally acknowledged.
 - 1. *Negative* side—absence of features found in other religions.
 - Magic, nature-superstitions, etc.
 - 2. *Positive* side—fundamental ideas of Israel's religion.
 - (1) Monotheism of religion.
 - Peculiar to Israel.
 - Opposite tendency in other religions.
 - Underlies the *whole* of Old Testament.
 - (2) Developing purpose of grace.
 - Sin and grace in Scripture.
 - The Bible a "history of redemption."
 - Found in no other religion.
 - (3) Indissoluble relation between religion and morality.
 - General relations of religion and morality.
 - Religion of Israel *dominated* by this idea.
 - God as the Holy One.
 - Union of religion and morality in psalms and prophets.
 - Such a religion not man-originated.
- V. CLAIM TO AN ORIGIN IN REVELATION.
- Modern substitution of psychology for revelation.
 - Biblical point of view—"Thus saith Jehovah."
 - Revelation of God in act and word.
 - The Israelite conscious of being possessor and guardian of a special revelation.

Objection—all religions claim similar origin.

Reply—No religion has a story of its beginnings like Israel's.

(1) Monotheism not of natural origin.

Only three monotheistic religions in world : Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism derived from other two.

(2) Ethical character of Israel's religion not of natural origin.

Contrast with Egyptian religion.

Claim to revelation justified.

VI. REVELATION IN RELATION TO ITS RECORD.

If revelation there, questions about date and placing of books of minor importance.

If revelation given—reasonable to expect a record.

Character of Bible shows it is such a record.

Qualities of Scripture a proof of inspiration.

Bible realises its own tests of inspiration.

VII. RELATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT TO CHRIST.

Christ the goal of Old Testament revelation.

The illuminating light in its study.

CHAPTER III

THE OLD TESTAMENT AS AFFECTED BY CRITICISM—I. THE HISTORY: ARGUMENT FROM CRITICAL PREMISES. — Pp. 58-81.

Does scientific criticism overthrow the history of the Old Testament?
Provisional adoption of critical standpoint.

I. CRITICAL ASSAULT ON OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY.

Views of radical critics : denial of historicity.

Patriarchal and Mosaic periods.

Later historical books.

Moderate critical positions.

Grounds of denial.

Late date of history.

Rudimentary state of belief.

Contradictions, etc.

II. IGNORING OF TELEOLOGICAL ELEMENT IN THE HISTORY.

Non-recognition by radical school.

Recognition by believing critics.

Explanation of appearance of teleology—

Reading back of prophetic ideas.

Refutation of this :—

1. Teleological element not on *surface* of history, but enters into its substance.

2. Where is the mind capable of inventing it?

III. CREDIBILITY OF HISTORY ON PREMISES OF CRITICAL THEORY.

Critical theory of the Hexateuch.

The Documents JEDP.

Consideration confined to J and E.

Theories of age (ninth or eighth century), authorship, relations, etc.

1. Main result from this theory—

J and E antecede written prophecy.

Wavering of critics.

2. Inferences :—

(1) Teleological character an integral part of the tradition.
Not due to prophetic manipulation.

(2) Tradition has already developed and settled form.

Contrast with popular legend.

(3) Critical theory assumes *two* histories.

Independent, yet in substance resembling and parallel.

Hence (1) check on free invention ; (2) proof of settled character of tradition.

IV. STEPPING-STONES TO EARLIER DATE OF TRADITION.

1. Tradition must antedate division of kingdom.

Age of Solomon, David, Samuel.

2. Critical dates do not fix *terminus a quo*.

Critical support for earlier date.

No good reason for putting late.

3. Hypothesis of earlier records.

(1) Support from history of language.

J and E from "golden age of literature."

Necessity of previous cultivation.

(2) Preceding development of literature.

Results as to J and E.

(3) Critical admission of earlier records.

V. CORROBORATIVE EVIDENCE OF EARLY DATE OF SOURCES.

1. New light cast by discovery of age and use of writing, and development of literature.

Revolution in ideas : Babylonia, Egypt, Canaan, etc.

2. Corroborations of *data* of history.

Genesis xiv. ; Genesis x. ; life of Joseph, etc.

3. Witness of Old Testament to early use of writing in Israel.

CHAPTER IV

THE OLD TESTAMENT AS AFFECTED BY CRITICISM—I. THE HISTORY: COUNTER-THEORIES TESTED.—Pp. 83-116.

Critical reconstruction of the history.

I. RIVAL CONSTRUCTIONS AS DEPENDENT ON THEIR PRESUPPOSITIONS

The critical presupposition and its results.
Naturalness of the Biblical view on its own presuppositions.
Meaning of "history" in the Bible.
Patriarchal history as carefully preserved *tradition*.

II. THEORY THAT PATRIARCHS WERE NOT INDIVIDUALS, BUT "PERSONIFICATIONS."

Prevalence of this theory: its grounds.

- Names of the patriarchs not *individual*, but *tribal*.
This only partially true: examination of names.
Difficulties in case of Abraham.
- Forms of *Scripture genealogies*.
Ethnographic genealogies (Genesis x.).
But family genealogies also.
No biographies of "Mizraim," "Ludim," etc.
- Assumed *law of growth of societies*.
Views of Stade, etc.
Lack of proof of this "law."
Maine on Patriarchal theory of Society.
Peculiarity of call and destiny in Israel.
Patriarchs *both* persons and progenitors.

III. WITNESS OF ISRAEL'S NATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS: THE PATRIARCHS.

Argument as to religion postponed.
Dillmann on patriarchal religion.
Minimising of later testimony to patriarchs.

- Application of critical method to *prophetic passages*.
H. P. Smith; Wellhausen.
Disproof of their assertions.
- Positive evidence in later literature—
The prophets.
The JE history.
Book of Deuteronomy.

IV. MOSES AND THE EXODUS.

- Belittling of testimony to *Moses* as lawgiver.
Carpenter on prophetic references.
Moses in Book of Deuteronomy.
In JE history.
History to be taken as a whole.

- The *Exodus* and *Red Sea* deliverance.
If ever happened, impossible should be forgotten.
Indelibility of national recollection.
Testimony of literature.
Song of Miriam; historical books; prophets.
Kautzsch on historicity of Exodus.
No tenable rival theory.
Unexplained how Israelites *did* leave Egypt.
"Escape" hypothesis impossible.

V. INTERNAL CHARACTER OF NARRATIVES A GUARANTEE FOR HISTORICITY.

Value of internal evidence of truthfulness.

Application to patriarchal history.

- Credibility* of narratives as a whole.
Dr. Driver's testimony.
Sobriety and sparingness of miracle in Genesis.
Contrast with period of Exodus.
- Unity of picture of patriarchs* in different sources.
Wellhausen's statements on this point.
Interdependence of sources.
Illustrations from narrative.
- Character of Abraham* a guarantee of historicity.
General grandeur of character.
His place in revelation.
Contrast with later fables.

VI. FIDELITY OF NARRATIVES TO PATRIARCHAL CONDITIONS.

Primitive character and simplicity of ideas.

- History moves in *primitive conditions*.
Free life of patriarchs: primitive ideas.
Alleged mirroring of later political events.
Gunkel in disproof of this.
- Primitive character of *religious ideas* and *forms of worship*.
Prayer and sacrifice; burnt offering, etc.
Objective character of revelation.
The theophany: "Angel of Jehovah."
Undeveloped character of doctrine of angels.
But "Angel of Jehovah" peculiar form of revelation in earliest age.
Identification with Jehovah.
- Idea of God* appropriate to this stage of revelation.
The names of God in Genesis: El, Elohim, El Shaddai.
Contrast with name "Jehovah."
Use of Jehovah in Genesis.
The divine character and attributes.
Absence of terms "holy," "righteousness," "wrath," etc.

4. *Ethical conceptions* of the patriarchs mark lower stage.
 Marriage of sisters, etc.
 Weaker sense of sin.
 Contrast with prophets.
 Advance in Book of Exodus in both religious and ethical conceptions.
 Grandeur scale of history in this book ; deeper ideas, etc.
 Greatness of Mosaic era.
 Vividness of narratives.
 Unity of representation of Moses and Aaron.

CHAPTER V

THE OLD TESTAMENT AS AFFECTED BY CRITICISM—II. RELIGION AND INSTITUTIONS: GOD AND HIS WORSHIP.—
Pp. 117–147.

Critical treatment of problems of religion.

I. FAULT OF THE CRITICAL METHOD.

- Rejection of history we have, and substitution for it of imaginary history.
E.g., Budde on Yahweh ; his admissions.
A priori rejection of Second Commandment.
 Failure of criticism to abide by its own assumptions.
E.g., Jephthah ; David ; golden calf, etc.
 More systematic inquiry.

II. EARLY ISRAELITISH MONOTHEISM.

1. *Biblical representation*—Israel from first monotheistic.
 Inability of people to maintain this standpoint.
 Belief in inferior gods.
 Religion itself based on belief in one true God.
 Genesis a monotheistic book.
 Jehovah in Exodus a supreme God.
 This not contradicted by "anthropomorphisms."
 2. *Views of evolutionary critical school.*
 Early monotheism rejected.
 Religion begins with polytheism.
 Yahweh a tribal God.
 Theories of early religion in Israel :—
 Moloch theory (Kuenen).
 Polydemonism (Kautzsch).
 Kenite theory (Budde).
 Superstitious elements ; fetishism, etc.

Grounds of critical theory :—

- (1) Old Testament conception of God too elevated for patriarchal and Mosaic times.
 Alleged dependence of monotheism on ideas of the world and of humanity.
 Fallacy of this ; Israel early in contact with high civilisations.
 High views of God in older religions.
 Views of other Old Testament scholars.
 Witness of Decalogue.
 (2) Examination of Kenite theory.
 Yahweh a new god to Israel.
 The storm-god of Sinai.
 Moses among Kenites—Song of Deborah.
 Reply : Jehovah the God of the fathers.
 Yahweh not a Kenite deity.
 Not proved by Song of Deborah.
 Stade's admissions of universality of Yahweh.
 Sublimity of Song of Deborah.
 (3) Proof from special passages :—
 Jephthah's words on Chemosh—
 Not conclusive for Israelitish view.
 David "driven" from Jehovah's inheritance—Wellhausen, etc.
 No idea of serving gods other than Jehovah *anywhere*.
 Comparison with Deuteronomy.
 "Ethical monotheism" not a creation of the prophets.
 Prophets all assume knowledge of one true God.

III. EARLY ISRAELITISH WORSHIP.

- Theories of fetishism, animism, ancestor-worship, etc.
 Contrast with Biblical view.
 Patriarchal and Mosaic periods.
 Bible on face of it does not support these theories.
 Examination of particulars :—
 1. Theory of *sanctuaries*.
 Biblical view of origin of sanctuaries (Bethel, etc.).
 Critical view—old Canaanitish shrines.
 Patriarchal legends an aftergrowth.
 Proof only by rejection of Biblical histories.
 2. *Ancestor worship*.
 Stade's theory and "proofs."
 "Graves" of patriarchs, etc.
 Mourning customs, etc.
 Budde and Addis on ancestor-worship.
 Baselessness of theory.

3. *Animism*—sacred wells and trees.
 “Wells” in patriarchal history—but for water.
 “Trees”—but God not thought of as *in* them.
 W. R. Smith on sacred trees.
 “Asherahs”—but idolatrous.
4. *Fetichism* and *stone-worship*.
 “Ark” alleged to be fetich.
 Sacred stones in ark (meteorites).
 H. P. Smith, etc.
 Sacred “pillars” (*maççebas*).
 Jacob at Bethel.
 No class of stones called “Bethels.”
 God not thought of as *in* stone.
 Memorial pillars (Dillmann, etc.).
 The prophets and *maççebas*.
5. *Totemism*.
 Alleged belief in descent of tribes from animals.
 Animal names, etc.
 Bearings on sacrifice.
 Theory not generally accepted.
6. *Human sacrifice*.
 Connection with Moloch theory.
 Other evidences secondary.
 Case of daughter of Jephthah.
 Interpretation of incident.
 No proof of general custom.
 Attitude of prophets to human sacrifice.
- IV. IMAGE-WORSHIP IN ISRAEL.
 Second Commandment denied to Moses.
 Positive assertion of worship of Yahweh by images.
 Alleged antiquity of bull-worship.
 Examination of evidence :—
1. No evidence in *older history*.
 Not in Genesis—case of “teraphim.”
 Not in Mosaic history—
 Golden calf a breach of covenant.
 2. State of religion *under Judges*.
 Lapse into Canaanitish idolatry.
 Little evidence of image-worship of Jehovah.
 Case of Gideon—
 Not proved that his “ephod” was an image of Jehovah.
 No proof that it was image of a bull.
 No proof that bull-worship was general.
 Case of Micah and Danites.
 Real instance of idolatrous worship of Jehovah.
 Not proof of rule in Israel.
 Micah at first without images.

3. *Calf-worship* of Northern Kingdom.
 Assumed revival of ancient usage.
 But why need “revival”?
 Theory disproved by silence of earlier history.
 No trace in age of Samuel or David.
 Absence of image in temple.
 Alleged absence of protest in prophets.
 Strong protest in Hosea.
 But also in Amos.
 Elijah's conflict with “Baal-worship”—not with calves.
 Incredibility of his approval of calf-worship.
 Threatens Ahab with doom of Jeroboam.
 Conclusion—Biblical view still valid.

CHAPTER VI

THE OLD TESTAMENT AS AFFECTED BY CRITICISM—II. RELIGION AND INSTITUTIONS: ARK, TABERNACLE, PRIESTHOOD, ETC.—Pp. 149-190.

Dependence of criticism on view taken of laws and institutions.

I. GENERAL POSITION OF MOSES AS LAWGIVER.

Difficulty of critics on this point.

Name of Moses given to all laws, yet all laws withheld from him.

1. Relation of Moses to Decalogue and Book of Covenant.

Grounds of denial of Decalogue to Moses.

So-called second Decalogue in Ex. xxxiv.

Baselessness of this.

Decalogue gives probability to Mosaic origin of laws in Book of Covenant.

Antecedent probability of legislation.

II. THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM AND RITUAL LAW.

Denial of belief in Mosaic or divine origin of sacrificial law before exile.

1. Assertion that P writer “knows nothing” of sacrifice before Moses.

2. Sacrifice in prophetic age not merely “traditional usage.”

3. Prophetic denunciations of outward ritual.

Real meaning of these.

Recognition of divine sanction of ordinances.

4. Admissions of Kuenen, Smend, etc.

Incredible that, in settling constitution, Moses should give no religious ordinances.

Special institutions.

III. THE SACRED ARK.

Critical theory of the ark; contradicted by facts.

1. The *making* of the ark.

An *old ark* admitted: alleged JE account of making.

Agreement of Deut. x. 1-5 with P account.

2. *Subsequent history* of the ark.

Notices regarding name, structure, uses.

These not discrepant with P.

The ark and Levites: H. P. Smith.

3. Relation of ark to *Solomonic temple*.

Solomonic ark was the *old ark*.

P's description, if taken from Solomonic ark, would agree with *old ark*.

Neglect of ark in pre-Davidic time: lesson of this.

IV. THE TABERNACLE.

Initial objection to splendour of tabernacle.

1. Admission that tabernacle of *some kind* existed.

Nature of tabernacle: Graf's views.

Alleged distinction from tabernacle of the law.

The "tent of meeting" in JE—Ex. xxxiii. 7.

Supposed contrasts.

2. *Place* of the tabernacle.

View that JE tent *outside* of camp; P tabernacle *in midst* of camp.

Examination of cases: Num. xi., xii.

Indications that JE tabernacle also *within* the camp.

3. *Use* of the tabernacle.

View that JE tent a place of *revelation*; P tabernacle a place of *worship*.

But (1) P tabernacle also a place of revelation.

Resemblances of JE and P tabernacles.

(2) And JE tabernacle a place of worship.

Notices till time of Judges.

The ark at Shiloh: centre for "all Israel."

Objection that Shiloh sanctuary a "temple"—still, however, a "tent."

Also that Samuel slept in chamber of ark.

Groundlessness of this.

The Levitical dues.

Subsequent fortunes of tabernacle.

V. THE UNITY OF THE SANCTUARY.

Wellhausen on centralisation of cultus in Deuteronomy.

Alleged relation to Ex. xx. 24 (JE) and to P.

Need of more careful scrutiny of facts.

1. The *fundamental law* in Ex. xx. 24.

Professor W. R. Smith on freedom of worship.

Law does not give *unrestricted* liberty.

"Recording" of God's name covers cases of special revelation (Gideon, Manoah, etc.).

2. Unity of sanctuary *the ideal for Israel* from beginning:

"An altar" in fundamental law.

One "house of God" in Book of Covenant.

One sanctuary in wilderness.

The altar *Ed* in Josh. xxii.

Worship at one centre in Judges.

3. Deuteronomy does not demand *immediate* realisation of the law of unity.

Postponement of full realisation till land had "rest."

Settled state first with David and Solomon.

4. Allowance necessary for *irregularities* in times of unsettlement and disorganisation.

Period of confusion specially after capture of ark—"a religious interregnum."

Samuel's relation to worship.

Spirit of law above its letter.

5. Religious attitude to "high places."

Paucity of early notices.

Worship till Solomon mainly to Jehovah.

Idolatry in later reigns.

Attitude of prophets to "high places."

VI. THE AARONIC PRIESTHOOD AND THE LEVITES.

A Levitical priesthood attested, but further questions.

1. Was the priesthood *Aaronic*?

Wellhausen's theorisings on tribe of Levi.

Denial of Aaronic "high priest" before exile.

Testimony to Aaronic priesthood—Aaron to Eli.

"High priest" seldom in Priestly Code.

2. *Priests and Levites*.

Alleged conflict of PC with Deuteronomy and early practice.

A relative contrast granted.

(1) Examination of *phraseology*.

"The priests the Levites" in earlier history.

"Priests and Levites" not in law.

"Levites" used also in wide sense in P.

"Sons of Aaron" in PC not a universal designation, and disappears later.

Change in designation with choice of tribe of Levi.

Nomenclature follows fact.

(2) Functions of priesthood attributed to *whole tribe* of Levi in Deuteronomy.

Even Urin and Thummim of priesthood.

- Nevertheless traces of distinction of orders.
 All "Levites" not "priests."
 Aaronic priesthood recognised.
 Priests and Levites not identical in Deut. xviii. 1-8.
 Terms for service applicable to both classes.
- (3) *Position of Levites* in Deuteronomy and in history.
 Alleged contradiction with PC.
 Legal provision for Levites, however, not ignored in Deuteronomy.
 Needy condition of Levites in accordance with situation before settled conditions.
 Levites in later times.
- (4) *Scant notices* of Levites in history.
 Samuel as Levite.
 Wellhausen and W. R. Smith on Samuel as "priest."
 Groundlessness of this view—(1) the ephod; (2) the mantle.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER VI

PRIESTS AND LEVITES (Dr. Driver on "ministering" and "standing" before Jehovah).—*Pp.* 191, 192.

CHAPTER VII

DIFFICULTIES AND PERPLEXITIES OF THE CRITICAL HYPOTHESIS: I. THE JE ANALYSIS.—*Pp.* 193-239.

New problem—validity of critical theory of documents.
 Criticism brings to light real phenomena.

I. STADIA OF THE CRITICAL DEVELOPMENT.

1. *Astruc*: Elohistie and Jehovistic documents.
2. *Eichhorn*: literary peculiarities in documents.
3. *De Wette*: problem of Deuteronomy.
4. *Huyfeld*: separation of 2nd Elohist.
5. The *Graf* revolution: the law post-exilian.

Theories of *relation* of sources.

Fragmentary—supplementary—documentary.

II. DIFFICULTIES OF THE CRITICAL HYPOTHESIS IN GENERAL.

Points of agreement among critics.

Wide divergences in detail.

Kautzsch and Kuenen on lack of agreement.

Justification of doubts as to soundness of principles.

1. *Conflicts of opinion* in critical schools.
 Hypothetical character of JEDP.
 Lack of agreement as to dates, relations, priority.
2. Excessive *multiplication* of sources.
 Serial Js, Es, Ps, Rs.
 This a necessity of theory (Ptolemaic epicycles).
 But creates insoluble complications.
3. *Resolution of JEP, etc., into "schools."*
 Impossibility of longer insisting on minute criteria.
 Effect on questions of date.
 Contradicted by unity of book.

III. SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF JE: PLACE OF ORIGIN AND EXTENT.

1. *Place of origin*, with bearings on *age*.
 E Ephraimitic (interest in sacred places, etc.)—J Judæan.
 Grounds inadequate for this distinction.
 (1) J also placed by leading critics in Northern Israel.
 (2) False assumptions of *motive*.
 Gunkel and Kuenen deny party-tendency.
 (3) Narratives do not bear out preference for North and South.
 J interested in Northern localities; E in South.
 Critics on "tone" of E.
 (4) Strained interpretation of incidents.
 Bethel, Beersheba, etc.
2. *Extent* of documents.
 Admitted difficulty in distinction after Genesis.
 Are J and E found in Judges, Samuel, etc.?
 Case of Joshua: *Pentateuch* or *Hexateuch*?
 Cornill, etc., on distinctness of Joshua.
 Differences in language, structure, etc.
 Wellhausen, etc., deny J in Joshua.
 Difficulties with E and P.
 Stylistic difficulties.
 Samaritan Joshua: balance against Hexateuch.

IV. ARE J AND E TWO OR ONE? DIFFICULTIES OF SEPARATION.

1. *No proof that E ever was distinct document*.
 Intermittent, fragmentary character of E.
2. Unity supported by *thoroughly parallel* character of narratives.
 Critical testimonies on parallelism.
3. *Stylistic resemblance* of J and E.
 Dr. Driver on resemblance.
4. *Fusion and interrelation* of narratives.
 Union "bewilderingly close."
 Narratives closely interconnected.
 The "omission" theory.

5. *Violent expedients* needed to make hypothesis workable.
Place and functions of "redactor."
Peculiarities of redactor.

V. THE PROBLEM OF THE DIVINE NAMES IN J AND E.

1. *Ascertainment of facts.*

These less simple than supposed.

- (1) "Elohim" in admitted J passages.
- (2) "Jehovah" in E passages.
- (3) Kuenen's admissions on discrimination.

2. *Explanation of facts.*

- (1) Theory of *distinct sources* loaded with difficulties.
Older sources not denied, but these not J and E.
- (2) Hypothesis of *discrimination*: has true elements in it.
Cessation of "Elohim" in E with Exodus iii.
Difficulties of critical explanation.

Revelation of Jehovah in Exodus vi.—true meaning of passage.

P avoids "Jehovah" till Exodus vi.; two stages of revelation.

Explanation inadequate for JE.

- (3) Possibility of *change* in text.
Examples of this; E's usage after Exodus iii.
Double names in Genesis ii., iii.
Usage of LXX in Genesis.

Outstanding case: phenomena of Psalter.

Klostermann's theory of Jehovistic and Elohistie recensions of one work.

VI. LINGUISTIC AND OTHER ALLEGED GROUNDS FOR SEPARATION.

Illusory character of these.

1. *Linguistic peculiarities.*
Typical cases examined.
2. *Mode of representation in E.*
The "dream" criterion—
Angel calling "out of heaven."
Partition tested by Gen. xxii. and Gen. xxviii. 10 ff.
Unity of narratives.
Significant use of divine names.
3. "Duplicate" narratives.
General principles affecting these.
Bethel—Joseph—Hagar, etc.
Test case: denial of wives by Abraham and Isaac.
 - (1) *Three narratives—two in J.*
Critical disintegration processes.
 - (2) Use of divine names: exaggerations, etc.
Difficulties of analysis.

(3) *Differences in narratives.*

Probably represent genuinely distinct traditions.

Abraham's action a result of settled *policy*.

Later narrative refers to earlier.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER VII

THE HISTORICITY OF THE BOOK OF JOSHUA.—*Pp.* 240-243.

CHAPTER VIII

DIFFICULTIES AND PERPLEXITIES OF THE CRITICAL HYPOTHESIS: THE QUESTION OF DEUTERONOMY.—*Pp.* 245-284.

Place of Deuteronomy in critical theory.

I. STATE OF THE QUESTION AND GENERAL VIEW.

Contents of Deuteronomy.

Critical theory of origin: age of Josiah.

Consequences of view of late date.

Doubts as to soundness of critical view—

From course of criticism itself.

From enormous difficulties of hypothesis.

II. UNITY AND STYLE OF DEUTERONOMY.

1. *Unity of thought and style* in the book.

Allowance for redaction.

Older critics held "unity" as indubitable.

Critical disintegration of the book.

Conflicting views: Wellhausen, Kuenen, Carpenter, etc. — a "dissolving view."

Dr. Driver on unity of style.

2. Relation of *style* to that of other Pentateuch sources.

Delitzsch on style of Moses—"Jehovistic-Deuteronomic."

Affinities with Deuteronomy in P (Lev. xxvi., etc.),

Affinities of Deuteronomy with JE.

Book of Covenant; Genesis, etc.

Affinities with Deuteronomy in later books.

"Pre-Deuteronomic" passages.

Decrease of Deuteronomic influence as history advances.

III. DIFFICULTIES OF CRITICAL THEORY ON AGE AND ORIGIN.

Presuppositions of criticism on date.

Relation to age of JE.

1. The *finding of "the book of the law"* in Josiah's reign.
Narrative of discovery.

- (1) Plainly believed to be discovery of an *old* book.
All concerned believed book to be Mosaic.
Difficulties of opposite hypothesis.
- (2) Theory of "fraud" in production of the book.
This the view of leading critics (Wellhausen, etc.).
Supposition morally condemnable and historically untenable.
- (3) Assumed earlier date under Manasseh or Hezekiah.
Disadvantages of this view; guiding principle lost—
Kuenen's "fatal" objection.
- (4) Did the book originate with prophets or priests?
Priests (Kuenen); prophets (Kautzsch, etc.).
Difficulties of both views.
2. *Testimony of book to its own origin.*
Apparently clear claim to Mosaic authorship.
Not whole Pentateuch.
But not code (chaps. xii.-xxvi.) only.
Theory of a "free reproduction" of written discourses of Moses
(Delitzsch, etc.).
Admissibility of this view.
But—*Cui bono?*
If Moses wrote, a literary "double" not called for.
Literary capabilities of Moses.
Real ground of objection—belief in non-historicity of Mosaic
period.
3. *Internal character of book.*
Minimising of difficulties here.
Book and history do not fit each other.
- (1) Josiah not moved primarily by idea of centralising
worship.
His reformation directed against *idolatry*.
Deuteronomy not aimed directly at "high places."
Even in Deuteronomy centralisation of worship not an
all-dominating idea.
- (2) Problem of *miscellaneous* laws in a book composed to
effect reform of *worship*.
Incongruity and irrelevancy of many of the laws.
Israel an unbroken unity.
Obsolete and unsuitable laws.
Deuteronomic law of death for idolatry not put in force
by Josiah.
Theory of Levites as "disestablished priests."
- IV. CRITICAL REASONS FOR LATE DATING OF THE BOOK: QUESTION
OF VALIDITY OF THESE.
Real ground with many: altered view of Moses and his age.
Importance of question of date: results for JE and P.

1. Extensive *concessions* of critical writers as to Mosaic basis.
Oettli and Driver on relation to older laws.
Only "real innovation" the centralisation of worship (Reuss).
This the *fundamental pillar* of hypothesis.
Results of previous investigations on the point.
2. Subordinate importance of other arguments.
- (1) Alleged discrepancies in *laws*.
Former results on Aaronic priesthood and Levites.
Reproduction of laws of Book of Covenant.
Freedom in reiteration and enforcement.
Tithe-laws as illustration of discrepancies.
Apparent conflict with Numbers.
But law of Numbers also recognised.
Possible lines of solution.
Difficulties of critical alternative.
Minor discrepancies.
- (2) Alleged *historical* discrepancies.
Inconsistencies in book itself: critical explanations of these.
Admitted general fidelity to JE history.
Is P also used? Critical denial.
Instances proving a certain use.
Examples of "contradictions":—
Appointment of judges: sending the spies.
Ground and time of prohibition to Moses to enter Canaan.
Joshua and the mission of the spies.
Dathan and Abiram (Korah omitted).
Aaron's death.
Cities of refuge.
- (3) *Expressions* thought to imply post-Mosaic date.
E.g., "Other side of Jordan" (standpoint western).
Double usage of phrase in Deuteronomy and Numbers.
Summary of conclusions on Deuteronomy.

CHAPTER IX

DIFFICULTIES AND PERPLEXITIES OF THE CRITICAL
HYPOTHESIS: THE PRIESTLY WRITING.I. THE CODE.—*Pp.* 285-329.

The Graf revolution in Pentateuchal theory.

I. THE GRAF-WELLSHAUSEN THEORY OF THE PRIESTLY CODE.

The Levitical legislation exilic or later.

Everything in code not absolutely new.

But now for first time *written*, and largely developed.

Thrown back into Mosaic age.

Idea of code from Ezekiel.

History invented to suit the code.

Introduction of Pentateuch by Ezra in 444 B.C.
Differences in school as to extent of Ezra's law.
Theory of later developments, etc.
Hypothesis loaded with difficulties.

II. INITIAL INCREDIBILITIES OF THE THEORY.

1. The *moral* issue involved.
Deliberate design of passing off code as Mosaic.
Not a work of mere "codification."
Alleged custom of ascribing all laws to Moses.
Comparison with mediæval Isidorian Decretals.
Inconsistent with moral standard of prophets, etc.
2. The *historical* incredibility.
Assuming the law concocted, how did it get accepted?
Narrative of reading of law in Neh. viii.
The transaction *bonâ fide*.
No suspicion of a new origin of law.
Classes most affected made no protest.
Parts of law already in operation at first return (priests and Levites, etc.).
3. *Unsuitability* of code to situation.
Not adapted to the conditions of the return.
Its Mosaic dress—tabernacle, wilderness, etc.
Deviations by Nehemiah from Levitical rules.
Unsuitability of the tithe-laws, etc.
A temple-organisation at return, of which code knows nothing.

III. ARGUMENT FROM SILENCE IN ITS BEARINGS ON THE CODE.

Positive grounds of theory: lines of reply.

Precarious character of argument from silence.

1. Inconclusiveness of argument shown from *critical admissions*.
Allowed that *materially* a large part of the legislation in operation before the exile.
Driver on "pre-existing temple usage."
Critical distinction of "praxis" and "code."
If *praxis* existed consistently with history, so might *code*.
Improbability that no written law existed regulating practice.
2. Wide *scope* of this "pre-existing usage": bearings on law.
How much presupposed in existence of temple, priesthood, cultus, sacrifices, feasts, etc.
Wellhausen's large admissions on cultus.
Silence of history on "feasts," etc.
3. Theory tested in case of *Levites*.
Most *post-exilian* books as silent about Levites as *pre-exilian*.
E.g., II. Isaiah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Psalter.
Silence even in Leviticus (one exception).

Silence in New Testament.

Scant allusion in Gospels and Acts: silence in Hebrews.

Application to *day of atonement*.

Here also *post-exilian* books as silent as *pre-exilian*.

Earliest notice in Josephus.

No notice in rest of New Testament: yet observance proved by Hebrews.

IV. PROOF OF EARLIER EXISTENCE OF PRIESTLY LEGISLATION.

Testimony of history to institutions (Chap. VI.).

1. Relation of *Ezekiel* to priestly laws.
Ezekiel's sketch of restored temple.
Theory that Priestly Code based on *Ezekiel*.
Proof that *Ezekiel presupposes* priestly legislation.
Saturated with ideas of law.
"Statutes and judgments."
2. Nearer determination—priority of "Law of Holiness" (Lev. xvii.—xxvi.) to *Ezekiel*.
Admitted relation of this law to *Ezekiel*.
Theory of Graf, etc., that *Ezekiel* was author of law.
Theory of Kuenen that law "imitates" *Ezekiel*.
Only satisfactory view—that *Ezekiel uses* the law.
Dr. Driver's agreement with this view.
Conclusions: (1) Priestly law before the exile; (2) Large vista opened of *extent* of written law.
3. Levitical laws presupposed in *Deuteronomy*.
Denial of this by critics.
Dr. Driver's admissions on the subject.
Views of Dillmann, Riehm, Kittel, etc., on dependence of *Deuteronomy* on priestly laws.
Leading examples in proof of such dependence.
But *Deuteronomy*, on other hand, not reflected in Priestly Code.
Latter therefore older.

V. DIFFICULTIES OF THE CRITICAL THEORY OF INSTITUTIONS.

1. *Ezekiel*-theory of origin of distinction of *priests* and *Levites*.
Levites degraded idolatrous priests (*Ezek. xliv.*).
Untenable assumptions of this theory.
Not proved from *Ezekiel*:—
(1) *Ezekiel presupposes older law* in his denunciations of ministry of uncircumcised.
(2) His code *purely ideal*: its degradation never carried out.
(3) *Inconsistency* of *Ezekiel's* regulations with those of Priestly Code.
(4) The people *received* the latter as in accordance with their own recollections and traditions.
2. Critical theory of *other institutions*.
E.g., (1) The *feasts* of the law.

The three feasts recognised from the beginning as *national* feasts.

Passover from first connected with Exodus.

Agricultural view of passover in Lev. xxiii.—a *priestly* law.

Wellhausen's theory of passover.

Historical notices of feasts.

(2) *Sin and trespass offerings.*

Ezekiel presupposes these as well-known.

References in Ps. xl. and in prophets and history.

(3) The *altar of incense.*

3. Incidental references to law in *history and prophets.*

Critical date of Joel: Joel's prophecy implies law.

But not more than Isaiah and other prophets.

Cultus and feasts in Isaiah, etc.

Written laws assumed: Hos. viii. 12.

Previous proofs from history.

Unique character of Levitical law.

VI. TIME OF ORIGIN OF THE LEVITICAL LAW.

If not post-exilian—when?

Mediating view of Dillmann, Nöldeke (age of kings), etc.

Untenableness of this view: "passive existence" of laws.

Service of Wellhausen theory in eliminating this view.

No halting-place between a post-exilian and an early origin.

This involves substantially Mosaic origin of laws.

Redaction of code probably early.

CHAPTER X

DIFFICULTIES AND PERPLEXITIES OF THE CRITICAL HYPOTHESIS: THE PRIESTLY WRITING. II. THE DOCUMENT.—
Pp. 331-377.

Critical stages in history of opinion on this document.

Compass of writing—age—independence—unity.

I. IS THERE A PRIESTLY WRITING IN DISTINCTION FROM JE?

The P style distinct from that of JE.

Its peculiarities.

Limitations of this difference.

Vocabulary—other alleged marks of P.

II. QUESTION OF UNITY AND INDEPENDENCE OF PRIESTLY WRITING.

1. P formerly regarded as a *connected narrative* from a *single pen.*

Change with rise of idea of "school," etc.

Later writers "imitate" earlier.

Effects on conception of unity of P.

Different relations of P to JE:—

(1) in Genesis, (2) in middle books, (3) in Joshua.

2. Is P an *independent* document?

Denial by Graf—logical grounds of his denial.

Independence disproved by character of writing.

(1) The *structure* of P adverse to view of independence.

The alleged "completeness" of the history.

This not borne out by facts.

Document scanty, fragmentary, unequal.

Its narratives presuppose JE.

Large hiatuses in lives of patriarchs.

Theory of "omissions"; its inadequacy.

(2) Relations to JE in *subject-matter* disprove independence.

Parts lacking in P supplied in JE, and *vice versa.*

P narrative throughout *parallel* with JE.

Kuenen and Wellhausen on this.

Onus of proof on those who affirm independence.

III. TEXTUAL INTERRELATIONS OF THE PRIESTLY WRITING AND JE.

Interrelation of P and JE inseparably close throughout.

1. P and JE narratives in *Genesis.*

(1) Stories of *creation*: these not contradictory, but complementary.

Close textual relation.

The Priestly Writer and the fall.

(2) Story of the *flood*: narratives again complementary.

Relation to Babylonian legend.

In separation each narrative incomplete.

Alleged discrepancy on duration of flood.

Discrepancy arises from the partition.

Alleged ignorance of flood in J¹.

Noah's three sons: critical substitution of Canaan for Ham.

(3) *Table of nations*: critical difficulties.

Inseparability of parts.

(4) Lives of *patriarchs*: Abraham, Gen. xii., xiii.

Gen. xiv.; peculiarities of narrative.

Hagar episode: Gen. xvi.

Gen. xix. 29.

Isaac and Jacob: fragmentary character of narratives.

Book a unity: divided, the unity disappears.

2. *Mosaic* period.

(1) *Early chapters* of Exodus: inseparability of P and JE.

Narratives of plagues: critical distinctions untenable.

(2) *Wilderness* incidents: two examples—

Mission of spies: unity of narrative.

Korah's rebellion: a double movement, but narratives inseparable.

- IV. ALLEGED INCONSISTENCIES AND HISTORICAL INCREDIBILITIES OF P.
Importance of critical admission that P knew JE.
1. Disproves supposed *ignorance* in P of fall, patriarchal sacrifices, errors of patriarchs, etc.
 2. *Duplicate* narratives—usually not really such.
Jacob at Bethel; revelations to Moses, etc.
 3. *Historical incredibilities*: a chief ground of objection.
Critical reliance on Colenso's "demonstrations."
Defects of Colenso's treatment.
 - (1) Colenso's difficulties about *tabernacle* and *priests* in the wilderness.
Absurdity of his calculations.
 - (2) Difficulties of the *Exodus*:
Increase of Israel, etc.
Colenso creates difficulties by a grotesque literalism.
The departure from Rameses.
 - (3) Special examples:—
Hezron and *Hamul* in Gen. xlvii.
The list of the Descent.
The number of the *first-born*.
Key to the solution.
- V. GENERAL RESULTS: MOSAICITY OF THE PENTATEUCH.
To what point has the argument conducted?
- (1) Not to view that Moses wrote the Pentateuch in present shape and extent;
 - (2) But to view of the unity, essential *Mosaicity*, and relative antiquity of the Pentateuch.
1. Support given to this view in *tradition*: crucial points:—
 - (1) Old Testament ascribes the three codes to Moses.
Two said to be *written* by him.
 - (2) Both Deuteronomy and Priestly Writing presuppose the JE history.
 - (3) Deuteronomy received as Mosaic in time of Josiah.
 - (4) Whole Pentateuch received as Mosaic in time of Ezra.
 - (5) Samaritans received Pentateuch as Mosaic.
 2. Critical results support *Mosaicity* of Pentateuch.
 - (1) No good reason for separating J and E, or giving them late date.
 - (2) Deuteronomy not of Josianic origin, but its discourses genuinely Mosaic.
 - (3) Priestly writing; not post-exilic; but legislation and history early.
 3. Proofs of early date of *Book of Genesis*.
Later references to Genesis.
 4. Early knowledge and wide diffusion of *writing* favours the *Mosaicity* of the Pentateuch.
Writing known and practised by Hebrews in Mosaic age.
This implies earlier use: possibility of pre-Mosaic documents.

5. *Mode* of composition best conceived of as *collaboration* or *co-operation*.
How Pentateuch may have grown to present form.
Would seldom be copied as a whole.
The "law of Jehovah" in pious circles.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER X

THE LATER HISTORICAL BOOKS.—Pp. 378-391.

- I. Bearings of *critical theory* of the Pentateuch on later books.
P history—Deuteronomy—JE.
- II. Results for later books of *opposite view*.
Delitzsch on Joshua.
Deuteronomic revisions.
- III. *Critical treatment* of later books.
General character of later histories.
 1. Book of *Judges*.
Critical analysis of this book (Kautzsch, etc.).
The Deuteronomic framework.
Consciousness of unity in Israel.
Religious and moral ideas.
Time of origin.
 2. Books of *Samuel*.
Diversities in analysis.
Kautzsch, Driver, H. P. Smith, Löhr.
Alleged diversity of representation.
Alleged partisanship of sources.
Mode and time of origin.
 3. Books of *Chronicles*.
Critical assaults on credibility.
Deepest ground—Levitical representation.
View of wholesale invention untenable.
Theory of older sources (Dillmann, Klostermann, etc.).
Corroborations of history.
Question of the numbers.
General result.

CHAPTER XI

ARCHÆOLOGY AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.—Pp. 393-430.

- Archæology as controlling criticism and history.
- I. GENERAL BEARINGS OF MODERN ARCHÆOLOGICAL DISCOVERY.
Triumphs of archæology in recovery of ancient civilisations.
Singular degree of illumination on Bible.
Effects on attitude of critics.

- Alteration of perspective in relation to Israel.
 Antiquity of letters and arts in Egypt and Babylonia.
 Babylonian libraries.
 Early explorations at Nineveh.
 Palace of Sargon—a Biblical confirmation.
 Library of Assurbanipal.
- II. BABYLONIAN LEGENDS AND THE EARLY CHAPTERS OF GENESIS.
 Does Genesis preserve oldest traditions of the race?
 Reasons for looking for answer to Babylonia.
 Glance first at *facts*, then at *explanation*.
1. *Table of nations* in Genesis x.
 Threefold testimony about Babylonia.
 (1) Babel before Nineveh; (2) Assyria colonised from Babylonia; (3) Founders of Babylonian civilisation not Semites.
 Monumental corroboration of these positions, formerly disputed.
 Statement that Elam is "the son of Shem."
 Recent confirmation from discovery.
 Distribution of mankind from plain of Shinar.
 Great antiquity of Babylonian civilisation.
 Tendency to derive other civilisations from this—Egypt, China, etc.
 2. *Creation and deluge* stories.
 Discovery of *creation* tablets—comparison and contrast with Genesis i.
 Polytheistic and mythological character; features of resemblance.
 The sabbath—paradise and fall.
 The *deluge* tablets.
 Debased by polytheism, but marked resemblance to Biblical account.
 3. *Explanations of connection*.
 (1) *Theory of borrowing* from Babylonia.
 Babylonian legends adopted and purified.
 When was this borrowing?
 In exile? reasons against this.
 In time of Ahaz or Solomon?
 In time after settlement in Canaan?
 Pervasion of Canaan by Babylonian influences.
 Difficulties of "borrowing" theory.
 Brought from Ur of Chaldees?
 Objection from absence of early mention; reply to this.
 - (2) *Theory of cognate relationship*.
 Radically different character of stories supports this view.
 Theory of cognate relationship favoured by many scholars (Kittel, Hommel, Oettli, etc.).
 Genesis preserves older and purer version of original tradition.

- (3) Babylonian *monotheism*—"Babel and Bible."
 Groundwork of truth in this view.
 Supposed occurrence of name Jehovah (JAU).
 Israelitish religion not borrowed from Babylonia.
- III. THE ABRAHAMIC AGE—THE CHEDORLAOMER EXPEDITION.
 Patriarchs bore personal names.
 Importance of age of Abraham.
 The Hammurabi Code.
Expedition of Chedorlaomer (Genesis xiv.).
 Strange character of story.
 Denial of its historicity (Nöldeke, Wellhausen, etc.).
 Singular corroborations from modern discovery.
 The Elamitic supremacy; names of kings; relation to Palestine;
 Uru-Salim, etc.
 Slighting of evidence by critics.
Midrash theory of Genesis xiv.
 In reality accurate knowledge of remote times and *bona fides* of writer thoroughly established.
 Defence of narrative by critics.
- IV. JOSEPH IN EGYPT.
 Transition with Joseph to Egypt.
 Admitted accuracy of picture of Egyptian life and customs.
 Points formerly challenged established from monuments.
 Egyptian manners; descent into Egypt, etc.
 Tale of two brothers.
 Bearings on place and time of origin of narrative.
 Must have originated on Egyptian soil.
 Objection from proper names not valid.
- V. THE MOSAIC PERIOD—THREE GREAT DISCOVERIES.
 Main periods in history of Egypt.
Old Empire: Menes as myth.
 Petrie's discovery of Menes and of first two dynasties.
Middle Empire: Joseph and Shepherd Kings.
New Empire: Israel and Exodus to be sought for in eighteenth or nineteenth dynasty.
 Theories of Exodus: Rameses II. and Menepthah.
 Recent discoveries bearing on Mosaic period.
 1. Finding of the *mummies of the Pharaohs* (1881, 1898).
 Recovery of all the great Pharaohs.
 2. Discovery of *Tel el-Amarna tablets*.
 Correspondence of Amenophis III. and Amenophis IV. (c. 1400 B.C.).
 Language and writing Babylonian.
 Letters from Palestine.

3. Discovery of name "Israel" on monument of Meneptah—
supposed Pharaoh of Exodus.
Difficulty arising from this: Israel already in Palestine.
Earlier traces of tribes in Palestine.
Need of modification of view.

VI. ISRAEL AND THE EXODUS.

- Was the Exodus under nineteenth dynasty?
The chronological difficulty:—
Too short interval till Solomon; too long from Abraham.
Biblical statements: Exodus placed about 1450 B.C.
Suitability of conditions of this time (eighteenth dynasty).
The "store-cities" not decisive.
Reign of Thothmes III.; on this view the oppressor.
Picture of brickmakers.
Career of Hatasu: "Pharaoh's daughter"?
Problem of the Khabiri of Tel el-Amarna tablets.
Their conquest of Canaan.
Tendency to identify them with Hebrews.

VII. EMPIRE OF THE HITTITES—PERIOD OF THE KINGS.

1. The *Hittites*—early Biblical notices.
Existence of empire denied.
Egyptian and Assyrian confirmations.
Discovery of Hittite monuments.
Hieroglyphic and origin of Hittites.
2. *Period of kings*.
Nearly all points of contact receive corroboration.
Assyrian and Hebrew chronology.
Instances in history—Shishak's invasion; Mesha; Jehu;
Tiglath-Pileser; fall of Samaria; Sennacherib, etc.
Manasseh and credibility of Chronicles.

VIII. THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

- Daniel put in age of Maccabees.
Theory of an older basis—historical and prophetic.
Disproof of objections to historicity.
Greek name of instruments.
Discovery of early date and wide range of Greek culture.
Character of Nebuchadnezzar.
Belshazzar now proved historical.
The capture of Babylon.
Not discrepant with Daniel.
"Babylonian Chronicle": stages in taking of Babylon.
Final capture: Belshazzar slain.
Question of "Darius the Mede."

CHAPTER XII

PSALMS AND PROPHETS: THE PROGRESSIVENESS OF
REVELATION.—Pp. 431-478.

Psalms and prophets the soul of Old Testament revelation.

PART I

DAVID AND THE PSALTER

- Value of psalms independent of their dates.
Yet dates important in history of revelation.

I. THEORY OF THE POST-EXILIAN ORIGIN OF THE PSALTER.

Post-exilian origin of psalms a dogma of Wellhausen School.
Wellhausen's estimate of the psalms.

1. Theory is not and cannot be proved.
There are post-exilian, possibly Maccabæan, psalms.
No proof that most, or all, of the psalms are post-exilian.
The theory conflicts with tradition.
2. Post-exilian period mostly a *blank* to our knowledge.
Opening for groundless theorising.
3. Age *not productive* of literature.
No record of itself.
Return from captivity an incentive to psalm-composition.
But bulk of psalms show no post-exilian marks.
Many psalms demand an earlier date.
Psalms about king, etc.
4. Traditional connection of psalms with David.
Presumption in favour of pre-exilian psalms.
Positive evidences of pre-exilian psalmody.
Temple "singers" at return.
References to temple praise.
"Songs of Zion"; quotations, etc.
Ascription of psalms to David in titles.
Chronicles traces temple singing and music to David.

II. THE HISTORICAL POSITION OF DAVID AS PSALMIST.

Critical view of David: untrue to history.

1. David's career surveyed:—

- (1) As *young man*: early piety and skill.
- (2) At *Saul's Court*: behaviour irreproachable.
- (3) As *exile*: relations to his men; mode of life; relations with Saul, etc.
- (4) As *king*: services to country and religion; foreign conquests; project of temple and promise.
Blots on life and reign: Bathsheba.
Estimate of character.

2. Abundant *material* and *motive* for psalm-composition.
View of David as model for effeminate frivolity.
A "sportful" muse.
Davidic psalms : genuineness of Ps. xviii.
If this genuine, doubtless many others.
Views of Ewald, Hitzig, Bleek, Delitzsch, etc.
Probably number of Davidic psalms not small.
Value of titles of Books I and II.

III. COLLECTION OF THE PSALMS AND PLACE IN CANON.

Probable main periods of pre-exilic psalm-composition.

David : Jehoshaphat : Hezekiah.

Separate collections of psalms : Davidic, Korahite, etc.

Later psalms : division into books.

Date of collections and of close of Canon.

Testimony of :—

1. Books of Maccabees.
2. Septuagint translation (before 130 B.C. ; probably a good deal earlier).

Meaning of titles forgotten.

3. Ecclesiasticus (implies Canon before 200 B.C.).

4. Books of Chronicles : Canon apparently completed ; implies pre-exilic psalmody.

5. Book of Jonah : use of earlier psalms.

6. Jeremiah : quotes Ps. i. (implies Davidic collection) ; thanksgiving formula.

7. Music of second temple an inheritance from first temple.

General result.

PART II

THE PREDICTIVE ELEMENT IN PROPHECY

Uniqueness of Hebrew prophecy.

Nature and development of prophecy.

Prophecy and genius : its supernatural side.

Tests of true prophecy.

I. SUPERNATURAL PREDICTION AN ELEMENT IN PROPHECY.

Essence of prophecy wrongly placed in prediction.

Modern denial of predictive prophecy.

Prediction not mere deductions of prophets' own.

Inevitable that prediction should enter into prophecy.

Has to do with promise and warning.

With future of kingdom of God.

Distinction from heathen soothsaying.

II. REALITY OF SUPERNATURAL PREDICTION.

Failure of critics to eliminate prediction.

Examples from Wellhausen.

Abundance of prediction in prophetic writings.

The captivities, 70 weeks, etc.

Messianic prophecy ; Professor Flint quoted.

III. HUMAN CONDITIONING OF PROPHECY : CANONS OF INTERPRETATION.

Psychological side of prophecy ; necessary limitations.

Contrast between prophecy of *near* and prophecy of *remote* events.

The former *definite* ; the latter necessarily more *ideal* in form and character.

Bearings on interpretation :—

1. Prophecy of distant future presented in *forms of present*.

Symbol in prophecy.

2. *Time-element* in prophecy.

Certain fact is triumph of kingdom of God ; steps to this hidden.

"Day of Jehovah" as background of every crisis.

Events grouped in ideal, not temporal relations.

3. *Conditional* element in prophecy.

Jeremiah on this : examples.

Bearings on fulfilment of promises to Israel.

Bearings on New Testament *Parousia*.

PART III

THE PROGRESSIVENESS OF REVELATION : MORAL DIFFICULTIES.

General recognition of progressiveness, but bearings not always clear.

I. NATURE AND ORIGIN OF THE MORAL DIFFICULTIES.

Not progress in knowledge only.

Growth from lower morality to higher.

Elements of evil in lower stages—

Polygamy ; blood-revenge ; slavery, etc.

Exaggeration of moral difficulties : Deistical controversy.

Central difficulty : apparent implication of God in laws and commands which our consciences condemn.

II. ERRONEOUS OR INADEQUATE SOLUTIONS.

"Progressiveness" alone not a solution.

Denial of evil in lower stage not a solution.

Evolutionary theory.

Reality of good and evil must be upheld.

Critical solution—laws and commands attributed to God not really His.

This a cutting of the knot, not a loosing of it.

Rolls burden on prophetic writers who endorse commands.

E.g., Deuteronomy and extermination of Canaanites ; revision of Joshua.

Tendency to undue lowering of morality of early Israel.
 Professor Gray on non-recognition of obligations to Gentiles.
 Moral precepts of universal scope always recognised.
 Lapses of individuals not measure of moral standards.

III. GENERAL LAWS OF PROGRESSIVE REVELATION.

Larger problem of God's general relation to evil of world.

1. Revelation must *take up man where it finds him* : results of this.
2. Revelation *responsible only for new element it introduces*, not for everything associated with it in mind of recipient.
3. Revelation *lays hold on better elements*, in order by means of them to overcome what is imperfect and evil.

Educative aspect of revelation.

Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac.

Cities of refuge and blood-revenge.

Laws of marriage ; polygamy and monogamy.

Restrictions of spirit of mercy ; Canaanites.

All through preparation for higher stage.

Higher stages of revelation conserve all elements of value in lower.

THE CLOSE

Culmination of progressive revelation in Christ.

Faith in Him essential to right view of Old Testament.

Bearings of Old Testament criticism on New Testament.

Same principles and methods now being applied.

Crisis in view of Christ and New Testament.

Bearing of foregoing discussion on issue.