

cannot without impiety declare that a volume so composed was given by inspiration of God.

As has been already intimated, however, the theory, in its English dress, comes before us in so vague a form that we may fairly call upon its English supporters to place it in a little more definite shape. Since it is on the general agreement of German writers, working on principles not hitherto accepted in England, that they found their claim to be heard,¹ we may ask how much of the German system they are prepared to adopt. They tell us that there is no desire to regard any other than Moses as the "ultimate founder" of Israelite institutions. Do these institutions consist of anything more than the "original form" of the Ten Commandments?² We may ask, again, whether they are ready to adopt the *tone* of their German *collaborateurs*. Will they, with Wellhausen, treat the narrative in Chronicles as a subject for ridicule, for contempt, for a lofty tone of moral rebuke?³ Do they ask us to embrace his canons of criticism, which not only preclude the possibility of actual prophecy, but of any remarkable prevision of coming events?⁴ Must we accept the dictatorial and dogmatic utter-

¹ Canon Driver in the *Contemporary Review* for February, 1890, p. 224.

² "It need not be repeated here that Moses bequeathed no book of the law to the tribes of Israel. *Certainly* nothing more was committed to writing by him or in his time than 'the ten words' in their original form" (Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, vol. ii. p. 7). The italics are mine. It seems likely that a good many Englishmen will be found who will attach no weight whatever to criticism of this kind, unless it be put forth with somewhat more modesty, and unless a little argument be added.

³ Thus "cunning, and treachery, and battle, and murder . . . are passed over in silence" by the writer of Chronicles, in "a deliberate, and in its motives a very transparent mutilation of the original narrative as preserved for us in the Book of Samuel" (*History of Israel*, p. 173). The purpose is, of course, the unjust glorification of David. 1 Chron. xii. 29 contains a "naïve remark" (p. 174). 1 Chron. xv. "positively revels" in priests and Levites, "of whom not a single word is to be found in 1 Sam. vi." In chapters xviii.-xx. the author "seems to refresh himself with a little variety" (p. 177). The closing chapters of this book are "a startling instance of the statistical phantasy of the Jews which revels" "in artificial marshallings of names and numbers . . . which simply stand on parade. . . . The monotony is occasionally broken by unctuous phrases" (p. 181). His is a "law-crazed fancy" (p. 195). "Power is the index of piety, with which accordingly it rises and falls" (p. 209).

⁴ As where Wellhausen says of the denunciations of disobedience contained in