

3. That sundry inaccuracies in numbers and dates have crept into the text.

4. That there are various interpolations inserted into the narrative.

5. That there are indubitable signs of later editorship.

What may be considered as unproved, and what ought not to be accepted without much stronger evidence than has yet been adduced is—

1. That any part of the Old Testament is a fictitious narrative, invented, with how excellent intentions soever, on behalf of a religious system.

2. That the greater part of the provisions of the law were drawn up subsequent to the career of Israel as an independent nation, and had no part whatever in moulding the national life.

3. That the documents used in the compilation of the Pentateuch are subsequent to the age of Moses.

4. That the interpolations are so important and so numerous as to affect to a very great extent the structure of the book.

5. That the editorship consisted in anything more than the arrangement of matter previously existing in a written shape, with explanatory glosses and appendices.

These are points on which many of us are anxious for more light. If it is proposed that we shall accept conclusions so sweeping, we are at least entitled to ask that sufficient evidence shall be produced. We are not prepared to bow even to the general consent of writers whose methods appear to us startling and their conclusions extravagant and *bizarre*. We admit the existence of difficulties and discrepancies, but the new theories, we believe, account no more for these difficulties and discrepancies than did the old. And until we have fuller and more satisfactory proof of the truth of these theories than any that has as yet been given, we must continue to believe that it is impossible to dissect the Mosaic Scriptures and assign the various portions of them to authors of whose historical existence we have no evidence, and must regard the Old Testament as in the main an authentic account of Jewish institutions and Jewish national life.

J. J. LIAS.