

we are told, embedded in the narrative.¹ But we are not told how they came there, when every consideration of interest and symmetry would induce the redactor to keep them out. But this same redactor, who, when it suits the theory, is so utterly incapable of understanding how to draw up a narrative which may promote the end he has in view, is the next moment gifted with the finest invention and the keenest literary tact. His skill in perverting the facts of history to suit his purposes is almost miraculous.² And his fine perception of the value of facts which were almost forgotten in his day is little less so. Thus he transfers to his pages the ancient document quoted in Gen. x. This passage, until lately supposed to be teeming with inaccuracies, has now been proved to be correct in every particular. A Turanian population was the first to inhabit Assyria and Babylonia, and was afterwards conquered by a Semitic invasion. The two peoples continued to dwell side by side for many centuries. Bilingual inscriptions have lately been found in great numbers, including a book of instruction for a Chaldean princess in the Accadian language.³ Even the sites of the three cities Erech, Accad, and Calneh, which, with Babel, made a kind of Mesopotamian quadrilateral, have been identified. It is for the advocates of the new criticism to explain how a post-exilic redactor thought of embodying so antiquated, and apparently in his days so useless a document in his history, or how to such a singular capacity for blundering as he must have possessed, if he can be so easily detected in our own day, should be added occasional lucid intervals of the rarest historical intuition.

The favourite theory of both schools of the new criticism is that Jewish institutions in the shape in which they reach us are the work of the sacerdotal class in the decline and fall of the kingdom, and after the return of the people to their native land in a condition very far removed from their ancient glory. It is the belief of writers such as De Wette

¹ See Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, p. 139. The citations from Wellhausen in this paper are from the German, not the English edition.

² Some instances of this will be given in a future paper.

³ See Sayce, *Babylonian Literature*, pp. 13, 64, 71.