

be unhistorical and untrustworthy, or that the alterations and additions are purely arbitrary." The *second* objection, it is manifest, can only carry weight with those who either deny the possibility or impeach the credibility of miracles ; to such as hold the contrary of these positions, there is nothing either impossible or incredible in the statements of the chronicler that Jahaziel foretold the victory without a blow, which Jehoshaphat obtained, or that Jehovah moved the Ammonites, Moabites, and Seirites to destroy one another. If every narrative that contains a flavouring of the supernatural is *ipso facto* discredited, there will be little of Scripture left to be believed when once the process of purgation has been completed ; and it is too much to expect that defenders of the authenticity of Holy Writ will concede without clear and irrefragable proof that only those paragraphs can be veracious which report nothing that transcends the horizon of either sense or reason. As regards the *third* objection, that, as Ewald expresses it, "it is only possible for a person who will not see to ignore the fact that the Jehoshaphat who is here described is quite a different person from the one depicted in 1 Kings xxii. and 2 Kings iii.," it is no doubt true that the Jehoshaphat who believed Jahaziel, and, depending on Jehovah's word, went forth to victory at Tekoa, was a better man than the Jehoshaphat who disbelieved Micaiah, and, in defiance of Jehovah's threatening, marched out to defeat at Ramoth ; and a better man than the Jehoshaphat who, at a later period, allied himself with Jehoram and the King of Edom to attack Mesha of Moab ; but surely one would require more convincing proof that an individual had lost his identity than simply the fact that at one period of his life he behaved more or less worthily than at another. Ewald perceives this, and recognises that it would be "altogether unfair" on this account "to deny that the narrative has a historical basis."

But not only is the narrative not open to valid indictment on the ground of being deficient in historic truthfulness, it contains as well a number of extremely interesting water-marks of its literal veracity. Passing by the names of