

be a part of the Church of God. There is such a thing as Protestantism, nevertheless. And there is a science of geology, and it has established some things, although geologists do not always agree among themselves. So there is a science of history, though Mr. Froude differs at many points from Macaulay, and the successors of Mr. Froude will differ again from him. It is, in fact, characteristic of historical study that each advance in knowledge invalidates some theory previously held. So long as there is progress there will be difference in detail.

Every new discovery is destructive just in proportion as it is constructive. In the sense in which established conclusions are demanded above, there are no established conclusions outside the multiplication table. The body of Chinese science is the only real science on this theory; the theology of the Roman Catholic church comes next to it.

All this applies to biblical criticism. In the sense in which and in the degree to which other sciences are discredited by the disagreement of the specialists, this science is discredited by the disagreement of specialists—but *no more*. There is a growing consensus on the main points of inquiry; and these points may fairly be called proved. What are they? Let me name the following:*

I.—THE COMPOSITE NATURE OF THE HISTORICAL BOOKS.

This composite nature is so obvious when once pointed out that it seems almost unnecessary formally to assert it. The phenomena presented by the Books of Kings and Chronicles are patent to the most superficial reader. They are not explained away by conservative scholars. Dr. Green, for example, has said that each author has taken from an older record what suited his purpose; in other words, no one now denies that these books were compiled rather than composed. The value of this discovery is that it lays bare to us the process by which all the historical books of our Old Testament assumed their present shape. In comparing Kings and Chronicles, we prove with arithmetical certainty that some Hebrew authors compiled their books, taking large sections verbatim from previously existing documents, and filling in other matter of different style and tenor. The composition is rightly understood only as we bear this fact in mind. But barring the fact that the evidence in these is twofold, the other historical books offer just the same sort of proof. The books of Samuel can be analyzed with almost as much certainty where we have no parallel account, as in the few cases where the chronicler has used the same material. The Book of Judges presents a problem somewhat more complex, but of the same general nature. So far from the documentary composition of the Pentateuch being an isolated phenomenon, it

*I confine myself to the Old Testament. As I write at a distance from books of reference, I cite no authorities, but the reader will find sufficient literature named by Professor Driver in his introduction.