

antagonized, but in some cases considered as hopelessly undermined. In the Pentateuchal problem, for instance, the acceptance of an analysis into various documents has been steadily gaining ground. Since the death of Keil there is no prominent German exegete who accepts the Mosaic authorship for the whole Pentateuch; and since the death of Bachmann, of Rostock, all the Old Testament professors in the Fatherland accept the analysis as a fact. In Holland matters stand in this regard about as they do in Germany. America has the best and ablest living antagonist of the documentary theory in the person of Professor Green, of Princeton, who just at present is making an elaborate defense of this position in the pages of the *Hebraica*, published at New Haven, Conn.

The dangerous feature of this hypothesis does not of course consist in the mere fact that the Pentateuch in its present shape is regarded as a composition of several documents, but that these documents are arranged in such a way as to overthrow entirely the accepted views as to the religious development in Israel, by making the law proper not the beginning and fountainhead, but the outcome and final result of this development. It is further made the text and pretext for schemes of the Old Testament religion that are substantially naturalistic in character. Naturally the Pentateuchal problem alone cannot suffice for this end. It is only one of the many reconstructions of Old Testament sources adopted for this purpose. There is scarcely a single book which is not dissected or shifted. In doing this the mere chronological redating cannot be looked upon as an objectionable feature. If this is a correction of an old blunder, the change is a matter of congratulation. But the radical methods adopted in many cases exclude the possibility of honest investigations and judgment. It is frankly acknowledged that the Biblical books in their present shape do not support the critical reconstructions. The hypothesis is accordingly advanced that many or most of these books have been revised from the standpoint of later Judaism, particularly from the standpoint of Deuteronomy, in order to give the older history and religion of Israel the stamp and image of a much later phase. In other words, the Old Testament books have been intentionally changed so as to tell an incorrect story as to what the primitive religion of Israel was, and the books are practically pious frauds, and in their present shape contain an odd and contradictory kaleidoscope of primary and secondary sources, which it is the work of the critic to analyze and estimate at their proper worth.

In the application of such more than objectionable methods quite naturally extreme subjectivism must be the controlling power. As to what, according to the principles of historiography and criticism, is to be considered probable or improbable in the sacred records, only the choice and approbation of the critic himself can decide. Indeed, the