

ances, of which some specimens have already been given, while the readers of Kuenen and Wellhausen may discover for themselves almost as many more as they please?¹ Are we to adopt all the results of the German method, or only some of them? Are we, for instance, to regard as incontrovertible the remarkable assignment to their sources of the various sentences of the history of the Deluge, which is issued on the authority of two professors of a German university? And if not, why not? How much of it are we to receive, and how much to reject, and on what grounds? Is the method which professes to yield such results a sound one, or, if not altogether sound, how far is it to be trusted at all? These are the questions which our English critics have as yet not fairly faced. But they must be answered categorically, if English Christians as a body are to place any confidence in what is put before them as scientific criticism. The following is the arrangement to which reference has been made.²

The seventh chapter of Genesis, down to the 9th verse, is the work of the second Jehovist, with the exception of the words "male and female" in ver. 3, added by the "redactor," and the statement that "Noah was six hundred years old when the flood (redactor, "flood of waters") came upon the earth," which was added by the author of the Priestly Code. We proceed with the narrative from ver. 9 onward, denoting

Lev. xxvi., "the words undoubtedly cannot have been written before the Babylonian exile" (p. 383).

¹ Thus Ewald, who, as a linguistic critic, was certainly better equipped for the task than those who have succeeded him, authoritatively pronounces Deuteronomy to be later Hebrew than Leviticus. Kuenen (*Religion of Israel*, p. 184) says of Knobel, "He makes Lev. xix. 5-8 younger than Lev. vii. 15-18. The converse is true." No attempt is made to prove this statement. Wellhausen is quite as infallible. He tells us that the "earlier prophets" of the Hebrew canon date, in their present shape, from the reign of Jeconiah (Introd., p. 1). The blessing of Moses is "an independent document of Northern Israel, which speaks for itself" (p. 135). Gen. v. belongs to the Priestly Code, while Gen. iv. is a compilation from the Jehovist and Elohist (p. 308). And yet Wellhausen complains of the "dogmatic way of making history" indulged in by other writers, who have used their authorities instead of picking them to pieces at pleasure (p. 40).

² *Die Genesis, mit äusserer unterscheidung der Quellschriften.* Übersetzt von E. Kautsch & A. Socin. Freiburg, I. B. 1888.