

There were also men there who were specialists. A professor from Princeton Theological Seminary sat three seats to my right. There were also a few specialists who were absolutely determined to hold the critical theory, but neither one of these, who knew more about the subject, raised the question about the divine names, for they, unlike the others, knew that there were enough holes and enough flaws in the argument from divine names that one cannot reasonably base a strong case upon that one factor. They have to try to evade it, and say that it is just one of many criteria. But, in the history of the development, it is the first thing that is presented, and it has probably been more influential in holding people to the theory than anything else.

Regarding the question of priority, I do not mean by priority that it is the basic thing. The divine names could be proven wrong even if the theory were proven right. If we disprove the argument from divine names, it does not disprove the theory, but this has a very vital place in the popular attitude of the theory and also in its historical development – so much that I would incline to think that without this clue, it is highly questionable whether the theory would have ever developed, regardless of all other suggested alleged proofs.

1) *The priority of this criterion*

I have here Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. For at least forty years this was the standard critical introduction to the Old Testament in the English-speaking world. (Now it probably has been replaced, to quite an extent, by the book by Professor Pfeiffer of Harvard, which appeared a few years ago.) I find that Driver is still more useful than Pfeiffer in this study, principally because Pfeiffer is apt to assume a thing as proven, and not think it necessary to go into the evidence to any great extent. It is proven, everybody knows it, it is so – and that is that. You will probably find most of the alleged evidences in his book but they are scattered here and there. That is not the way that Driver presented them. He was the noted professor at Oxford University who began teaching the Higher Criticism to people who thought it was entirely wrong. He was determined to convince people that it was correct. His book became