

detail have been made, and it is at least a justified suspicion that a scholarly piety toward the past, rather than historical evidence, is the main foundation for their position (pp. 32-33).

Frank M. Cross ("The Priestly Tabernacle," The Biblical Archaeologist Reader<sup>1</sup>, eds. G.E. Wright and D.N. Freedman, ~~Chicago: Quadrangle Books, Inc., 1961~~ <sup>Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1961</sup>) makes these cogent statements:

ft-note

Today the Old Testament lies in a new setting. The horizons of ancient Near Eastern history have been pushed back. Israelite history can no longer be made to climb the three-flight staircases of Wellhausen's Hegelian reconstruction (pp. 203-204).

Finally, John Bright ("Modern Study of Old Testament Literature," The Bible and the Ancient Near East, ed. G. Ernest Wright, Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1961) states:

ft-note

To the theory of documents there was added at this time most notably by Wellhausen himself, a reconstruction of the history of Israel's religion. This had its ultimate origin in the philosophy of Hegel as applied to the religion of Israel by certain scholars of the school of W.M.L. De Wette (1780-1849), notably J.F.L. George and W. Vatke. It was ~~assumed~~ held by proponents of this school that an evolutionary pattern was observable in all of human history, and in the history of Israel no less than elsewhere... This was the theory which dominated Old Testament studies a generation ago... It is probable that thirty-five years ago few could have believed that it would ever be superseded... Yet, secure as this critical orthodoxy may have seemed then, forces were already at work which would eventually undermine it. These forces were various, many of them lying beyond the scope of this paper. Not least of them was the fact that the philosophical understructure upon which the whole scheme rested, and which lent to it an aura of self-evidence, fell into discredit... More positively, the amazing access of knowledge regarding the ancient Orient- and Israel- which recent years have brought has served to throw the critical theories of yesterday into question and to show that a revision of them is required so drastic as to amount to virtual abandonment (pp. 3-5).

41

All the above ~~quotations~~ <sup>sections</sup> reject Wellhausen's reinterpretation of Hebrew religious history very emphatically. The idea of a ~~straight-line or unilinear~~ historical process is a carry-over from nineteenth century thought. Israelite religion, as well as other historical phenomena, must be viewed in all their ups and