

monarch who claimed credit for everything that happened during his reign and to show on the evidence of Isa. that it actually was one of his generals and not he himself who made the conquest. So the higher criticism having originally led us to distrust the accuracy and dependability of the Bible, we have now reached the point where, instead of that, we are correcting many of the statements which are preserved to us in archeological evidence on the basis of evidence taken from the Bible, which represents a great shift in the attitude toward the dependability of the Bible, a shift which has naturally come about as a result of finding more and more instances where the Biblical statements are in accord with newer discoveries.

A very interesting instance of this which might be cited is that in relation to the 5th chapter of the book of Daniel. Here (leave a space) (12)

Of course it may be said that these do not directly bear on the point with which we began, the higher criticism of the Pentateuch, and this of course is true. The movement may be extended on to the entire O.T. There's not a book of the O.T. which some critic has not tried to divide up into many, various sources. The whole approach has been carried to a wild extreme. I think perhaps one of the most interesting instances of it, the extreme to which it can go is Briggs commentary on (12 1/2) in the International Critical Commentary. Briggs, Prof. Briggs was a man of great erudition, very wide study, amassed a great number of facts. Many of his statements are very useful. When it came to the Psalms, however, he applied this system of, this ~~the~~ divisive method to the point where there is hardly a Psalm which he does not feel confident to divide up into two or three different sources, original Psalms, making commendations here and changes there, putting two words from this source, and three in that, and it is the most interesting example of human ingenuity. But of little value