

Theology Today, July, 1946 "Interpreting The Old Testament " by G. Ernest Wright

p. 181 As applied to the history of Israel, this was taken to mean that within the space of one thousand years (from c. 1500 to 500 B.C.) we have the perfect example of religious evolution, beginning with animism and ending in monotheism. During the last century this view was much easier to hold than it is today, because at that time comparatively little was known of Israel's religious environment. . . . The developmental hypothesis so current in the past and in most of the textbooks/<sup>p.182</sup> and commentaries now available has proved to be far too simple, since it leaves far more facts unexplained than explained.

p. 182 A third presupposition of a large section of critical scholarship in the past is theological; it assumes that the Old Testament is a history of man's ideas about God, rather than a history of the Divine self-disclosure or of the Divine activity. The Old Testament itself claims to present the latter: . . . We today are inclined to convert the whole into a story of Israel's apprehension of God, and thus we make of the Old Testament something it was never intended to be - a history of ideas both good and bad.

p. 190 The evolutionary conception of Biblical religion has actually handicapped the scholar in his attempt to understand the real content of the Bible.

---

p. 181 Footnote 10 . . . Symptomatic of the direction in which the leaders in the field of Old Testament scholarship are moving is Eichrodt's designation of Fosdick's book as the "obituary" of nineteenth century critical study.

((See Book Review on Fosdick's Understanding the Bible by W. Eichrodt in JBL, Vol LXV, Part II, June 1946, pp. 205-217)))