1/17.1.4

The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow, edited by Harold R. Willoughby (Chicago: University of Chicago Press) 1947. Reviewed by H. H. Rowley in Theology Today, April, 1948 (pp. 122-126.)

p. 123 In the Old Testament parts of the book there is frequent reference to Wellhausen, who comes in for a good deal of castigation. Many of that scholar's positions are no longer held, and in particular our age is not dominated by the evolutionary and Hegelian ideas which were fashionable in his day and which dictated the ushiy ii Domed presuppositions with which he approached his work. The reviewer differs strongly from many of the positions taken by Wellhausen and his school. Yet he is so conscious that he is a child of his own day that he has no heart to blame Wellhausen for being the child of his, and recognizes a debt to Wellhausen, despite deep differences from him. Moreover, he shares Bowman's view with which some of the other authors disagree that while Wellhausen's view of the religious development of Israel cannot stand, his analysis and dating of the sources of the Pentateuch in broad outline are still valid. He is aware that there is a Scandinavian group which believes that the literary criticism of Wellhausen has been dealt a mortal blow by the school which emphasizes the importance of oral tradition - a school which is poles assunder from Cassuto, who is prematurely hailed in the present volume as the slayer of the dragon. From within Scandinavia Mowinckel, in his Prophecy and Tradition, has now sought to exercise a balanced influence. Yet a third aspirant for the throne of Wellhausen is Professor E. Robertson, who, in a series of articles in the Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, has outlined another theory of the origin of the Pentateuch.

No rival theory is likely to displace Wellhausen's if it merely deals piecemeal with

this or that element of his view.

ininoes of Truch toko is ik nigadra 797 (Liveli) kumike icaematus, iridas jēkanā