

whom they claimed to be written and that they are entirely true. If we do not accept the historical reliability of the Old Testament the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ is involved, and eventually the declension of faith that starts here leads to denial of the super-natural Christ and to apostasy from His clear teachings.

It is slightly over 200 years since Astruc first suggested that we could divide the book of Genesis into interwoven documents and tell what was originally in each of them. From this small beginning developed the whole attitude of the higher criticism toward the Old Testament. Theories were advanced, dividing the book into various alleged sources, and holding the general assumption that few, if any, of these sources were very reliable. This was partly the result of the generally sceptical attitude toward all ancient history which was characteristic of the critical school of about 1800. For a time all early Roman history was considered to be entirely legendary. As time went on, this sceptical attitude toward ancient history was largely given up, but in the case of the Old Testament it was maintained longer, because of its union with the theory of evolution, and with denial that God has actually revealed Himself to human beings.

This denial of the historical dependability of the Old Testament was extended to the New Testament, and then to the great doctrines contained in the New Testament. It is one of the primary roots of the modernism that is now so prevalent.

NEW LIGHT ON THE HISTORICAL RELIABILITY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

During the past century and a half much new evidence has come to light bearing on the historicity of the Old Testament. Most of this is from archeology.

Sometimes an archeological discovery has seemed, at first sight, to present a direct contradiction of a Biblical narrative. An interesting instance of this was found in connection with the fifth chapter of Daniel. Nowhere do we