

Page 25

¹ e.g. Lods., op. cit., 152, who likens the effort to reconstruct the patriarchal age from the Genesis traditions to an attempt to reconstruct the age of Jesus from traditions no older than St. Louis or Francis I.

Page 19

¹ I refuse to document this statement. To do so would in honour oblige me to a debate with the books in question, which would be beside the point here. I do not necessarily refer in particular to any of the works listed in n.⁶ p. 18.

Page 25

² Once more, I must beg leave not to document this statement.

Nor does it in general alater the essentially sceptical evaluation of the early traditions.⁴

⁴ Lods, op. cit., 151-162; Olmstead, op. cit., 194 f, are good examples.

Page 17

³ . . A. Lods, Israel: from the Beginnings to the Middle of the Eighth Century, trans. by S. H. Hooke (London, Routledge, 1932);

Page 25

³ Lods, op. cit., 251-253 who, although making use of a mass of archaeological data, still describes the religion of the pre-Mosaic Hebrews as 'a polydaemonism tinged with polytheism' or a polydaemonism 'moving towards polytheism'.

Page 28

Yet the feeling cannot be resisted that, right or wrong, the reconstruction has not been achieved on the grounds of sound historical method. The doctrine of Scripture appears as a deus ex machina to solve the problem. The problem is thus removed from the sphere of the historian into a realm where the historian as historian may not enter.