

This statement, as is true of all redacted statements, may be overly general or simplified. But my feeling is that this definition is not misleading and accurately portrays the thinking of many modern critics towards the canon of the Old Testament and its origin. Some will give more force to a cultic motif, some less. Others may emphasize covenant and kingship, etc. But all are in the broad outline and confines of this statement and apart from our entrenched orthodoxy, none will suggest or allow a supernatural source for the canon and/or its content.

### 3. Implications of the Theory

Without a long presentation we may summarize the implications of the theory, so far as the Old Testament goes, on this line:

a. The old Testament is purely a human book in both origin and ideal.

b. The redemptive plan in the Old Testament is evolved religiously to meet a national consciousness.

c. The esteem given the Old Testament among the Jews is best seen as a step towards national and ethnic solidarity.

d. Retention of the O.T. by the church is paradoxical and inconsistent. Why should a spiritual people need a work that justifies national aspirations?

e. The church is not the fulfillment of Judaism and the covenants but on the whole is more antithetical to both.

f. The regard of the New Testament writers for the Old Testament merely indicates how little they understood of their new position and history. Most of them were still under the rabbinic influence and so hopelessly provincial in world view and exegesis.

The foregoing statements may appear severe but they are the implications of the critical theory of the canon. There has been a strain of scholars throughout our history that has argued to the effect that we could concede the Old Testament and maintain the New. But there is no such possible stand.