

ARTICLE II.

SKETCHES OF PENTATEUCH CRITICISM.

BY REV. SAMUEL IVES CURTISS, D.D., PROFESSOR IN CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

II. — CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICS.

THE first appearance of constructive criticism was in the age of Louis XIV. It cannot, however, be regarded as an outgrowth of an intellectual activity which was fostered by the grand monarch. While he sought to surround his reign with a halo of glory, there was only one theme — himself — which could secure his patronage for men of letters. Such patronage was repressive of all independent research, and the censorship of the press imposed a check on the publication of all opinions which were not approved by the literary magnates of the court.¹

This criticism, however, was favored by the dominant philosophy of the period, that of Des Cartes (b. 1596; d. 1650). A fundamental principle of this philosophy — a *sine qua non* — was doubt, the tearing down of all that was accepted and traditional that there might be a building up.² Des Cartes had attended the best Jesuit school³ of that age, and had pursued his studies for eight and a half years with

¹ Cf. The Knickerbocker, New York, 1862, pp. 148-157; Kitchin, A History of France, Oxford, 1877, Vol. iii. pp. 160 f.

² Cf. Wallace in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, New York, 1878, Vol. vii. p. 122; Kuno Fischer, Geschichte der neuen Philosophie, Mannheim, 1865, Vol. i. p. 207; Erdmann, Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie, Berlin, 1870, Vol. ii. p. 11: "Dass in der Forderung *de omnibus dubitandum*, von der Descartes ausdrücklich sagt, sie sey nicht im skeptischen Interesse als das Ziel, sondern als das Mittel anzusehen, um zum Ziel zu kommen, jener Protest gegen alles bisher Gültige enthalten ist . . . der sich bei dem epochemachenden System finden werde, ist klar. Durch die Erfüllung jenes Postulats wird der Boden geebnet, auf dem das neue Gebäude errichtet werden soll."

³ La Flèche in Anjou, which was founded by Henry IV. as a training school for the French nobility.

diligence, only to become persuaded of the unsatisfactory character of all his attainments, and to be fired with the determination to seek truth for himself.

It was his principles, then, that doubtless gave birth to constructive criticism. Its three representatives felt constrained, with one exception, to admit the accuracy of Hobbes's Peyrere's, and Spinoza's conclusions in denying the Mosaic authorship; but they were not satisfied to rest with this negative result. Following the example of Des Cartes, they sought to secure a more positive conclusion. They tore down the old edifice of tradition that they might rebuild it in accordance with the demands of the scientific criticism of that time, and that they might still present nothing to the theological world which, in their opinion, should be subversive of the Christian faith. Although the medium of this criticism was the French language, we can hardly speak of it as constituting a French school, as we now speak of a German and Dutch school of Old Testament critics. Three men appeared between 1638 and 1766 who wrote in the French language; but they do not seem to have left any appreciable impress upon the theological thinking of France.

1. *Simon* (b. 1638; d. 1712).

The most marked critic of the century, who is sometimes called the father of biblical introduction, is Richard Simon, who was born at Dieppe.¹ There were two things which doubtless had a very decided influence in giving direction to the natural tendency of his mind. One was the Cartesian philosophy, to which we have already alluded, and the other was the Oratory (*Oratoire*), where that philosophy found a

¹ Interesting and valuable materials from many sources concerning his life and times have been gathered together by Bernus, *Richard Simon et son Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament, La Critique Biblique au Siècle de Louis XIV.*, Lausanne, 1869, pp. 142. There is also a pleasant sketch of his life by Masson in the *Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record*, London, 1866, Vol. ix. pp. 249-274. One of the best discussions of his life and critical opinions is said to be by Graf in *Beiträge zu den theologischen Wissenschaften*, Jena, 1851, Vol. i. pp. 158-242. To this latter work I have not had access.

home. The congregation of the Oratory was founded at Paris in 1611. The object of this foundation was to elevate the intellectual and religious character of the priesthood, and thus interpose a barrier to the continuous and disquieting progress of Protestantism. The Oratory was composed of pious priests, who were especially devoted to a conscientious performance of the duties of the sacerdotal life, and who were to cultivate science less for science's sake than for the services which it would enable them to render to their fellow-creatures."¹

Richard Simon began his studies at Dieppe, in the college of his native city, under the direction of the fathers of the Oratory, who were connected with a branch of the main congregation of Paris. Subsequently he spent one year in study under the Jesuit fathers in Rouen, but was compelled to leave for lack of means. Later he attended the Sorbonne in Paris, where he devoted himself especially to the study of the Sacred Scriptures. At the same time he pursued Hebrew and Syriac with great diligence.

When he was twenty-four years of age he entered the Oratory at Paris. Here he had access to a magnificent library. Here he studied the Bible in the original languages with one of the fathers. Here he read the commentaries of the principal church fathers and the works of the abler critics. Here he devoted himself to the Arabic language. Even in such a liberal congregation as the Oratory the un-

¹ Bernus in his *Richard Simon, etc.*, just quoted, gives the following passage from Perraud, *L'Oratoire de France au xvii^e et au xix^e siècle*, Paris, 1866, p. 39, taken from the papal bull of Paul V, which states the aim of this community: "L'Oratoire devait se composer 'de prêtres pieux, spécialement appliqués à remplir avec toute la perfection possible les devoirs de la vie sacerdotale et se dévouant à toutes les fonctions qui appartiennent en propre à l'état de la prêtrise. . . . Vivre ensemble dans une société soumise à des règles, et dans un esprit de continuelle humilité, se conduire comme les serviteurs du Tout-Puissant, en cherchant par-dessus tout à réaliser dans toutes leurs actions la perfection de l'état sacerdotal, demeurer soumis aux évêques pour les travaux du saint ministère, s'appliquer à la formation des clercs et leur faire cultiver la science, moins pour la science elle-même que pour les services qu'elle permet de rendre aux prochains.'"

usual character of his studies provoked criticism, and he was accused to the father Senault, who was the general superior, of reading heretical books, such as Walton's Polyglott¹ and the Critici Sacri, but, thanks to his friend, father Berthard, he was soon cleared. 9

After a comparatively brief absence as a Professor of Philosophy in the college of Juilly, he was recalled by Senault to make a catalogue of the Oriental manuscripts in the chief house of the order in Paris. He spent several years on this work, and improved the opportunity to read most of the Oriental and rabbinical works in the library. But he did not only devote himself to books, he also made the acquaintance of Malebranche, to whom he gave lessons in the Oriental languages; and of the famous Jew, Raphel Levy, who was known after his conversion as Louis de Bysance, to whom he gave religious instruction, that he might prepare him for Christian baptism.

In 1670 he became a priest. Six years later the project was formed for a new version of the Bible by the Protestants. He was by far the best qualified to make a translation of the Old Testament. At this time he prepared a plan for a translation of the Bible, with some notes which could serve for Protestants and Catholics. This plan was to exclude all dogmatic and edifying notes. While he did not execute this design, yet the way was thus prepared for his Critical History of the Old Testament. This book was in press two years afterwards, and had been approved by the official censor. The publisher, who was waiting for the king's consent that the volume might be dedicated to him, although Simon had received the assurance from the royal confessor that he should obtain permission, had sent out the preface and the table of contents to some foreign booksellers. An enemy of Simon's sent a copy of these to Bossuet, the tutor of the dauphin. He was thunderstruck when he read: "Moses

¹ For a description of this admirable work, in which nine languages are used, see Horne, An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, London, 1869 (12th ed.), Vol. iv. pp. 715-717.

cannot be the author of all which is in the books [of the Pentateuch] that are attributed to him."¹ He at once ordered the publisher to do nothing further with the book until it had been carefully examined. The final result of this examination was an order that the whole edition should be destroyed. This order was carried into effect, although at least six copies, two of which had been sent to England, were rescued. Meanwhile the learned world was very curious to see this work. The celebrated publisher Elzevier sought to secure a reprint; but Simon, who was considering a proposition from Bossuet to print an edition of the work from which the objectionable matter should be excluded, would not consent. Nevertheless, Elzevier secured a written copy of one of the books which was sent to England, and made a reprint from that.² This was translated into Latin and English, but was full of errors. The proposition which Bossuet made, that Simon should prepare an expurgated edition of his *Critical History of the Old Testament*, although the author cheerfully professed his readiness to carry it out, was never realized. In 1685 Leers of Rotterdam reprinted the work³ from one of the remaining copies of the French edition. It was furnished

¹ "Chap. v. Preuve des additions et autres changemens qui ont été faits dans l'Ecriture, et en particulier dans le Pentateuch. Moïse ne peut être l'Auteur de tout ce qui est dans les Livres qui lui sont attribués. Divers exemples."

² In order to secure entrance for it into France, several copies were also published by Elzevier under the following fictitious title: *Histoire de la religion des Juifs et de leur établissement en Espagne et autres parties de l'Europe, ou ils se sont retirés après la destruction de Jérusalem, par Rabbi Moses Levy, Amsterdam, P. de la Faille, 1880.*

³ My copy, which is 10 × 8 inches, pp. xl + 667 + xlv + 48, and thus has 667 pages, not including the index, the table of contents, etc., which are not paged, has the following title-page: *HISTOIRE CRITIQUE DU VIEUX TESTAMENT, Par Le R. P. RICHARD SIMON Prêtre de la Congregation de l'Oratoire. Nouvelle Edition, et qui est la premiere imprimée sur la Copie de Paris, augmentée d'une Apologie generale et de plusieurs Remarques Critiques. On a deplus ajouté à cette Edition une Table des matieres, et tout ce qui a été imprimé jusqu'à present à l'occasion de cette HISTOIRE CRITIQUE. A AMSTERDAM, Pour la COMPAGNIE DES LIBRAIRES. MDCLXXXV. Quérand, La Franco Littéraire, ou Dictionnaire Bibliographique, Tome Neuvième, Paris, 1838, p. 159, says very truly: "Cette édition doit être la même que celle que Nicéron cite sous la rubrique, Amsterdam, 1685, avec un titre un peu différent, on ne sait pourquoi."*

with a special preface, besides that of the author, and also with additional notes. Although Simon did not acknowledge that they were from his hand, yet there was no mistaking that they were by him. While it might be of interest to consider other events in his career, let us turn to his special views respecting the Pentateuch.

1. We find him holding in regard to it, as well as with reference to the rest of the Bible, that "the truths contained in the Sacred Scriptures are infallible and of divine authority, since they have come directly from God."¹ We are at once reminded by the form of this statement of a distinction which is now commonly made by those who hold that the Scriptures are the infallible rule, as distinguished from such as affirm that they contain the infallible rule, of faith and practice. But it is certain that Simon has no such distinction in mind; for he holds that a theologian of the faculty of Paris occupies dangerous ground when he affirms that "all that is in the Bible is not equally divine and canonical." He says: "This theologian has maintained that the writers of the sacred books have not really been inspired by God, except in that which appertains to faith, or which has some relation or necessary connection with it. In regard to other things which are contained in these same books, he holds that we ought not to recognize a more particular inspiration of God than in all the other works which have been composed by persons of piety. But aside from the fact that this sentiment can have very dangerous consequences, it is entirely opposed to the doctrine of the New Testament, which does not recognize anything that is not prophetic and veritably inspired in all Scripture. This is why I have thought that I ought to establish principles which attribute to prophets or to persons directed by the Spirit of God all that is contained in the sacred books, even to changes, only excepting those which

¹ Histoire Critique, p. 1: "On ne peut pas douter, que les veritez contenuës dans l'Ecriture Sainte ne soient infallibles et d'une autorité divine, puis qu'elles viennent immédiatement de Dieu, qui ne s'est servi en cela du ministere des hommes, que pour être ses Interprètes."

have arisen through the length of time or the negligence of the copyists.”¹

2. It was not to be expected that Simon should accept the traditional view of the Jews as to the Pentateuch. They not only held that the five books of the law were entirely by Moses,—some of them even maintaining that he wrote the account of his own death, while he wept, by a spirit of prophecy,²—but also that God dictated the things contained in the Pentateuch to Moses, not even allowing him to write by his own authority a single verse of the law. So rigid was their adherence to this belief, that they excluded from Paradise any one who presumed to hold the contrary.³

3. This theory had been essentially shattered for him even by Roman Catholic scholars. While he did not admit that the Jews had maliciously corrupted the Scriptures,⁴ he felt that he was shielded by the example of the Roman Catholic scholar Morinus, who was also a member of the Oratory, and who had shown the great number of readings, and the numerous errors which had slipped into the Bible by means of the copyist.⁵ This, of course, was a terrible shock to those who maintained that even the accents were inspired,⁶ and that the Scriptures were written in the finest forms of literary

¹ *Histoire Critique*, Preface de L'Auteur, pp. [3–4].

² Cf. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Vol. xli. p. 8, note 1.

³ *Histoire Critique*, p. 40.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁶ *Johannis Buxtorfii, P[ater], Tiberias Sive Commentaria Masorethics Triplex Historicus, Didacticus, Criticus, ad illustrationem Operis Biblici*, p. 17 f., where he gives quotations from the Rabbins referring the vowels and the accents back to Moses, e.g. “Sed puncta et accentus et vocales soni, sunt doctrina Mosis à monte Sinai,” etc.—*Johannis Buxtorfii Thesaurus Grammaticus Linguae Sanctae Hebraeae*, Basilea, 1609, pp. 59–69. This theory received its death blow from Cappellus (b. 1585; d. 1658), *Arcanum Punctuationis, Amstelodami*, 1698, pp. 1–979. The first edition, however, was published at Leyden in 1624. In this he is said to have held against Buxtorf senior (b. 1564; d. 1629) that the vowel-points and the accents were not an integral part of the Hebrew language, and that they were added to the text of the books of the Old Testament by Jewish grammarians, at a time when the language had long since ceased to be spoken. Buxtorf junior (b. 1599; d. 1664) answered this in his *Tractatus de Punctorum Vocalium, et Accentuum, in Libris Veteris Testamenti Hebraicis, Origine Antiquitate, et Autoritate: oppositus Arcano Punctuationis Revelatio*. Basileae, 1648, pp. 1–437, and was moved by a subsequent work of Cappellus to

excellence by virtue of their inspiration.¹ Now the most conservative critics, who hold to a kind of verbal inspiration, cease to make any such claims for the text of the Scriptures. While holding to a divine original, they admit the errors of copyists and the human element with respect to style.

4. But Simon went farther than this, and advanced a principle which is urged with great force by the critics against those apologists for the Sacred Scriptures who deny that there can be any real discrepancies or mistakes in the Bible. He says, after quoting such passages as Deut. xxxiv. ; Gen. xii. 6 ; xxxvi. 31, "I know that replies can be made respecting most of these passages and certain others which it would be useless to adduce ; but a little reflection will show that these replies are more subtle than true."² Simon here indicates the weakness of all replies to the objections of the critics made on the basis of the method which meets each objection singly as it arises, until all are disposed of, instead of refuting the philosophical generalizations which have been made by the observance and classification of many phenomena. Hence systems of objections are to be refuted, rather than single ones.

5. Simon clearly and definitely holds that Moses could not have been the author of the Pentateuch. The reasons assigned are not dissimilar to those now urged, although they

publish his *Anticritica seu Vindiciae Veritatis Hebraicae : adversus Ludovici Cappelli Criticam quam vocat Sacram, ejusque Defensionem : quibus Sacrosanctae Editionis Bibliorum Hebraicae autoritas, integritas, et sinceritas, a varis ejus strophis, et sophismatis, etc.*, Basilea, 1653, pp. 1-1026. For the complete literature of the subject, cf. Siegfried in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, Leipzig, 1876, vol. iii. pp. 668-676.

¹ See Glassii *Philologia Sacra*, Lipsiae, 1713, where (in the preface, p. 17) he quotes Gerhard, as expressing his own views as follows : "Forma externa Scripturae sacrae (inquis) est, tum idioma linguae Hebraeae, quo vetus ; et Graecae, quo novum perscriptum est Instrumentum : tum sermonis ac styli, quo in Scriptura Spiritus S. utitur, proprietates, imo singularitas, simplicitatem et majestatem, miraculo vere divino, conjunctam habens. Sermonis genus, quo Scriptura est exarata, est simplex, nullam redolens humanam et fucam eloquentiam, interim tamen est angustum, et ad percellendos hominum animos maxime efficax," etc.

² *Histoire Critique*, p. 32.

are not so elaborately stated. (1) It is nowhere asserted in the Pentateuch that Moses wrote the five books. Since the term "law" is not equivalent to Pentateuch, the passages which affirm that Moses wrote this law do not necessarily involve anything more than that Moses wrote certain parts of the Pentateuch. This he establishes by an analysis of the passages bearing on the subject. He says that Ex. xxiv. 12 cannot indicate the whole Pentateuch, because the Israelites were forty years after this time in the desert, and Moses could not yet have written an account of the events which occurred during those forty years. He maintains that we cannot conclude anything else from this passage than that Moses received from God upon the mountain the tables of the law, the ordinances, and the commandments. It is not said, here or anywhere else, that God dictated to Moses the history of creation, the genealogies, or anything related in Genesis. He therefore limits the reference in this passage to the Book of the Covenant (Ex. xix.-xxiii.). The next passage which is applied by the Jews to the entire Pentateuch is Deut. xxvii. 2, 3. Simon says that this does not indicate anything more than the twelve curses; for it is not affirmed generally, "Thou shalt write all the words of the law," but "Thou shalt write all the words of *this* law," and at the beginning of the same chapter Moses and the elders are ordered to observe exactly all which is commanded them this day, and this is called the law in the following verses. With reference to Deut. xxxi. 9 he argues that it cannot be quoted to prove that Moses wrote the entire Pentateuch, but simply the Book of Deuteronomy, which is a repetition of the other books of the law. He adds that it is not even true that Moses wrote all of Deuteronomy, since there are facts and certain expressions which cannot be attributed to him:¹ (2) "The diversity of style which we find in the books of Moses seems also to prove that the same writer is not the author. We sometimes see there a style that is very abrupt, and sometimes very expanded, although the diversity of the

¹ *Histoire Critique*, p. 41 ff.

subject does not require it.”¹ How this opinion, which probably rested on critical sensibility rather than on critical analysis, was wrought out by a subsequent critic we shall see a little farther on. (3) Leading the way for more modern critics, he finds many repetitions which render it unquestionable to his mind that Moses could not have been the author of the Pentateuch. Making all allowance for the great number of passages where the order is reversed, because the Hebrews are not particular about order, he says: “Can we imagine that one historian has written the history of the creation of man, with the little order which exists in the first chapters of Genesis, where the same things are repeated many times, without any method, and as a digression?”² He speaks of the repetition, in the second chapter of Genesis, of the creation of woman, and adduces the deluge, which is so often quoted by critics, where he remarks that the length of the time that the waters were upon the earth is given differently.³ (4) The manner in which the history is there composed is different than that which we should expect from Moses. He says that he does not refer to those passages, which some quote, where Moses is mentioned in the third person and his praises are recounted, because Caesar speaks of himself in the third person,⁴ as well as Josephus,⁵ who even utters his own eulogy.⁶ But he says, if one regards with any degree of attention the whole body of the Pentateuch, he will recognize this diversity of writers.

6. Simon's theory of the composition of the Pentateuch is as follows:⁷ “In well regulated states, principally in the

¹ *Histoire Critique*, p. 39.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 35, 36.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 34: “L'Histoire du Deluge, par exemple, est embarrassée, principalement dans ce qui regarde le tems que les eaux demeurèrent sur la terre.”

⁴ See his Commentaries, where he speaks of himself constantly in the third person.

⁵ *De Bello Jud.*, Lib. ii. Cap. xx. sq.

⁶ Simon has perhaps in mind such passages as the following: *Vita 2*, *ἔτι δ' ἔρα παῖς ὢν, περὶ τεσσαρεσκαδέκατον ἔτος, διὰ τὸ φιλογράμματος ὑπὸ πάντων ἐκπαιδευμένη, συνιδόντων αἰετῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν τῆς πόλεως πρῶτων ὑπὲρ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐμοῦ περὶ τῶν νομίμων ἀκριβέστερόν τι γινῶναι.* Cf. *De Bello Jud.*, Lib. iii. 7 and 8.

⁷ *Histoire Critique*, pp. 15, 16; cf. Preface p. [2].

Orient, there were always certain persons who took care to put in writing the more important affairs of the republic, and to preserve the acts in the archives destined for this purpose. We learn from the books of Esther [vi. 1], Ezra [vi. 1], Josephus, and Diodorus Siculus [Lib. ii. xxxii. 4], that this custom was formerly observed among the Persians. The Egyptians, among whom Moses had been educated, had priests, to whom they gave the name of scribes, or writers of sacred things, because their principal business consisted in writing out that which had respect to the state of religion, and then of publishing what was necessary."¹

And now comes the weak point in the armor, against which, as we shall see, the next critic directs a well-aimed shaft: "It would appear that Moses, who had been trained at the court of Egypt, as we have said, and who united in himself all the qualities of a perfect legislator, established from the first commencement of the republic this kind of scribes, whom we may call public or divine writers to distinguish them from the particular writers, who did not ordinarily engage in writing the history of their times, except from motives of interest."² He calls these writers prophets, because they were directed by the Spirit of God, and because Peter calls all Scripture prophecy (2 Pet. i. 21), and adds: "In supposing these public writers, we attribute to them those things which have respect to the history of those books, and to Moses everything which pertains to the law and the ordinances, and this is that which the Scriptures call the law of Moses. So we can say, in this sense, that all the Pentateuch is truly from Moses, because those who made the collection lived in his time, and what they did was by his order."³ Assuming that there were such prophets or scribes all through the Old Testament history, and that we should not inquire too narrowly who the author of any given book was,⁴ he finds

¹ Diodorus Siculus, i. 44: *περὶ ὧν πάντων οἱ μὲν ἱερεῖς εἶχον ἀναγραφὰς ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς βίβλοις ἐκ παλαιῶν χρόνων ἀεὶ τοῖς διαδόχοις παραδεδομέναις.*

² *Histoire Critique*, p. 16.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁴ *Histoire Critique*, p. 2: "C'est pourquoi on ne doit pas rechercher avec trop de curiosité, qui ont été les Auteurs particuliers de chaque Livre de la Bible. Il

the following advantages in this theory with respect to the Pentateuch and other parts of the Old Testament: (1) "By this principle we can give a solid reason for the additions and changes which are found in the sacred books, without diminishing their authority, since the authors of these additions and changes were veritable prophets, directed by the Spirit of God. This is why these changes which they were able to introduce into the ancient acts have the same authority as the rest of the Bible."¹ He holds, however, that we should be on our guard against multiplying these additions or amendments, as Spinoza and others have done. On the other hand, he says that we ought not to deny them absolutely, or explain them away in too subtle a manner and in one which is not consistent with good sense, because it is necessary that these additions should have the same authority as the rest of the Scriptures; otherwise we should be obliged to say that all that is in the Bible is not equally divine and canonical.² (2) "The same principle touching the public writers or prophets serves to afford a reason for the many expressions which are found in the books of Moses, and seems to indicate, at the same time, that he was not the author. The scribes or public writers who were of his time, and who described those ancient events, have spoken of Moses in the third person, and have employed many other similar expressions, which cannot indeed have been by Moses, but which have no less authority, because they can only be attributed to some persons whom Moses ordered to put in writing the more important events of his time."³ (3) "[This principle] is of great use in solving an infinitude of very difficult questions which they are accustomed to make touching the chronology and the genealogies. For it is certain that these books are only abridgments of other more extended acts, and that they have given to the people only that which they judged necessary to publish for their instruction. . . . It is

suffit, selon la maxime de St. Gregoire Pape, que ces Livres ayent été écrits par des Prophetes."

¹ Ibid. Preface De L'Auteur, p. [2].

² Ibid. p. [3].

³ Ibid., p. [4].

easy, therefore, to reconcile by this means many apparent contradictions which seem to be in these same genealogies where they appear in different passages of Scripture.”¹

7. He also offers another suggestion, which serves to explain the lack of order which we find in certain narratives of Scripture. He says: “They formerly wrote these books upon small leaves, which they were satisfied more frequently to roll one upon another around a small stick, without sewing them together. It has happened that, as there was not enough care in preserving the order of these ancient leaves or rolls, the arrangement of the matter has become somewhat changed.”²

8. While he is the only one, so far as I am aware, who has presumed to make such a conjecture, he has broached another theory which finds favor among the most recent critics: “It would seem, indeed, that those who have joined together the ancient memoirs in order to form the body of canonical books which remain to us, have not taken pains to retrench many synonymous terms which they have found in their copies, and which even might have been added for greater clearness.”²

Simon’s position in regard to the composition of the Pentateuch was quite as conservative as that of some of the more orthodox German critics.³ But his theory in regard to inspired prophets, who under Moses’ orders recorded passing events which were embodied with the legislative part from Moses’ own pen, was not destined to endure. The destructive, rather than the constructive, elements in his theories were influential in moulding the opinions of later critics.

2. *Leclerc*⁴ (b. 1657; d. 1736).

Jean Leclerc is of importance for our sketch not so much

¹ *Ibid.*, p. [5]; cf. pp. 5, 35.

² *Ibid.* Preface De L’Auteur, p. [6.]

³ See my Article, Delitzsch on the Pentateuch, in the *Presbyterian Review*, New York, 1882, pp. 559-562.

⁴ Sketches of his life are found in the Preface to his *Commentary on the Pentateuch, Genesis sive Mosis Prophetæ Liber Primus, etc.* Tubingæ, 1733, [pp. 1-8]. Hoefer *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*, Paris, 1883, Vol. xxix. pp. 196-200, etc.

on account of his posthumous influence on the course of criticism, as in forming a connecting link between Simon and Astruc. He was descended from a French family, and was born in Geneva. His early advantages were of a high order. His thirst for knowledge found relief in the fine libraries of his father and uncle. Through the perusal of the works of his great uncle he became a pronounced Arminian. He pursued the study of philosophy under Chouet the Cartesian. After studying theology for three years he went to London, where he preached in the Wallonian church; but as the climate was unfavorable to his health he passed to Holland, where he became acquainted with Limborch, the most celebrated Arminian theologian of this period, and also with Locke. In 1684 he was made a Professor of Belles-Lettres, of Philosophy, and of Hebrew; and after the death of Limborch (1712) he was appointed Professor of Ecclesiastical History at the College of the Remonstrants in Amsterdam.

His critical views respecting the Pentateuch are contained in a work called, "Opinions of some Theologians in Holland upon the Critical History of the Old Testament composed by Father Richard Simon of the Oratory; where in remarking the Faults of this Author we give Various Principles which are useful for understanding the Sacred Scriptures."¹ This work is divided into twenty letters, and opens in the following informal way: "You wish to know, sir, what our friends say here about the Critical History of Father Simon, a new edition of which has just appeared at Rotterdam. I can tell you, in general, that they speak of this book as of most others, and that nobody of my acquaintance altogether finds fault with it or approves it. Most say that they can place it in the rank of good books, because they find in it many remarks which are curious and useful for

¹ *Sentimens de Quelques Theologiens De Hollande sur L'Histoire Critique Du Vieux Testament, composée par le P. Richard Simon de l'Oratoire. Où en remarquant les fautes de cet Auteur, on donne divers Principes utiles pour l'intelligence de l'Ecriture Sainte. Amsterdam, 1685. This volume is 6½ × 4 inches, and has 457 pages.*

the understanding of Sacred Scripture; although Father Simon has indeed advanced some things in it which they do not approve, and has omitted many others which appear to them to be essential to his design. Three of our friends have met every day for some weeks to read this work together, after each had read it alone, and as they have done me the honor to receive me into their conferences, I can give you a sufficiently good account of what they have said; and they have not suffered anything of importance to pass without examining it with care."¹ Under this representation of the views of three friends, which was perhaps a literary mask, he criticises Simon with an unsparing hand.² He accuses him of inapposite quotations, of a failure to give his authorities, of repetitions—the substance of some of his views being given in the preface which are more extended in the body of the work. He banteringly suggests that there are quite as many repetitions in Simon's book, and quite as much lack of arrangement, as in the Pentateuch. He attacks Simon's theory of inspired prophets who kept the annals of the Hebrew republic from the time of Moses, and of a confusion arising from the custom of rolling leaves around a stick without sewing them together. He shows that Simon has said "it is probable," or "it has the appearance," that Moses constituted such writers, when it is only possible. Indeed, he seemingly deals this favorite theory of Simon a death-blow. He is not more conservative, however, than his opponent. Although a Protestant, his views of inspiration and of the formation of the canon are far more free than those of his Catholic antagonist.

1. He utterly rejects the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch in its present form.³ While he holds that certain parts of the five books are pre-Mosaic and Mosaic, he holds quite

¹ Sentimens, pp. 1, 2.

² Leclerc says, e.g. Sentimens, p. 3: "On y remarquerait une extrême confusion dans les matières et dans les pensées. On y trouveroit mille conjectures peu vraisemblables, mille faux raisonnemens, mille chimères."

³ Sentimens, p. 116: "Voilà, Monsieur, des marques assez sensibles que Moïse n'a pas écrit le Livre de la Genèse, au moins tel que nous l'avons. Quand

as strongly that others are post-Mosaic.¹ He says these consist not only in some words which might have slipped into the margin of the text, or have been inserted to explain some passage, but also in entire periods and long chapters.

2. He answers the objection "that Jesus Christ and the apostles often cite the Pentateuch under the name of Moses, and that their authority ought to be of greater weight than all of our conjectures," much as a modern critic would. He says: "Jesus Christ and his apostles not having come into the world to teach criticism to the Jews, it is not astonishing that they should speak according to the common opinion. It was of little consequence to them whether this was Moses or another, provided that the history was veritable; and as the common opinions were not prejudicial to piety, they were at little trouble to disabuse the Jews."² He illustrates this by the use which the apostles made of the Septuagint, saying that they cite it "not because they believe it is always perfectly conformed to the original, but because, as it did not contain anything contrary to piety, it was not necessary to scandalize those who regarded it with respect in refusing to make use of it."³

3. No modern critic has given a better, or at least a more plausible, answer to the question: "If Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch, whence came this so ancient opinion?" While he recognizes the difficulty, and even says, "We cannot reply to this question," yet he affirms that this inability is merely due to the fact "that the history of the sacred books not being sufficiently known to us, we cannot satisfy our curiosity as we would wish." But he offers this suggestion: "It would seem that at the beginning they called these books 'the law of Moses' only because it was inserted in them; for they contain more than the

on ne trouveroit aucune chose dans les Livres suivans, qui ne pût être de Moïse, il ne s'ensuivroit pas qu'ils en fussent véritablement, puis qu'étant du même Auteur que celui de la Genese, si ce dernier, tel que nous l'avons, n'est pas de Moïse, les autres n'en sont pas non plus." etc., in regard to other passages in the Pentateuch.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 120.

² *Ibid.*, p. 126.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 126

law, 'sed denominatio fiebat a potiori parte'; and they have extended this manner of speaking as if it signified that Moses was the only author of these books." He finds a support for his conjecture in the fact "that there is no title before the Pentateuch [in the Hebrew text] which attributes it to Moses, as is seen before the writings of the prophets, by which the author of each book is known."¹

4. He rejects Spinoza's theory that Ezra was the author of the Pentateuch, as appears from the following quotation: "The Samaritans, as all the world knows, and as Father Simon has remarked, have the five books of the Old Testament in the ancient Hebrew characters, in the place of which the Jews have changed these characters, and have substituted for them those which they used in Chaldea. . . . One cannot conceive how these people, who were sworn enemies to the Jews, would be willing to borrow the law from them, and so it is not credible that they made their copy from that of Ezra."²

5. For these reasons, as well as on account of the accurate knowledge which the author of the Pentateuch in certain passages betrays of Chaldea,³ he holds that the five books were brought into their present forms by "an Israelitish priest, whom they sent from Babylon to instruct the new inhabitants of Palestine concerning the manner in which they ought to serve God" (2 Kings xvii. 28). He thinks that this priest, either alone or aided by others, in order to break up the polytheism of the people of the country, undertook to give

¹ Sentimens, p. 127.

² Ibid., p. 128.

³ He says (Sentimens, p. 107), concerning Gen. ii. 11, 12: "Ces remarques semblent venir d'un Auteur qui a été en ce pais-là, c'est à dire, en Chaldée, . . . Il n'y a pas d'apparence que Moïse, qui ne s'étoit jamais fort éloigné de l'Egypte, eût tant de connoissance d'un pais assez éloigné, dans un temps où les voyages étoient fort rares et fort difficiles. Il y en a encore moins que Dieu lui ait révélé qu'il y avoit de l'or dans ce pais là, et que cet or étoit bon." The assumption that Moses could not have had the geographical knowledge presupposed in Genesis is quite without foundation. We have reason to believe that the Egyptians, whose country was the home of Shemites and Phoenicians, had a pretty thorough knowledge of Chaldea. Certainly there is no difficulty in believing that one who was "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" in the time of Ramses II, could have written all that Leclerc attributes to his Chaldean priest.

them a history of the creation of the world by one God alone, and an epitome of the history of the Jews, with the law from which "it appears that there is only one God, who is the one whom the Israelites adore."¹

These free opinions, although not all conflicting with the Mosaic authorship of those parts of the Pentateuch which are assigned to Moses and the historicity of the whole, brought much animadversion upon Leclerc, until he finally withdrew them in favor of the Mosaic authorship in the preface to his commentary on the Book of Genesis.

3. *Astruc* (b. 1684; d. 1766).

While the preceding critics, as we have seen, were theologians by profession,—one being a Roman Catholic priest, and the other a Protestant minister and theological professor,—Jean Astruc² was a layman. He was born in Languedoc. His father was a Protestant preacher, but soon after the birth of his son he became a Roman Catholic. The son devoted himself to the study of medicine, and in this manifested a truly scientific spirit. He rose rapidly in his profession, occupying various positions of honor, and serving as Professor of Medicine in Toulouse and Montpellier, until he reached the summit of his ambition in his appointment to the royal college of Paris. He was a voluminous writer, mostly of medical treatises, some of which were of a very high order of merit. When he was about seventy years of age, after he had had a literary career for fifty years, he published his *Conjectures upon the Original Memoirs which Moses seems to have used in composing the Book of Genesis*.³

¹ *Sentimens*, p. 129.

² Cf. Hoefcr, *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*, Paris, 1861, Vol. iii. pp. 486–488.

³ *Conjectures sur les Memoires Originiaux Dont il paroît que Moÿse s'est servi pour composer le Livre de la Genese. Avec des Remarques, qui appuient ou qui éclaircissent ces conjectures.* Avia Pieri lum peragro loca, nullius antè Trita solo. A Bruxelles, Chez Fricx, Imprimeur de Sa Majesté, vis-à-vis l'Eglise de la Madeleine. M.DCC.LIII. Avec Privelege et Approbation. The size of the volume is 6½ × 4 inches. This is a rare book, and is found in very few German university libraries. There is a copy at Leipzig, although there are said to be none at Erlangen and Berlin. The one which I have used, besides the copy at Leipzig,

The fear that the pretended free-thinkers of the time would misuse his work to degrade the authority of the Pentateuch kept him for some time from publishing it. His earnest desire not to be a stumbling-block in the way of true religion, and his readiness to withdraw his views at any time if they should be found erroneous, as well as the whole tone of his discussion, indicate a truly noble and conservative spirit. It would seem as though one could not read his book without being impressed with his sincerity and love of truth.¹

His position with reference to some of the preceding critics is best indicated by his own statements: "Spinoza, who in abusing the apparent disorder of these two histories [i.e. the marriage of the children of Judah and the abduction of Dinah] has taken upon himself to say² that 'all is written was kindly loaned me by my friend, the Rev. Alexander Robb, D.D., of Kingston, Jamaica.

¹ The following is part of the preface (*Avertissement*), which shows the spirit of the author: "Cet Ouvrage estoit composé depuis quelque tems, mais j'hésitois à le publier, dans la crainte que les pretendus Esprits-forts, qui cherchent, à s'étaier de tout, ne pussent en abuser pour diminuer l'autorité du Pentateuque. Un homme instruit, et trez zelé pour la Religion, à qui je l'ai communiqué, a dissipé mes scruples Sur son avis, j'ai donc pris le parti de donner cet Ouvrage, et de le soumettre au jugement des Personnes éclairées, dont j'écouterai les observations avec plaisir. Je proteste d'avance trez sincèrement, que si ceux qui ont droit d'en décider, et dont je dois respecter les décisions, trouvent mes conjectures ou fausses, ou dangereuses, je suis prêt à les abandoner, ou pour mieux dire, je les abandonne dès à present. Jamais la prévention pour mes idées ne prévaudra chez moi à l'amour de la Verité et de la Religion."

² Astruc, *Conjectures*, pp. 452, 453, refers to Spinoza's *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, cap. ix. He says that there was a French translation of the book printed in 1678, and entitled, *Reflexions curieuses d'un esprit des interessé, etc.* Spinoza in the chapter cited above, states the case as follows: "At non tantum hoc caput, sed totam Josephi et Jacobi historiam ex diversis historicis decerptam et descriptam esse necessario fatendum est, adeo parum sibi constare videmus. Cap. enim 47. Genes narrat quod Jahacob cum primum Pharahonem ducente Josephus salutavit, annos 130. natus erat, a quibus si auferantur viginti duo, quos propter Josephi absentiam in moerore transegit et praeterea septemdecim aetatis Josephi cum venderetur, et denique septem, quos propter Rachelem servivit, reperietur ipsum provecitissimae aetatis fuisse, octoginta scilicet et quatuor annorum, cum Leam in uxorem duceret et contra Dianam vix septem fuisse annorum, cum a Sechemo vim passa est, Simeon autem et Levi vix duodecim et undecim, cum totam illam civitatem depredati sunt, ejusque omnes eives gladio confecerunt," etc. See his *Opera Quae Sypersvnt Omnia*, Jenae, 1802, Vol. i. pp. 291, 292.

pell-mell in the five books of the Pentateuch; that neither history nor narration is in the right place; that there is no regard to time; and all that we read there has been gathered and put confusedly together.' His temerity is not even confined to this point. All the world knows that he has carried it so far as to maintain 'that it was Ezra who composed the five books of the Pentateuch, that he did not put the last hand on the narratives contained in them,' In order to prove this, he has collected in the ninth chapter of his book different passages of the Pentateuch, and in particular of Genesis, which he is compelled to abuse in order to establish this strange paradox.

"In this he has been anticipated by Thomas Hobbes,¹ who in a work written against religion and against the clergy had some time before attempted to establish the same sentiment, and has made use of the same passages; and by Isaac de la Peyrere,² who in order to maintain that there were men before Adam has attempted to discredit the authority of Genesis, which is contrary to him, in advancing that Moses was not the author, and has alleged in proof the same citations.

"It seems that this has been the malady of the last century. M. Leclerc, who published in 1685 against *L'Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament* of M. Simon a collection of letters under the title of *Sentimens de Quelques Theologiens de Hollande*, far from combatting these false and hazardous opinions well, that M. Simon has advanced upon the subject, has gone much farther than he, and, after having gathered all that Hobbes, la Peyrere, Spinoza have said besides, and after having added all the other passages which he could gather, and which he believed to favor this opinion, he has boldly concluded that the Pentateuch was the work of an 'Israelitish priest, whom they sent from Babylon to instruct the new inhabitants of Palestine in the manner in which it was necessary that they should serve God, as the author of the Books of Kings relates in the seventeenth chapter of the second book.'

¹ Cf. my article in the *Bib. Sac.*, Vol. xli. p. 12 ff.

² Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 14 ff.

“We must not, however, refuse an honor that he has merited, in that, having better examined this question in a dissertation entitled *De Scriptore Pentateuchi*, the force of the truth has struck him, and he has had the courage to retract, and to declare that he regards Moses as the author of the Pentateuch. He has proved the same by a great number of precise testimonies, taken from the same Pentateuch, which he has quoted, in which he has imitated and even copied M. Huet and most of the other commentators. He has joined to these proofs the suffrages of the whole Jewish church, which has attributed the Pentateuch to Moses constantly, and that which is infinitely more strong, the testimony of Philip (John i. 45) one of the apostles, and especially that of Jesus Christ (John v. 46), who has also attributed it to him. [Thus] the question has been carried to such a degree of evidence that one cannot doubt that the Pentateuch is the work of Moses.”¹

While Astruc stoutly maintained that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch, he held, as he says, with Clericus, Simon, Fleury, and François, “that Moses in writing Genesis had recourse to ancient memoirs, which guided him with respect to the circumstances, the dates, and the chronological order of the events which he relates, and also in regard to the details of the genealogies.”²

Astruc says that fundamentally he has the same view, only he carries his conjectures farther, and is more decided. He maintains that “Moses had in his hands ancient memoirs containing the history of his ancestors from the creation of the world; that in order to lose nothing of these memoirs he has separated them into bits (*par morceau*), following the facts which are there related; that he has inserted these bits entire, one after another; and that the Book of Genesis has been formed through this combination.”³ Before giving his account of these different sources, which he groups under certain letters, we subjoin the following table :

¹ *Conjectures sur la Genèse*, pp. 455, 456. ² Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 7. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

TABLE OF THE DIFFERENT MEMOIRS.¹

VOL. XLII. No. 164.

96

A. (Elohim).	B. (Jehovah).	C.	AB.	D. [= E.F.G.H.I.J.K.L.M.] ²
Gen. i.-ii. 3.	ii. 4-iv.			
v.				
vi. 9-22.	vi. 1-8.			
vii. 6-10, 19, 22, 24.	vii. 1-5, 11-18, 21, 24.	vii. 20, 23, 24.		
viii. 1-19.	viii. 20-22.			
ix. 1-10, 12, 16-17.	ix. 11, 13-15, 18-27.		ix. 28-29.	
xi. 10-26.	x. 1-xi. 9, 27-xiii.			
	xv.-xvii. 2.			xiv. [E.]
xvii. 3-27.	xviii.-xix. 28.			xix. 29-38. [F.]
xx. 1-17.	xx. 18-xxi. 1, 33-34.			
xxi. 2-32.				
xxii. 1-10.	xxii. 11-19.			xxii. 20-24. [G.]
xxiii.	xxiv.			
xxv. 1-11.	xxv. 19-xxvi. 33.			xxv. 12-18. [H.]
	xxvii., xxviii. 5, 10-xxix.			xxvi. 34-35. [K.]
xxx. 1-23.	xxx. 24-xxxi. 3.			xxviii. 6-9. [K.]
xxxi. 4-47, 51-xxxii. 2.	xxxi. 48-50.			
xxxii. 24-xxxiii. 16.	xxxii. 3-23.	xxxiv. [?]		xxxiv. [I.]
	xxxiii. 17-20.			xxxv.
xxxv.				xxxvi. 1-19; 31-43. [L.]
xxxvii.	xxxviii.-xxxix.			xxxvi. 20-30. [M.]
xl.-xlviii.	xliv. 1-28.			
xliv. 29-1.				
Ex. i.-ii.				

¹ Astruc arranges the various extracts from the documents through 255 pages, in columns something as follows, e.g. (Gen. vii. 19-21):

A 19 Et les eaux se renforcerent trez fort sur la terre, & furent convertes toutes les plus hautes montagnes estans sous les cieux.

O 20. Les eaux se renforcerent de quinze condées par dessus: dont les montagnes furent convertes.

B 21. Et toute chair qui se mouvoit sur la terre, expira, tant desoiseaux que du bestail, des bestes & de tous reptiles qui se trainent sur la terre: & tous hommes.

² The subdivision of D into E-M is not indicated in columns, but in a separate analysis, which is given pp 303-314.

Astruc gives the following description of the memoirs, together with that of their authors :

A. — He believes, in general, that Moses had two principal memoirs, which embrace the entire extent of Genesis ; in one of which, beginning with the first chapter, the name Elohim occurs. This he places in the first column, and calls it *Memoire A.*¹

As to the authorship of these memoirs, he is not ashamed to confess that he does not know anything.² He conjectures, however, with respect to the Elohim document, that the first two chapters of Exodus, which belong to it, were written by Amram, Moses' father, as a family document ;³ and that the rest of the memoir, which contains more ancient facts, came from the patriarch Levi, the grandfather of Amram, who could have written the events of his time at the end of a more ancient account (*memoire*) which he received from his ancestors Jacob, Isaac, or Abraham, without being able to determine who could be the historian of the times preceding the deluge, but with the full persuasion that they were preserved in the families of Seth and Enoch."⁴ He suspects that the history of Joseph, which is found almost complete in this memoir (Gen. xl.—xlv.), was written by Joseph himself, because it contains personal facts which could only be known by himself, and which are far better written than the rest, as might be expected, since the author passed a great part of his life at the court of Egypt, where politeness and the sciences were regnant. He naïvely remarks that as Joseph was kept by modesty from alluding to Potiphar's wife, that therefore Moses derived this account (Gen. xxxix.) from Memoir B.⁵ He thinks it probable that Gen. xxxiv., with

¹ Conjectures, p. 308.

² Conjectures, p. 316 : " Mais j'avoué de bonne foi que je n'en sai rien, *Nec [me] pudet fateri nescire, quod nesciam* (Ciceronis Tusculan. Disputat. i. 25).

³ Conjectures, p. 317.

⁴ Conjectures, p. 318.

⁵ Conjectures, p. 319 : " Il faut pourtant excepter le chapitre xxxix, où se trouve l'histoire de la femme de Potiphar. . . . Comme le nom de Jehovah est employé dans ce chapitre en parlant de Dieu, on doit le rapporter au Mémoire

reference to the rape of Dinah and its consequences, was written by Levi, the great grandfather of Moses. He conjectures that Moses secured the particular accounts which give the genealogy of Ishmael (Gen. xxv.), the marriage of Esau, his genealogy, and that of the Horites (Gen. xxvi., xxviii., xxxvi.) during the forty years that he passed among the Midianites with Jethro his father-in-law, or during the forty years in which he wandered in the wilderness with the Israelites. On one side the Ishmaelites and Idumeans were neighbors of the Midianites; and Moses, who was conducting the flocks of his father-in-law and went to Mount Sinai (Ex. iii. 1), could more easily go to the lands of these peoples. The Hebrews, whom Moses led from Egypt, camped for a long time on the frontiers of these peoples before their entrance into the promised land. Hence Moses could have the opportunity of gathering all the memoirs which they might have concerning their origin and history.¹

He believes "in the same manner that Moses could have derived the history of the war of the five cities in Gen. xiv. from the Midianites who dwelt to the east of the Dead Sea, and who suffered from the invasion of the four allied kings, particularly from the inhabitants of Zoar, where Lot retired after the destruction of Sodom." He also holds the same in regard to the history of the daughters of Lot, and conjectures that Moses received it from the Moabites and Ammonites, who were descended from these two children who were the fruit of their incest. "It is objected in vain that these people would have been on their guard against avowing an origin so shameful. They then had very different ideas on this subject from those that we have at the

B, et par conséquent à un autre Auteur que celui qui a écrit le reste de l'histoire de Joseph, laquelle appartient en entier, à cela près, au Mémoire A. Mais ne pourroit on pas soupçonner avec quelque vraisemblance, que Joseph aiant supprimé par modestie cet événement, Moïse a esté obligé de le prendre dans le Mémoire B, où il estoit raconté. . . . mais qu'à l'exception de ce fait particulier, tout le reste de l'histoire de Joseph a esté pris du Mémoire A, où elle estoit mieux écrite et mieux circonstanciée."

¹ Conjectures sur la Genese, pp. 320, 321.

present day.¹ Abraham himself confessed that his wife was his sister (Gen. xx. 12), and, to quote a more conclusive example, Pharez and his posterity also came from the incest of Judah with his daughter Tamar; but they were not on this account less esteemed by the members of the tribe, nor did they fail to receive the first place."²

¹ Cf. Ebers, *Durch Gosen zum Sinai*, Leipzig, 1872, p. 83, says that "as in ancient Persia so also in Egypt, where this custom also existed in the time of the Ptolemies, a connection of a brother and a sister was regarded as the best marriage for a prince, who thus kept the blood of his divinely honored race pure." Such a connection was not strange when we consider the mythology of the Egyptians and Assyrians. Rawlinson, *History of Ancient Egypt*, New York, 1882, p. 369 says of Osiris: "Isis, at one time his mother, at another his sister, at another his daughter, is always his wife." So Belis was "the sister and consort of Bel." See Cooper, *An Archaic Dictionary*, London, 1876. Lenormant, *Manual of the Ancient History of the East*, London, 1869, Vol. i. p. 256, says of Ramses II.: "Considering himself superior to all moral laws, he even went so far as to marry one of his own daughters, the princess Bent-Anat." Cooper, however, in the work cited above, disputes this. W. Robertson Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, Edinburgh, 1881, p. 270, finds in the marriage of Abraham and his sister, and in Tamar's proposition to her half-brother Amnon that they should be married (2 Sam. xiii. 13), a custom which was still current in the days of Ezekiel (xxii. 11). From this he infers that the strict prohibition of such marriages could not have been in existence until the time of Ezra. But we might about as reasonably conclude that while the law against taking foreign wives had been enacted, that against marrying a niece did not exist 200 B. C., since, while Solymius, the brother of Joseph, had conscientious scruples on account of the Jewish law about allowing his brother to have connection with a foreign dancing-girl, he gave him his own daughter, Joseph's niece. See Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.*, Lib. xii., iv. 6. It is evident that such argumentation as that of W. Robertson Smith in this case is based upon a too limited induction.

² In the above paragraphs I have given a free rendering from Astruc, *Conjectures*, pp. 321, 322. His comments upon the ancient custom of connections which were afterwards clearly stamped as incestuous, in view of the preceding remark, are far more reasonable than the supposition of some critics that this story has arisen from the hatred of Israel against Edom and Moab. Stade presents this idea in his *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Berlin, 1881, p. 118: "Der ganze Hass Israels gegen den seinen Besitz vertheidigenden und immer wieder zurückerobernden Bruderstamm Moab spricht sich in der Sage aus, dass Moab und das nachher zu besprechende Volk Ammon aus dem blutschänderischen Umgange Lots und Seiner Töchter entstanden seien, Gen. xix. 30 ff." Goldzier, in his *Mythos bei den Hebräern und seine Geschichtliche Entwicklung*, Leipzig, 1876, who discovers the dualism of light and darkness between most of the so-called Biblical myths, gives this same story quite another expla-

B.—In the other memoir the name which is given to God is *Jehovah*. It commences with the second chapter of *Genesis*; hence he places it in the second column, and designates it by the letter *B*.¹ *Astruc* does not venture any conjecture as to its authorship, or the manner in which *Moses* secured it. But he thinks we cannot doubt that it came from some of the ancient patriarchs, who were pious and very much attached to the worship of the true God; for they always speak of the greatness of God and the reverence that is due to him. Moreover, it is a very important memoir for religion, and contains the facts which lie at its foundation,—as the history of the terrestrial paradise, the temptation of *Eve*, the fall of *Adam*, the fratricide of *Cain*, etc.²

C.—In the description of the deluge he finds some things repeated in *Gen. vii.* three times. He therefore assigns verses 20, 23 to a third memoir, which he calls *C*. He also places in the same column certain facts—as the abduction of *Dinah*—which have respect to the families of the patriarchs, and in the narration of which the name of God does not occur, although in this translation they appear under *D*.³

D.—There are several other passages where the history is interrupted by the narration of events which are foreign to the direct history of the patriarchs so far as it relates to the Hebrew nation, and where there was no occasion to speak of God either as *Jehovah* or *Elohim*. He thinks that these

nation in accordance with his theories, thus illustrating the lengths to which critics can go in support of a favorite hypothesis. He says (p. 223): “Es kann nun kein Zweifel darüber obwalten, dass unser *Lôt* identisch sei mit z seinem Arabischen Namensbruder *kâfir*, dem Verhüllenden, der verdeckenden Nacht. Betrachten wir nun den Mythos. Die Töchter der Nacht vereinigen sich mit dem Vater. Wenn die Abendröthe—sie ist auch Tochter der Nacht (denn der Mythos identificirt, wie wir gesehen haben, Morgen- und Abendröthe)—sich mit den Schatten der Nacht vereignigt, immer finsterer und trüber wird, um dann endlich ganz in der Nacht aufzugehen, da sagte der mythoschaffende Mensch: Die Töchter *Lôts* des Verdeckenden, gehen zu ihrem Vater ins Beilager, und der muntere, lebensfrohe Charakter, den der Mythos an der Röthe wol im Vergleiche mit der dunkeln, schwerfälligen Nacht gefunden haben mag, liess ihn die Sache so erscheinen, als wäre der alte *Lôt* das Opfer einer Intrigue seiner wollüstigen Töchter.”

¹ Conjectures, p. 308.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 322–323.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 309.

passages must belong to a different narrative than those which precede, and so he places them under the letter D.¹

E. — He regards Gen. xiv. as belonging to an entirely different account from that which precedes or follows. In it Abraham plays a great *rôle*, but one that is entirely different from that which is represented in the rest of Genesis. Hence he thinks there is no doubt that it is an extract from a fifth memoir E.

F. — With reference to this document he says: "After the description of the destruction of Sodom, which occupies a great part of chapter xix., and which belongs to Memoir B, we find at verse 29 the history of the incest of the daughters of Lot with their father, whence have come the Moabites and Ammonites. This fact is foreign to the history of the Hebrews, and it appears that it is a manifest interpolation. Hence I regard it as an extract from a sixth memoir, which I have called F."²

G. — "At the end of chapter xxii., at the five last verses, we find a detail concerning the family of Nahor which may well have some connection with the history of the patriarchs, whence the Hebrew nation was descended. In this way we learn the origin of Rebecca, who was espoused some time afterwards to Isaac. But this genealogical detail is none the less a foreign piece in the body of Genesis, and I believe that it ought to be placed under a seventh memoir G."³

H. — Under this letter he places the genealogy of Ishmael (Gen. xxv. 12-19), which he considers still more foreign to the history of Genesis, of which it interrupts the narrative. He is inclined to the same opinion about the genealogy of Abraham and Keturah, in the first five verses of the same chapter, although he is not decided."⁴

I. — He considers the history of the rape of Dinah a ninth narrative. He says: "It has the same characteristics as the history of the war of the Pentapolis (Gen. xiv.), in being foreign to the history of Genesis, in intercepting the narra-

¹ Conjectures, p. 310.

² Ibid., p. 311.

³ Ibid., p. 311.

⁴ Ibid., p. 312.

tive, and in appearing to have been inserted as an interpolation."¹

K and **L**. — He says: "There remain three passages respecting Esau: the first xxvi. 34-35, which treats of his first two marriages; the second xxviii. 6-10, where his third marriage is mentioned; and the third xxxvi., where a detailed account is given of his posterity, occupying the whole chapter. The narrative is so broken that one cannot doubt that they are interpolations."

He does not believe, however, that these interpolations could be regarded as extracts from the same memoir, for the following reason: "In the two first passages there is given to Esau for his first wife Judith the daughter of Beeri the Hittite; for the second, Bashemath the daughter of Elon, also a Hittite; and for the third, Mahalath the daughter of Ishmael and the sister of Nebajoth. In place of these in the last passage, where the same three women are given to Esau, the first is called Ada the daughter of Elon the Hittite; the second, Aholibamah the daughter of Anah, who was the daughter of Zibeon the Hivite; and the third, Bashemath the daughter of Ishmael and the sister of Nebajoth."

He remarks: "I have not been embarrassed by the diversity of the names, for which the commentators give good reasons. Names are only epithets among the Orientals. The same person has several, or changes them according to occasions; and this is confirmed by a great number of examples. But I could not persuade myself that if these three passages came from the same hand the author would give such different names to the three wives of Esau." He thinks, therefore, that it is more reasonable to refer these three passages concerning Esau to two different memoirs — the first two to **K**, and the last to **L**.²

M. — In this last passage, where the posterity of Esau is mentioned, he finds a particular insertion (Gen. xxxvi. 20-31), where the question is concerning the posterity of Seir the Horite, which is not only foreign to the history of Gen-

¹ Conjectures, p. 312.

² Ibid., pp. 312-314.

esis, but also to that of Esau, and which he consequently regards as an extract from a twelfth memoir M.¹

He says respecting the ten last memoirs (C-M), that each has reference to some particular fact, and that they are either mere extracts from much longer memoirs, which Moses did not find it fitting to insert entirely, because they were too foreign to the history of the Hebrew people, or were originally particular simple relations of those facts which Moses inserted entirely. He remarks in closing that one can reduce the ten last memoirs to a less number, or, on the contrary, can divide the two first (A and B) into several.²

Astruc next raises the question as to the language in which the memoirs were written. His conclusion is that they were written in Hebrew. He rejects the theory that Hebrew was the language of Paradise,³ but maintains that it was the language of Canaan, which Abraham easily learned, since his native language, the Chaldee, was a dialect of the same group of languages.⁴ In any case, he says, it is undeniable that all the nations from whom as he supposes Moses received these memoirs belonged to the posterity of the family of Abraham, as the Ishmaelites by Hagar, the Midianites by Keturah, the Idumeans who were descended from Esau or Edom; finally, the Ammonites and Moabites, who were descendants of Lot, the nephew of Abraham. Hence he argues that the Ishmaelites, Midianites, Idumeans, Moabites, and Ammonites all spoke the Hebrew language. He affirms that this conclusion is confirmed by examining the proper names of the kings and of the illustrious men of these nations, who are named in the Scriptures, or the places which these nations occupy, and of which Scripture makes mention.⁵

¹ Conjectures, p. 314.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 314, 315.

³ It was held by some not only that Adam spoke Hebrew, but also that he invented the consonants, the vowel-points, and the accents. See Buxtorf *Tractatus De Punctorum Vocalium, et Accentuum, in Libris Veteris Testamenti Hebraicis, Origine, Antiquitate, et Autoritate*, Basilae, 1648, p. 305.

⁴ Conjectures, p. 325.

⁵ The theory that Hebrew was the language of Canaan is accepted at the present time as the true one; cf. Gesenius, *Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache*

Astruc proceeds to consider the advantages of his theory :

I. It explains the peculiarity which we find in Genesis of long narratives where only the name Elohim or Jehovah is used, without confounding them together in the same passages. He calls attention to the fact that Tertullian caught a glimpse of this peculiarity. According to Tertullian God is God by his essence, and when this is to be expressed he receives the name of Elohim. But he can only be called Lord when he has created the universe, and especially man, who ought to recognize his dominion. God is the designation of divinity; Lord is the designation of power. The substance with its name God always existed; but the name Lord was afterwards added, as of something coming into being. Tertullian finds proof of this theory in the first chapter of Genesis. He says: "How neatly does the Scripture lend us its aid, when it applies the two titles to him with a distinction, and reveals them each at its proper time! For [the title] *God*, indeed, which always belonged to him, it names at the very first: 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth'; and as long as he continued making, one after another, those things of which he was to be the Lord, it merely mentions God: 'And *God* said,' 'and *God* made,' 'and *God* saw'; but nowhere do we yet find the *Lord*. But when he completed the whole creation, and especially man himself, who

und Schrift, Leipzig, 1815, pp. 16, 17; Schröder, Die Phönizische Sprache, Halle, 1869, pp. 9, 10; Schenkel, Bibel-Lexikon, Leipzig, 1869, vol. ii. p. 614; Herzog and Plitt, Real-Encyklopädie, Leipzig, 1879, vol. v. p. 688. Stade, however, Morgenländischen Forschungen, Leipzig, 1875, pp. 169-232, and König, Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der Hebräischen Sprache, Leipzig, 1881, pp. 14 ff., maintain that the patriarchs did not exchange their language for that of Canaan, but that the close resemblance between the Phœnician and Hebrew languages has arisen because both were derived from an old Canaanitic language. König thinks it probable that Abraham in his home, Ur of the Chaldees, spoke a dialect which was closely related with that of the Phœnicians who originally lived [according to a credible tradition] on the other side of the Persian Gulf previously to their emigration to Palestine. While it may be accepted as certain that the Hebrews and the Canaanites spoke essentially the same language, it cannot definitely be determined whether Abraham learned the language of Canaan after coming into it, or whether the dialect which he brought with him was essentially the same as that of the country which he made his home.

is destined to understand his sovereignty in a way of special propriety, he is then designated Lord. Then also [the Scripture] added the name *Lord*, 'And the Lord God took the man whom he had formed,'"¹ etc. Augustine has also recognized the difference in the names which are given to God in the first and second chapters of Genesis; and in order to give a reason he has adopted the remark of Tertullian. But Astruc, while admitting that this reason might be good for the first two chapters, says: "This variation is so striking and so often repeated that I defy any one ever to render a sufficient reason for supposing that all of Genesis came from the same hand, and that it was composed by the same person. This difficulty vanishes, however, if one admits my conjecture, and supposes that the memoir where God is called Elohim came from one hand, and that the other, where he is called Jehovah, came from another."²

II. A second advantage is in the avoidance of repetitions, of which he gives the following examples:

1. There are two accounts of the creation. "After a detailed recital of the creation of the world day by day, which fills the first chapter [of Genesis]," we have the completion of the account in ii. 1-3. After this is another recital, from ii. 4 to iv., where we have in a few words the creation of the universe, of plants, of animals, and of man, but where there is a detailed account of the creation of Eve; after which there is a description of Paradise, the temptation of Eve, the fall of Adam, and their punishment.

Astruc says that "this repetition has appeared so shocking to all the translators, even to those who made the Genevan version, that they have sought to palliate it by translating the preterite perfects or the aorists, which alone are found in Hebrew, by pluperfects, which are not known in the Hebrew language; e.g. ii. 7, 'L'Eternel avoit formé l'homme de la poudre de la terre, et avoit soufflé és narines d'icelui respiration de vie, dont l'homme fut fait en ame vivante,' in place of which the original has, 'Or l'Eternel forma l'homme de la

¹ *Adversus Hermogenem*, iii.

² *Conjectures*, pp. 332-335.

poudre de la terre, et souffla ez narines d'icelui respiration de vie, dont l'homme fut fait en ame vivante.'"¹ And so, he says, all the other passages have been represented as a simple recapitulation of the first narrative, where there is a second narrative accompanied by new circumstances.

Astruc remarks further: "But in my opinion there is no need of doing the least violence to the words of the text, nor of seeking to palliate the repetition, for there is none. The first narrative pertains to a first memoir A, and the second to a second B, which Moses found it desirable to join together, because of some important particulars which are in each, and which he believed he ought to transmit to posterity."²

2. There are parallel repetitions in the history of the deluge. (1) The corruption of man before the deluge is described twice (cf. Gen. vi. 1-8 with vs. 11-14). (2) God (Elohim) commands that Noah should receive into the ark a certain number of pairs of animals, of birds, and of reptiles (Gen. vi. 19-21), and it is added (vs. 22) that Noah did according to all the things which God had commanded him. We find the same orders given by Jehovah to Noah (Gen. vii. 1-4), and it is added that Noah did according to all the things which Jehovah had commanded him. (3) Noah's age is given twice (Gen. vii. 6; cf. 11). So, too, it is twice said that all the beasts entered into the ark (cf. vs. 8-10 with 14-16), etc.

3. The genealogy of Shem is given as far as Peleg and his brother Joktan in Gen. x. 22-25. The posterity of Joktan is given in the following verses, from 26 to 29. The same genealogy of Shem to Peleg is given in xi. 10-19. The latter belongs to A, and the former certainly belongs to B, because the name Jehovah is given in it to God (vs. 9).³

While giving these and other parallel accounts, which

¹ While Astruc is right as to the translation of this passage, his statement that there are no pluperfects in Hebrew is of course wrong. Cf. Green, *A Grammar of the Hebrew Language*, New York, 1871, § 126, 2; Müller, *Outlines of Hebrew Syntax*, Glasgow, 1882, p. 1, etc.

² Conjectures, pp. 359-361.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 361-364.

prove to his mind that Moses drew from two documents, he says that there are some repetitions which have not arisen from the combination of two different accounts, but have come: (1) Through the insertion in the text by the transcriber of certain notes and explanations which were placed in the margin by way of explanation; e.g. Gen. xiii. 18; xxiii. 2, 19; xxxv. 27, where in speaking of Mamre, or Kirjath Arba, the name Hebron is added. But Astruc says it is evident that this repetition came because the copyists inserted in the text a marginal note, which they added to indicate the modern name of the place, because it had another in the time of Abraham, and even of Moses, which was no longer in use when it was found necessary to add the marginal note. (2) Such repetitions have arisen through the genius of the Hebrew language. Since it is wanting in certain words, it has to employ circumlocutions which have the air of repetitions (Gen. xxix. 10). (3) There are other repetitions which are formulas of civility and respect established by usage, which might not be dispensed with when an inferior was speaking with a superior. (4) Repetitions used to make a greater impression (Ex. xxxii. 9; xxxiii. 5; xxxiv. 9). He also adds repetitions arising from the poverty of the Hebrew language in the conjugation of the verbs, in the declension of the nouns, etc.; from Hebrew idioms; and from the custom of primitive times. But, making due allowance for all such repetitions, he considers those of which he speaks of a far different character.¹

III. The greatest advantage that he claims for this theory is, that it disposes of the anachronisms and the hystero-logies, that is, the reversals in the order of the chronology and in the course of the narrative. He says that the commentators have labored to explain these in vain, and gives the following examples:

1. The anachronism which makes Abraham die before the birth of Esau and Jacob. The twenty-fourth chapter treats of the orders which Abraham gave to the servant when he

¹ Conjectures, pp. 366-370.

went to Haran to seek in his family a wife for his son Isaac, of the arrival in the land of Canaan, and of the consummation of her marriage with Isaac. We read in xxv. 1-6 of the second marriage of Abraham with Keturah, of the children which he had, and of the posterity of these children. In vs. 7-11 the death of Abraham is given, and his funeral, which his two sons Isaac and Ishmael attended, where occasion is taken to relate the posterity of Ishmael; after which, returning to Isaac (vs. 19 to the end of the chapter), it speaks of his marriage, of the sterility of Rebecca, and finally of the birth of Esau and of Jacob.

“To follow the order of this narrative we should be persuaded that Isaac did not marry, and with yet stronger reason that his sons were not born, until after the death of Abraham; and so Josephus understood the matter.¹ But Josephus is deceived.”

“Abraham was one hundred years old when Isaac was born (Gen. xxi. 5), and Isaac was forty years old when he married (Gen. xxv. 20), and sixty years old when his two sons Esau and Jacob were born (Gen. xxv. 26). Thus the marriage of Isaac corresponds to the year 140 of the age of Abraham, and the birth of Esau and Jacob to the year 160, but Abraham died at the age of 175 (Gen. xxv. 7). Hence, Isaac was married thirty-five years before the death of Abraham, and Abraham did not die until fifteen years after the birth of the two sons of Isaac.”²

Astruc finds in his theory an explanation of this difficulty. He says that xxv. 19, which belongs to memoir B, joins on to the ends of xxiv., which belongs to the same memoir, and of which it is a continuation, and that the eighteen verses at the beginning of xxv. range themselves under two other memoirs.

2. He says that Gen. xxxviii. furnishes a still greater difficulty. After it has been related in the preceding chapters

¹ Antiq. Jud., lib. i. cap. xviii. : “*Ἰσάακ δὲ μετὰ τὴν Ἀβραάμου τελευταίην ἐπέει τὸ γάμου.*”

² Conjectures, pp. 380, 381.

how Joseph was sold by his brothers to the Midianites who carried him to Egypt, the following chapter gives an account of Judah's marriage, of the marriage of his first-born, his death, and the marriage of Tamar with his second son, Judah's own connection with her, and the fruit of it in the birth of Pharez and Zarah. In xlvi. 12 it is related that Pharez was married and had two children when he descended into Egypt with Jacob his grandfather.

He continues: "Now we are to see whether these events could have happened between the time when Joseph was sold by his brothers and the descent of Jacob into Egypt. When Joseph was sold he was seventeen years of age (Gen. xxxvii. 2). He was thirty years of age when he was presented to Pharaoh (Gen. xli. 46). Consequently, computing the seven years of abundance, and the two years of sterility, he ought to have been thirty-nine years of age when he made himself known to his brothers, since their second journey to Egypt marked the second year of famine (xlv. 6); and he ought to have been forty years of age when his father descended into Egypt, since it is certain that Jacob did not arrive until after the second journey of his sons. Subtracting the seventeen from forty we find that the space of time between the coming of Joseph and the descent of Jacob ought to have been twenty-three years, and all the commentators agree in this.

"But it is manifestly impossible that in an interval of twenty-three years Judah should have married, that his wife should have had three sons, that the two first should have been of an age to espouse Tamar, and should have married her successively; that after the death of the second Judah should have diverted Tamar for some time with the [hope of a] marriage with his third son"; that she should have deceived him, and conceived twins, of whom the elder begat two sons; all this the commentators regard as an impossibility.

"This difficulty has been met in two ways. Some adopt the explanation that the two sons of Pharez were born in Egypt, and say that this narrative of Moses, giving this history of Judah and his children is in its place, and that it really

occurred after the coming of Joseph; that Pharez, the elder of the children of Judah and Tamar, was not married, still less had children, when Jacob went down into Egypt. They maintain that Moses no more pretended to say this when he made mention of those two children in the enumeration of the children of Judah (Gen. xlvi. 12), but that he only mentioned them because they were born in Egypt during the seventeen years that Jacob still lived, and that this is the reason that they ought to be counted as if they had entered with him.

“They think that they can establish this opinion by the example of the sons which Moses attributes to Benjamin, to the number of ten (Gen. xlvi. 21), when he descended into Egypt with Jacob his father. According to them it is absolutely impossible, in view of the age of Benjamin at that time, that all his ten children should then have been born; and it is necessary to suppose that the greater part of them were not born until he came to Egypt; but they believe that Moses did not omit to mention that, as it were, they entered into Egypt with Jacob, because they hold with Augustine that the time of the entrance of Jacob and his family into Egypt ought to embrace the whole life of Joseph.¹ . . .

“But these conjectures are completely destroyed by the text of Genesis: (1) Moses says expressly (xlvi. 7) that Jacob brought with him to Egypt his children, and his children’s children,—this can only mean the children who were already born; (2) Moses, after making an enumeration of the family of Jacob, adds (xlvi. 26) that all the persons appertaining to Jacob who came into Egypt, and who went out of his loins . . . were in all sixty-six,—this can only comprehend the persons really existing. To these passages, which should be decisive, we can add several others which are not less clear or conclusive, Ex. i. 1, 5; Deut. x. 22, etc.

“If it be true that the time of the entrance of Jacob into

¹ Cf. De Civitate Dei. Lib. xvi. 40: “Sed nimirum introitus Iacob in Aegyptum, quando cum in septuaginta quinque animabus scriptura commemorat, non unus dies vel unus annus, sed totum illud est tempus, quamdiu vixit Joseph, per quem factum est ut intrarent.”

Egypt does not reduce itself to the time when he made it, but can be made to mean the whole duration of the life of Joseph, there should not be sixty-six persons in Moses' enumeration of those who entered into Egypt with Jacob, but five or six thousand; since it is evident that the family of Jacob ought to increase in Egypt to this number at least in the space of seventy years, from the arrival of Jacob until the death of Joseph."¹ This Astruc maintains on the supposition that in two hundred and fifteen years the Israelites became 2,000,000 (Ex. xxxviii. 26; Num. i. 46).

"Now this first opinion is absolutely untenable. Few of the commentators have followed it. A great number, and Augustine on reflection,² do not hesitate to agree that the history of Judah related in Gen. xxxviii. is displaced not only in the order of the narrative, but also in that of the chronology, and it is necessary to go back until the time of the arrival of Jacob in the land of Canaan. By this means we gain an interval of thirty-four years instead of twenty-three, for Joseph was six years of age when Jacob came from Mesopotamia, as appears on comparing Gen. xxx. 25 with xxxi. 41. So taking six years from forty for the time when he arrived in Canaan and his departure for Egypt, we can better put in this space of time all the events that happened to Judah and his children.

"This opinion accords perfectly well with my conjectures upon the distribution of Genesis; for xxxviii., where the history of Judah and his children is found, belongs to memoir B, and consequently should be joined to xxxvii. 17, which belongs to the same memoir, and which contains that which Jacob did when he arrived in Canaan, without having any connection with xxxiv.-xxxvii., which are between both, and which belong to other memoirs, as one can see in the distribution of Genesis."³ These will suffice to show the kind of difficulties which Astruc points out, and which he thinks are partially relieved by his theory.

¹ Conjectures, p. 387.

² Quæst. Super Genesis, 128.

³ Conjectures, pp. 378-389.

It will be seen that none of the critics of this school try to explain away any real difficulty which has been brought to light by the destructive critics. They frankly admit it, and seek to account for its existence on critical principles.

And yet, it is a significant fact that their spirit has been misunderstood both by the destructive critics and the conservatives of subsequent generations. Simon and Astruc are popularly reckoned to-day as holding views which are subversive of the historical character and authority of the Pentateuch. The edifice which they reared so carefully from the ruins that were left them by the destructive critics has fallen, and nothing remains but the building-stones which they sought to rear in new forms of enduring beauty.

We shall next consider the views of the apologists, who seek to explain away all the facts which the destructive critics claim to have found in disproof of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.