

ARTICLE V.

SKETCHES OF PENTATEUCH CRITICISM.

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

III. DEFENDERS OF THE MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH.

THE effect of the attacks upon the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, whether on the part of destructive¹ or constructive² critics, was to bring defenders of that authorship to the front. Such was their learning and influence that they made the traditional view dominant until nearly the end of the eighteenth century. The three representatives that we shall choose are from France, Holland, and Germany.

1. *Huet* (b. 1630; d. 1721).

Peter Daniel Huet,³ born at Caen, may be considered a type of the highest culture of the French nation during the reign of Louis XIV., concerning whom we have

¹ Cf. my article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. xli. pp. 1-23.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 660-697.

³ The chief sources of our information respecting Huet are twofold: (1) An autobiography entitled *Memoirs of the Life of Peter Daniel Huet, Bishop of Avranches*: written by himself [at the age of eighty-five] and translated from the original Latin, with copious notes, biographical and critical, by John Akin, M.D. In two volumes. London, 1810. (2) An article in the *Quarterly Review*, London, 1855, which is a review of a book by Christian Bartholmées (Paris, 1850), with the title *Huet, Evêque d'Avranches; ou Le Scepticisme Théologique*, pp. 291-335; and a German translation of the above work in the *Beiträge zu den Theologischen Wissenschaften* B. 2., Jena, 1857, pp. 1-88, which came to hand too late to make much use of it. There are also other sketches in the chief encyclopædias, but they are derived almost altogether from one or more of these sources.

spoken in a preceding article.¹ No man of his age, or, perhaps, of any other, had such a reputation for learning, or possessed so many distinguished acquaintances.

Although he died a bishop, he did not enter the service of the Roman Catholic Church as a priest until he was forty-six years of age.² Before he formally laid aside the vanities of the world he was scholar, gallant,³ and courtier.

His advantages were of a high order. He came of a good family.⁴ Though left an orphan at an early age, he enjoyed an excellent education, and possessed ample means by inheritance, and subsequently through the patronage of the crown.⁵ For an entire decade he was associated with Bossuet as the tutor of the dauphin.⁶ While still a boy in years he came under the personal influence and stimulus of Bochart, the great Protestant geographer,⁷ and was thus led to see his defects in the sacred languages. From this time forward he pursued them with quenchless ardor, spending at least two hours a day in the study of the Bible in the original, and reading the Old Testament in Hebrew through twenty-four times⁸ during thirty years. In company with Bochart he visited the gifted but eccentric queen of Sweden, Chris-

¹ *Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. xli. p. 660.

² *Memoirs*, vol. ii. pp. 196, 197.

³ *Memoirs*, vol. i. p. 48: "I omitted nothing that I thought necessary to ingratiate myself with them [*i. e.*, the ladies]; such as care of my person, elegance of dress, officious and frequent attention upon them, amatory verses, and gentle whispers, which feed the insanity of love."

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁵ Vol. ii. pp. 28-31.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 63, 64; cf. *The Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. xli. pp. 663, 664.

⁷ Besides his geography, which is entitled *Phaleg and Chanaan* [The first part, for example, is entitled, *Geographiae Sacrae pars prior Phaleg, seu De Dispersione Gentium et Terrarum divisione facta in aedificatione turris Babel, Cadomi, MDCXLVI.*] he published a work on the animals of the Sacred Scriptures. This is called *Hierozicon*, and fills three large quarto volumes, which, in one edition, were edited by Rosenmüller, and published in Leipsic, 1793-96.

⁸ *Memoirs*, vol. i. pp. 33, 34.

tina,¹ when he was scarcely out of his teens. To name over the celebrated scholars of his time is simply to name those with whom he was personally acquainted, or was more or less frequently in correspondence; for it was a principle of his, formed in early youth, to become personally acquainted with all whom he heard mentioned as eminent for genius or learning.²

Along with these advantages, he enjoyed the blessings of excellent health and long life. He could study almost uninterruptedly for seven hours, and rise from his work without fatigue and in the best of spirits. During the ten years that he was engaged on his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, which we shall mention later, after working all day with the dauphin, he would often steal at dusk to Paris, and spend most of the night in his library, consulting authorities and verifying references.³ Even when he was dressing or undressing, he had some one to read to him. As he was endowed with a good memory, and lived to be over ninety years of age, it is not strange that his attainments were prodigious.

The range of his studies was remarkable. He was poet,⁴ novelist, anatomist,⁵ astronomer, antiquarian, editor of the Delphine classics,⁶ and of the works of Ori-

¹ This was the daughter of Gustavus Adolphus. Shortly before, through her zeal for philosophical studies at five o'clock in the morning, she had occasioned the death of Descartes, her private tutor, who, by reason of his delicate health, had been in the habit of doing most of his thinking in a warm bed until late in the morning.

² Golius and Herbelot, celebrated orientalisks, Manasseh ben Israel, a distinguished rabbi, and Henry Oldenburgh, who had previously been a correspondent of Spinoza's, are a few of the distinguished names which he claims as acquaintances in his autobiography.

³ *Memoirs of the Life of Peter Daniel Huet*, London, 1810, vol. ii. p. 158.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 371-373.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 21, 22. He says, "I can safely affirm that, with my own hand, I have dissected more than three hundred eyes, taken from the heads of animals of every species."

⁶ Huet supervised the preparation of these while writing his *Demonstratio Evangelica*. He was primarily impelled to undertake this work for the benefit of the dauphin.

gen,¹ philosopher, and theologian. A certain writer has said that he became *acclimated* to all sciences without being *naturalized* in any.² Still, we must account his attainments in the Old Testament, and his knowledge of the sacred authors, as extraordinary.

By nature and education he had no sympathy with the critics who had preceded him. He utterly renounced the Cartesian philosophy, which at first he greatly admired;³ and wrote a treatise against it.⁴ He has, however, been accused of failing to understand Descartes, and so of doing him injustice.⁵

In a work,⁶ published after his death, on the Weakness of

¹ The title of this work is *Origenis Commentaria in Sacram Scripturam*; Rouen, 1668, 2 vols. folio. It was first suggested to him by finding an ancient manuscript of Origen's Commentary on Matthew at Stockholm. On the recommendation of Bochart, and with Queen Christina's consent, he began copying it at the time of his visit to Sweden. The work is said to manifest great acuteness and critical instinct, although Huet was naturally disinclined to text-criticism. The biographical part (*Origeniana*) is the best, and is still of high value. (Cf. *The Quarterly Review*, London, 1855, vol. xcvi. pp. 306-308.)

² *Encyclopædia Britannica*, eighth edition (Boston, 1856), vol. xi. p. 793.

³ *Memoirs*, vol. ii. pp. 29, 30: "I cannot easily express the admiration which this new mode of philosophizing excited in my young mind, when, from the simplest and plainest principles, I saw so many dazzling wonders brought forth. . . . In fact, I was for many years closely engaged in the study of Cartesianism, . . . and I long wandered in the mazes of this reasoning delirium, till mature years, and a full examination of the system from its foundation, compelled me to renounce it, as I obtained demonstrative proof that it was a baseless structure, and tottered from the very ground."

⁴ *Censura Philosophiæ Cartesianæ*. Lutetiae Parisiorum, 1689. The volume is 6½×3½ inches, and contains 222 pages, besides a full table of contents.

⁵ See *The Quarterly Review*, London, 1855, vol. xcvi. p. 329; and *Beiträge zu den theologischen Wissenschaften*, Jena, 1851, p. 8.

⁶ *Traité Philosophique de la Foiblesse de l'Esprit Humain*. Par Feu Monsieur Huet, ancien Evêque d'Avranches. A Londres, 1741. This volume is 5×2½ inches, and contains pp. xl, 296. It is divided into three books, which treat of the following subjects: 1. The truth cannot be known by the human understanding through the aid of the reason with a perfect and entire certainty; 2. The most sure and legitimate mode of philoso-

the Human Spirit, he has sought to prove that we have no certain standard of truth aside from divine revelation.

philizing ; 3. Objections and their refutation. He seeks to establish the first proposition in fifteen chapters. The first proof he takes from the sacred writers, quoting such passages as Eccl. viii. 16, 17 ; 1 Cor. i. 19 ff. ; iii. 19 ; Isa. xxix. 14. The others are mainly as follows : The phenomena do not correspond exactly to the objects which they represent, the media are imperfect, and the fidelity of the organs of perception and of the understanding is doubtful. Further, he argues, on the one hand, that the human spirit is incapable of knowing the nature of things with a perfect certainty ; and, on the other, that they themselves cannot be known because of their continual change, because of the difference in men, and since their causes are infinite. Then he holds that man has no certain rule for knowing the truth, and that it is a begging of the question to attempt to prove by reason that reason is certain. He finally affirms that the law of doubting has been established by excellent philosophers, of whom he names more than thirty ; and concludes that it is necessary to doubt, and that this is the only means of avoiding error.

In the second book—to indicate some of the chapters—he shows that man is naturally deprived of the means of knowing the truth either very clearly or certainly. Faith, however, supplies the defect of reason, and renders those things very certain which are less certain by reason. He urges, against Plato and Descartes, that there is nothing in the understanding which has not been in the sense, and that in life we must follow the highest probability. He advises eclecticism, but says that above all things we should not adopt any thing contrary to faith.

In the third book he considers the following objections : This mode of philosophizing paralyzes action and deprives us of knowledge. Besides, we have a rule for distinguishing between the true and the false. Nor does this mode of philosophizing constitute a school or system, but is simply an enemy of all. Furthermore, we condemn ourselves when we say that we cannot distinguish between the true and the false ; because, if that is the case, we cannot make such an affirmation ; nor can we say that God formed us in such a way that we are always deceived, without supposing that God himself was deceived, which would be impiety. Finally, this law of doubt seems to prevent the spirit of man from submitting to faith, and is favorable to corrupt morals. To all these he replies, at some length, that we must adopt a working hypothesis ; that knowledge is an equivocal term ; that there is a difference between apparent truth and that which is absolute ; that probabilities can be arranged into a system ; that the objection that we are not in a position to affirm that we cannot distinguish between the true and the false comes from bad logic ; that it does not at all follow, because God made us in such a way that we are deceived, that he was deceived, since he has shown us that our senses are treacherous, that our reason is deceptive, that our spirit is weak, and that our perceptions are obscure and uncertain.

In short, he adopts Pyrrhonism,¹ or the doctrine that our human faculties are incapable of finding the truth.

He stands at the farthest remove from the spirit and scholarship of the present age, *i. e.*, from the so-called historico-critical investigation. He looked with contempt upon the exact and minute labors of those engaged in text-criticism.² He had a ready way of cutting the Gordian knot of any difficulty, by deciding how a passage ought to read to fulfil the conditions of Romish orthodoxy.³ He lacked pre-eminently the first qualification for sound criticism,—a judicial mind.

His great work, on which his fame pre-eminently rests,

In regard to the last objection, he affirms that, since the light of reason is not sufficient, we ought to submit our lives to the faith and regulate them by its precepts.

¹ Cf. Lewes, *The History of Philosophy*, London, 1871, vol. i. p. 340 ff. The publication of this work by Huet occasioned great astonishment. The Jesuits even doubted its genuineness. *Beiträge*, *ibid.* p. 24.

² *Memoirs of the Life of Peter Daniel Huet*, London, 1810, vol. i. pp. 221 ff.: "At the period in which I began to hold a certain rank among the votaries of sound literature, the art of criticism was particularly flourishing. . . . It was especially an object, at great expense and from remote parts, to collect ancient copies, by the collection of which the errors of more modern ones . . . might be amended. It was certainly proper to seek a remedy for these evils. . . . But now, in this light of letters, after such long and assiduous toil in the emendation of ancient books, by which they have been restored to their pristine splendor, to spend a whole life in the same exercise, as I saw done by Gruter, Le Fevre, and many others, . . . appeared to me an ignoble employment of the intellect, worthy only of a little mind,—a task necessary, indeed, but mean; like that of the weeders whom I employ in freeing my garden from noxious plants, while I eat and store up the fruits."

³ See Peter Daniel Huet, *Life and Opinions*, in the *Quarterly Review*, London, 1855, vol. xcvii. p. 307: "The most serious blot on his critical character is his assuming, as a principle of editing, that, where there is doubt, the reading must be decided by dogmatical considerations." Cf. *Id.* p. 306, remarks on his *Origines de la Ville Caen*: "He had formed in his mind a system as to the original ground-plan of the city, with which he endeavors to force the existing facts into harmony,—often with violence enough. Indeed, in this work, as much as in any other, may be seen all the faults of criticism which made Heyne describe him as 'vir opinionibus plura superstruens parum explorata.'"

is his *Demonstratio Evangelica*.¹ Like Barnes' Commentaries,² it was written in the hours usually devoted by others to sleep and recreation. It is a brilliant testimonial to the wide reading of the author. The work was long considered an impregnable citadel for the authenticity and genuineness of the books of the Scriptures. Now we wonder how any one could have proposed such a defence, or have sought seriously to maintain it.

A fine mathematician, it seemed to Huet that the evidences in favor of the genuineness and authenticity of the Scriptures could be reduced to a mathematical demonstration.³ To this end he devotes eight hundred and twenty-four pages, including tables of contents and indexes. In the preface he affirms that the truth of the Christian religion can be proved by a kind of demonstration which is not less certain than those of geometry.⁴ Then follow seven definitions, two postulates, four axioms, and ten propositions.⁵ The development of the

¹ The full title is *Patri Danielis Huetii Episcopi Abrincensis Designati Demonstratio Evangelica Ad Serenissimum Delphinum. Tertia Editio Ab Auctore recognita, castigata, et amplificata. Parisiis 1690 Cum Privilegio Regis.* The size of the volume is $10\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$ inches. This work was published in several editions, the first appearing in 1679. It appeared not only in Paris, but also in Frankfort, 1722, and in Venice, 1733; cf. Brunet, *Manuel, du Libraire, Tome Troisième, Paris, 1862.* p. 361.

² As is well known, these were prepared before nine o'clock in the morning, and it was his habit to rise at four o'clock. Cf. Barnes, *Life at Threescore and Ten, New York, 1871,* pp. 74, 75.

³ *Memoirs of the Life of Peter Daniel Huet, London, 1810, vol. ii. p. 157:* "I imagined a new path might be struck out, different from the trodden ones, but certain, plain, and direct, leading to a demonstration of that truth, not less clear and indubitable than the argumentative processes of geometers, who boast that they do not persuade, but compel, conviction."

⁴ *Demonstratio Evangelica, p. 3:* "Probari potest Religionis Christianae veritas eo genere demonstrationis, quod non minus certum sit, quam demonstrationes ipsae geometricae."

⁵ DEFINITIONES.

1. Liber genuinus is est, qui ab eo auctore scriptus est, à quo scriptus esse dicitur, et eo circiter tempore, quo scriptus esse fertur.

2. Liber coaetaneus is est, qui eo circiter tempore scriptus est, quo res in eo scriptae contigerunt.

propositions forms the main part of the book. In the fourth proposition he treats of the genuineness of the Old Testament books. In this he devotes fourteen chapters to the books of the Pentateuch. He employs, in the main, three kinds of testimony to prove that the books of Moses are genuine: (1) the testimony of the Sacred Scriptures; (2) of other writers; (3) the fact that the theology of the heathen is almost universally derived from Moses. He says, "[we] shall show that Moses himself,

3. Historia est narratio rerum, quae jam contigerant eo tempore, quo Historia illa scripta est.

4. Prophetia est narratio rerum futurarum, quae nondum contigerant eo tempore quo Prophetia illa edita est, quaeque ex naturalibus causis praevideri non possunt.

5. Religio vera ea est, quae res solum veras ad credendum propositas habet.

6. Messias est homo Deus, à Deo divinitus missus ad hominum salutem, et à Prophetis in Veteri Testamento praedictus.

7. Religio Christiana ea est, quae Jesum Nazarenum Messiam esse statuit, et quaecunquae in Libris Sacris, sive Veteris, sive Novi Testamenti, de eo scripta sunt, pro veris habet.

POSTULATA.

1. Postuletur adhiberi hic animum docilem et veritatis studiosum, non refractarium et pertinacem.

2. Tam certo ea credi quae hic probabuntur, quam creduntur reliqua quae parvis roboris rationibus nituntur.

AXIOMATA.

1. Omnis liber est genuinus, qui genuinus habitus est ab omnibus proxime et continuata serie sequentibus eum aetatibus.

2. Omnis historia est verax, quae res gestas ita narrat, uti narrantur in multis libris coaetaneis, vel aetati proximis qua res gestae sunt.

3. Omnis Prophetia est verax, quae praedixit res eventu deinde completas.

4. Omnis prophetica facultas à Deo est.

PROPOSITIONES.

1. Genuini sunt libri Novi Testamenti. 2. Coaetanei sunt libri Novi Testamenti. 3. Historiae in Novo Testamento scriptae veraces sunt. 4. Genuini sunt libri Veteris Testamenti. 5. Multae habentur Prophetiae in Veteri Testamento. 6. Multae Prophetiae Veteris Testamenti veraces sunt. 7. Multae habentur in Veteri Testamento Prophetiae de Messia. 8. Is est Messias, cui uni conveniunt Prophetiae omnes Veteris Testamenti de Messia. 9. Jesus Nazarenus est Messias. Πόρισμα [corollary]: Libri Veteris Testamenti sunt divinitus inspirati. 10. Vera est Christiana Religio. Πόρισμα: Religiones omnes, praeter Christianam, falsae sunt et impiae.

and the things done by him and committed to writing, were about the only fountain whence almost all the nations throughout the world have formed their gods, heroes, and authors, and have drawn all their theology; I mean the Phœnicians, Egyptians, Persians, Indians, Thracians, Germans, Gauls, Britains, Spaniards, even the Americans themselves, and especially the Greeks and the Romans; all of whom have reckoned Moses, masked, indeed, but discerned by certain proofs, among the gods."¹ He says that he has often wondered that no one has appeared before to strip away this mask, that he might restore Moses to Moses and offer him for public recognition; and proposes to prove that the rest of the fables of the Greeks are drawn and copied from the books of Moses, and that very many rites of other nations have been derived from the same source.

He quotes about a hundred writers in proof of the genuineness of the books of Moses. Among these we find the names of Sanchoniathon,² Homer, Solon, Pythagoras, Socrates, and Plato. In this he follows some of the Church Fathers,³ although at much greater length. It was once a favorite way of explaining analogies existing between the narratives or teachings of the Sacred Scriptures and other writers, that all heathen literature in which

¹ *Demonstratio Evangelica*, ter. ed. Parisiis, 1690, p. 46.

² For the account of the theology of the Phœnicians, see Cory, *Ancient Fragments of the Phœnician, Chaldean, Egyptian, Tyrian, Carthaginian, Indian, Persian, and other writers*, London, 1832, pp. 32 ff; and Orelli, *Sanchoniathonis Berytii quae feruntur Fragmenta de Cosmogonia Et Theologia Phœnicum*, Lipsiae, 1826. Cf. Baudissin, *Sanchuniathon*, in the *Real-Encyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, Leipzig, 1884. Bd. xiii. pp. 364 ff.

³ Clement of Alexandria (b. 150-160) claims that Plato was aided in his legislation by the books of Moses, *Stromata*, Lib. i. xxv. According to Eusebius, *Praeparat. Evangel.* Lib. i. ix., Sanchoniathon lived before the Trojan period, and had access to the Hebrew Scriptures, which he had received from Hierombalus, a priest of Jehovah. Baudissin, however, in the article just cited, holds that he was subsequent to the post-Alexandrian period.

such things were found had been derived from the Bible. This was an easy and superficial solution of the problem which still engages the students of comparative religions.

It is with no little wonder that we read that almost all the theology of the heathen has come from Moses, and follow the transmigration of the great lawgiver through the various heathen divinities.¹ We can hardly trust our eyes when we read: Adonis was the same as Moses,² Bacchus was the same as Moses, Apollo was the same as Moses, and so throughout almost the entire pantheon.

While he takes up the objections of the critics to the Mosaic authorship,³ yet it will be more profitable to examine the answers of another apologist, which, in some respects, seem fairer and more convincing, and to combine with them the answers of some others, so far as they may be of importance.

2. *Witsius* (b. 1636; d. 1708).

While the character of Huet is, in some respects, repulsive to a Protestant, that of Hermann Wits⁴ is unusually

¹ *Demonstratio Evangelica*, Parisiis, 1690, pp. 68, 69: "Atque illa juxta institui operis leges, ad demonstrandum Mosem Mosaicorumque scriptorum antiquitatem et γνησιότητα possit sufficere, alio tamen insuper utemur genere probationum, ac priscos illos gentium Deos et Heroas quicunque per universum fere orbem culti sunt; earumdem etiam conditores plerosque ac legumlatores, totamque Ethnicorum, Theologiam, ex Mose ipso, Mosisve actis, aut scriptionibus manasse demonstrabimus."

² *Ibid.* p. 3: "Adonis idem ac Moses." Cf. p. 70: "Alteram Mosis imaginem Phoenices affixerunt Adonidi, qui non ab iis solum, sed à vicinis quoque gentibus inter Deos celebratus est."

³ This he does in the fourteenth chapter, *Ibid.* pp. 174-183, under twenty heads. According to his *Autobiography*, vol. ii. pp. 162, 163, he came into a curious connection with Richard Simon, the famous biblical critic. He says that, after his *Evangelical Demonstration* appeared, Simon proposed to his publisher to epitomize it. Huet was at first greatly delighted with the proposition; but, when he got the impression that Simon merely designed to adapt it to his own critical views, he requested him, through his publisher, to desist from his purpose.

⁴ For a sketch of his life, see *The Economy of the Covenants between God and Man*. New York, 1798, vol. i. pp. 9-30.

attractive. He was born at Enkhuysen, in Holland. His parents, who were of good family and great piety, consecrated him, on his birth, to the ministry. His advantages were the best which the age afforded in the country of Holland, which was famed not only for its religious liberty but for its scholars. He pursued his theological studies at the universities of Utrecht and Groningen. At the former he enjoyed the instruction of one of the most celebrated Hebraists and successful teachers of the seventeenth century.¹ He attained such proficiency in the language that he was able to hold a disputation in Hebrew. His knowledge of the original languages was the basis of a solid theological education. Like Calvin² of an earlier period, and Hodge³ of recent memory, he was, for the time in which he lived, first a good exegete, and then a sound biblical theologian.

As might be expected, his life was one round of promotions and honors, earnestly pressed upon him and modestly received. Ordained at the age of twenty-one, during a devoted ministry of eighteen years he was called from one church to another, until he was made a professor of divinity in the University of Franeker, Friesland. Here he remained five years, and obtained such fame, all over Europe, as a writer, and attracted so many students from the most distant parts of the continent by the ability and Christian warmth of his instruction, that he was not only called to the University of Groningen,⁴ but also to that of

¹ John Leusden (b. 1624; d. 1699).

² Cf. *Encyclopædia Britannica*, New York, 1868, vol. iv. p. 719.

³ Rev. Charles Hodge, D.D., was, for several years before his appointment to the department of Systematic Theology, Professor of Oriental and Biblical Literature. See *The Life of Charles Hodge, D.D., LL.D.*, New York, 1880, pp. 93 ff.

⁴ This occurred in the year 1679. He was called as the successor of James Altig. See *The Economy of the Covenants*, New York, 1798, vol. i. p. 19. Another apologist for the Mosaic authorship, Heidegger, whose book we shall mention later on, was also called to the same chair from Zürich in 1681, and declined. See *Historia Vitae Johannis Henrici Heideggeri*, Tiguri, 1698, Sect. cxxiii.

Utrecht. He accepted the latter call, and labored at Utrecht for eighteen years, where he became a colleague of John Leusden, his former teacher. While occupying this position he was sent as the chaplain of an embassy from Holland to James II. of Great Britain. During his absence of several months he became acquainted with some of the most eminent divines of the Church of England and among the Dissenters.

The crowning honor of his life still awaited him. He was called to the University of Leyden with the approval of William, Prince of Orange, then king of Great Britain. Here he labored for ten years, and combined with his professorship of divinity in the university the inspectorship of a theological college in West Friesland, until the infirmities of age compelled him to resign.

His fame rests principally upon his *Œconomy of the Covenants*, written while he was at Franeker, and his *Sacred Miscellanies*,¹ which first saw the light in Utrecht. His life and writings were the embodiment of his favorite maxim, "In essentials unity, in non-essentials liberty, in all things charity."

His philosophical stand-point is set forth in *An Essay on the Use and Abuse of Reason in Matters of Religion*.² In this he speaks of those who make reason the arbiter of those things which God has set forth in the Holy Script-

¹ *Hermanni Witsii Miscellaneorum Sacrorum Libri IV quibus De Prophetis et Prophetia, de Tabernaculi Levitici mysteriis, . . . Editio Secunda, Amstelodami, 1695; 6×4½ inches, pp. 859, besides a preface and copious indexes. To this a second volume was appended, published in 1700, which is of especial interest to Americans because of a dissertation (pp. 400-425) entitled, Exercitatio xiii qua disputatur Euangelium per Apostolos Americanis olim praedicatum fuisse. In this he maintains that the apostles might have reached America by natural means, or at least by supernatural, so as to preach the gospel.*

² This is in the second volume of his *Miscellanies*, pp. 582-597. In this he alludes with great respect to Huet, and speaks of his own treatise as if it were an abridgment of that of the French divine on the Agreement between Reason and Faith (*De Concordia Rationis et Fidei, Parisiis 1690*). See p. 585.

ures, while others servilely follow the opinion of their ancestors. He thinks both extremes should be avoided, and that while "in examining the mysteries of faith the aid of reason ought to be called in. Yet it should not be wholly and altogether relied upon."¹ In defining reason he considers it as a faculty for discerning between truth and falsehood, or as those maxims which are self-evident or are believed to have been drawn from self-evident principles. He then makes a distinction between right reason and wrong reason.² After some other preliminary definitions he says:

"When we inquire into the meaning of the Holy Scriptures, the question is whether then the dictates of what is accounted right reason must primarily be consulted, that it may in the first place determine concerning the things themselves, whether they are worthy of divine revelation; or whether we ought simply to attend to what the words in all their circumstances properly signify, so that what they are found to mean may forthwith be received for true without any further test or examination of the things accorded to pretended axioms of reason."³

He says that the Socinians contend for the former, and the orthodox for the latter; and argues that reason considered as a faculty in the present state of man is inclined to error, and that it belongs to faith to subdue reason to its obedience. He affirms that God never makes known any thing to man by supernatural revelation which is repugnant to self-evident truths or any dictates of right reason, and thus far, he says, "Those axioms may avail in some measure, as a rule, that nothing can be admitted as revealed by God which is contrary to the principles truly known by nature."⁴ He however warns against weakness of mind, and remarks that one may think something opposed to the truth which is in harmony with it. In illustration of this he quotes the opinion of Socinus, that it is contrary to the divine truth, holiness, and justice, for an innocent person, on any occasion, to bear the punish-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 584.

² *Ibid.*, p. 585.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 586.

⁴ *Witsii Miscellaneorum Sacrorum Tomus Alter*. Amstel., 1700, p. 589.

ment of the guilty, and by suffering for the guilty to make satisfaction to divine justice, and that the passages in regard to the atonement ought not to be interpreted according to their literal import, but as extraordinary tropes and figures.¹

The rationalism against which Wits contends in this treatise, which sets aside the evident meaning of Scripture, became dominant in Germany toward the end of the eighteenth century. As we shall see, this rationalism no longer exists among the scientific theologians of Europe, although there is something very much like it in the way that many interpret the Bible.² One of the first canons of modern biblical criticism is, that we should find out the original meaning of the writer. But after this point has been reached reason and critical judgment are considered ultimate.

If Huet was inclined to be partisan, Wits is certainly a model of a judicial temper of mind. In one place, where he says that the account of the burial of Moses must have been by another hand, and where he remarks that he does not think it well to invent prophecies³ where there is no necessity for them, and where they are contrary to the appearance of the truth, he gives utterance to the follow-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 590: "Et idcirco sacra verba in alium sensum quam ipsa sonant per inusitatos etiam tropos quandoque explicantur."

² This is especially the case where the Bible is treated as a collection of texts, to establish certain doctrines in a theological system, contrary to their legitimate meaning.

³ This is in allusion to the theory among the most orthodox Jewish and Christian interpreters, that those things which Moses could not have written in the Pentateuch, as occurring after his time, he wrote by the spirit of prophecy. For an illustration of this among Jewish commentators, see the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1884, vol. xli. p. 8; and among Christians, Carpvov, *Introductio ad Libros Canonicos* . . . Lipsiae 1757, p. 83, where, in commenting on Ex. xvi. 38, in reply to an objection by Spinoza that Moses could not have written this, he says: "Quid prohibet, quo minus Prophetico, quo gaudebat, Spiritu suggerente, Deoque ipsi revelante ista praeviderit et in literas retulerit?" There is a great difference here, however, between the Jewish and the Christian interpreter, which is favorable to the latter.

ing golden sentiment, which is too often neglected in the critical discussions of this enlightened age:

“It is my firm opinion, that we ought to deal candidly in all things, and that in every disputation we ought not to seek that we may differ as much as we can from an opponent, but that we should approach the truth sought in friendship and sincerity, as nearly as possible. Nor should we consider so much how we may put down an opponent as how we may satisfy our own conscience, and then the consciences of others. And I could wish that each discussion were pondered with no less placidity than if there were none. Indeed, where a certain thing presents itself for examination, I could wish that attention were not even given to other hypotheses, that by some art it might be explained in whatever way might best fit them; but it should be considered in itself as it is, and as it offers itself of its own accord to the mind which is not occupied by any outside prejudice.”¹

In regard to the content of revelation he would satisfy the most orthodox theologians of the present day, but would be opposed by the majority of continental critics. Leclerc seeks to establish his theory, that Moses was not the author of the Pentateuch, by showing that such exact knowledge as is indicated in Gen. ii. 11, 12, could not have come from Moses, but from some one living in Chaldea; since Moses could not have had such a knowledge of foreign geography, and God would not have revealed to him that the gold of that land [Pishon] was good. Wits' reply is emphatic, and has no uncertain sound:

“This whole observation rests on a hypothesis which seems to me indeed, for I may not dissemble any thing, impious, and fundamentally to subvert all the divine authority of sacred history; as if the Spirit of God did not teach the sacred writers some things which otherwise they would have been ignorant of if left to themselves. If it be true that the sacred historians have not related any thing, except what they have searched out by their own diligence, what difference is there between the history of Genesis and the commentaries of Diodorus Siculus?”

His further reply to Leclerc is too keen to be lost:

“Moses was not so ignorant, stupid, and dull as appears to our critic. If Leclerc, living with his friends at Amsterdam, knows so accurately that the Pishon is a branch of the Euphrates falling into the Persian gulf near Ormus, why could not Moses know the same, who was educated in the

¹ Witsii *Miscellaneorum Sacrorum Libri IV*, Amstel., 1690, vol. i. p. 120.

much frequented court of a neighboring king, and instructed in all the arts of the Egyptians, among which was geography?"¹

Wits' discussion of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, as well as that of Huet and others of the same school, is apologetic, or defensive. The question of the Mosaic authorship is considered as a citadel which must be held, at all hazards, against the assaults of the enemy. He contends mainly against Hobbes, the author of the *Preadamites* whom he does not name, Spinoza, Simon, and Leclerc. In the contest he displays a Damascus blade, and certainly comes off with honor. His arguments in favor of the Mosaic authorship are twofold. He considers first the probabilities, and then the testimony of Christ and his apostles.

I. PROBABILITIES IN FAVOR OF THE MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH.

1. "[It] is conceded by almost all, that he [Moses] wrote those things which pertain to the laws. This is so expressly stated that it cannot be called in question without a stern denial of the Scriptures. After the Israelites had made a covenant with God, and had heard the law partly from the mouth of God himself, and had partly received it from Moses, as it was delivered to him in darkness, 'Moses wrote all the words of Jehovah,' and indeed 'in the Book of the Covenant,' which he read before the entire people (Ex. xxiv. 4-7). When many other commands are added to these precepts by God, Moses is again commanded to write them down (Ex. xxxiv. 27). Finally, when Moses had finished setting forth all the commands of God to the people, and the same were comprehended in writing, he brought them together in one volume to be preserved in the side of the ark as a testimony against the Israelites (Deut. xxxi. 24-26). Fur-

¹ Witsii *Miscellaneorum*, Amstel., 1695, p. 121. This supposition is supported by modern investigations, for the ancient Egyptians wrote treatises on Geography. Cf. Rawlinson's *History of Ancient Egypt*, New York, 1882, vol. i. p. 139.

thermore, the autograph of this book was found in the temple in the latest times of the Jewish republic, under the reign of Josiah (2 Kings xxii. and 2 Chron. xxxiv)."¹

The admission which Wits mentions, that all the laws said to be written by Moses were actually written by him, is now only made by the most conservative school of critics. We shall see, in a later article, how uniformly the modern school rejects the Mosaic authorship of any of the laws as they now stand, even denying that the Ten Commandments are Mosaic. It is evident that Wits cannot affirm, except by conjecture, that the autograph of the Pentateuch was found in the Temple in the time of Josiah.²

² "It should be observed, that this book not only embraces those things which are contained in some chapters of the repetition of the law [Deuteronomy], but also the entire system of divine laws, in the observance of which the Israelites were under obligations to approve their trust in the divine will."

He quotes, in proof of this, Josh. i. 7, 8, and asks, "Where, then, is all that law found?" and replies, "In the book which Joshua had in his hands." He holds that this was the same book which the Levites taught the people in the time of Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xvii. 9).⁴

This argumentation is defective for present uses, because it does not afford the proof, by quotations from the other books, that any thing more than Deuteronomy was intended: and further, if the whole Pentateuch is meant in Josh. i. 7, 8; 2 Chron. xvii. 9, yet neither passage can be used in arguing with the modern school of critics, for they claim that the former belongs simply to the Deu-

¹ Witsii Miscellan. Amstel., 1695, pp. 108, 109.

² Cf. p. 325 for the ground on which this assumption rests.

³ The Greek name in the Septuagint, *Δευτερονόμιον*, is equivalent to the Hebrew term *מִשְׁנֵה תּוֹרָה*, *Repetition of the Tora*.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 109.

teronomist,¹ and the latter, to writings which were not found until after the time of Ezra.

3. "The precepts concerning whole burnt-offerings, and the duties of the priests in regard to them are contained in this same book of the law, although they are not found in the same form in Deuteronomy as in Leviticus and the Book of Numbers. And, indeed, these precepts are so exact, and so accurately delineate the duties of the priests and people with respect to every class of sacrifices, even down to the most minute *minutiae*, if it is proper thus to speak, that the memory of no man would be equal to retaining them, unless they existed in writing. But by whom could it rather be written than by him who himself received them from God, and delivered them to the people, and urged a most accurate observance of them?"²

He argues from 2 Chron. xxiii. 18, and Ezra vi. 18, where it said "as it is written," or "according as it is prescribed in the Book of Moses," that in the latter passage we have a reference to the third and eighth chapters of Numbers, and in the former to Leviticus. Hence, that Leviticus and Numbers were contained in the "Book of Moses." This is a valid argument; but, according to the canons of advanced criticism at the present day, which deny historical infallibility to the Scriptures, these references from post-exilic books are of no avail in maintaining the Mosaic authorship against critics of almost every school, including even Delitzsch. Of course to apologists like Hengstenberg and Keil the testimony of an inspired post-exilic writer would be sufficient.

4. Moses must not only have written the history of Amalek, but also other events of still greater importance. Omitting the assertion that Moses wrote prophecies (Deut. xxviii.—xxxi. Cf. Neh. i. 8, 9) and historical

¹ Cf. Kleinert, *Abriss der Einleitung Zum Alten Testament*, Berlin, 1878. Tables at the end of the book.

² *Witsii Miscellan.* Amstel., 1695, p. 110.

events (Ex. xvii. 14), we give his comments on this last passage:

"This mandate is strongly expressed, and if rightly pondered leads us to the consideration of many other things. And first, indeed, I wish it to be considered, that the history concerning the Amalekite war is not more memorable than many other things which God brought to pass in liberating the Israelitish people, both in Egypt and the wilderness. If, therefore, God wished that this memorial should be inscribed perpetually in a book, and Moses consecrated it to eternity by writing it, what cause can be assigned, why the same ought not to be done in regard to the other works of God, which far surpass this in marvellousness? And concerning which it is said (Ps. lxxviii. 5, 6, 7): 'He set a testimony in Jacob, and made a law in Israel, when he commanded our fathers to teach them to their children. In order that the following generation might know, the sons who should be born, that they should arise and teach them to their sons,' etc.

"When, therefore, God wished these illustrious and prodigious facts to be preserved in the memory of the Israelitish people, and he himself commanded that they should be written in a book as the best remedy for aiding the memory; by whom could this writing be made with greater fidelity, dignity, and authority than by Moses, who himself was the most prominent actor in the events, and was incited so many times by an express command of the divine will to write?

"Add to this that this history of the war with the Amalekites could scarcely be described properly unless it were narrated, at the same time, in what way and on what occasion the Israelites came into the desert and to the confines of the Amalekites, what were the causes of irritation through which the Amalekites were incited to battle, and, finally, who the Amalekites were with whom the Israelitish people were compelled to fight. But these things make up no mean part of sacred history."¹

5. The fact that Moses wrote a list of the stations (Num. xxxiii. 2) would seem to indicate that he wrote an account of events which are of far more importance than mere names. He says:

"It is not at all credible, that Moses should thus have written the journeys of the Israelites in the desert, and that he should not at the same time have written those far more notable things which happened, and of which the remembrance is infinitely more worthy to be preserved than that of bare journeys, which, whether known or unknown, do little for wisdom or probability."

6. The history and legislation are so indissolubly connected that the one cannot be explained without the other.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

"When, therefore, it is certain that the legislation and the conclusion of the covenant was described by Moses, and that this could not be understood without the history of the Israelitish people; how envious it is to deny the writing of these things by Moses without which it is necessary that those which he indubitably wrote should be mutilated and defective."¹

This last argument must certainly have been one of great strength, and must still have weight with those who admit that Moses was the author of any part of the legal code in the Pentateuch. Whatever replies may be made to these arguments, he regards another as unanswerable.²

II. THE TESTIMONY OF CHRIST AND HIS APOSTLES TO THE MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP.

I. *General Testimony with respect to the entire Pentateuch.*

Wits considers the authority of the Lord Jesus sufficient to settle this question, and says, that such a passage as John v. 46 ("If ye believed Moses ye would believe me, for he wrote of me") is proof positive that the Books of Moses are not so named from their object, as the Books of Judges, Ruth, and Esther, as Hobbes and Spinoza foolishly claim, but from their author, "Moses wrote." Where, then, do we find these writings concerning Christ? He replies:

"In the promise concerning the seed of the woman [Gen. iii. 15], concerning the seed of Abraham [Gen. xxii. 18], Isaac [Gen. xxvi. 4], Jacob [Gen. xxviii. 14], and in the prophecy concerning Shiloh [Gen. xlix. 10].³ They are found in the description of the angel in whom is the name of Jehovah, and who has the power of forgiving or not forgiving sins [Ex. xxiii. 21]. They are found in the types of the priests, and chiefly of the high priest, and in the types of sacrifices, especially of that expiatory sacrifice offered once a year [Lev. xvi.], which Paul⁴ explains and applies (Heb. xiii. 12, 13). They

¹ Ibid., p. 112.

² Ibid., p. 112: "At quid ego haec argumentando conficere laboro? quum sola Domini *Jesu auctoritas* dirimendae huic quaestioni sufficiat?"

³ For an explanation of these passages which are controverted by the critics, see Delitzsch, *Messianic Prophecies*, Edinburgh, 1880, pp. 28-36.

⁴ One of the latest defenders of the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews is Biesenthal in *Das Trostsprechen des Apostels Paulus an die Hebräer*, Leipzig, 1878, pp. 19-43. This book is remarkable, because of the author's attempt to remove all exegetical difficulties from the Epistle

are found in the prophecy of Balaam, mentioned in Numbers xxiv. 17. They are found, finally, in the promise of a prophet who shall speak the words of God (cf. Deut. xviii. 15-18, with Acts iii. 22)."

He argues from this that the testimony of Moses to Christ exists in all the books of the Pentateuch.¹

2. Testimony with respect to Exodus and Leviticus.

Christ declares that Exodus is by Moses, in a quotation that he makes from it. Wits considers it worthy of note, that it was the Sadducees who came to Christ, saying, "Master, Moses wrote, If a man's brother die, and leave a wife" [Mark xii. 19], not the Pharisees, who, as Spinoza holds, were trying to put forth the most recent writings for the most ancient Mosaic. He says that the Sadducees would not easily believe their enemies.² Christ replies to the Sadducees (ver. 26): "But concerning the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read in the Book of Moses,³ in the bush [*i. e.* in the passage about the bush],⁴ how God spake to him, saying?" "These words exist in

by reproducing the Hebrew original from our Greek text through a retranslation. It is hardly necessary to say that the weight of scholarship is now opposed to the Pauline authorship. See Zahn, Hebräerbrief in Herzog und Plitt's Real Encyclopädie, Leipzig, 1879, vol. v. pp. 656-671.

¹ Witsii Miscellan., p. 113.

² Ibid., p. 113: "Nota, *Sadducaeos* hoc dicere. Non ergo Pharisei fuerunt, qui suae aetatis hominibus imponentes, recentissima scripta pro antiquis Mosaicis venditarent; quod Spinoza calumniatur." I have not been able to find any such representation respecting Pharisees in the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*. On the other hand, the following passages seem to be unfavorable to such an idea. Cf. Spinoza, *Opera*, Jenae, 1802, vol. i. p. 310, where he speaks of the Sadducees as authors of counterfeit books of Daniel, Ezra, and Esther, which the Pharisees never received, p. 314. Possibly Wits has in mind p. 277: "Incipiam et primo de Scriptore Pentateuchi: quem fere omnes Mosen esse crediderunt, imo adeo pertinaciter defenderunt Pharisei, ut eum haereticum habuerint qui aliud visus est sentire."

³ This was a common designation for the Pentateuch in the later Hebrew (ספר משה, Book of Moses, 2 Chron. xxxv. 12; Neh. xiii. 1; Ezra vi. 18).

⁴ As the Hebrew Bible was not divided into chapters and verses, it was natural that this account should be said to be found in the bush. Cf. Meyer, *Kritisch Exegetisches Handbuch*, Göttingen, 1867, p. 165.

Ex. iii. 6. Therefore Christ most expressly declares that the Book of Exodus is a book of Moses. Paul declares the same thing concerning the Book of Leviticus." (Rom. x. 5. Cf. Lev. xviii. 5.)

3. *Particular testimony with respect to the Pentateuch.*

"Finally, the entire Pentateuch receives the name of Moses. For thus James the apostle [says]: 'For Moses from generations of old hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath'" (Acts xv. 21).

"But what is read as Mosaic in the synagogues? The entire Pentateuch is divided into fifty-four parashas, or sections, so that it can be finished yearly.' Paul imitates James (2 Cor. iii. 14, 15): 'For until this very day at the reading of the old covenant the same veil remaineth unlifted. . . . But unto this day, whensoever Moses is read a veil lieth on their heart.' Where it is evident that the books containing the history of the old covenant, which were read at this time by the Jews, were inscribed with the name of Moses."

Wits gives the following summing up of the argument :

"We have proved, from evident testimonies of the Sacred Scriptures, the following things : (1) Moses, at the command of God, was the most celebrated writer of his age among the people of God ; (2) He wrote laws which were the norm for the people of Israel of every virtue ; (3) Not only those which were contained in some chapters of Deuteronomy, but also those which exist in the Books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers ; (4) All these were comprehended in one volume, to be preserved by the side of the ark of the covenant ; (5) He also wrote the prophecies in which the fate of the Israelitish people was foretold ; (6) And the histories of the events in the desert and of other things, without which the legislation and the

¹ These are the great parashas, which are subdivided into small ones. Hupfeld, however, claims that the fifty-four larger sections never occur in the Talmud, but were first introduced in the Massorah. The smaller sections are not unfrequently mentioned. See *Beleuchtung dunkler Stellen der alt-testamentlichen Textgeschichte*, in the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, Hamburg, 1836. p. 843. The theory of the author, that the whole Pentateuch was read through each year in connection with the synagogue service aside from the exception taken by Hupfeld is undoubtedly correct.

covenant between God and the Israelitish people could not be understood ; (7) Also numerous testimonies concerning Christ, very many of which are found in the Book of Genesis ; (8) The Book of Exodus was called the Book of Moses by Christ ; (9) The whole Pentateuch, which in any case was read through in the times of Christ and his apostles in the synagogues, is called Moses by James and Paul ; (10) And this is not because it was written about Moses, but by Moses. If these do not prove that Moses was the writer of the Pentateuch, in what way can an author be assigned to any ancient book whatever?"¹

It will be remembered that Leclerc denied the validity of this entire argument, when he affirmed: "Jesus Christ and his apostles not having come into the world to teach criticism to the Jews, it is not strange that they should speak according to the common opinion."²

Wits considers Leclerc guilty of profanity in broaching such an opinion, and answers him in this fashion:

"But may evil betide that audacious and rash critic who is so destitute of religion that he places his own conjectures, as he himself confesses, before the authority of the apostles, and even of Christ himself. Truly, Christ and his apostles were not critical doctors such as those demand that they should be considered who to-day claim for themselves the kingdom of letters in every sort of knowledge ; nevertheless, they were teachers of truth, nor did they suffer themselves to be imposed on through common ignorance or high craft. They certainly did not come into the world to cherish vulgar errors,³ and fortify them by their authority ; nor to scatter them far and wide not only through the Jews, but also through people solely dependent on them. In a word, whoever has the Christian religion at heart ; whoever considers the authority of Christ and his apostles sacred will more readily

¹ Witsii Miscellan. Amstel., 1695, pp. 114, 115.

² See Bibliotheca Sacra, vol. xli. p. 675.

³ This is eminently true if by errors are meant false doctrines. There seems to be evidence, however, that Christ did not always correct the *form* of popular beliefs, which in their literal interpretation were quite different from views which good Christians now hold. For example, it seems not to have been an uncommon belief among the Jews, that in the Messianic time the good would recline at a great banquet with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Christ does not endeavor to correct this impression, but uses it to convey the truth that, while multitudes of the Gentiles will be saved, the Jews, the children of the kingdom, will be lost. (Matt. viii. 11, 12 ; cf. the quotations from the Talmud, in connection with this passage, by Wünsche, Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien aus Talmud und Midrasch, Göttingen, 1878, p. 113.)

give credence to Christ and his apostles, when speaking about Moses as the author of the Pentateuch, than to any number of Hobbeses, Spinozas, Simons, Leclercs, and the whole race of profane critics with all their rash conjectures."¹

When it is remembered what these conjectures were, all must agree that Wits was justified in using this language, and that it behooves scholars to be very careful about adopting new critical theories.

III. CONFUTATION OF THE CRITICS.

I. *Simon.*

"It is proved, if we give up Moses, that no one else can be assigned as author of the Pentateuch with any greater degree of probability, much less with any certainty. For the learned have recently demonstrated that Simon has simply drawn on his imagination when he argues copiously (*prolixè*) that the public scribes reported every thing in the daily journal, and when he contends that they even existed from the beginning of the republic in the wilderness. Nor has Simon been able, hitherto, to throw aside the objections of Leclerc and others. It is little less than blasphemy to hold, as he thinks, that our sacred books were compiled from public commentaries of such a sort so confusedly and with so little judgment, and whatever is pretended is said in mere mockery of the Scriptures."²

2. *Spinoza.*

"Nor was the Pentateuch finally written by Ezra after the Babylonian captivity. For it already existed in the time of Amaziah (2 Chron. xxv. 4), and of David (1 Kings ii. 3), and of Joshua (viii. 34). And soon after the captivity this same book is represented as the ancient norm of religion (Ezra iii. 2). The critics indeed declare that this must be understood not concerning the Pentateuch, but concerning some other book of Moses,—I do not know what. They declare, I say, but do not prove. But certainly all those things which are alleged only in the passages quoted exist even now to-day in the Pentateuch. . . . Truly the Samaritan Pentateuch is a strong argument for antiquity; especially if it is believed, as many of the critics think to-day, that the sacred *codices* were first written with Samaritan letters,³ which letters Ezra changed for the newer and more elegant ones

¹ Witsii Miscellan., pp. 115, 116.

² Bibliotheca Sacra, vol. xli. pp. 668 ff.

³ They were certainly written with letters which, in a somewhat modified form, have been preserved in the Samaritan. The earliest representation of these letters is seen on the Moabite Stone (ninth century B. C.), and a further development in Phœnician inscriptions. The square characters, on the other hand, were developed from the ancient Aramaic. It has not been

which are now in use. But they say that the Samaritan letters — not those which belonged to the new colonists, but the most ancient Hebrew letters — were retained by the Samaritans. It is known that an internecine hatred came between the Jews returned from the Babylonian captivity and the Samaritans; so that neither were these willing to receive from those, nor those from these, any thing as sacred. But if Ezra, or any other contemporary, wrote the Pentateuch, how did it come to pass that the Samaritans admitted a volume composed by their most deadly enemy, with so great veneration as divine, and that they should have suffered that to be obtruded on them as Mosaic which a recent [writer] was issuing from the hands of a contemporary? How did it happen that the Samaritans do not have a volume written with their own letters, but with the ancient characters of the Hebrews, while the Hebrews did not have one at this time, except in the Assyrian or Chaldean letters?"

Although this argument, that while the Samaritans preserved the Pentateuch with the ancient Hebrew letters, the Hebrews transmitted it in the square characters, cannot be urged to prove that Ezra was not the author of the Pentateuch because we cannot determine that the square characters were introduced by Ezra; yet Wits makes a strong point when he asks, how it happened that the Samaritans should have adopted a volume composed by their most deadly enemy as divine? This is certainly unlikely, and Dr. W. Robertson Smith's assumption that the Samaritans first received the Pentateuch about the year 430 B. C. from the Jews is without sufficient foundation.¹

determined whether the square characters were introduced among the Jews as early as the time of Ezra. Stade thinks that they could not have come into use until the definite separation between the Jews and Samaritans in the time of Nehemiah. He argues since the ancient Hebrew characters are found on coins 66–135 A. D., these letters were in use much longer. This argument cannot be pressed too much, since the square characters were evidently common in the time of Christ (Matt. v. 18), and the ancient Hebrew letters may have been used on coins, as old English is now not unfrequently employed. It is definitely known that the square characters were used after the year 176 B. C.; cf. the admirable remarks in Bickell's *Outlines of Hebrew Grammar*, Leipzig, 1877, pp. 10, 11; Stade, *Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1879, pp. 25–27; and König, *Historisch-Kritisches Lehrgebäude der Hebräischen Sprache*, Leipzig, 1881, p. 27.

¹ W. Robertson Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, Edinburgh, 1881, pp. 73–398; cf. *The Bibliotheca Sacra*, vol. xli. p. 676.

3. *Leclerc.*

"But the silly talk (*hariolatio*) of John Leclerc is the most ridiculous of all, if in so serious an affair it is right to laugh. For what folly this is that a Samaritan priest, distinguished in nothing, a man of no reputation, should suddenly rise as the author of so great a work. Forsooth, that zeal was so wanting to the greatest prophets which the Jews and the tribes of Israel had, that a Samaritan, a schismatic, who had served against the precept of God at the altar of Bethel, committed the history of the people of God to writing from the foundation of the world until the death of Moses. Paul wrote long ago: 'What advantage, then, hath the Jew? or what is the profit of circumcision? Much every way: first of all, that they were intrusted with the oracles of God' (Rom. iii. 1, 2). Now truly we hear of some one who dignifies the Cutheans, the Havaeans, the Camatheans, the vilest dregs of the people, with this honor that that venerable book, which not only the Jews, but also Christ and his apostles, made so much of, was first written for their advantage. Does the Samaritan priest seem so much more worthy to you, Leclerc, to whom the Pentateuch is inscribed than Moses? and those miserable Cutheans in whose behalf it was written than those whose is the adoption, and glory, and covenant, and constitution of the law, and worship, and promises? By what author are these things said? By what witness? All antiquity is for Moses. You confess it. Nevertheless, it pleases you to go against it. Concerning that Samaritan priest no mortal ever dreamed before. Nevertheless, you substitute him for Moses. Therefore, in matters of fact, it is permitted you to invent what you like, and whatever the lying Greek dares in history."

Although this is sound reasoning, yet the mention of the "Samaritan priest" as the author of the Pentateuch is a little misleading. Leclerc's theory was, that an "Israelitish priest" from the ten tribes, who had been carried away captive by the Assyrians (721 B. C.), and who was sent by the king of Assyria to instruct the mixed inhabitants of the land (2 Kings xvii.) was the author of the Pentateuch. He holds, however, that the book was not composed until after the discovery of the law in the eighteenth year of Josiah¹ (621 B. C.).

¹Leclerc, *Sentimens*, Amsterdam, 1685, p. 129: "Toutes ces circonstances se trouvent dans le personne du Sacrificateur Israélite, que l'on envoya de Babylone, pour instruire les nouveaux habitans de la Palestine, de manière dont il faloit qu'ils servissent Dieu. . . . Il y a de l'apparence que ce Sacrificateur . . . pour faire comprendre à ces peuples idolâtres la fausseté de leurs opinions, touchent la pluralité des Dieux, entreprit de leur donner une Histoire de la Création du monde par un seul Dieu, et

IV. CONCESSIONS.

Wits freely concedes that there are some things in the Pentateuch which were not written by Moses, but were added by Ezra or some other divinely inspired man (*θεοπνεύστω*); such, for instance, is the account of the death and burial of Moses (Deut. xxxiv). He contends, however, that these things are so few and small that they do not affect the Mosaic authorship.

Taking up the difficulties raised by Leclerc respecting the Mosaic authorship, he answers them in detail:

Genesis.—1. Gen. xii. 6 and xiii. 7 were cited by the critics, then as now, to show that Moses could not have written the passages in question, since the Canaanites who were residing in Palestine in the time of Moses could no longer have been resident there when these were written. Wits replies:

(1.) "It does not follow that the Canaanites had already been driven from their seats when this history was written, nor that their dwelling in that country is narrated to this end. But Moses wishes to teach that Abraham, also, had business with the Canaanites, and that they then inhabited that land from which they were to be driven sometime through the descendants of Abraham, and on their account; and he did this to show the faith of Abraham, who, having followed God as a leader, dared to wander about in that country which was occupied by strong tribes that were hostile to him." (2.) "The reason is given why that tract would not hold the flocks of Abraham and Lot; and the prudence of Abraham is praised, who affirmed that the strife between his herdmen and those of Lot should be quickly composed, on account of the vicinity of savage tribes. What is there here that could not be said by Moses?"

2. Gen. xiv. 14: "And he pursued [them] unto Dan" (cf. Josh. xix. 47). Wits says that the explanations given of this passage do not satisfy his mind. He therefore admits that it is from a later hand. He holds that

un abrégé de celle des Juifs jusqu'à la Loi, par au il parût qu'il n'y a qu'un seul Dieu, qui est celui que les Israélites adoroient. . . . On ne peut pas marquer l'année, dans laquelle il entreprit ce travail, mais il semble qu'on peut assurer, que ce ne fût qu'après l'année dix-huitième du regne de Josias. Et la raison de cela est, que ce fût cette année que l'on trouva le Livre de la Loi, qui avoit été si longtemps caché, et sans lequel ce Sacrificateur ne pouvoit mettre la dernière main à son ouvrage."

either Samuel, or Ezra, or some other divinely inspired writer (θεόπνευστος), could have substituted a more recent name, better known and more celebrated, in place of the ancient name, which was unknown to the Israelitish people.

3. As we have seen, the critics claimed, as they do now, that in Gen. xxxvi. 31 we have a strong indication that the Pentateuch was written by a later hand, and certainly after the time of the kings. Wits replies:

"There is nothing here which could not have been said by Moses. A promise was made to Jacob concerning kings, (Gen. xxxv. 11), but not to Esau. Moses therefore well observes, as a memorable thing, and in which there might be a great exercise of faith, that before this prophecy was fulfilled in the posterity of Jacob, that of Esau already had so many kings. . . . Every thing is historical. But neither is another difficulty insoluble. From the death of Moses, after Esau had occupied Edom, until the command (*ducatus*) of Moses, there were two hundred and thirty-six years. Within this time there could easily have been seven and more kings in Edom."

4. He confesses that Gen. xxxvii. 14, where Hebron is mentioned, as well as Gen. xiii. 18; xxiii. 19; xxxv. 27, are from a later hand; since the city was originally called Kirjath Arba, and received its name from the father of Caleb (Josh. xiv. 13-15).

5. It was objected that since the Hebrews owned nothing but a sepulchre in the land of Canaan in the time of Jacob, and were mentioned as strangers, Joseph could not speak of his being taken from the land of the Hebrews (Gen. xl. 15). Wits, however, says that this was the most convenient designation of that part of Canaan which is near Hebron, where Abraham lived, who is first called a Hebrew (Gen. xiv. 13) after he had arrived in Canaan with a very numerous family; where Isaac and Jacob sojourned a long time as strangers indeed, but as strangers of great reputation, who were regarded as chiefs (Gen. xxiii. 6) and had their own laws; and who made covenants not only with private individuals, but also with kings (Gen. xxi. 22; xxvi. 26), and with states (Gen. xxxiv). If, too,

we remember the victory of Abraham (Gen. xiv), and that the neighboring people did not dare to take vengeance when the sons of Jacob plundered Shechem, we can see that Joseph was justified in saying that he was stolen from the land of the Hebrews, *i. e.*, from that part of Canaan which is around Hebron (Gen. xxxvii. 14), where the Hebrews had lived for many years subsequent to their covenant with the foreigners. From the preceding remarks it will be seen that Wits finds only two places in Genesis that are from a later hand.

Exodus.—6. With reference to the critics' objection that no writer would use such language concerning himself as we find in Ex. vi. 26, 27, he says that it would be entirely in keeping with the ingenuousness and candor of those times that Moses should add this remark to his own genealogy, and finds almost a parallel in the saying of John with respect to himself in his own Gospel (xxi. 24), the genuineness of which, he says, is not called in question by any one.¹ He also finds expressions in the writings of Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah² which are much of the same sort.

7. The critics think that they discover another sign of a late age in the use of the word מִן־בְּנֵי, which did not begin to be employed until long after the time of Moses, as we learn from 1 Sam. ix. 9.³ But Wits reminds them that

¹ The late lamented Ezra Abbot, in *The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, Boston, 1880, p. 7, makes the following statement as to the present drift of opinion with respect to this subject: "Among scholars of equal learning and ability, as Hilgenfeld, Keim, Scholten, Hausrath, Renan, on the one hand, and Godet, Beyschlag, Luthardt, Weiss, Lightfoot, on the other, opinions are yet divided, with a tendency, at least in Germany, toward the denial of its genuineness."

² The authorship of these books by the persons named, especially of the first, is called in question, except by the most conservative scholars. See Keil, *Lehrbuch der Historisch-Kritischen Einleitung*, Frankfort, A. M., 1873, who vindicates their genuineness, pp. 416, 417, 480, 482, 483.

³ Thus Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel*, London, 1874, vol. i. p. 191, claims that prophecy did not arise until the time of Samuel. He, of course, considers such passages as Wits quotes as from later writers, and consequently of no weight, *Ibid.*, p. 213.

everywhere this word was most common and best known in the time of Moses (Gen. xx. 7; Ex. vii. 1; Num. xi. 29; Deut. xiii. 1, 3, 5; xviii. 18), and that neither *חֹזֵן*, nor *רֹאֵה*, nor any other Hebrew word, was adapted to express the idea contained in *נָבִיא*. Anciently this word signified an intercessor with God and an interpreter of the divine will.¹ In this sense it is applied to the prophets. It did not precisely indicate a foreteller of future events, which began to be the signification about the time of Samuel.

8. In regard to Ex. xvi. 35 he says that, considering Josh. v. 11, he does not dare with some to turn a clear and simple history into a prophecy.² He therefore recognizes here a later hand; but with reference to the following verse (Ex. xvi. 36) he does not make the same admission, because he thinks that the definition of the omer may have been added by the writer for the sake of posterity.

Deuteronomy.—9. As the old critics did not take Leviticus and Numbers into account, which have now become so fruitful a field for discussion, Wits passes to Deuteronomy. From i. 1 the critics gather that this book was written in Palestine, and hence cannot be attributed to Moses, who did not cross the Jordan, but died in the land of Moab. Wits, Huet, and Carpzov all substantially agree, that in Scripture usage *בְּעֶבֶר* is an indefinite term which signifies in transit (*in transitu*), and may designate the things on one side of the river with as much propriety as those on the other. Thus we find in several passages after *בְּעֶבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן* either *מִזְרְחָהּ*, toward the east (Deut. iv. 41, 47, 49 [cf. Deut. xi. 30]; Josh. i. 15; xii. 1; xiii. 8), or *יְפוֹה*,

¹ Kuenen, *Ibid.*, p. 214, holds that *nābī* must be interpreted as a passive participle, hence one who is entered into by the Divine Spirit. Orelli, however, *Die alttestamentliche Weissagung*, Wien, 1882, p. 77, considers that the active signification of this word, which is supported by Delitzsch, v. Hoffmann, Ewald, Dillmann, and Schultz is established beyond the shadow of a doubt in the sense of "speaker."




² Cf. remark — p. 304.

toward the west (seaward, Josh. v. 1; xii. 7; xxii. 7), to avoid ambiguity, and to designate more clearly either this or that side. He illustrates the usage by a reference to 1 Sam. xiv. 40, where Saul says to the people:

אַתֶּם תְּהִיּוּ לְעֵבֶר אַחֵר וְאֲנִי וַיּוֹנָתָן בְּנֵי נְהִיָּה לְעֵבֶר אַחֵר

“Ye shall be on one side, and I and Jonathan my son will be on the other side.” He also argues that the expression עֵבֶר הַנְּהָר (1 Kings iv. 24) should be translated, *this side of the river*. While there can be no doubt that this indicates the west side of the Euphrates, yet we cannot prove that it is to be translated *on this side*, since the writer may have been on the other side of the river, as the critics claim, in Babylon.¹ It seems evident, however, from the use of the other passage, that עֵבֶר did not always signify across from the stand-point of the speaker; especially, when we remember that the plural is used of the river lands,² (e. g., עֵבֶר נְהָר Is. vii. 20) of Assyria and Egypt. It would seem, therefore, that this point is well taken where the stand-point of the speaker is clearly given, and that the word in certain connections may signify *this side*, as well as *the other*.³

¹ Cf. Thenius, Die Bücher der Könige, Leipzig, 1873, p. 42; and Reuss, La Bible . . . Livres des Juges, de Samuel et des Rois, Paris, 1877, p. 424: “Nous avons là encore une remarque du rédacteur définitif, qui vivait sans doute à Babylone, ou quelque part dans l’intérieur de l’empire chaldéen; car pour lui, le royaume de Salomon est situé *au-delà* de l’Euphrate, vers l’ouest.”

² See Fuerst, A Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament . . . New York, 1867, p. 1009; also Hebräisches und Chaldäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament . . . [ed] Dr. Victor Ryssel, Leipzig, 1876, vol. 2, p. 107. Compare with this the use of the Arabic words  and  or . “The bank or side of a river or valley,” Lane, an Arabic-English Lexicon . . . London, 1874, Book I.—Part 5, p. 1938.

³ This Gesenius admits when he says: “Ex quibus manifestum est, עֵבֶר ab uno eodemque scriptore, de ulteriore et citeriore regione dici potuisse. Similis ratio est locutionis: עֵבֶר הַנְּהָר, quae non solum *regionem transeuphratenesem significat*, Josh. xxiv. 2, 3; 2 Sam. x. 16; 1 Chron. xix. 16 . . . sed etiam *ciseuphratenesem*, 1 Kings iv. 24; Ezra viii. 36; Neh. ii.

10. He acknowledges that there is an interpolation in Deut. iii. 14, but affirms that in the entire Pentateuch there are only four passages in which an interpolation must be recognized, and concludes in these words: "Haec autem tantilla tam immanis postulati molem non sustinent: et contra antiquitatis fidem, contra Apostolorum et Christi auctoritatem, Pentateuchi conscriptio Mosi abrogetur."

Notwithstanding this claim in regard to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, Wits was eminently fair in his methods, and was far in advance of his predecessor Huet, and of the eminent man who followed him.

3. *Carpzov* (b. 1679; d. 1767).

John Gottlob Carpzov³ may be considered an illustration of the saying that "blood tells." His father was not only a celebrated minister, but the whole family for several generations were famous as soldiers. He enjoyed the best advantages the age afforded in Germany, and when he was only twenty-four years old was permitted to visit England and Holland as the chaplain of the ambassador of the Saxon elector. He served for some years as a pastor in his native city, Dresden; was afterward transferred as one of the ministers (*Diaconus*) of the Thomas Church in Leipsic, where he was also an extraordinary professor in connection with the university, and delivered lectures on Hebrew antiquities, dogmatic, polemic, hom-

7-9; iii. 7; although he says that the expression עָבַר הַיַּרְדֵּן where there is no ambiguity signifies *across the Jordan*. See his *Thesaurus*, Lipsiae, 1840, under עָבַר.

³ Cf. Jöcher's *Gelehrten-Lexicon*, ed. Adelung, Leipzig, 1787, vol. ii. cols. 133-136; Meyer *Geschichte der Schrifterklärung*, Göttingen, 1805, vol. iv. pp. 289 ff., 417 ff.; Ersch und Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, Leipzig, 1826, vol. xv. pp. 217 ff., and best of all, Siegfried in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, Leipzig, 1876, vol. iv. pp. 23-25.

iletic, and pastoral theology.¹ He finally became superintendent in Lübeck, where he spent the rest of his life, until he died full of years and honors at the age of eighty-eight. His theological stand-point was that of the strictest orthodoxy.² Strictly speaking, Moses was not the author of the Pentateuch, but the Holy Ghost.³ The arrangement of the Psalms,⁴ and the irregularity claimed by the critics in the order of the prophecies in Jeremiah⁵ was the work of the Holy Spirit. Moses was not dependent upon tradition for the facts related in Genesis; but they were directly revealed to him by the Spirit of God. Hebrew was the language of Eden;⁶ the verses of the text were arranged by the authors themselves;⁷ the Masoretic pointing is as old as the Hebrew letters.⁸ The Old Testament Scriptures were not only the word of God, but also the words of God transmitted through the cen-

¹ This is an illustration of the freedom which German professors still have of going out of their special departments to lecture on such themes as may especially interest them. While no German professor would now presume to take in all theological departments, yet there is far more liberty in lecturing than among us.

² This may be found in his *Introductio ad Libros Canonicos Bibliorum Veteris Testamenti Omnes, Praecognita Critica et Historica ac Auctoritatis Vindicata Exponens . . . Editio Quarta*, Lipsiae, 1757, 8½ x 7 inches, pp. 1-376, vol. ii. (1756), pp. 1-437, and index.

³ *Ibid.*, vol. i. pp. 62 ff.

⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. ii. p. 132: "Qui Psalmos non fortuita et temeraria collectione in unum, absque ordine, coaluisse volumen, sed certa methodo, nexusque lege digestos et sapientissima collectoris θεοπνεύστον structura ita dispositos fuisse tradunt, ut exactissima ordinis ratione unus alterum sequatur."

⁵ *Ibid.*, vol. ii. p. 141.

⁶ *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti . . . Secunda Vice Editae*, Lipsiae, 1748, pp. 174 ff.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 153: "Eaque textus divisio quum omnium sit antiquissima, et ad sacros Dei amanuenses, Mosen atque Prophetas omnino referenda, nulli dubitamus."

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 247. "Sed et puncta vocalia, aequae ac accentus, eandem cum literis aetatem ferunt, et a sacris amanuensibus, in ἀνογράφοις adscripta rectius censentur, quam negantur."

turies without change,—as fully divine as the original autographs.¹

With such a theological position there is no room for criticism. The judge becomes an advocate; the critic, an apologist and polemic. Carpzov took, however, the best orthodox arguments of his time, stated them clearly, and gathered them in an Introduction² which was a citadel and armory for orthodoxy until nearly the end of the eighteenth century.

In the polemic parts of his introduction he deals with Hobbes, Peyrere, Spinoza, Simon, and Leclerc. He also mentions Huet, Heidegger, and Wits, not to speak of others, many times.

His views respecting the authorship of the Pentateuch do not differ essentially from those already stated. We give them, at the expense of repetition, for the sake of clearness, and as a summary of that which has been stated more at length.³

1. It is evident that Moses consigned laws to writing by the divine command (Ex. xxiv. 4-7; xxxiv. 27; Deut. xxxi. 24, 25, 26).

2. It is equally clear that he consigned to writing prophecies (Deut. xxviii.—xxxi.), certain sections of which are mentioned as Mosaic (Neh. i. 8, 9).

3. He asserts the same in regard to the history, quoting in support of this the document with respect to the Amalekite war (Ex. xvii. 16), and also affirms that, from the description of the journey of the Israelites through the desert (Num. xxxiii. 2), we see that the connection of the history and of the covenant entered into with Israel is most close.

¹ Ibid., p. 92: "Consistit itaque codicis Hebraei puritas in eo, quod textus ejus ad illum prorsus modum ad nos devenerit, quo primum a Spiritu Dei suggestus, et ex *θεοπνευστία* literis consignatus fuit; nec vel adversariorum fraudibus ac technis, vel temporum injuria, vel librariorum incuria, vel criticorum aut correctorum audacia, corruptionis quicquam. mutationis aut labis admiserit."

² For the title of this work see p. 323.

³ Cf. pp. 317-322.

4. He holds that the book of the law found in the temple in the time of Josiah was not merely Deuteronomy, but the entire Pentateuch, and that the language used, ספר תורת יהוה ביד משה, *liber legis Domini per manum Mosis, scil.*, נכתב, *scriptus*, may well indicate, as many interpreters suppose, an autograph by Moses.

5. He maintains that the testimony of the New Testament is explicit with reference to the Mosaic authorship: (1) Genesis is Mosaic on the testimony of James (Acts xv. 20, cf. Gen. ix. 4); (2) Exodus is, in the same way, attested by Christ himself (Mark xii. 26, cf. Ex. iii. 6); (3) Leviticus is stamped as Mosaic by Paul, who cites Levit. xviii. 5 in Rom. x. 5; (4) The same apostle also cites Num. xii. 7 in Heb. iii. 2; (5) Deuteronomy is also mentioned by the Sadducees, with Christ's tacit approval, as Mosaic (cf. Matt. xxii. 23, 24; Mark xii. 19 and Deut. xxv. 5, 6).

The Pentateuch is thus indicated as written by Moses, not only by references to separate books, but also to the whole; since Christ says, in John v. 46, 47, that Moses wrote of him (e. g. Gen. iii. 15; xlix. 10 ff.; Num. xxiv. 17 ff.; Deut. xviii. 15 ff.), and Moses is quoted as equivalent to the Pentateuch (Luke xvi. 29; Acts xv. 21; 2 Cor. iii. 14, 15).¹

He differs radically from the critics of the present day with respect to the theory of the composite origin of the Pentateuch. He holds that the Pentateuch was written only by the hand of Moses, and was destined for the canon;² but he does not accept Heidegger's³ theory, that

¹ Cf. Carpzovii Introductio ad Libros Canonicos Bibliorum, vol. vii, Lipsiae, 1757. pp. 41-42.

² Ibid., vol. i. p. 45.

³ John Henry Heidegger (b. 1633; d. 1698), the author of *Exercitationes Biblicae Capelli, Simonis, Spinosae, et aliorum sive aberrationibus, sive fraudibus oppositae, . . . Tiguri [Zürich] 1700*; and the author of the *Formula Consensus Helvetica* is worthy of a place scarcely inferior to that of the other apologists for the Mosaic authorship. As his views with respect to the Pentateuch are not essentially different from those already given it

Moses recorded the principal facts in commentaries, as one might infer from the description of the Amalekite war; and that from them the Book of the Covenant sprung; that then God himself cut the decalogue on stone tables; that Moses added the rest, and then those things which pertain to the doctrine of the law and the gospel, finally adding the history of the origin of the world until his successor Joshua. Carpzov rejects this as contrary to inspiration, and to the apt and harmonious connection of the Mosaic language, and the uninterrupted thread of the narrative which does not seem to admit of the composition of the Pentateuch in bits. He is merely willing to concede to Heidegger that the four later books (Exodus-Deuteronomy) may have been written successively, although at intervals; and admits that the distribution into five books which we use to-day cannot perhaps be referred to Moses.

Although his Introduction was published four years after Astruc's Conjectures,¹ he does not manifest any knowledge of it. Hence he does not furnish us with answers to the objections which Astruc thought were removed by his theory of the derivation of the Pentateuch from various documents by Moses. Nevertheless, the work of the apologists whom we have considered was sufficient to stem the tide which was raised by the free critics until the criticism of Simon and Astruc had been naturalized in Germany. Before we enter upon the Second Period, we must first learn how the father-land became the especial home of Old Testament criticism.

does not seem worth while to reproduce them. The subject of his ninth dissertation in the work already quoted is *De Pentateuchi Scriptore*, pp. 245-275. For his life, see *Historia Vitae Johannis Henrici Heideggeri* . . . Tiguri, 1698. This is added to the work cited above; also Schweitzer's Sketch in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*, Leipzig, 1879, vol. v. ff. 701-708, which especially defines his theological position.

¹ Cf. *The Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1884, pp. 677-697.