

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bib-sacra\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php)

## ARTICLE II.

## RUPPRECHT ON THE PENTATEUCH.

BY THE LATE REV. SAMUEL COLCORD BARTLETT, D.D.

A THOROUGHLY conservative and able work on the Pentateuch in these days from Germany is a noteworthy phenomenon. In Edward Rupprecht's "Des Rätsels Lösung"<sup>1</sup> we have it—conservative of the conservatives—a work which appears to have made some sensation even in Germany. Its chief disadvantage is its extent of more than eleven hundred pages, which, however natural for a German to write and for another German to read, are a little discouraging to any other nationality. An outline of the discussion may be a matter of interest, as indicating a rising revolt against the methods and results of the higher criticism, so-called, in the land of its supremacy. Obviously all that can be done within moderate limits is to indicate the course and method of the discussion without attempting to reproduce the arguments to any extent, even in an abridged form.

The volumes open with a *résumé* of certain positions maintained in a previous critique by the author, mainly on Strack's division of the "sources of the Pentateuch." As these positions reappear directly or by implication in the discussion, and give a clue to the author's reasoning, we cite them, as follows:—

1. The methods of determining the so-called "sources" are at variance with the universal conditions of procedure in the literary investigation of documents, resorting, as it does, to a course of arbitrary conjecture and phantasy,

<sup>1</sup>Gütersloh: Bertelsmann.

which cuts loose from every mark of science. For the text often shows the one characteristic name of God in inseparable connection, logical and phraseological, with the other characteristic name (Jehovah, or Elohim), and moreover in the environment of the qualities of style ascribed by the theory to the other.

2. The peculiarities of style, set forth in long lists with the aspect of science, are themselves but an hypothesis. The text lies before the critic as an unbroken continuity. Dividing lines must first be drawn by the critic, in order to say, This expression is found in that portion, and another in that. But what are the landmarks by which to draw the lines? Answer, The divine names. But the fact is, that, when the continuous text is divided according to these names, there are frequently found in connection with the one name expressions which are found connected with the other; and a close division on the ground of peculiarities of style is impossible.

3. In many cases the assignment of a passage to J, E, or P is determined solely by the properties of style; that is to say, while the distribution of the divine names is to determine what properties of style belong respectively to J, E, or P, this assignment has to be maintained in a multitude of cases where the characteristic name is wanting. A perpetual reasoning in a circle. It might be otherwise, if, even on the basis of ten chapters, there could be established indisputably a certain style which should serve as a decisive standard for all other cases. But this is not the case.

4. When the attempt is made to explain the fact that the divine name and the wrong qualities of style are found together, by saying that the redactor has intruded, it is forgotten that the redactor is another hypothesis growing out of the hypothesis of "sources." No sources, no redactor. While he is an auxiliary hypothesis growing out of the

previous hypothesis, yet, conversely, in the exigency he must sustain the sources against the actual phenomena which show the sources to be non-existent. The burden becomes the bearer. A logical circle.

5. Had a redactor, so often as is alleged, changed the sources arbitrarily, and even planlessly and needlessly, then the text is thoroughly uncertain. Therewith the foundation of the "source" division drops away under our feet; for its necessary presupposition is that the text (i.e. the divine names and the properties of style) lies before us in its integrity, and is not arbitrarily changed by a third party. But with what innocent lack of principle and of adherence to fundamental consistency this division is pushed, may be seen in prominent writers like Strack and König.

6. The third characteristic—the so-called parallel narratives—is artificially created by the critics. Precisely in the same way can every circumstantial narrative of the New Testament and even the Epistle to the Romans be separated into "sources." A method applicable to everything is scientifically distinctive of nothing.

Some of these are very strong points; the fifth, for example, which is also made substantially by Klostermann, though from a different point of view. It is impracticable to give even briefly the details by which Rupprecht sustains these positions. He truly remarks that the linguistic history of the Old Testament lies much in the dark, and we have no adequate means to elucidate it beyond doubt, so as to say what is old and what is new, and how far both are thrown together. We have but a fragment of the Israelite literature, and it is presumptuous to pass decisive judgment as to the contents of the language, the range of its words, the style and mode of speech in any one century. "According to critical rules I must deny the second part of Faust to the author of the first part." He

ridicules high-sounding claims and phrases of "incontestable results," "undeniable conclusions," "facts clear as the sun," "irresistible arguments," or, in American phrase, "remorseless logic."

From this exhibition of the weak points of the critical analysis the author turns to his main task, which is the proposition that "the Pentateuch proceeded from the Mosaic period of revelation and had Moses for its author"—that is, as we understand him, immediately or mediately.

In presenting his evidence he proceeds "regressively," ascending from Christ and the apostles upward to Deuteronomy, and thence to the preceding books. First, the position of the New Testament in reference to the Pentateuch, then of the post-exilic sources, those of the exile, of the time of the divided kingdom before the exile, of the time of David and Solomon, of the Judges, of Joshua, of Deuteronomy, then of the preceding four books—these are the several stages of the ascent. "My course of argument," says he, "will be (*a*) historical, drawn from the documentary facts; (*b*) psychological and moral, which to a reasonable and moral man are as valid as historical facts; (*c*) linguistic, so far as these can be presented beyond all doubt. With arbitrary, individual changes of the original and all conjectural procedures I have of set purpose nothing to do. Such a process, in which De Wette, Vatke, and Wellhausen and their followers have taken pleasure, does not deserve the name of historical investigation, and may be left to the destiny which certainly awaits it as soon as German conscientiousness and thoroughness recover themselves from the frenzy of the hour." These are bold words to come from Germany.

In showing the testimony of the New Testament, Rupprecht proceeds from the Gospels consecutively to the close of the volume. Here he finds it necessary, taking the passages as they stand, to deal with the historicity and

the authority of the Pentateuch together, inasmuch as they are so frequently conjoined. He assumes, with the church generally in the past, the view expressed by Delitzsch in regard to the earliest narratives of the Pentateuch when he says, in his *New Commentary*, that "the essential truth of what is here narrated and the truth of Christianity stand in the closest mutual relation." And he holds in the strongest form that if the testimony of Christ and his apostles can be ascertained it is decisive,—the same view maintained by Ellicott, Leathes, Alford, and formerly by such Germans as Professor Storr of Tübingen, Knapp of Halle, and others. He also maintains, as do those writers, that the evidence in the New Testament is distinct. We cannot follow him as he passes in review carefully every reference to the Pentateuch, accompanying each with a brief explanation of its bearing. We will, however, give a specimen or two in his words, but abridged.

His first instance is the account of the temptation (*Matt. iv.*). "Three times Satan assails Christ the Son of God as soon as he had been recognized by God the Father. He appeals to the bodily craving for food, to the intense desire for honor, and finally to the longing for dominion and the worldly enjoyment connected with it. Three times Jesus repels him; yet not with the might of his own words, but with the words of the Old Testament Scriptures. That is, every time, the authority which he proposes to himself, and which Satan the Prince of this world must recognize, and to which he must unconditionally submit. All three declarations are taken from the fifth book of Moses. The first is found in *Deut. viii. 3*, the second in *vi. 16*, containing a reference to *Ex. xvii. 2, 7*, the third in *Deut. vi. 13* in combination with *Ex. xx. 5* and *Ps. lxxx. 10*. . . . To the Son of God, as well as to the tempter, the words of Deuteronomy, Exodus, and the Psalms stand as the highest authority, by which both are absolutely bound, divine

declarations, not to be trifled with nor set aside. But he who takes his stand on these declarations is the same who said, 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.'" Other references are examined with similar directness and force. Thus he discusses John v. 46, "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me," showing that the entire point of the speech lies in the antithesis of the two *personalities*—Moses, who speaks to them out of the past in his writings, and Jesus, who speaks to them in the present and in person. The total result of his examination is given by him as follows:—

1. For the divine authority of the five books of the Pentateuch: (*a*) for the first book, Matt. xix. 4–8 (comp. Gen. i. and ii.); Matt. xxiv. 37–39; Mark x. 4–9; Luke xi. 49–51 (comp. Gen. iv.); Luke xvii. 26 *seq.* (comp. Gen. vi., ix., xviii., xix.); John i. 51 (comp. Gen. xxviii.); John vii. 22–23 (comp. Gen. xvii.); John viii. 44 (comp. Gen. iii.); John viii. 56 (comp. Gen. xvii.); (*b*) for the second book, Matt. iv. 7, 10; Matt. xii. 3–5 (comp. Ex. xxix., xxxiii.); Matt. xxii. 31–32 (comp. Ex. iii.); Mark vii. 9–10; x. 19; John vi. 31–49; (*c*) for the third book, Mark i. 44; John vi. 31–49; John vii. 22–23; (*d*) for the fourth book, John iii. 14; John vi. 31–49; (*e*) for the fifth book, Matt. iv. 4, 7, 10; Mark xx. 4–9 (comp. Deut. xxxiv.); (*f*) for the Old Testament Scriptures generally, therefore for the Pentateuch, Matt. v.–vii.; xi. 13; xxvi. 54; Luke xxiv.; John v. 39; xix. 28.

2. For the authorship of Moses, Matt. xix. 4–8; Mark x. 4–9; Luke xx. 37; xix. 29; xxiv. 25; John v. 46–47; vii. 22–23.

Should it be thought that in any of these passages the author's inferences are pressed too far, it is difficult not to feel the force of the clearer and stronger points, and the entire effect of the whole. Thus, he says, Jesus testifies

for the first and the other books of Moses as divinely inspired Scripture in twenty-eight passages, and for the Old Testament in its threefold division, as recognized by Jewish custom; and that he testifies for the Mosaic authorship in seven passages. It should be said, however, that two of these references are virtually duplicates, found in parallel passages.

Then follows a presentation of the respective attitudes of the various church confessions and of the rationalist critics toward this testimony, and of the final results of the latter, exemplified in the Ritschlian school, as our author thinks, in a rejection of the historic validity of the early Scripture narratives and of Christ's testimony. He then turns to the accommodation theory in regard to Christ's utterances, to which he replies with great earnestness and even intensity, saying that its actual issue has not only been to discard the Mosaic authorship and the course of the external history, but the central idea, the whole moral content of the history, namely, its saving truths, the whole *Dogmatik* of the Old and New Testaments,—a method which, he declares, finds its last results in Strauss, and, as he still more vigorously remarks, will give "the highest pleasure to the devil."

Rupprecht, however, endeavors to reply in detail to the accommodation theory, but at too great length to be indicated here, except in regard to one point. König has alleged that in referring to the Pentateuch the Saviour could not do otherwise than to use a prevalent formula, "Moses." The reply is that no such necessity existed, and that, as a matter of fact, the Saviour did not confine himself to that expression. He had a sufficient choice of expressions, and used a variety of phrases: "The Scripture says," "the Holy Ghost says," "how is it in the law," "how readest thou"; so that his reference to Moses was matter of deliberate choice. It should be added, however, that, besides



meeting the arguments of the accommodation theory, and especially the implication that in these cases Christ spoke only of matters of indifference, the author shows that much of his reference to the Pentateuch, and the Old Testament in general, involved great and fundamental points of the religion of which he was the central object.

The citations from the Gospels are followed by references found in the Acts, Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Peter, and Hebrews, with explanatory comments.

In this connection it is interesting to observe the return in Germany to the same views that were strongly advocated there a century ago, and curiously enough in the very Tübingen since then so long the storm-center of ultra-liberalism. It was but a year after the birth of the noted Baur that Theophilus Christian Storr, then professor in the same Tübingen, published an "Elementary Course of Biblical Theology" containing this statement: "As the religious instructions of Jesus and his apostles are of divine authority, it follows of course that all their declarations, and of course their assertions relative to the Old Testament, must be received implicitly as being accordant with truth. But Jesus and his apostles not only declare that God is the author of the Mosaic laws, but they receive other parts of the writings of Moses as true, not excepting his account of events which took place before his birth; and they assume that the books of Moses were written at the special instance of God, and under his particular guidance. They assert that the Pentateuch and the sacred books of the Jews in general contain divine predictions (not the conjectures and fictions of men), which are therefore prophecies of indisputable certainty." Each of these points he substantiates by references nearly identical with those of Rupprecht. Storrs's colleague, Karl Christian Flatt, joined with him in the notes accompanying. So the pendulum can swing forth and back again even in Germany.

Rupprecht's investigation of the New Testament testimony occupies the whole first volume of 278 pages, and is strongly controversial. The pages are overloaded with emphasized words and phrases in his earnestness to be understood. His second and third volumes, of 408 and 458 pages respectively (issued in 1896 and 1897), are somewhat less polemic in tone, though none the less intense and emphatic.

The second volume is chiefly devoted to the testimony of the several Old Testament books, bearing on the authenticity and historicity of the Pentateuch. But he finds so many preliminaries to settle, so many erroneous assertions to dispose of, and so many evasions and objections to meet, that a hundred pages are thus occupied, which, though not aside from the main purpose of the volume, may possibly divert attention from the more positive aspect of the argument. He boldly declares "the unscientific character of the false criticism," founded, as he says, largely by Vatke, Von Bohlen, and De Wette, and reproduced in Cornill, Martis, Smend, Stade, Kittel, Kautzsch, Meinhold, and others; unscientific, he says, in its very basis, because, on the rationalist side, the recognition of the Mosaic authorship and credibility of the Pentateuch is rendered impossible on any historic proof, however strong. For it requires but a glance into their present and past literature to see how freely and arbitrarily those grounds would be set aside by alleged changes, "interpolations," and the like. "The prejudgment, the fundamental axiom, which lies at the foundation of all the procedures of the negative criticism of earlier and later times is the denial of the miraculous, the supernatural. Everything is made subservient to this axiom. Hence the maltreatment of the sources, maltreatment in the strictest sense, such as is not heard of in the case of any secular author. Hence that Jesuitic dealing with history, so sharply to be condemned.

Thus it has been from Vatke and De Wette to Reuss and Wellhausen. Such a procedure is the grave of true science." For them there can be no history which contains real miracles and prophecy. Thus "the text is made to order as it is needed." He substantiates his statement as to this assumed axiom by quotations from the early leaders of the movement, Stäudlin, Berthold, Von Bohlen, De Wette. The assertion of the last-mentioned writer in his "Introduction" is thus distinct: "As soon as it is settled for the educated mind that such miracles have not actually occurred, the result is already reached that the narrative is not contemporary nor from contemporary sources." Rupprecht might easily have brought down the list to the present time. For, as Professor Sanday remarks, "Kuenen wrote in the interest of almost avowed naturalism, and much the same may be said of Wellhausen"—the two great champions of the latest modern movement. And while this is probably not true of the majority of those who adopt their conclusions, it is perhaps safe to say that a large part of them are influenced quite as much by the supposed scholarship and great authority of these naturalists as by any thorough weighing of the facts and arguments.

From such prejudiced conclusions the author naturally turns to the remarkable testimony given to the manifest historic quality and value of the Pentateuch by the great German historians, some eight of whom he cites to that effect. He quotes also the recent striking statement (1895) of Roscher, in his work on "National Economy," that "modern science is right in applying the same fundamental tests to the biblical books as to secular writings. But it should actually do so, and judge these books, though not more favorably, yet not more unfavorably than other books. But the school which to-day calls itself preëminently the critical one has done wholly otherwise. It

follows fundamental principles which, if applied in profane literature, would arouse general remonstrance" (*Kopfschueteln*).

After some forty pages furnishing illustrations of the false criticism, the author lays down the foundation of a scientific criticism, which must be, objectively, the "tradition," and, subjectively, a reasonable confidence in the sources thus handed down, and in the authors and the intermediate agents of the transmission, but no preliminary dogmatism, either positive or negative. Rupprecht frankly adds, however, that, as every one will come to the investigation of moral and religious questions either from a religious or an irreligious position, in dealing with such subjects the former must be the only proper standpoint. But he fully accepts the view of Ranke: "The standpoint of criticism for me is that of one who takes the Scripture in hand, earnestly seeking the truth, and neither in the interest of belief or unbelief endeavors to ascertain whether these doings of God have actually taken place, whether they have the same confirmation as the events of the world's history."

Then follows a consideration of the foundations of a genuine historic criticism. While in the last result all historic knowledge rests on eye and ear witnesses, this witness is conveyed to later times by what Rupprecht broadly calls "tradition," comprising all documents and monuments of antiquity by which the original knowledge is made known to posterity. It often forms a more or less continuous and trustworthy chain of evidence from the earlier to the later and latest times. This chain of historic tradition becomes especially weighty when it has assumed from early times a fixed written form. Historic tradition has nothing to do with hypotheses. Its force lies in the fact that it is the transmission of the certainty of the eye and ear witness by personalities, more or less

cognizant and retentive of the certainty, to their successors and thus to the present time. And thus not only the individual testimony, but also the governing assent of contemporaries, often passes down this historic chain to us.

Assuming the present Hebrew text, for reasons rendered, to be substantially that which has come down from the past, the author devotes 200 pages to the task of tracing the authenticity and veracity of the narrative through the long line of references embodied in the Jewish literature, proceeding "regressively" from post-exilic times to the time of Moses, that is, from Ezra and Nehemiah to Joshua. His references are of course accompanied with comments on their force as well as on the books and connections in which they are found. The conclusions which he claims, which we simply report without affirming or denying, are these:—

1. During the exile there was a book of the law of Moses, which in compass and contents was the same as our Pentateuch, as is admitted by the extreme critics.

2. It was in possession of the church of the exile as an inherited and completed book, not put into its final, authentic form by Ezra.

3. Ezekiel and Jeremiah knew and used the whole Pentateuch.

4. The book of the law in Josiah's time (about 600 B.C.) was not Deuteronomy alone, much less a newly composed Deuteronomy. The exact testimonies and references of the times show it to be the entire law-book of Moses.

5. Ascending two hundred years higher, to the time of Jehoshaphat, and still further to the date of Hosea, Amos, and Isaiah (about 800 B.C.), we find abundant references in facts and language to the five books of Moses, such as are incompatible with mere oral reminiscences, but distinctly involve the contents and language of the Pentateuch codex as it was in the time of Ezra.

6. In the time of Jeroboam (about 900 B.C.) the same conditions exist, and the career (*Politik*) of Jeroboam is intelligible only on that basis.

7. Under Solomon the books of Kings exhibit the same references to the contents of this book of Moses, to the faithful observance of which David exhorts his successor. And Chronicles, from its own documents and those of David's time, shows the existence of the book of Moses already in the time of David. So do the books of Samuel.

8. The book of Judges equally recognizes the Pentateuch and, notwithstanding all the prevalent disobedience, holds it as the decisive authority.

9. The book of Joshua, written soon after his death by one of his contemporaries, completes the chain of testimony, which thus extends through all the centuries by closely joined links, from Ezra to Joshua.

The third volume (454 pages) is occupied with internal evidences of the authority and historic quality of the Pentateuch. Only the merest outline of the argument can be given. He broadly characterizes his theme as the Unity of the Pentateuch, by which he means that it is the coherent, systematic product of one mind. Meanwhile he explains that he does not maintain that this one author drew on no other sources than himself. He might have used previously existing writings or valid oral tradition, his own experience or immediate divine revelation. He might have assistants who labored according to his plan and under his direction. After a careful distinction between this kind of unity and the mechanical result of the various theories of compilers and redactors, he proceeds, as the negative part of his argument, to deal with these several hypotheses in detail: the document theory as presented by Astruc and by Eichhorn, the fragment, the supplement, the crystallization, and the modified document process; and separately with the evolution theory of Wellhausen.

Nearly half the volume is occupied with the minute examination and refutation, showing their inconsistency with the actual phenomena of the book, and the constant force which they apply to its contents. Here he frankly owns his indebtedness to the labors, too much forgotten, of his predecessors, Ranke, Keil, Hävernick, Baumgarten, as well as to his contemporaries, especially Dr. Green. This part of the work is elaborately and sometimes strongly done.

Especially effective is his attack upon the device originated by Hupfeld, of a second Elohist, which figures so largely and constantly in subsequent writers, to escape, with the added help of the "redactor," the inextricable entanglements of J and E. Here his six telling points are actually and confessedly a reproduction from Dr. Green. Rupprecht adds somewhat of his own, and occasionally a touch of grim German humor, as when he describes the notorious redactor "who now plays the part of a genuine Proteus, now appears as a tethered ass, and again as a genial spirited historian. Special precautions are thus taken against all inconvenient questions asked on the basis of a true secular and scientific criticism, by always having a hole to slide through with snaky wriggings."

After the protracted process of refuting these several hypotheses as inconsistent with the actual conditions of the case, the last and largest part of the volume is devoted to the positive exhibition of the essential unity of the Pentateuch, as showing it to be the product of one mind. He traces first its chronological, then more fully its material unity, contending that a governing purpose pervades it not only as a whole, but in its related parts, just as is the case with other historical compositions,—although of course having its own characteristics. This process is necessarily accompanied by refutations of counter claims all along the line, and involves an examination of the passages so often

adduced as post-Mosaic, and as often thoroughly answered. This one responsible author, it is next maintained, was Moses. This is done in several propositions, which we will indicate summarily, although their force depends on the illustrations:—

1. The geographical aspects of the Pentateuch point to the time of Moses.

2. The order of the portions of the law, not systematically arranged, but as occasions suggested, indicates contemporaneousness.

3. The exactness of the narrative, especially in Exodus, indicates occurrences minuted down at the time or shortly after.

4. The style and language of the law give evidence of composition in the desert and before the conquest.

5. While all laws of David, Solomon, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah are issued in their own names and authority, the law of Moses invariably came down as such, and no instance exists of other kings' laws given in his name.

To the objection that it is not supposable that a system of laws should have been made in the wilderness admitting of no development, he replies that the code left ample room for all real progress of the people. He cites numerous instances of subsequent political measures enacted and adopted, but never put forth as part of the Mosaic law, and emphasizes the fact maintained by Rawlinson and others, that there is nothing in the Levitical code unsuited to Moses, or to the circumstances in which he was declared to be a legislator. Alleged exceptions are treated, chiefly those presented by Strack and König.

Then follows a series of inquiries and their answers, namely, (1) could Moses write; (2) could he write such compositions (*das und so*); (3) was it necessary for him to write; (4) did he write? The first of these inquiries has long been superfluous, admitting no answer but an affirm-



ative. To the second inquiry the answer is, that he certainly could write whatever came directly from God, and also all that came from personal knowledge, that is, all that took place from Exodus to Deuteronomy. As to Genesis it is conceded that he must have tradition, oral or written or both, in regard to which we have no certain knowledge, but may make reasonable and probable inference from the circumstances and indications. The history in the first eleven chapters is so brief and noteworthy that it might have been handed down in the line of pious men from the time of Adam. The longevity of the forefathers, which Rupprecht is not inclined to reduce, would require the tradition to come but through three links to Abraham. It is otherwise from Abraham's time. A passage so definite and so thoroughly sustained by archæology as the fourteenth chapter of Genesis could hardly have come down otherwise than by written conveyance, as is also the case with many details of Abraham's history; and these very likely came from Abraham himself. Most of Genesis from the fourteenth chapter onward may probably have come in recorded form; and the same suggestion is made which has been made by other writers in regard to the account of the Deluge. Moses, standing on the border-line of two great historic periods, by his training and history as well as his position, was fitted to produce such a narrative of which the style and diction were worthy of his character and purpose, while it contained nothing incompatible with his time; and the difference in these respects between Deuteronomy and the preceding books is but in accordance with the didactic purpose of the one portion and the hortatory aim of the other. To the third inquiry, "Was it necessary for him to write?" the answer must be, Yes. First, for the reason that the long and complicated legislation of which God made him the organ, not even the phenomenal memory of antiquity could have retained

otherwise correctly. Secondly, because of his official relation. The settled law for the chosen people must be made matter of official record to which appeal could be made, and the person to make that record was the person who received the communication.

From these preliminaries the author proceeds to his closing inquiry, Did Moses actually commit these things to writing? To this inquiry he gives some seventy pages, in which he adduces the several passages in which Moses is directly declared to have written (some half a dozen), in connection with indirect implications, and the various considerations contained in his previous arguments. A large space is given to a reply to objections, in many cases with much success. Here we cannot follow him either in detail or in outline.

This work is to be viewed with no little interest for two reasons: First, as the token of a strong conservative movement in Germany. It is intensely evangelical in its spirit, exalting in the strongest form the authority of both the Old and New Testaments. No volume published recently on either side of the Atlantic excels it in this respect. And it is not alone. To the same purport is George Stosch's book, "The Origin of Genesis" (1897), written, as he says in his preface, "to prove that there still exists in Germany a school of theology bound in obedience to the word of God," and "as a defense against the destructive criticisms of a disintegrating science." Less scholarly in method, it is a reverential and popular exhibition of the "external and internal coherence of" the book of Genesis as designed to "comprise the record of a wondrous history." It was somewhat longer ago (1890) that Dr. Adolph Zahn published his defense of Deuteronomy "against the disorderly procedure (*Unwesen*) of modern criticism,"—a method, he avers, unknown in secular historical investigation, and permitted only in the territory of the Scriptures; one which

makes of the Pentateuch especially "a heap of ruins that harmonizes well with the desolation of the church which surrounds us on every hand." In 1894 he published his "Sober View of Modern Criticism," which brought him such a return of appreciation and encouragement as proved that there still is a church which holds fast the truths of the Bible. In 1893 Hermann Billieb issued his defense of the Pentateuch, founded on the evidence of the old prophets Hosea and Amos (like the volume of Professor Robertson, 1892), in which he shows that "a divine providence has taken care that these historical prophets, standing on the outpost of the kingdom of the ten tribes, should become incontrovertible witnesses, and abundant in their testimony." These bold utterances of German pastors, put forth in the very presence of all the learned ingenuity and boastful claims of scholarly rationalism in its stronghold, are a striking and significant indication.

A second source of interest in this work is the value of the discussion as a whole. It is not necessary to accept all the points and propositions advanced by the author, in order to recognize the general vigor and value of his arguments. For wide and practical effect it is open to criticism. It is too protracted. To read through 1150 pages is a heavy task. It might well have been compressed one-half. It contains much that is personal, subjective, rhetorical, and repetitious. While many things are sharply stated, many others are needlessly drawn out. The subordinate matters may be thought too much to keep the main points in the background, and the negative to be made more predominant than the affirmative and positive; and the fundamental, positive positions, some of them at least, might be made to carry far more weight. But it is German, and intrinsically valuable, and we may be thankful for it. Professor Zöckler does not hesitate to say that it is the most important treatise of its kind in German literature, and that opponents will be compelled to answer it.