

or collection of narratives, the one calling God by the name Elohim, the other terming him Jehovah; of two oral or written collections of laws called respectively the Priestly and the Prophetic Torah; and of a Deuteronomist. The latter belonged to the time of King Josiah and the other elements of the Pentateuch were brought together, out of the other four documents or traditions, in the period of Ezra. How does Professor Smith know this? By finding that the later historical books and prophecies indicate the non-observance by Israel of all the precepts of the Pentateuchal code. A conclusion of this kind founded upon the silence of the chroniclers and prophets is worthless. The Bible writers take many things for granted, such as the existence of God and the immortality of the soul. The author's negative proofs are the very reverse of convincing. His prophetic and priestly Torahs are a pair of myths, and the distinction drawn between the Elohist and the Jehovist, which originated in the brain of Dr. Astruc, one of the greatest of unchanged scoundrels the world has ever seen, is based upon an utter misconception of the legation of Moses. Professor Smith makes much of the reference in Genesis xxxvi to the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, holding that the chapter cannot have been written before the time of Saul,

probably not before that of David, when Edom was subject to Israel. If Professor Smith and his German teachers knew history, as they arrogantly profess to know it, they would be aware of the fact that these kings, *in the land of Edom*, were not Edomites at all, and that the last of them was dead before Israel entered upon its wilderness journey. Our author quotes Wellhausen's *De Gentibus et Familiis Judæorum* to the effect that Caleb the Kenizzite was a descendant of Esau. He was nothing of the kind, but a member of the Egyptian house of the Amenophids from Philæ or Tell el Amarna. I believe Professor Smith is a fine Arabic and Semitic scholar generally, but he does not know history, and is thus incapable of profitably criticising a work that is largely historical. There is evidence that letters had advanced to a high stage of proficiency in the time of Moses, and that the books ascribed to him, whatever later additions may have been made to them, suit better his period than any other in Israel's history. The new edition of The Old Testament in the Jewish Church contains much additional matter on the historical books, the Canon, the Hexateuch, and the Psalter. There are some grains of wheat in this literary barn, but they are as nothing compared to the chaff. If insinuation, assumption, and the total absence of external proof, constitute the