

the contrary, the same linguistic features as the Arabian names of the second millennium before Christ, and are entirely dissimilar to those with which we are brought into relations during the times of the Captivity and of Ezra.

Whether all these conclusions shall be found tenable or not, it is quite evident that they open up a new period in the discussion of this intricate question. We are still far from having heard the last word, and it is not safe for anyone to assume that the results of literary criticism are beyond question. We may yet have a theory which will hold fast the historical character and contemporaneous origin of the Pentateuch, while at the same time it gives reasonable explanation of the literary peculiarities which are undoubtedly perplexing. An original and unique attempt at such a theory has been furnished by Klostermann in a recent work on the Pentateuch. His view is that there was an original Mosaic Pentateuch containing the nucleus of the legislation and of the history both, but that variations in this arose from the multiplication of copies in the different schools of Jewish thought which were more or less in antagonism, and that our present Pentateuch is simply the result of Ezra's attempt to harmonize these different recensions without seeking to decide between them. This would explain the peculiarities that now appear in it, and at the same time preserve its essentially Mosaic character. It is not improbable that along some such line as this the ultimate solution of the problem may be found.

II.—Passing now from the Pentateuch, we find a somewhat similar controversy as to the correctness of the received Jewish history at a much later period, viz., that of the building of the second temple on their return from the Babylonian captivity. According to the Book of Ezra, the foundations were laid in the second year after the return during the reign of Cyrus, then interrupted by the machinations of their jealous neighbors, and resumed only sixteen years later in the reign of Darius. As long ago as 1867, Prof. Schröder, then in Zurich, called attention to the fact that this statement