

The later writers of this school appear to depend less upon excavation and more upon introspection than the earlier ones. Merely by examining its fossil remains these scholars can give the "anatomy of the Pentateuch" and show how it grew, chapter by chapter, to its present form.* The present writer must acknowledge that he is not sufficiently well acquainted with archaic anatomy to follow these great doctors into the secret and lonely clinics held in the profound depths of their critical consciousness. He frankly confesses, in his ignorance, that the bones on which they operate seem very dry, and in all the clinics to which he has been admitted he has seen no sign of life or a possible resurrection from the dead.

More than this, he has been discouraged at finding that a fossil bone which one leading examiner would assign with unhesitating confidence to the head, another examiner, equally acute and eager with the scalpel, would declare to belong undoubtedly to the toe of the corpse. On such questions this scribe acknowledges his incapacity to express an opinion, but he must be allowed to utter the regret which he has felt for years that these introspective critics have not considered it advisable in these later decades to ask any questions of Egypt respecting the minute accuracy of R or R', the Deuteronomist, the Great Unknown, or any other of the supposed writers of the earlier Scripture narratives.

This regret may not be necessary much longer, however. At length one who is in the highest degree qualified to speak has spoken, and has declared that certain recent Egyptian discoveries confirm the theories of those critics of the scriptural text who, "with scientific freedom from prejudice, have surmised that Moses could not possibly have been the compiler of the five books passing under his name." Such is the claim of Dr. Heinrich Brugsch, in a late issue of the *Deutsche Rundschau*. Such a claim made by such a man demands a most thorough examination.

His first proof is as follows: "If in the story of Joseph the Rameses town is already mentioned, why, that is a historico-geographical error, for it is nearly 400 years after the time of Joseph that it is mentioned [in the Egyptian records] for the first time—viz., when King Rameses II. had this city built, or had an older town extended, and allowed it to be called by his name." Here, then, the "last redactor has assigned to the older record, quite unquestioningly, what really belonged to a later epoch."

The answer to this is swift. The only place in the story where this word occurs is Gen. xlvii. 11. The statement that Joseph gave his brethren a possession in the "land of Rameses" contains no slightest indication of a post-Mosaic authorship of the passage, since no one denies, and even Dr. Brugsch himself affirms, that the city of Rameses did have an existence at the Mosaic epoch. As the Septuagint designates the "Land of Goshen" as "Gesem of Arabia," and the Coptic version as "Tarabia," and the Arabic translators as "Sadir," so does the Hebrew writer of the Mosaic age refer to it as "the Land of Rameses," because that was the name by

* "Prolegomena to the History of Israel," Julius Wellhausen, 1885.