

Genesis is really a composite one. Either the Babylonian poet had before him the present text of Genesis, or else the 'Elohists' and 'Yahvists' must have copied the Babylonian story on the mutual understanding that the one should insert what the other omitted. There is no third alternative.

It follows from all this that the 'critical' method is scientifically unsound, and its results accordingly will not stand the application of a scientific test. It is quite as much an artificial creation as was the Ptolemaic system of the universe, and like the latter requires for its support an ever-increasing number of fresh hypotheses and complicated qualifications. With its disappearance will disappear also the historical conclusions that have been derived from it.

The varying dates assigned to the hypothetical authors of the Pentateuch, the successive strata of religious belief and custom supposed to be discoverable in it, the denial of the historical character of the narratives it contains, must all alike go with the foundation of sand upon which they have been built. An edifice reared on the subjective fancies and assumptions