

into account, which have already been placed in view by the spokesmen of these theories, as much to the one who is agreed with the conclusions as to the one who is anxious (?). The derivation of different elements from some personalities of history can't help but take its inspiration from one's subjective choice, and recall the fancy of the rabbis in attributing each book of the Bible to a known author.

This is damaging, because this systematization, which is unacceptable, throws discredit upon certain interesting ideas of the author. There is not a great deal of distance between the organized growth which he proposes and the developments of tradition such as the School of Uppsala represents; but Lewy is more attached to a "literary" conception of this development (authors and dates are necessary for him) and more negligent of the rigorous method which criticism requires, whether literary or tradition. In his work, he places weight upon the facts which make the classical documentary theory look foolish, but which are now recognized to a greater extent: the existence of the Code of Alliance before the monarchy, the Ephraimite origin of a part of Deuteronomy, the antiquity of part of the Sacerdotal Code; but he neglects some other equally acceptable facts, such as the later character of some elements of Leviticus, not only by connection with Deuteronomy, but by connection to the political, religious, and social situation at the end of the monarchy. His reaction to a rather late date for the composition of the Pentateuch is justified, but the final redaction, with the modifications which it brings, can not be placed before the Exile, as he does. One must meanwhile say of this book: it brings the kind test of contradiction to some positions, at times appearing too comfortable.

R. de Vaux