
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

Essays and Reviews (1860): The Advance of Liberalism[1]

ROGER BECKWITH

Essays and Reviews (London, 1860), the historic manifesto of modern Liberal Anglicanism, originated in the following way. Two of the contributors, Frederick Temple and Benjamin Jowett, had been friends since their days together at Balliol College, Oxford, and Temple's account of the origin of the book (dating from 1861, the year after it appeared) is this:

> First, I must tell you that the book owes its origin to some conversations between Mr Jowett and myself, as far back as eight or nine years ago, on the great amount of reticence in every class of society in regard to religious views. We frequently talked of the melancholy unwillingness of people to state honestly their opinions on points of doctrine, and I believe that I myself first raised the subject.
>
> We thought it might encourage free and honest discussion of Biblical topics if we were to combine with some others to publish a volume of Essays; and this idea gradually worked itself into the present reality. Several changes occurred in the group of men who agreed to write, so that some of the present essayists were not among those who originally agreed to join. There was one stipulation made, namely, that nothing should be written which was inconsistent with the position of ministers of our Church.
>
> I think I ought further to tell you that I saw none of the Essays except my own until I saw them in the book itself; and I believe that all the other writers were equally ignorant of what was written by any but themselves, with the exception of one who acted as editor, but had no control over what was written.[2]

Essays and Reviews, the volume which resulted, gives every outward appearance of being a commonplace and uninteresting book. Its title tells one nothing. Its page of contents lists seven very miscellaneous subjects, broadly religious, treated by seven different authors (the names of the others being Rowland Williams, Baden Powell, H.B. Wilson, C.W. Goodwin and Mark Pattison), and a prefatory note states that they wrote in entire independence of each other. There is no introduction or conclusion. Six of the seven authors are Anglican clergymen, three teaching at Oxford (Powell as Savilian Professor of Geometry, Pattison as Rector of Lincoln College and Jowett as Regius Professor of Greek), one (Temple) is

Headmaster of Rugby School, one (Williams) is Vice-Principal of a theological college and one (Wilson) a parish clergyman. The layman (Goodwin) gives no description of himself, but is in fact a lawyer and amateur Egyptologist. They are not people who have made any mark in the theological world, and relatively few of them have made any considerable mark in the world of scholarship generally.

Yet their book created a sensation. In two years it went through ten editions. Quite apart from periodical literature, two formidable *symposia* in reply to it were published by distinguished bishops, professors and theologians. One was *Aids to Faith* (London, 1861), edited by William Thomson, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, and afterwards Archbishop of York, and the other was *Replies to Essays and Reviews* (Oxford, 1862), by E.M. Goulburn, afterwards Dean of Norwich, and others, with a preface by the Bishop of Oxford, Samuel Wilberforce. Able one-man replies to the book were written by T.R. Birks, afterwards Professor of Moral Theology at Cambridge, under the title *The Bible and Modern Thought* (London, 1861); by Edward Garbett, in his first series of Boyle Lectures, *The Bible and its Critics* (London, 1861); and by J.W. Burgon, afterwards Dean of Chichester, in his famous book *Inspiration and Interpretation* (Oxford, 1861), the first half of which, in the original edition, was a reply to *Essays and Reviews*. Some of the respondents were Evangelicals, but many were High Churchmen of the old school. The notoriety of the book spread outside England and outside Anglicanism: replies were written by two overseas bishops, Bishop Parsons of Meath and Bishop McIlvaine of Ohio, and by two distinguished non-Anglicans, James Buchanan, the Free Church of Scotland theologian, and J.N. Darby, the leader of the Plymouth Brethren.

The matter was not allowed to rest at the literary level. Protests and addresses were drawn up by the clergy and widely signed, and in response to these a pastoral letter condemning certain opinions in the book was issued by the Archbishop of Canterbury (Sumner) and the episcopate of England and Ireland. Proceedings were begun in Convocation, and were only suspended while two of the ordained essayists, Rowland Williams and H.B. Wilson, were tried for heresy. In the Court of Arches they were each convicted on three counts, and suspended from their duties for one year, but on appeal to the Privy Council they were acquitted, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York (Longley and Thomson) dissenting. After their acquittal, which was in 1864 and was on the grounds that the charges were not sufficiently proved for a criminal action, the proceedings in Convocation were revived and *Essays and Reviews* was synodically condemned in July 1864 by both houses.

Yet the acquittal was not without its effect. It had shown that Liberalism could not easily be controlled by legal action, a fact which later became clear with regard to Anglo-Catholicism also. From being an outrage, negative Liberalism became a tolerated evil and then a legitimate option. As

early as 1869, Frederick Temple, the author of the opening essay in the book (admittedly the most innocuous one), was appointed a bishop, and by the end of the century he had become Archbishop of Canterbury.

What, then, does this remarkable book contain? The first essay, by Frederick Temple, is entitled 'The Education of the World', and is a form of the old comparison between the progress of revelation and the growth of a human being. It is particularly reminiscent of Lessing's essay 'The Education of the Human Race'. The three stages in human life, of obedience in childhood, example in adolescence and responsible freedom in adulthood, are paralleled with the periods of the Law, the Gospels and Pentecost. In this last period, the period of the Spirit, man is come of age, Temple claims, and he must be free to make his own decisions and draw lessons, as he deems fit, or as his conscience dictates, from all worthy sources, though chiefly from the Bible. As Goulburn points out in his reply, sin and redemption do not seem to feature in the author's scheme. The implied optimism about human nature has been characteristic of Liberalism ever since, and the vague idea of man now come of age, which today we associate with Bonhoeffer and John Robinson, is obviously a notion with a history behind it.

The second essay, by Rowland Williams, is entitled 'Bunsen's Biblical Researches'. The dependence on current German scholarship now becomes obvious, but the shallowness of the writer's acquaintance with it soon becomes equally clear. The Chevalier Bunsen is not an important figure in the history of German biblical criticism. John Rogerson's informative book *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century: England and Germany* (London: S.P.C.K., 1984) devotes a chapter to him only because of the attention he received in England. Williams, however, regards his work as epoch-making, and for this reason devotes his essay to Bunsen alone. The main point of his essay is to endorse Bunsen's scepticism about predictive prophecy, especially messianic prophecy, and to declare the Book of Daniel a product of the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, in the second century BC, not the sixth, containing only prophecies after the event.

The third essay, by Baden Powell (father of the founder of the Scout and Guide movement), is entitled 'On the Study of the Evidences of Christianity'. It concentrates mainly on the evidential value of miracles, and does for miracles what the previous essay does for predictive prophecy, *viz.*, declares them incredible. This is because they are contrary to the uniformity of nature. In passing, it pays glowing tribute to Darwin's *The Origin of Species*, then newly published, because of its testimony to the 'self-evolving powers of nature'. Powell did not live to read the formidable refutation of his essay by the philosopher H.L. Mansel in *Aids to Faith*.

The fourth essay, by H.B. Wilson, bears the curious title 'Séances Historiques de Genève—the National Church'. It begins by speaking of a

recent controversy between two lecturers in a series of public addresses delivered at Geneva, one of whom attacked and the other defended the principle of 'multitudinism', that is, of a national, established church. Wilson sides with the defender, but this is not the real point of his essay, which is to maintain that the moral principles of Christianity are more important than its doctrinal principles, and that, for a national church to apply doctrinal tests, is really contrary to its national character. His essay thus resolves itself into an attack upon the requirement of subscription to the 39 Articles, and upon its basis in the doctrinal authority of the Bible.

The fifth essay, by the one lay essayist C.W. Goodwin, is entitled 'On the Mosaic Cosmogony'. It deals with the first chapter of Genesis, which it regards as simply a speculation about the origin of the world by a powerful but primitive mind. It rejects the explanation that the first verse of Genesis covers a long period of time, prior to the six days, or that the six days themselves correspond to long periods of time—one or other of which hypotheses is nevertheless defended by most of those who answer the essay. Gilbert Rorison, however, who answers the essay in *Replies to Essays and Reviews*, holds that Genesis 1 is a sort of psalm of creation, a narrative written in poetic picture-language, with a poetic parallel structure, in which the events of the first three days and the second three days correspond. This is an example of the so-called 'schematic' interpretation, favoured by many conservative commentators today.

The sixth essay, by Mark Pattison, is entitled 'Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, 1688–1750', and recalls the period of the Latitudinarians and the Deists, when reason had a rather more prominent rôle in theology than it has had since the Evangelical Revival and the Oxford Movement.

The seventh and last essay, by Benjamin Jowett, is entitled 'On the Interpretation of Scripture'. Despite the author's linguistic ability, Burgon reckoned this the most mischievous essay of the seven, because the most explicit in its disbelief that the Bible is the word of God. It contends, in words still familiar today, that the Bible should be read and interpreted 'like any other book', and more especially like any other *ancient* book. The Bible's teaching is not readily applicable to later times, and the author is rather scornful of the Fathers and later theologians as interpreters of the Bible. He is sceptical about inspiration, and is especially insistent that arguments must not be rested upon single words of Scripture, failing to note that this often happens in the New Testament itself.

Such are the contents of this much-discussed book. Though the authors professedly wrote independently of each other, one can hardly fail to see that they have an agreed approach. Their main subject-matter is the Bible, and their main contention is the need to subject the Bible to the scrutiny of autonomous reason. Even the chapters on miracles and on subscription to the Articles are really only dealing with the Bible at one remove, and the

opening essay says explicitly, in its concluding summary, 'The immediate work of our day is the study of the Bible'.

Essays and Reviews proved to be a watershed. A new trend in English study of the Bible began then, which increased in strength as time went on, and became dominant, as it still is. Only two years after the book appeared, a practical example of its principles was issued by Bishop Colenso of Natal, who in 1862 published at London the first part of his book *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined.* Six further parts were to follow.

It would, of course, be a mistake to think that the Bible was not studied in England prior to 1860: it was. Some account of this study is given by Rogerson in chs. 11–14 of his book, already cited. Yet the amount of study was limited, compared with what had been happening in Germany. Germany, of course, was a much larger country, but the difference was not just due to this. As Rogerson points out,[3] the only faculties of theology where the Bible was taught in England, up to about 1830, were at Oxford and Cambridge, to which those at King's College, London, and at Durham, were then added. By contrast, for most of the years 1800–1860, the Bible was taught at seventeen Protestant faculties in the German states. A second contrast is that most of the teaching given in Germany was extremely free-thinking in character, whereas conservative views prevailed in England. Even Liberal churchmen at this period treated the Bible with reverence, and some of them, such as Bp. Thirlwall, were deeply shocked by *Essays and Reviews* when it appeared. In the first volume of Liddon's *Life of Pusey*, chapters 4, 5 and 8, there is a vivid and fascinating account of the first impact which German biblical scholarship made on the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. This was in the 1820s. The brothers Hugh James and Henry John Rose were two of the first at Cambridge to investigate it, and in 1825 the former delivered four discourses there on 'The State of the Protestant Religion in Germany', which were published at Cambridge the same year, dedicated to Bp. Blomfield. Rose was very alarmed at what he had learned. At Oxford in this period there were only two people who understood German, and, though some theology in both countries was still being written in Latin, the vernacular was becoming normal; so the Regius Professor of Divinity, Charles Lloyd, decided the same year (1825) to send a promising young graduate, E.B. Pusey, then twenty-four years old, to study in Germany for a year, after which a second year followed. He studied under many great names—Eichhorn, Schleiermacher, Neander, Ewald, Tholuck and Hengstenberg, among others—and spent his time acquainting himself with German theology and deepening his knowledge of Semitic languages (Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac and Arabic). As Pusey recalled years later,

> I can remember the room in Göttingen in which I was sitting when the real condition of religious thought in Germany flashed upon me. I said to myself, 'This will all come upon us in England; and how utterly unprepared for it we

> are!' From that time I determined to devote myself more earnestly to the Old Testament, as the field in which Rationalism seemed to be most successful.[4]

Such was Pusey's progress in his studies, that in 1828, the year after his return to Oxford, he was appointed Regius Professor of Hebrew, and this was the academic post which he held right up to his death in 1882, when he was succeeded by S.R. Driver, a scholar of very different views. Pusey is much better known today for his activities in another field, as a pioneer of the Oxford Movement, which aimed to accentuate (and indeed to exaggerate) the traditionalism of the Church of England, and to resist the reforming zeal of those mildly Liberal churchmen and politicians who were so active in the first half of the nineteenth century. Our concern, however, is with Pusey's labours as an Old Testament scholar, and in this field his great work was occasioned by *Essays and Reviews*. In *Essays and Reviews*, Pusey's early premonition of what was coming upon England was at last, after more than thirty years, realized: Liberalism, under German influence, had now become aggressive and destructive in England, and had been espoused by ordained members of the established church. And even at this date there was no one in England so well qualified by his studies and experience to answer it on its own ground as Pusey. We have spoken earlier of what was written in reply to *Essays and Reviews*, but have yet to mention Pusey's *Lectures on Daniel the Prophet*, which were delivered at Oxford in 1862 and 1863 and were published at Oxford, as a thick book full of varied learning, in 1864. The opening words of the preface read,

> The following lectures were planned, as my contribution against that tide of scepticism, which the publication of the 'Essays and Reviews' let loose upon the young and uninstructed.

And the opening words of the first lecture are these,

> The book of Daniel is especially fitted to be a battlefield between faith and unbelief. It admits of no half-measures. It is either Divine or an imposture.

Such frank language is not in fashion today. Anglo-Catholics long ago abandoned Pusey's attitude to the Bible, and Evangelicals often today (more often than a few years back) endorse theories stemming from rationalistic biblical criticism without expecting their faith to be injured as a consequence. The 'accepted results' of critical study tend to be taken for granted as a basis for one's own further study, and radical questions are rarely asked about them. When they *are* asked, and in a public manner, the presumption is against those who ask them, and any attempt the questioners make to turn back the tide of critical opinion is disregarded, as self-evidently perverse. New ideas receive an open-minded reception, but attempts to revive old ideas are, not unnaturally, seen as simply reactionary.

Yet it seems to me reasonable to suggest that the truth is not after all on the side of this sort of biblical criticism, the sort championed by *Essays and Reviews*, but on the side of its opponents. There are four reasons for suggesting this.

1. *The opposition did not quickly collapse (as discredited cases regularly do), either in Germany or in England.*

In Germany, Tholuck opposed it, and Hengstenberg founded an opposition school of conservative Old Testament criticism, in which the other great names were Hävernick, Kurtz, Keil and Delitzsch. In England, opposition was maintained, in the Church of England as well as outside, right up to the end of the century, and indeed until the First World War.[5] In the 1890s, Eyre and Spottiswoode, the royal printers, published a series of informative and well-argued studies called the Bible Student's Library, and also a volume even larger than Pusey's *Lectures on Daniel the Prophet*, maintaining the essentially Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch. This was *Lex Mosaica, or the Law of Moses and the Higher Criticism* (London, 1894), edited by Richard Valpy French, brother of the famous missionary bishop, and with many distinguished contributors. Like Pusey's book, it argues a very powerful case. When eventually this school of thought did fade into the background in England, it seems to have been due to fashion rather than to argument, and to the very imprudent assumption that the Old Testament could be safely surrendered, provided the New Testament was defended. In reality, the conservative case for the New Testament was then being maintained (by Lightfoot, Westcott and others) with the same sort of arguments as conservative Old Testament scholars were using, and the surrender of the Old Testament has since imperilled the New Testament as well.

2. *The origins of German biblical criticism are highly suspect.*

Attention has recently been drawn by H.G. Reventlow, in his learned book *The Authority of the Bible and the Rise of the Modern World* (E. T., London, 1984), to the fact that negative biblical criticism did not *begin* with the German critics but with the English Deists. In its origins, it was not the result of German scholarship but of English scepticism. The Deists were a school of thought in the England of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, who maintained a sort of natural theology which they thought could be justified by reason alone, and discarded whatever else the Bible teaches. They ridiculed the supernatural. One of the Deists, Anthony Collins, was the first writer since the Neo-Platonist philosopher Porphyry, in his book against Christianity in the third century, to claim that the Book of Daniel was not really written until the persecution of the Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes in the second century BC, and contained only prophecies after the event (see Reventlow, p. 368). Yet this is now the accepted wisdom![6] The writings of the Deists were translated into continental languages, and were promoted also from France, where Voltaire had been greatly influenced by the English Deist Bolingbroke, and, though refuted

and discredited in England, by the efforts of Bp. Joseph Butler and others, they acquired a following in Germany. These facts were well understood in the mid-nineteenth century, both in Germany and in England, but have since been conveniently forgotten, until Reventlow revived the knowledge of them. See C.F.A. Kahnis, *Internal History of German Protestantism since the middle of last century* (E. T., Edinburgh, 1856), and Alexander McCaul, *Rationalism and Deistic Infidelity* (London, Wertheim, 1861), where McCaul quotes as his German authorities Stäudlin, Hagenbach, Weber, Tholuck and Guericke. Rogerson, in his book already several times cited, accepts from Reventlow this account of the Deistic origin of Germany biblical criticism, but he does not seem to realize its serious implications for the credibility of the movement he upholds.[7]

3. *The eighteenth and nineteenth-century philosophical assumptions incorporated into German biblical criticism further undermine its claims to be objective and scientific.*

Between 1828 and 1830, Rose and Pusey had a friendly literary controversy on the reasons for the prevalence of rationalism in German theology. Among the reasons discerned was a reaction against the rigid confessional scholasticism of Lutheran theology in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. In reaction against this, it appeared, both free-thinkers and Pietists had effectively dispensed with confessions of faith, and in the case of the free-thinkers this had led first to so-called 'Neology' [easy-going Modernism] and then to negative Rationalism, as rigid as the scholasticism which preceded it. By this stage, German theology had become thoroughly integrated with non-Christian philosophy, and there can be little doubt which had the upper hand. Rationalism produced its own philosophical reactions, in the moralism of Kant, the experientialism of Schleiermacher and the pantheistic idealism attributed to Hegel, none of which abandoned the earlier rationalism, but attempted to modify it. The German biblical critics of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were trained under these influences, sometimes by the great philosophers in person, and it would be wonderful if the critics' theories did not bear marks of the fact. Rogerson fully admits this. He writes,

> In the case of Old Testament scholarship, it can be said that in the nineteenth century, German scholars adopted philosophically orientated views of religion and theology that led them to propose radical reconstructions of the history of the Israelite religion based upon source criticism.[8]

The *exact* relationship between biblical criticism and philosophy cannot be known until it has been carefully investigated by someone equally well versed in the history of both, but in the meantime a substantial beginning has been made by Wayne Hankey in his learned essay 'The Bible in a Post-Critical Age'.[9] The sequence of the supposed documents in the Pentateuch, according to the accepted critical theory, provides an example of philosophical influence. J.F.L. George, the first critic to date the Priestly

Document later than Deuteronomy, used the argument that the religion of the heart (in Deuteronomy) was a more basic kind of religion than the religion of the head (in the Priestly Document): this was precisely the view of Schleiermacher, of whom George was at that stage in his life a devoted follower.[10] George's contemporary J.K.W. Vatke, meanwhile, was an outspoken disciple of Hegel, and Hegel taught that religion is constantly evolutionary, from the lower to the higher: on this basis, Vatke was able to maintain a similar order to George's, though for different reasons, holding that stress on holiness, cultic ritual and divine transcendence, as in the Priestly Document, belongs to the last and highest stage of Israel's religion.[11] The same order of documents in the Pentateuch was later standardized by Wellhausen.

4. *The arguments of conservative criticism were in fact more credible than those of liberal criticism: they were also more Christian.*

This final reason for judging the truth to be on the side of the opponents, not the authors, of *Essays and Reviews*, and of the kind of biblical criticism which it championed, is much the most contentious reason and cannot be fully argued here. It calls for a book, or rather, perhaps, a library of books, showing that biblical criticism is indeed legitimate as a historical investigation, but *only when informed by faith in the Bible's contents.* However, a few points can be quite briefly made here and now.

a. If the Law of Moses is not the work of Moses, whose work is it? And similarly, if the teaching of Jesus, for example in the Fourth Gospel, did not come from Jesus, from whom did it come? The implication of current critical theory is that the supposed anonymous authors of the biblical literature were greater religious geniuses than Moses or than Jesus himself, and yet they ascribed what they wrote to others, and have left behind them no clear mark of their identity! Is this credible?

b. The Pentateuch is an ancient oriental book. If it presents difficulties, as it does, this is only what we should expect. But to have undoubting confidence in the logical analysis of a modern western mind as an explanation of the difficulties of an ancient eastern book is hardly realistic. We must not disguise the difficulties, but we may not necessarily be able to explain them, except in a tentative way.

c. The archaeological evidence showing the antiquity of writing in Israel was only discovered about the time of Wellhausen, towards the end of the nineteenth century, and Wellhausen himself refused to belief it. But if, as we now know, writing dates back to the fourth millennium BC, and Israel was a literate people even during the formative period of its history, is it credible that it would have left no contemporary or near-contemporary account of the events which brought the nation into being; and since the Pentateuch professes to be such an account, what plausible reason can we give for not accepting its testimony?

d. What is supposedly the latest component of the Pentateuch is the Priestly Document, dating from the exilic or post-exilic period. Yet the

Priestly Document includes the detailed directions for constructing the Tabernacle in the wilderness, which (if it ever existed) had by then long ceased to exist, while including no directions for constructing the permanent Temple in the promised land: surely this is a strange anachronism, if the Document was written so late![12] Moreover, parallels to the technical language of the Priestly Document have now been discovered at Ugarit, carrying this language back to Mosaic times.

e. Two of Daniel's prophecies, those of ch. 8 and of chs. 10–12, do clearly foretell the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, but the latter prophecy extends beyond the time of Antiochus, ending with the resurrection of the dead. The same is true of Daniel's other two great prophecies, the Four Kingdoms prophecy of chs. 2 and 7, and the Seventy Weeks prophecy of ch. 9, which can only be made to end in the time of Antiochus by the greatest violence of interpretation. So, even if the book had been written in the much later time of Antiochus, it would still foretell the future events of the resurrection of the dead, the triumph of the Son of Man and the death of the Messiah the Prince.

f. To say that a book like Daniel must be late because it contains predictions of the future, something manifestly impossible; or that the narratives of the Old and New Testament must be legendary because they contain miracles, events which do not occur; is pure unbelief, contrary both to Christianity and to the existence of God.

g. To say that the Old Testament needs to be interpreted in its own terms, and that the prophecies it contains relate to its own days, may be partially true but cannot be the whole truth, since some prophecies resist such interpretation, and nothing is more basic to the message of Jesus than that he came to fulfil the Old Testament. The Christian interpretation of the Old Testament is ultimately the true interpretation of it.

h. To try to have Biblical revelation without Biblical history is a perverse and impossible attempt, since the Bible is not just a book of meditations but a record and interpretation of events—the events by which God created, sustained and redeemed the world. If the events did not take place, the interpretation falls to the ground. To call Biblical history legendary is therefore to attack its character as revelation. And to say that it does not matter whether the Bible is historical or not, is either a statement of the obvious or is utter scepticism; that is, it either means that the norms of historiography were not exactly the same in antiquity as they are today, which is of course true, or else it means that it does not matter whether any revelation ever in fact took place, or whether people simply imagined it.

All things considered, therefore, the revolution in Biblical study which began in England with *Essays and Reviews*, and the similar revolution which preceded it in Germany a hundred years before, is a revolution which did more harm to the Church than good. In so far as it taught us to approach the Bible historically, it taught us an important lesson, from which conservative Biblical criticism has since benefited, but in so far as it

taught us to approach the Bible unbelievingly, it has hindered the mission of the church ever since. It lies at the root of many of the calamities which have afflicted the church in our own day, and from which, until we repent of unbelief, the church will never recover.

ROGER BECKWITH is the Warden of Latimer House, Oxford.

NOTES

1 This paper was read at the 'Origins of Conflict' conference of the Protestant Reformation Society in September 1993, and is printed by permission of the Society.
2 *Memoirs of Archbishop Temple*, ed., E.G. Sandford, London, 1906, Vol. 1, p. 223.
3 Rogerson, *op. cit.*, pp. 138–144.
4 *Life of Pusey*, London, 1893–97, Vol. 1, p. 77.
5 Contrary to Rogerson's assertion (p. 234) that 'in *scholarly* circles from the 1880s, the defenders of the old orthodoxy were hardly to be seen'.
6 The authenticity of Daniel is said to have been denied also by the Portuguese rationalist Uriel (or Gabriel) Acosta in the early seventeenth century. Acosta first left Christianity for Judaism, and was then excommunicated by the Jews, having abandoned revealed religion altogether.
7 The Deists had debts to writers earlier in the seventeenth century, such as the philosophers Hobbes and Spinoza, but they were the first actual school of thought to practice what we call biblical criticism. As well as to the Deists, the German biblical critics owed something to the speculations of the eighteenth century Roman Catholic writers, Jean Astruc and Alexander Geddes.
8 Rogerson, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
9 Included in William Oddie, ed., *After The Deluge*, London, 1987.
10 Rogerson, *op. cit.*, pp. 63, 65.
11 *Ibid.*, pp. 70–71, 77–78.
12 How anomalous it seemed to someone living in Temple times that there was no explicit guidance about the Temple in the Pentateuch is illustrated by the recently discovered Qumran Temple Scroll. Since Moses had given no directions on the subject, the writer thought it proper to invent a book in which Moses did so. Yet the truth is that, because the Pentateuch is of Mosaic date, it gives directions about the Tabernacle but not about the Temple.