

Luther, we know, was not fond of Esther or James. Calvin had some testing moments with 2nd Peter. Both worked over the authorship of Hebrews. It is a mistake to think that the critical questions did not exist in the Reformation period but they existed in an aura of belief in the Word. The men and women who wrestled with them were essentially believers given to the proclamation of truth. Their findings may have lacked something in objectivity, I suppose, but they were not biased in the direction of being opposed to the fundamental claims of the Bible for itself. What was raised in discussion by these parties was raised in the hopes of Bible relevance...not Bible dismissal.

The Enlightenment produced a wave of literary criticism that descended on the classical models with a great force. Homer, Virgil, Ovid, and even Shakespeare were subjected to literary criticism that stripped them of integrity. This literary criticism was a critique of the model to discover its parts and origin. It sought to discover these by dissecting the finished product and looking for the subcontractors who had labored on the project through time. The literary ideas of Wolffe, et al, were behind much of this in the non-biblical sphere and hardly any classic work was overlooked. In the church similar expressions in early form were brought forth by men such as Richard Simon. These were, on the whole, simplistic statements compared with later ideas. The thinkers of the enlightenment did not develop a real methodology but existed on suggestion and theory. This was quite enough to destroy the unity of Homer, Beowulf, etc., and also the Scripture. As the reactions against the religious literature of antiquity paralleled the reactions against the secular literature of the same period, the enlightenment produced a general non-acceptance of the classic values of the past.

Out of this background came the most significant work of centuries in terms of biblical higher criticism--the work of Astruc in 1753. A French physician, the author worked with classical studies and Biblical motifs as a sort of hobby. He applied literary criticism to the book of Genesis in an attempt to learn the sources of Moses. So far as I know, he did not doubt Moses or the general thrust of his work but in seeking to find Mosaic background material he discovered a system of dividing the sources on the basis of the **Divine names** used in each. On this we have much discussion in the third section of the syllabus.