

nothing to justify the exception made to this passage except the sheer necessity of the case. The statement in verse 10—"There hath not arisen a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses"—implies a range of comparison extending far beyond the time of Joshua, to whom tradition ascribes the passage; and the description of Joshua as being "full of the spirit of wisdom"—verse 9—could scarcely have been written by Joshua himself.

These were the things first seized upon in Pentateuchal criticism. They were urged as objections to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch by the Roman Catholic scholar, Peyrerius, 1660, and by the philosophical and sceptical Jew, Spinoza, 1670.

3. The Higher Criticism finds in these books, in the third place, repetitions, duplications, a lack of unity of plan and order, and a diversity of style, inconsistent with the theory of a single author, working, for the most part, with immediate knowledge of what he relates. This will be illustrated by what will be adduced under another head.

Richard Simon, a Roman Catholic scholar, was the first to give serious consideration to these facts in his work on the Historical Criticism of the Old Testament, 1678.

4. The Higher Criticism finds, in the fourth place, a different usage in different parts of these books in the designation of the Divine Being. In parts the Divine name Elohim is used, in other parts the Divine name Jehovah is employed, and in yet others the two are used conjointly.

This was first observed by Jean Astruc, a French physician, and author of a number of scientific and scholarly works. The full meaning of this important discovery was not at once perceived, nor had Astruc himself the critical scholarship to develop it fully. Yet that it was a discovery of immense significance was recognized from the first. It laid the foundation of what has been known as the documentary theory of the composition of Genesis. Astruc published a work in 1753 in which he unfolded and applied his discovery, finding in the Book of Genesis two principal and nine subordinate documents; and his theory, variously modified, has been generally adopted.

But the discovery has been extended and applied far beyond what Astruc ever dreamed of. It has been developed through different stages by a succession of scholars, mostly German—as Eichhorn, who is called the father of the Higher Criticism, and who gave it its name, De Wette, Gesenius, Ewald, Hupfeld, Nöldeke, Reus, Graf, Kuenen (who may be classed with the Germans) and Wellhausen; and now for some time Scotch, English, and American scholars—as Professor W. Robertson Smith, late of Aberdeen, Professor Driver, of Oxford, Professor Briggs, of Union Theological Seminary, and President Harper, of the Chicago University—have been prominent exponents of the movement. More conservative recognition and application of it has been advocated by such scholars as Hengstenberg, Bleek, Lange, and Delitzsch, in Germany, and Professors Green of Princeton and Schaff of Union, in this country, though Delitzsch and