

treated so much by itself both in attack and defense. The results of criticism here are not to be understood apart from the results elsewhere. So far from the critical treatment of the Pentateuch making it out an abnormal book, this treatment brings it quite into line with the other historical books. Notice:

1. *Its Composite Character.*—The evidence which shows the compilatory character of the other books exists here in abundance. There is, in fact, no clear line of division between these five and the other historical books. So far from there being a visible break between this and the others, the Book of Joshua is needed to complete the Pentateuchal history, for that history points forward to the occupation of Canaan as its culmination. A mere biography of Moses might end with the death of Moses; but the lives of the patriarchs, containing repeated promises named to them, could not rest short of showing the fulfilment of the promises. Even if the literary analysis failed us, we should have to speak of a Hexateuch instead of a Pentateuch. As a matter of fact, the literary analysis shows characters common to the six books and confirms this division. What is actually proved by the literary analysis is known to every one; and the growing unanimity among critics of all schools shows that this analysis rests on solid ground.

2. *The Post-Exilic Date of the Final Redaction.*—This follows from the patent fact that the whole series of historical books (Genesis to Kings, inclusive) has been made into a continuous narrative. This could be done only by an editor who lived after the completion of the several works. And as the Book of Kings was self-evidently composed in the Exile, the subsequent redaction can hardly be put before the return. This is enough, apart from the independent evidence we have of the date of the Pentateuchal documents.

3. *The Date of Deuteronomy.*—This is one of our fixed points. The Book of Deuteronomy easily separates itself from the rest of the Pentateuch as an independent work.* We see that it must have been an epoch-making work, and we easily discover the epoch at which it began to work. That epoch was the age of Josiah, when the Book of the Law was discovered in the temple. All the indications, from style, point to its composition not far from the time of its publication. It follows that it was not written by Moses. It was the free reproduction of Mosaic tradition current in the age of Josiah—but Mosaic tradition molded to enforce a new lesson. Such a use of literary fiction, which would cause no shock outside the Bible, need not disturb our faith if found in the Bible.

4. *The Order of the Documents.*—This is the only point on which there has been serious difference, and that difference is now scarcely more than nominal. The analysis shows the following constituents,

*I pass over matters of detail, as the various editions through which the book has passed, the extent of the original nucleus, and the different prefaces.