

and Ewald, and Knobel and Dillmann,¹ as representing the older school, who believe Deuteronomy to be the latest form of Mosaic institutions, as well as of Wellhausen and Kuenen, who believe it to be earlier than the Priestly Code. All these writers regard Deuteronomy as a book written in or about the days of Josiah by what Wellhausen calls "the reforming party," for the purpose of carrying their point in abolishing idolatry and polytheism. Kuenen tells us² that Deuteronomy is "the programme of the Mosaic party of Josiah's day."

¹ Ewald's theories, though now obsolete, deserve more attention than those of Kuenen and Wellhausen. Though he is no doubt unduly dogmatic, his assertions are by no means as rash as theirs. He treats Jewish literature with respect. We have, according to him, something like a real account of Jewish life and polity. As we have seen in the former paper, he regards the first source of the present Pentateuch—save some few archaic fragments—as not later than the age of Solomon. The prophets of later reigns supply further information, and Deuteronomy, the latest work of them all, is not later than the age of Manasseh. He regards this book as the "authoritative basis" on which the whole of the Reformation under Josiah was founded. But he does not go so far as to say that it was palmed off by the priests on the country as the veritable book of the Law of Moses. Knobel regards the first thirty chapters of Deuteronomy as written by the last law-giver, with the exception of certain short passages which he specifies. The greater portion of chap. xxxi. is also his, and two verses of chap. xxxiv. Also certain portions of Joshua are attributed to him. *Kritik des Pentateuch und Josua*, p. 579. We may very fairly ask, before we can rely on Knobel's authority, how far his assignment of these passages is to be attributed to critical analysis, and how far to the necessities of his theory. If the latter, his judgment is of little value on the point. Yet it will be found that all the passages in Joshua assigned to the Deuteronomist, with one or two trifling exceptions, are quotations from, or allusions to, Deuteronomy. In other words, he is not led to his conclusion by critical considerations. He has made his theory first, and then has manipulated his author to square with it. He does not regard Deuteronomy as the book found in the temple, but regards it as the work of a man of position and influence in the reign of Josiah. He regards the language as the chief proof of the date of the book. *Ib.* p. 591. This is sufficient to justify us in asking for something more than the mere fact of the agreement of German critics. Until we are in a position to settle authoritatively what parts of the Bible are archaic and what otherwise, Hebrew linguistic criticism can hardly be very trustworthy. The history of the English language could hardly be regarded as in a very advanced stage if we did not know to what age Chaucer and Pope should be respectively assigned. Dillmann (*Commentary on Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua*, 2nd edit., 1886, p. 611) regards the date of Deuteronomy as about the 7th or 8th century B.C., i.e., between the reigns of Hezekiah and Josiah. But he adds that some words to be found in it are hardly, one is certainly, not before the 7th century B.C. As usual, no proof is given.

² *Religion of Israel*, ii. 15.