

denounces Knobel's conclusions as "unsatisfactory and perverse." Originality, no doubt, there was in these speculations, but there was certainly very little unanimity. It has not lessened the confusion that the solution of this intricate problem of language and history, the results of which are so confidently offered to us, was meanwhile being sought in a different direction. Deuteronomy had hitherto been regarded as the latest form Mosaic institutions had adopted. But as this theory broke down in its application, a new one has been invented in its stead. The school of Reuss and Graf, popularized in this country by Kuenen and Wellhausen, selects somewhat arbitrarily portions of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, which it calls the Priestly Code, and makes this the latest development of Jewish institutions, and its authors the men who brought the historical narratives into something near their present shape. A forgery of a very elaborate kind certainly, and it might be said one rather difficult to palm off successfully on a nation not altogether destitute of literary culture.¹ If it be asked what evidence these writers give for their theories, it must be confessed that it is slight enough. It consists very largely of unproved assertions. Some evidence of this statement will be found below, and it could be added to almost indefinitely. Not one shred of direct historical evidence is offered in support of the theory. The ground on which these conclusions are offered to our acceptance is simply critical, and the critics themselves differ on every point except one, which we shall presently mention. As Professor Freeman has lately complained in the case of certain speculators on the origin of the English race, they

¹ Delitzsch's adhesion to the new criticism, as announced in the last edition of his commentary on Genesis, has been received with much delight by its supporters. But thirty years ago and more he had accepted the theory of the "Elohist" and "Jehovist," and thus, as Mr. Bissell says (*The Pentateuch, its Origin and Structure*, p. 69) has "placed himself in a very stiff and ugly current," from which a hope is expressed that "he may get safely out." The coarsest form the new criticism has assumed is in Renan's *History of the People of Israel*. Yet its leading principles of the impossibility of the supernatural and the possibility of reconstruction of ancient documents by purely critical methods once conceded, the seems no reason why we should stop short anywhere.