

in the argument, and, as far as I can see, adds nothing to its meaning. The unusual mode of expression, however, may reasonably suggest a doubt if the familiar mode of interpretation be the true one.

I venture, therefore, to submit a reading of the passage which, according to Bishop Lightfoot, is found in the Syriac version, but to which he apparently does not himself attach much importance. This would insert a comma after the word *είσακουσθείς*, and so detaching the clause *ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας* from what precedes it, render it possible to connect it with what follows. The passage will then run,—taking the antecedent from the fifth verse—‘the Christ,’ ‘Who in the days of His flesh,—having offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears to Him that was able to save Him from death, and having been hearkened to,—by His submissiveness (*under the sufferings which were laid upon Him*), though He was a Son, learned obedience (*such that, except as man, He could never have been called on to render, scil., creaturely obedience*) from the things which He suffered.’

I substitute the word ‘submissiveness’ for the ‘godly fear’ of the Revised Version, as expressing, according to my view, with clearness and precision the meaning of the writer, and as being as etymologically legitimate a translation of *εὐλάβεια* as that of the Revised Version. The word (from *εἶ* and *λαμβάνω*) simply means ‘a taking well’ in general, without limiting the special way in which the ‘taking well’ is to be manifested. But it scarcely seems in itself so necessarily to imply a reverent fear under suffering as it does a submissive and acquiescent spirit in suffering. Still, even if the ‘godly fear’ of the Revised Version be preferred, the connexion of the clause with what follows will suffice to relieve it of the objections

which seem to lie against the generally received reading.

The change proposed is really so slight as to require no violence to be done to the text, no artificial interpretation of words out of their ordinary use, and, so far as I can apprehend, no grammatical strain of any kind. The established punctuation is a matter of use rather than of authority, and the interpolation of a comma appears justified, if my objections to the usual mode of reading be valid, by the necessity of the case.

By the change of the verbal connexion the argument flows on uninterruptedly, being strengthened rather than weakened by the clause in question. The submissiveness of the Divine Son in bearing the sufferings of humanity is emphasised, not indeed as having been the reason why the Father hearkened to His prayers, but as having been the condition and means whereby those sufferings, unmerited as they were, became capable of teaching Him, notwithstanding His divine Sonship, an obedience of which He could not have had the same knowledge without them. It was a new experience for the sinless Son of God to taste of the penalties due to the sinner, which, as taking manhood upon Him, He had incurred. And His filial submission to this experience, simply because so it seemed good to the Father, was the subjective condition of His learning, though He was a Son, the obedience due from the creature. What His submissiveness was subjectively, namely, the means of His learning (*ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας*), the sufferings were objectively, namely, the source and occasion of His learning (*ἀφ’ ὧν ἔπαθεν*); so that the writer could say with full meaning and perfect accuracy that He, notwithstanding His recoil from the sufferings ‘by His submissiveness, though He was a Son, learned obedience from the things which He suffered.’

Professor Peake on the Reply to Wellhausen.

BY THE REV. W. L. BAXTER, D.D., CAMERON MANSE, ST. ANDREWS.

IT has been suggested to me as desirable that Professor Peake’s article, ‘Wellhausen and Dr. Baxter,’ in the June number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, should get some rejoinder from me. I think its tone and taste (whether ‘comical’ or not) best carry their own exposure; but, so far as it is

argumentative, a little pricking of its pretentiousness may be useful. In one respect I resemble him—‘my material is so great’: twenty or thirty pages of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES might be filled with an exhibition of his evasions and suppressions and inconsequences; so with the space which

I can reasonably occupy, I shall much condense.

I. As the avenger of misrepresentation, he very appropriately begins by himself notably misrepresenting the book, which he professes to criticise. He has read only the first seventy pages of my book, but he says 'no injustice is done' to me, in founding his criticism exclusively on these seventy pages, because 'he (Dr. Baxter) tells us again and again that Wellhausen's whole position is overturned in these chapters.' The misrepresentation here is simple, and complete; it consists in attributing to me what is uttered by Wellhausen. I open with a prominent quotation of the latter's words: 'My whole position is contained in my first chapter;' and, every time I requote the words I show that it is the contention of my opponent, of which I am reminding my readers.

But there is worse than this. Had Mr. Peake read my book, he would have found that I expressly repudiate the opinion which he ascribes to me. He would have found me saying: 'We have repeatedly quoted his estimate that his "whole position" is contained in his theory of the One Sanctuary. To our thinking, his theory of Sacrifice brings his attitude to the writers of Scripture, whether legislators or historians or prophets, into much more frequent and serviceable illustration than his theory of Sanctuary.' And, having illustrated this, I add: 'We shall leave him, however, to adjust his estimate of the relative values of different branches of his History as he chooses; our sole concern is with their truth.' Mr. Peake thus represents me as 'telling again and again' that which I not only do not 'tell' once, but that of which I 'tell' the opposite. He thinks I have not read other literature; it is a more elementary peril not to read the book itself, which you are reviewing.

II. Having thus misrepresented me, he immediately proceeds, in a most superlative degree, to misrepresent Wellhausen. He says Wellhausen virtually takes the whole mass of recent (so-called) critical conclusions for granted, as needing no proof, and that he has only to settle whether P comes before or after D. This is turning the Prolegomena into an utter farce, and is directly in the teeth of Wellhausen's own proclaimed intention in writing it. Referring to the three main divisions of the (so-called) Hexateuch, he says his book is to trace the true succession and the true dating of

the whole three by a new and independent investigation of his own: 'It is necessary to trace the succession of the three elements in detail, and at once *to test and to fix each* by reference to an independent standard, namely, the inner development of the history of Israel, so far as that is known to us by trustworthy testimonies from independent sources.' And, as if that were not plain enough, he proceeds to emphasise that his investigation, instead of seeking to settle one point only (however important), is to take the widest possible sweep, so as to settle the true relation of all Pentateuchal elements: 'The literary and historical investigation on which we thus enter is both wide and difficult. It falls into three parts. In the first, which lays the foundations, the data relating to sacred archæology are brought together and arranged in such a way as to show that in the Pentateuch the elements follow upon one another and from one another precisely as the steps of the development demonstrably do in the history.' Was I not justified in writing: 'First he will take the history and demonstrate three clearly-marked stages of development in the views of Israel regarding centralisation of worship. Then, he will take the legal enactments and demonstrate that they consist of three separate codes, of diverse authorship and widely-sundered dates, and that these three codes contain regulations as to the place of worship, precisely coincident with the three stages of the nation's practice, as already historically fixed.' Later on, was I not justified in again saying, 'His profession is that, by an impartial examination of three codes of law, he will prove them to be diverse in contents, and to have been produced in different periods; and then, by an equally impartial examination of history, he will show three clearly distinguished periods, during which the three codes were recognised and reigning. Such a procedure is incomparably fair, and, besides (so far as principle is concerned), it involves no novelty whatever; it is simply the application of the elements of common sense to a literary and historical investigation.' These extracts show that Wellhausen's description of his aim is unmistakable, and that my paraphrase of it is fair in the extreme. I understand him thoroughly, and I applaud his distinctly announced method. To this general vindication I cannot forbear adding the following special test of Mr. Peake's accuracy. One of the (so-called) 'elements'

of the Hexateuch is Deuteronomy, regarding which Mr. Peake writes: 'The dating of the Deuteronomic Code in or shortly before the reign of Josiah . . . is assumed by Wellhausen as common ground, and he never intended to prove' it. These words occur almost verbatim in an *Academy* review, to which I shall presently refer. Compare with them their express annihilation from Wellhausen's own pen, as follows: 'Moreover, however strongly I am convinced that Deuteronomy is to be dated in accordance with 2 Kings xxii., I do not, like Graf, so use this position as to make it the fulcrum of my lever.' That is (as the context explains), the date of Deuteronomy is not to be 'assumed,' but is first to be '*historically ascertained.*' Yet even then it is not to be made a 'fulcrum': by a similar independent investigation, the date of the Priestly Code is to proceed to be 'historically ascertained' also. In view of these quotations, and in view of the arrogance of Mr. Peake's article, I venture to ask my readers if they ever met in with such a glaring misleader of the public. If I do not turn in absolute contempt from such a controversialist, it is not that he 'has earned a refutation.' I notice him *ex gratiâ*, and at the request of others.

The following circumstance enhances Mr. Peake's aptitude. Wellhausen actually proclaims that, if he had written a book, on the lines on which Mr. Peake says he has written, he would have been producing a book 'of no value'! And most people will agree with him. He sketches the state of criticism at the time (and Mr. Peake has confounded this sketch with the statement of the object of the book, which follows), and declares the position, in the critical world, to be such that he could almost 'upon admitted data' call for a verdict on the historical genesis of the three codes, the Priestly Code included: but he dismisses such a course as 'of no value,' and as a founding on 'mere generalities,' and, instead thereof, he enters on the new and characteristic inquiry, whose description I have given in his own words. Nay more, he will not even make one chapter of the *Prolegomena* a 'fulcrum,' on which to base the next and following chapters: thus the 'definite result,' regarding Sanctuary, which he claims to have established in his first chapter, is not to be carried forward, as proved when he deals with Sacrifice: the latter is to be 'solved *independently*, so as not to throw too much weight on a single

support.' Nothing could exceed the certainty, and the independence of his professed demonstrations. This is what he means when he says that the critical results, of whose warrantableness he feels assured, are not, without more ado, to be treated as established, but are to be proved or 'justified,' and that the 'justification' is to be of 'an ever-recurring' kind. I emphasise this as my argument proceeds; but then Mr. Peake has not read my book; neither, with intelligence, has he read his Wellhausen.

On no one does Mr. Peake's 'crowning achievement' cast a greater slur than on the late Professor Robertson Smith. It turns him, to borrow a euphemism from Mr. Peake, into 'an absolute fool.' The lamented professor lauded the *Prolegomena* as the first sufficient and independent guide to the English reader in reference to Pentateuchal dismemberment; instead of a bundle of undiscussed assumptions (assuming say nine-tenths of critical results, and proving only the last tenth) he introduced it to every reader of the English Bible as a '*complete and self-contained work*': it was to hang on nothing, but begin *ab ovo*. Nay, he adds, 'even on the Continent, where the subject has been much more studied than among us, Professor Wellhausen's book was the first *complete and sustained* argument which took up the question in *all its historical bearings.*' Where is dependence then? It is excluded. Robertson Smith scouts the idea of dependence, 'even on the Continent.' I think he rendered a grievous disservice to his age and country when he recommended Wellhausen to them as a conclusive reasoner: but in the quotations which we have given he describes with absolute accuracy, and to Mr. Peake's utter discomfiture, the magnificent aim of the *Prolegomena*.

The point is no way material, but I incline to think that Mr. Peake was far from original in discovering the mare's nest at which we have seen him. The nest had been discovered by Mr. Alfred W. Benn in the *Academy* six weeks before. For a considerable time after the issue of my book there was an ominous silence among the superior school, broken only by an occasional cry of 'all scholars are agreed,' or 'who cares for Gladstone?' At length, on 11th April, Mr. Benn appeared in five columns of the *Academy*, and opened with the cry (that Wellhausen takes all the main critical results for granted) which Mr. Peake resuscitates,

and of which I trust I have disposed above. I think Robertson Smith foresaw that Mr. Benn and Mr. Peake would declare that 'Wellhausen writes for a public of scholars who are already convinced,' and so, with withering plainness, he slew them by anticipation: 'The title (*Prolegomena*) of the book has a somewhat unfamiliar sound to English ears, and may be apt to suggest a series of dry and learned dissertations meant only for Hebrew scholars. It is worth while, therefore, to point out in a few words that this would be quite a false impression.' He then goes on to insist that the *Prolegomena* is a complete and independent and popular treatise, tracing the growth of 'the whole Pentateuchal law,' on lines 'intelligible by any one who reads the English Bible carefully,' and adapted 'for the mass of Bible readers.' The Germans should refrain from 'unfamiliar sounds' in their titles: they should remember there are 'babes' at Oxford. Let the reader now settle who has made the 'bad blunder to begin with,' who it is that multiplies 'the amazing blunders,' and who it is that, 'whatever Wellhausen may mean,' perpetually attributes to him the opposite.

III. I might really plead the propriety of going no further. A writer who begins by so grossly misrepresenting both my own position and Wellhausen's has no claim on me for pursuit. But I shall now look at him a little in detail. Every reader of my *Sanctuary* knows that it handles three topics mainly: (a) Wellhausen's analysis of the History; (b) Wellhausen's analysis of the Codes; (c) the Evolution, which Wellhausen professes to prove, and to prove from both the analyses. What impression has my critic made on my handling of these three topics?

(a) Taking the Evolution first (because my critic does so), Mr. Peake's defence of his master consists in virtually throwing Wellhausen's whole reasoning to the dogs. (1) I charge the Evolution with being a pure fiasco, not an advance from lower to higher, but a retrogression from perfection to the germ. Mr. Peake acknowledges I am right! 'Viewed from the ideal standpoint, no doubt the restriction of the sanctuary to a single place implies a less spiritual conception.' (2) I charge the Evolution, in a glorious march down a whole millennium, as amounting to an absolute standing still, with not even a 'pious desire' to advance a step. Mr. Peake again acknowledges I am right! 'We need not wonder if, as Well-

hausen thinks, *no earlier* indications of this kind of reform *are to be found.*' That is, Josiah's centralisation is a first step, instead of a glorious culmination of 'earlier' steps. (3) He tries to bring Wellhausen off on both the above counts, by pretending that he never promised to prove the evolution of oneness of sanctuary (that oneness having been 'a single step'), it was only the evolution of religion that he promised to prove. Such language is a perfect insult to Wellhausen. His words are: 'This oneness of the sanctuary in Israel was a slow growth of time.' 'It is possible to distinguish several stages of development.' [No doubt, he has flatly to contradict himself when he comes to the history, there being no 'slow growth' visible: but this is the perpetual fate in which his mere imaginations involve him; and to bring this home to the British public is the great burden of my book.] (4) Mr. Peake cannot lift his fallen master in the least through the 'environment' in Babylon. Was the temple on Zion 'an integral part of Israel's religious life' in Babylon any more than the high places were? Were Abraham's and Isaac's high places 'an integral part of Israel's religious life' when they re-entered Canaan after the four hundred years' sojourn in Egypt? Were those who 'remembered the first temple' incapable of remembering the high places too? High-sounding words cannot conceal that they are but a 'bringing forth wind.'

(b) Let us consider next my remarks on Wellhausen's '*demonstrable*' dating of the Codes. This is a most vital point. First, as to the dating of Ex. xx.-xxiii. (1) Wellhausen gives two pages of quotations from Genesis regarding patriarchal sacrifices, and then, without a syllable of further argument, he declares that these prove this First Code to be a post-Rehoboam document. I have argued that a more naked absurdity was never penned. And Mr. Peake has not a rag wherewith to cover its nakedness. (2) As if I had not mentioned it, Mr. Peake explains that Wellhausen regards the patriarchal narratives as illustrating the times of the narrator. I mention that hallucination three times over. And it only intensifies the absurdity. What we desiderate is one atom of proof: (a) that the narrator was photographing his own praxis; (b) that said praxis was a specially post-Rehoboam praxis. And of such 'proof' not even the 'atom' is forthcoming. (3) Besides exposing the nakedness of Wellhausen's

'demonstration' I marshal six arguments, or difficulties, that bar its acceptance. Mr. Peake leaves the whole six ungrappled with. (4) In another part of his article, Mr. Peake hints that 'criticism' had already come to a definite 'result' as to the date of the First Code, and that it contains other criteria of date besides 'laws as to altars.' But these pleas are utterly irrelevant. Wellhausen professes to give an independent demonstration; and the five 'criteria of data' are not like the steps of a stair, each is a 'solving independently.'

Secondly, let us consider the dating of Deuteronomy. (1) Wellhausen argues that such words as 'Ye shall not do after all that we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes' show conclusively that Deuteronomy must be dated under Josiah. This is simply wanton dogmatism without an atom of proof. The only indication of date in the words is 'this day,' and that 'day' is declared with overwhelming emphasis to be before Israel crossed the Jordan. (2) All that Mr. Peake can urge is that it was 'only' in the days of Josiah that 'the reforming party in Jerusalem' were 'attacking the high places.' But the words contain not the slightest reference to 'the reforming party in Jerusalem'; they proceed avowedly from an earnest 'reforming' Moses in the plains of Moab. It is only by murdering the history and by letting imagination play its most 'romancing tricks' that the slightest reference to Josiah can be brought in. (3) 'As matter of fact,' not Deuteronomy only, but other books of the Old Testament prove how justifiable was Moses' 'polemic' against the wilderness praxis of his people. Nay, had we been left (as we have not been left) to mere conjecture, I suggest numerous historical occasions, in which the words might have been as appropriately delivered, as in Josiah's day. And Mr. Peake has not a word in answer. (4) I treat with scorn the sentences in which Wellhausen pretends to prove that the book found by Hilkiah was Deuteronomy alone. Mr. Peake agrees with me. He says, 'I freely grant these sentences do not prove this.' Therein he 'freely grants' all I need. His only recourse is to fly off to 'other literature.' But this is his *πρῶτον ψεῦδος* (or 'bad blunder to begin with') over again. Wellhausen offers new and independent demonstrations. When I say 'all that the advanced critics have to offer,' surely a child might understand that I mean all they have to offer

in the person of their chosen champion, issuing 'a complete and self-contained work,' and disposing of the Pentateuch 'in all its historical bearings.'

Thirdly, how does Wellhausen fare with the dating of his priestly code? (1) He argues that this code shows centralisation to be a well-established practice, and that, as that practice existed only in the post-exilic period, therefore the code must be post-exilic. I point out that this is equivalent to holding, 'A Jewish law could be delivered only at a period when the proprieties and requirements of said law were being duly observed by the Jewish people.' Mr. Peake says that Wellhausen uses no such words, and that he would have been 'an absolute fool' if he had used them. I never said he used them; I merely show (quoting his own pages in full) that his reasoning necessarily implies them. If Mr. Peake will read Lord Macaulay's attempted refutation of Mr. Gladstone, he will come on this: 'It is not unusual for a person who is eager to prove a particular proposition, to assume a major which includes that particular proposition, without ever reflecting that it includes a great deal more.' That is Wellhausen's precise position: he 'assumes a major,' clearly 'without ever reflecting' that it includes what Mr. Peake sadly confesses none but 'an absolute fool' should assume. False reasoners do not write down their own stultification: it is the office of the critic to come, and 'search' their premises. (2) Mr. Peake tries to wriggle away from Wellhausen's 'absolute folly,' by declaring that it is only a 'probable' date, which he (Wellhausen) assigns to the Code. This is unworthy and cowardly: Wellhausen actually proclaims that '*all the laws of logic*' support his datings of the Codes: the dates, which he promised, were to be, not 'probable,' but 'demonstrable.' (3) Even assuming it were only a 'probability,' here is the false 'major,' as Mr. Peake (trying to improve upon his master) would put it: 'When a law is promulgated, and there is no polemical reference to practices contrary to a position taken for granted as fundamental, it is probable that such practices did not exist at the time': he might as conclusively have said, 'It is probable that such practices had not recently caused the nation's ruin, and had not been their immemorial curse in bygone centuries.' (4) I urge that the code does not contain the slightest proof whether its requirements were being (or had 'for long' been) ob-

served, or broken. Mr. Peake has not a pinpoint of proof that they were universally obeyed. If it is 'indirect,' it is also invisible. Law does not state what practices are, but what practices should be. History and law have diverse aims. (5) I offer a *reductio ad absurdum*, from the First Code, of Wellhausen's dating of the Third. Mr. Peake leaves it unanswered. I could hardly say which of Wellhausen's 'demonstrable' datings is weakest, but, assuredly, the whole three are rank romances. They are a mere 'vapour, that appeareth for a little.'

(c) There remains only my handling of Wellhausen's analysis of the History. (1) This is the first and longest section of my treatise, filling thirty-six of its sixty-nine pages. It is an excellent indication of the value of Mr. Peake's article that he, practically, leaves untouched the whole of the many arguments which I multiply throughout these pages. I accuse Wellhausen of turning Jewish history topsy-turvy, as regards (a) the temple, (b) the central house in Shiloh, (c) the tabernacle. Mr. Peake makes no attempt to show that Wellhausen's views are warrantable under any of the three heads. And this is the critic who is so bursting with 'material,' and who 'puts down the book, feeling that there is nothing to be learned from it'! (2) He has two quite fragmentary references to the above-mentioned arguments. The first is a carping, almost bewildering in its weakness, about Jer. vii. 21, 'For I spake not to your fathers, in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings and sacrifices.' Wellhausen holds very absurdly that these words prove Jeremiah's ignorance of the Mosaic Code. Further on, I show that they presuppose Jeremiah's knowledge of the Mosaic Code, but then Mr. Peake has not read my book. But how could the words prove Jeremiah's ignorance, except by treating them as an avowal that no code, like the Mosaic, was delivered at the Exodus? And yet I am held up to odium for saying that Wellhausen accepts Jeremiah's negative witness as to what transpired at the Exodus. We ought next to have a strict definition of the difference between six and half a dozen. Let me add that my main charge (of which the foregoing is only an aggravation) is that Wellhausen directly contradicts Jer. vii. 12 regarding Shiloh. This crucial charge Mr. Peake leaves unnoticed. It is the mere fringe or aggravation of the charge, with which he so

unsuccessfully attempts to deal. (3) The other carping is as to 1 Sam. ii. 22. He says, I 'surely overstate the case' when I say that the genuineness of that verse would annihilate Wellhausen's 'whole position.' But there is not the least 'overstatement.' One undoubted historical mention of the Mosaic tabernacle in the days of Eli annihilates the romance that said tabernacle never existed. Further, I do not discuss the genuineness of the second half of 1 Sam. ii. 22 (though there seems no good ground for rejecting it, except that it annihilates a German craze), I merely contrast its ample attestation by both English and American revisers with its cool effacement by Wellhausen, and I ask the Bible student to recognise, from this, not the falseness, but 'the perilous self-confidence' of Wellhausen's 'science.' The foregoing are the only two fringes, which Mr. Peake notices, of all the arguments I draw from 'the historical and prophetic books from the period of the Judges onwards.' He has certainly done nothing to uphold Wellhausen's caricature of history.

IV. I trust I have thus abundantly shown how completely Mr. Peake misrepresents Wellhausen, and also with what evasion and inefficacy he has handled the main elements of my *Sanctuary*. My threefold historical demonstration (regarding which Bishop Ellicott 'wondered what answer your opponent could possibly make') is left practically unassailed. The wondrous datings of the Codes seem acknowledged to be, by themselves, failures; and their only defence is an irrelevant flight to 'other literature.' The paraded Evolution appears in Wellhausen's form of it to be discarded, and to be left trampled in the mire. The tendency to think that 'no answer (to my book) is possible,' which Mr. Peake dreads, may thus be fomented by his own effort at repression.

He has a few other scattered references to my book (or rather to a seventh part of it), at which I may glance. (1) He asks: 'Why should the northern Israelites be expected to visit the chief shrine of the southern kingdom?' He must settle that with Wellhausen. The latter (p. 21) makes the want of 'visits' from 'the northern Israelites' a test of the inferiority of Jerusalem. (2) Wellhausen says that Lev. xvii. confessedly belongs to a special collection, whereon Mr. Peake says, 'This "confessedly" ought to have set Dr. Baxter on the proper scent, and he might have discovered that, if Wellhausen does not give the

proof, it is assumed by him as well known'; whereto we reply, 'This "confessedly" ought to have set Mr. Peake on the proper scent, and he might have discovered that Wellhausen, with his usual infirmity, is assuming what he ought, and what he promised, to prove.' [Elsewhere, I show the contradictoriness of his dating of H G; but then Mr. Peake has not read my book.] (3) He says I refer to only one miscriticism of Chronicles by Wellhausen: I refer to four! Nay, I devote three and a half pages to the three suppressed references, and (for comparison) I give Wellhausen's miscriticisms in full. (4) He sticks to Wellhausen's hallucination that Deuteronomy refers to 'the priests of the suppressed sanctuaries,' and he fails to see (though Wellhausen appears to have seen) that this invention necessitates the 'mixing two different things up.' (5) He says I argue 'as if the book (of Kings) had been written from end to end by a single author.' Most people will think that the author necessarily incorporates the materials of successive narrators, and I expressly point to the likelihood of an Exilic (or even Ezraite) editor; but then Mr. Peake has not read my book. (6) I say that Wellhausen can slip in proofs from Joshua, though without warrantableness and candour, when it suits him. Says Mr. Peake: 'It is a mere reference to the theophany at Gilgal, which is related in J E, an early source.' (a) If it were 'merely' this, it would still have the fatal flaw that it is a quotation from J E, as an independent corroboration of J E: this is describing a circle. (b) But there is much more. I refer to Wellhausen's treatment of Joshua's narrative of the altar of the two and a half tribes, and I show that he wantonly and absolutely reverses the history of which he is a professed exegete. (c) Wellhausen makes inconsistent uses of the two quotations from Joshua: he wrongly uses a Hexateuchal J E to illustrate the subsequent history, but (on his basis) he rightly enough tries to use a Hexateuchal P to illustrate the reigning legislation. It will, perhaps, be getting obvious now who understands Wellhausen best. Mr. Peake has similarly weak references to a non-'ethical' inference from Chronicles, to the orthodoxy of the good Naaman, and to an unrecorded 'importance' of Shiloh in the beginning of 'the period of the Judges.' And he has not a stricture on my book besides. If, therefore, his 'materials' were not 'exhausted,' mine (so far as brevity admits) are.

I shall conclude with two important references to the position of the whole controversy.

(1) Mr. Peake winds up by giving great and generous prominence to what he calls two Scottish 'puffs' of my book. For a reason which I shall state, let me give him one or two English 'puffs.' If he look to the advertising columns of this issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, I intend that he shall read this: 'This is by far the most telling challenge to the "Higher Criticism" that has yet appeared in English' (*Methodist Times*). 'It is the most powerful book I have read for a long while, and I think it absolutely conclusive' (Dr. Stanley Leathes). 'I recognise, in all, the great ability with which you conduct a great controversy' (Bishop Ellicott). 'You have laid us all under obligations never to be repaid' (Dr. Parker). 'Page after page convicts Wellhausen of reckless assertions and assumptions, which are nailed up like vermin to a barn door' (*Record*). 'It has simply made 'mince-meat' of Wellhausen and his friends. No reply to it is possible' (Professor Sayce). Now, is Mr. Peake justified in allowing 'appreciativeness' like the above to fly broadcast over England, without girding himself to read the remaining six-sevenths of my book, and then coming forward to emancipate the public from the superlative absurdity of these 'puffs'? It is to the six-sevenths they specially refer; for, in professed exposure of Wellhausen, my Part I. is 'as water unto wine' compared to my Part II.; the position of the controversy, therefore, is that, until Mr. Peake (or some 'Higher') speaks, the idea of Ezekiel being a sacrificial legislator, or the idea of the early prophets abhorring the least divine regulation of sacrifice, or the idea of all sacrificers having 'no reference to sin' till they were in Babylon, or the idea that a Code, which multiplies social feasts, is characterised by absolute unsocialness,—these, and such like, pleasantries of 'science' are in danger of being flung away as nonsense, by a multitude who are at present led captive by the Imaginationists at their will. Surely such a prospect will appal Mr. Peake. Meantime, let me give all prominence ('long may it retain its enlivening power') to the following: 'The book fails completely. I put it down feeling there is nothing to be learned from it' (Professor Peake).

(2) My other concluding remark is this. What the British public wants is to let triviality and

personality go by the board, and to be spoken to seriously and conclusively of the great issues that are at stake. As far as I have yet (19th June) seen, Mr. Benn's and Mr. Peake's are the only attacks, of any note and size, that I might be expected to notice: their main argument the former seems to have lent to the latter. In their succession of special criticisms, the former is ten times pettier than the latter: in discussing the latter, therefore, I have been dealing with the most responsible attack on my book which I have yet observed. Now the public do not care to know whether Mr. Benn should be flung out of his 'window' with 'tongs,' nor whether Professor Sayce and Mr. Gladstone 'cheer' Dr. Baxter's 'whoops' and 'yells,' nor whether Mr. Peake sits smiling at 'the sound of Dr. Baxter's trumpet' behind (*absit omen*) 'the obstinate walls of Jericho': let such trivials pass as idle wind.

What the public want to know is, Has the whole Christian world been trained to 'believe a lie'? a most stupendous and unimaginable lie! Were holy men 'borne along by the Holy Ghost' in the deliberate work of 'completely altering' most essential facts? Have we the formula, 'the Lord spake unto Moses,' scores of times as fiction, and hardly once as truth? The question, 'Is Wellhausen *consistent*'? is important, and I treat it fully (and with that Mr. Benn and Mr. Peake seem to think I am exclusively occupied). But the title to my *Thinker* articles puts a deeper question, which I canvass still more anxiously, the question, 'Is Wellhausen *right*'? I deal with that throughout my volume. Is it Proof, or Imagination, that he offers us? Is he the Samson, who has leaned, and brought down the temple? Or, is he the child, blowing its airy soap-bubbles against the 'Impregnable Rock'?

At the Literary Table.

THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

LIFE AND LETTERS OF FENTON JOHN ANTHONY HORT. BY HIS SON, ARTHUR FENTON HORT. (*Macmillan*. Crown 8vo, 2 vols., pp. x+475, 505. 17s. net.) 'There was, doubtless,' says Professor Armitage Robinson, 'an occasional exaggeration in our talk about him. But he had so seldom failed us, that we felt as if he really knew everything. Of the obscurest book, we said, "Dr. Hort is sure to have it"; of the most perplexing problem, "Dr. Hort knows the solution, if he would only tell"; of any subject, "Dr. Hort will tell you all the literature." And, indeed, nothing seemed to have escaped him that had been done in any branch of theological research.' And, it may be added in a word, not theological research only, Dr. Hort was more than a dilettanti botanist, and published some valuable monographs in that branch of science; while there are scattered sentences in letters to various friends which reveal at least an intelligent interest in architecture.

Did he know too much, then? It is not a common fault, but it might be argued of Dr. Hort. Why did he publish so very little? Other men rushed past him into print, and their words were accepted as the highest watermark of scholarship.

Hort knew it was not the highest, had something higher himself indeed, and would not publish. Is it not possible that if he had known less, the world would have known more?

But he was a personal force of great power. We have heard one pupil. And it is manifest from this biography that it was not merely nor mainly his encyclopædic knowledge that was his power. There is one feature as marked and much more momentous—his honesty and outspokenness. On the Old Testament question, for example. That was not his own special subject, but he knew it, and was not afraid of it. He even would have others speak out, as a most interesting letter to Dr. Westcott lets us see, and stood beside them when they spoke.

'If thine eye be single'—there is so much virtue in that; and Hort's eye was single. Once there was a great literary project on foot between the Cambridge three—Lightfoot, Westcott, Hort. It was a Commentary on the New Testament. Lightfoot would do the Pauline Epistles, Westcott the Johannine Writings and some others, Hort the Gospels and the Acts. But suddenly Hort perceived the dimmest shadow of a doubt in one of