

venomous reptile was placed against the brave man's cheek. Over and over again his friends had warned him of his danger, but, having so often escaped with impunity, he laughed their protestations to utter scorn. At length repeated reasonings called forth the promise that *only on one more occasion* would he attempt this hazardous experiment. In a vast amphitheatre, before a large and fashionable assembly, all eyes are fastened on the man. He allows the huge snake, crawling to his feet, to entwine itself round and round his frame, until at last its fangs are placed beside his cheek. A moment's solemn silence follows, as men and women with bated breath gaze down and tremble for the intrepid man. Suddenly a wild cry rings over the entire building. Again and again it sounds forth. The spectators applaud with mad delight what seems to them to be a realistic imitation of man in mortal agony. Alas, however, the experiment has been made once too often, for the serpent, wakening up to a consciousness of its deadly power, leaves upon the arena only the mangled remains of what was once a brave and gallant man.—H. BROWN.

MORALITY to the uttermost,
Supreme in Christ as we all confess,
Why need we prove would avail no jot
To make Him God, if God he were not?
What is the point where Himself lays stress?
Does the precept run, 'Believe in good,
In justice, truth, now understood
For the first time'? or 'Believe in Me,
Who lived and died, yet essentially

The Lord of Life'? Whoever can take
The same to his heart and for mere love's sake
Conceive of the love—that man obtains
A new truth; no conviction gains
Of an old one only, made intense
By a fresh appeal to his faded sense.
BROWNING, 'Christmas Eve.'

Sermons for Reference.

- Benson (E.), *Fishers of Men*, 60.
Bickersteth (E.), *Condensed Notes*, 406.
Brown (H.), *Christ's Divinity School*, 162.
Goodwin (H.), *Hulsean Lectures*, 1855, 19.
Hodge (C.), *Princeton Sermons*, 16.
Maclaren (A.), *Paul's Prayers*, 180.
Maurice (F. W.), *Kingdom of Heaven*, 180.
Milligan (G.), *Lamps and Pitchers*, 165.
Morrison (G.), *Sermons*, 17.
Newton (R.), *Sermons*, 147.
Pierson (A. T.), *Heart of the Gospel*, 23.
Price (A. F.), *Fifty Sermons*, vi. 265, ix. 97.
Salmond (C. A.), *For Days of Youth*, 213.
Stevenson (J. F.), *God and a Future Life*, 69.
Stewart (J.), *Outlines of Discourses*.
Thomas (J.), *Myrtle Street Pulpit*, ii. 309.
American Pulpit of To-Day, i. 187, ii. 801.
Christian World Pulpit, xviii., xxi., xli., xlvi., xlvii.
Contemporary Pulpit, 1st Series, vol. i.
Homiletic Review, xx. 283.
Preacher's Magazine, v. 382.
Scottish Congregationalist, xxxix. No. 18.

Wellhausen and Dr. Baxter.

BY PROFESSOR ARTHUR S. PEAKE, M.A., FELLOW OF MERTON COLLEGE, OXFORD.

DR. BAXTER has in his volume, *Sanctuary and Sacrifice*, reprinted some papers which appeared in *The Thinker* on Wellhausen's chapter on the 'Place of Worship' in his *Prolegomena*, and added to them a much longer discussion of his chapter on 'Sacrifice.' He has secured some very flattering testimonials as to the former from men eminent in various ways, Mr. Gladstone, who confesses to 'a rather slight acquaintance' with Wellhausen's works, heading the list. Appreciative reviews of the complete work have also appeared, in which we are assured that this is a conclusive answer to the *Prolegomena*. Nay more, it is roundly declared that Wellhausen must answer it, or his literary and theological character is destroyed. The author himself is as loud in his assertions of the finality of his arguments as anyone, and his demand that Wellhausen should

answer them or judgment go against him by default. A more self-confident writer it would be hard to find, and if 'the triple steel of dogmatism' encases the critics, what density are we to assign to his 'unfailing, if unconscious, covering'?

I do not know if Wellhausen has seen the book. If so, with his keen sense of humour he must have had an enjoyable half-hour glancing through it. Perhaps it will be clear, before I have done, why he should be more than content to let it go without reply. No doubt the author sets a high value on his production. But we cannot take it at his valuation; and if I write of it, it is not because I think he has earned a refutation, but because so many are likely to be taken in by its pretensions, and say that if the book is not answered, it is because no answer is possible. I have only read the chapters dealing with the Sanctuary, and what

I shall have to say will have reference simply to them, though I am quite willing to believe the author's assurance that the validity of the rest of his argument is on a par with his argument on this head. No injustice is done to him by this limitation, for he tells us again and again that Wellhausen's whole position is overturned in these chapters, and it is to these that the puffs he prints at the beginning of his volume refer. Besides, these chapters supply me with much more material than I can use. I have gone twice through them carefully, verifying his references; and if his eulogists had done the same, I expect their testimonials would have been worded somewhat differently.

The author has dignified his work with the title of 'A Reply to Wellhausen.' But in a reply there are some things we have a right to expect. The writer should first of all be conversant with the general subject with which the book deals, and especially he should understand its place in the literature of the movement to which it belongs, and its special relevance to that literature. Then he should be capable of understanding the author whom he is criticising, and when he has understood him, he should be careful not to misrepresent him. And he should give special attention to the strongest points of his opponent's case. Judged by these tests, the book fails completely. I hope to make this good in what follows, and to show that though he blow his trumpet never so loudly, the walls of Jericho obstinately refuse to come down.

It is largely through neglect to attend to the first of these requirements that the discussion is fundamentally wrong. Dr. Baxter may or may not be familiar with critical literature outside the *Prolegomena*. There is nothing except a reference to Kuenen's *Religion of Israel* to show that he is, much to show that he is not,—in fact, to save his veracity, I am obliged to assume that he is not; and if he had been, his polemic would have taken in several cases a very different form. It was, in the first place, a bad blunder to begin with the *Prolegomena* at all. And for this reason, Wellhausen takes so much for granted. Dr. Baxter is continually holding up his statements to scorn as mere statements without a shred of evidence to support them. 'Not a trace' (a phrase he has picked up from Wellhausen, and reiterates in a way that succeeds only in being tiresome instead

of humorous), 'not a trace' of evidence does he supply for this, that, or the other. This is far from being the truth; but so far as it is true, the reason is quite obvious. Wellhausen's contribution is relevant to the state of criticism at the time. There is simply no excuse for Dr. Baxter on this point, for Wellhausen says clearly enough what he takes for granted. Criticism had achieved several definite results, the analysis of the Hexateuch into the four main documents now commonly known as J, E, D, and P, the dating of the Deuteronomic Code in or shortly before the reign of Josiah, and of J and E, including the Book of the Covenant, in the earlier period prior to Josiah. All this is assumed by Wellhausen as common ground, and he never intended to prove any of these points. The main question that he had to discuss was the date of the Priestly Code. His book was not directed against the traditional view at all, but against the prevailing critical view that P was earlier than Deuteronomy. It is to this that Robertson Smith's words in the Preface to the *Prolegomena* refer; and the work was aptly characterised by Kuenen as 'the "crowning fight" in the long campaign.' Dr. Baxter's misapprehensions of Wellhausen's meaning in particular cases may be counted by the score, but his crowning achievement is that he has misunderstood the object of the book itself. And it is not open to him to say that Wellhausen ought to have given detailed proof of the documentary analysis and of the dating of the codes. He gives references to books where the detailed discussion was to be found, and what is more, he refers to papers of his own in which the composition of the Hexateuch is discussed. Now, this criticism cuts away much of Dr. Baxter's reply at one stroke. For example, he quotes a couple of sentences about the identity of Deuteronomy with the book found by Hilkiyah, which I freely grant do not prove this, though they do contain an important argument. He says that this is all advanced critics have to say for themselves on this point, and adds, 'Let the Bible student take special note of the points just emphasized, in view of the axiomatic certainty with which the late date of Deuteronomy is being continually proclaimed to him' (p. 54). Of course, this is quite false, though Dr. Baxter's ignorance of the literature of the subject exonerates him from any intention to mislead. Again, he says that the priority of the small body of laws

generally known as the Law of Holiness (Lev. xvii.-xxvi.) to the Priestly Code is 'mere guess-work,' he offers 'not a trace' of proof for it. No, but he says of Leviticus xvii. that it 'confessedly belongs to a peculiar little collection of laws, which has indeed been taken up into the Priestly Code, but which in many respects disagrees with it' (*Prolegomena*, p. 51). This 'confessedly' ought to have set Dr. Baxter on the right scent, and he might have discovered that if Wellhausen does not give the proof in the *Prolegomena*, it is given elsewhere, and assumed by him as well known. So, too, with reference to the date of the Book of the Covenant, mere guess-work as usual; and as the whole period from Moses to Josiah was on a dead level with respect to place of worship, why should it be fixed to a post-Rehoboam date? (p. 47). From this one would gather that the Book of the Covenant contains no criterion of date except laws as to altars, and that here also criticism had not come to any result. The fact is, that Dr. Baxter has failed to see that Wellhausen builds very largely on results attained by his predecessors and in his own earlier works; and the words in his Preface (p. xi), 'he' (*i.e.* Wellhausen) 'offers to prove his whole case from a critical and independent survey of the records of Scripture,' scarcely state the case as it is.

The same ignorance of the general state of criticism underlies other arguments that he employs. Thus he charges Wellhausen with slipping in evidence from Joshua, though apparently bent on ignoring him, without warrantableness or candour when it suits him. It is a mere reference to the theophany at Gilgal which is related in J E, an early source. Wellhausen would be really inconsistent if he treated the whole of Joshua as on a level. So with Kings. He argues as if the book had been written from end to end by a single author, whereas a critic would distinguish between the work of the compiler and the documents he incorporated. Nor would any historian assume that the narrative of the same author must be on the same level of accuracy throughout. Much would depend on the materials he had at his disposal or the distance at which he stood from the events which he narrates. So with Wellhausen's use of Chronicles. No doubt he rejects much on the ground that the compiler writes from the standpoint of the completed law, and reads the earlier history through it. But where the narrative

is taken over from the earlier books it is frequently valuable as an aid to textual criticism, especially for Samuel. The only passage referred to by Dr. Baxter is 1 Chron. xvii. 5, of which Wellhausen simply says that it correctly interprets the parallel passage in Samuel, and that as simply confirming an argument already complete, though Dr. Baxter strangely misunderstands it, and then calls it *very* wooden. The 'absurd literalisation' (p. 31) applies to the exegesis which he attributes to Wellhausen, and his own interpretation is simply read into the passage. According to it, 'from tent to tent and from *one* tabernacle to *another*,' simply means the same tent which moved from place to place. Another instance is his note on Wellhausen's rejection of 1 Sam. ii. 22b (not the whole verse, as Dr. Baxter says). 'If that one verse stands, Wellhausen's "whole position" is annihilated' (p. 27). This surely overstates the case; but the point to which I wish to call attention is this: He says the verse is 'amply attested by the scholarship of the day.' In other words, the English and American Revisers have not hinted any suspicion of genuineness in the margin. I suppose he has also omitted to read the preface to the Revised Version, though one would have thought that he would have known their practice in matters of textual criticism from the mere study of the version itself. The reader who was dependent on Dr. Baxter would be quite unaware that Wellhausen states that the passage is absent from the LXX, and that the sanctuary at Shiloh in 1 Sam. i.-iii. is elsewhere called *hēkal*. It is paraded as an instance of 'the perilous self-confidence of his science,' and he charges him with suppressing it because it would ruin his case. The best authorities on the textual criticism of Samuel, including Klostermann, treat it as an interpolation.

I will next notice his strictures on the evolutionary character of the history as constructed by Wellhausen. He says, first, that the reform under Josiah is not an instance of evolution since it appears suddenly at that time, whereas we ought to have had a gradual approach to centralisation through the earlier period. And next, the process could not in any case be called evolutionary, because from many sanctuaries to one is a retrograde movement. In the first of these, it must be said that he presents us with a very pinched conception of evolution. The evolution is that of the religion of Israel, and in it the centralisation

of worship is a single step which stands in intimate relation to what goes before and what follows. According to the theory, whether right or wrong, Deuteronomy is the fruit of the work of the prophets of the eighth century, and their work in its turn rests on that of Elijah, who also has his predecessors, and the whole development goes back for its origin, at anyrate to Moses. The reform was as much, probably more practical than due to any theory, the purification of the religion demanded the suppression of the high places. In other words, centralisation was less an end in itself than a means to an end; and if so, we need not wonder if, as Wellhausen thinks, no earlier indications of this kind of reform are to be found. (It may be said that Dr. Baxter's assertion that Wellhausen's theory would be destroyed by the admission of Hezekiah's reform is simply disproved by the fact that Kuenen did not assent to Wellhausen's denial of it.) Wellhausen says (p. 47) that the reformation was accomplished step by step. And this leads to another remark, he forgets that evolution is largely influenced by environment. The whole process of the evolution was directed to the elevation of the people to the more spiritual conceptions of the prophets. How this would work out in practical reform was determined by the actual state of things. The worship at the high places was the most serious hindrance, because of the abuses already denounced by the prophets; and thus the centralisation of the worship was dictated by the environment. Further, we must never forget that evolution does not move in a straight line, it is a very complicated, not at all a simple, process. And in reply to his second criticism this may be said. Viewed from the ideal standpoint, no doubt the restriction of the sanctuary to a single place implies a less spiritual conception. But from the point of view of the actual circumstances the centralisation under Josiah was an advance, just because it worked for the greater purity of the religion. He also charges Wellhausen with inconsistency because he regards the exile as causing a breach of historical continuity, which he says is incompatible with evolution. But clearly this will not stand. The 'breach' essentially consisted in this, that by exile the Jews were forcibly plucked away from all the old associations which had made reform impracticable. The generation that returned had not been rooted in the soil, the local sanctuaries were

not an integral part of its religious life. But what is this but to say that the Jews were torn from their environment? The evolution, certainly, did not stop in the Exile—in other words, the religion and religious life of the people continued to develop.

I come to his failures to understand the author whom he criticises with such superiority. He constantly misses the point of Wellhausen's argument, or he accuses him of self-contradictions which do not exist, or by omission or other garbling of what he says quite misrepresents him, or he criticises a statement in a way which would only be justifiable if Wellhausen were writing from his point of view. I hardly know where to begin, the material is so great. But take the following. He charges Wellhausen with contradicting Jeremiah as to Shiloh, and then with accepting Jeremiah's testimony as to what happened some time earlier in the wilderness (p. 15). But Wellhausen does not quote Jeremiah as a witness for the period of the Exodus, but as testifying that he knew of no Mosaic code of sacrifice. This is required by his argument, which is not to prove that Moses did not promulgate the priestly law, but that this law was later than Deuteronomy, because unknown to Jeremiah. Again, on p. 26, he quotes Wellhausen's words (in proof of the free rewriting of history that prevailed in the post-Exilic period): 'For what reason does Chronicles stand in the Canon at all, if not in order to teach us this?' On this he makes the indignant comment: 'A book stands in the Canon for the express purpose of teaching free and wholesale unverity to be permissible in the service of the God of truth!' But of course he is not speaking of the ethical lesson, but of the lesson as to a matter of fact. On p. 50 we have a choice example. He is referring to Wellhausen's view of the date of the Book of the Covenant. He says: 'His only proof (!) that it did originate, in some undiscovered crevice of these "centuries," is the fact that the *patriarchs* are described as building altars freely anywhere, a thousand years before these "centuries" began.' The case is really this. Wellhausen takes the stories of the patriarchs in J and E not as evidence for the times of the patriarchs, but for the time of their composition; but the date of J and E or the Book of the Covenant are certainly not fixed as Dr. Baxter, with a strange ignorance of the facts, supposes. Again, on p. 52,

he states Wellhausen's argument as to the date of Deuteronomy in this way: '(1) The above law condemns existing usage; (2) *at no period* did existing usage require to be condemned, *except in the days of Josiah*; (3) *therefore* the above law must have been promulgated in Josiah's reign.' This is simply a false representation. He refutes the argument by saying that reform was 'required' at other periods. But Wellhausen says nothing about what was *required*, but that only at this time as a matter of fact was the reforming party in Jerusalem attacking the high places. The 'huge *petitio principii*' is not Wellhausen's at all, 'not a trace' of it is to be found in his book. A still more flagrant case occurs on p. 58. He represents a view of Wellhausen as amounting to this: '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.' As Wellhausen is not an absolute fool, he never said anything of the kind; with Deuteronomy staring him in the face, how could he? His point is this. In Deuteronomy we have a polemical attack on the local sanctuaries, which proves that it belongs to a period when worship was not centralised. In P the centralisation is taken as a matter of course, and there is no polemic, which shows that at the time the local sanctuaries did not exist. What Dr. Baxter should have said is this: When a law is promulgated, and there is no polemical reference to practices contrary to a provision taken for granted as fundamental, it is probable that such practices did not exist at the time. This applies also to his argument, p. 59 (2), the evidence for the state of things is indirect but may be very cogent. All these cases he insists on as important for the overthrow of Wellhausen's main positions. On pp. 54-56 he collects 'a catch of ten interpolations in one sentence' of Wellhausen's. The cases all break down, as usual, under investigation. This may be taken as a sample: Wellhausen says, referring to the author of the Deuteronomic Code: 'When he provides for the priests of the suppressed sanctuaries, recommending the provincials to take them along with them on their sacrificial pilgrimages, and giving them the right to officiate in the temple at Jerusalem just like the hereditarily permanent clergy there.' One of the 'interpolations' (the word is used curiously by Dr. Baxter) runs thus: 'That when he came to *stay permanently* at Jeru-

salem, it was not "the desire of his own soul" that brought him, but the invitation of "provincials" coming on their sacrificial pilgrimages.' But his common sense might have told him that Wellhausen knew his Deuteronomy too well to mix two different things up in that way, and they are kept quite distinct in his sentence. The legislator is represented as doing two things to provide for the priests of the local sanctuaries. He recommends them to the care of the provincials on their sacrificial pilgrimages, and he ordains that they shall have the right to officiate at the temple. He adds: 'In view of the swelling arrogance of the "Higher Criticism," it is well to notice what a daring absurdity it sometimes amounts to, when it is patiently taken to pieces.' How aptly one might retort this bombast on the writer. His pages are studded with wild flowers of rhetoric of the same kind. On pp. 62 ff. he gives us fourteen 'happy samples of contradictoriness.' Needless to say, they turn out for the most part as worthless as all the rest. Thus: (1) Shiloh acquired importance as a centre of worship when Canaan was entered. On the next page, *this* importance did not emerge till towards the close of the period of the Judges. This is a case of garbling by suppression. Wellhausen says that towards the close of the period of the Judges it appears to have acquired an importance *that perhaps extended even beyond the limits of the tribe of Joseph*. The 'importance' is not the same in the two cases. (2) Certain sanctuaries are described as, for long, Jehovah's *favourite* seats of worship; but in another place the Captivity has for its object to teach their heretical character. 'What kind of divine consistency is this?' The question is not of divine consistency, Wellhausen does not state that as a fact these were Jehovah's favourite seats. He means they were popularly so regarded, as he says in the same sentence that the prophets declared them to be an abomination to Him. (3) The temple overtopped all the other shrines in Judah, but Ephraimites left it unvisited. 'Can any ingenuity reconcile these two views of the holy city?' There is nothing to reconcile. Why should the northern Israelites be expected to visit the chief shrine of the southern kingdom? (8) The Jehovistic law will not admit of indifferent and casual localities, but must have immemorially holy places. Yet from the same law Wellhausen also draws the conclusion that people might sacri-

vice where they liked. The former of these is wrongly stated. It is not the law but the narrative of the patriarchs that is in question. *Their* sacrifices are connected with immemorially holy shrines, no law of worship is spoken of. (14) Wellhausen says (p. 22): 'After all, the ruling idea was that which finds its most distinct expression in 2 Kings v. 17—that Palestine as a whole was Jehovah's house, His ground and territory.' Dr. Baxter turns 'the ruling idea' first into 'the highest religious thought of Israel'; and as this does not garble it enough, it is further described, as 'the devout conviction of (say) twenty-five generations of the faithful in Israel.' The idea, of course, was fitly enough expressed by Naaman, for it was one the Israelites held in common with their heathen neighbours.

My materials are far from exhausted, and I may say, as the result of my examination of this part of his book, that it is unsafe to take a single statement of Wellhausen's views on Dr. Baxter's authority without verification. It would not be a great exaggeration, in view of the amazing blunders that he makes, to say that whatever Wellhausen may mean, it is highly probable that it is at least not what Dr. Baxter says he means. And as for the arguments for the critical view, I cannot believe that any one who really understood it would feel

that the work had made any difference to his opinion. I began the book expecting a stimulating discussion of the subject. I put it down feeling that there is nothing to be learned from it. The language he uses about his opponent is comical, when we think of the two books. 'Our infallible critic,' 'self-stultification,' 'domineering dogmatism,' 'pompous neo-history,' 'egregious process,' 'free and easy romancing,' 'his code beats Melchizedek hollow,' 'this incomparable "not a trace" fiasco,' 'ludicrous inconsequence,' 'ridiculous axiom,' 'house of cards,' 'tissue of dissolving inconsistencies,' 'out-Nöldeke's Nöldeke,'—these are some of his choice expressions. After this tiresome examination, let us read once more in our present light two of his testimonials. Long may they retain their enlivening power. The first is from Dr. Story: 'I wish to thank you for your dressing of Wellhausen. You have taken him thoroughly to pieces, and exposed his pretentiousness in a way which would confound anyone but a "Higher Critic." But dogmatic self-satisfaction is the badge of all their tribe.' The second is like it; it is from Dr. Boyd: 'I have enjoyed the bright and incisive way in which you have gone for Wellhausen. As far as I can judge, you have made mince-meat of him.'

Recent Foreign Theology.

Mizraim or Muzri?

THE recent publication of Herr Winckler's *Geschichte Israels*, Teil I., gives us a suitable opportunity of bringing together the various items of information and conjecture on a somewhat important subject which he has propounded in several works during the past few years.¹ It will not be necessary to discuss them exhaustively. The mere statement of his conclusions stimulates thought. One of them is certain to provoke a vigorous opposition. We shall not attempt much more than to indicate the possibility that the

¹ In this paper we shall make use of the following abbreviations:—K. for *Keilinschriftliches Textbuch*, 1892; F. for *Altorientalische Forschungen*, 1893; U. for *Alltestamentliche Untersuchungen*, 1893; G. for *Geschichte Israels*, 1895.

light which he has focused may contribute to the better understanding of some Old Testament passages.

Everyone is aware that the Hebrew name for Egypt is Mizraim (מצרים), or, in a few places, Mázôr (מצור). On the Assyrian monuments it appears in the form *Muzri* or *Muzur*. But on these monuments the same designation is shared by several other countries.² As an Assyriologist Herr Winckler is well aware of these facts, and his suggestion is that in several cases where the original writer of an Old Testament document used the shorter form corresponding to the Assyrian *Muzri* and meant one of these other lands, the Masso-

² Herr Winckler does not hesitate to say 'many lands.' He seems inclined to accept Hommel's interpretation of the word as meaning 'military frontier,' which, if correct, would explain the wide range of its application (F. p. 25, note).